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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide a phenomenological, postmodern description of the induction phase of socialization as experienced by a neophyte principal and a researcher within a rural context. The research involved two actors: one secondary school principal as the co-researcher and myself in the bifurcated role of primary researcher and participant observer in an anticipatory induction mode.

From the perspective of the co-researcher, the central phenomenon explored was: What sensemaking did the neophyte principal develop to enable him to function in the educational organization? With the phenomenological perspective of experiencing the social world through one's own lens, my own sensemaking provided the culminating, over-riding, issue-oriented questions: What sensemaking did I develop in the context of the principal's experiences, and what outcroppings and ideas fascinated me in terms of the principal's experiences?

The raw data were collected from August to December 1997 and were transcribed by the end of January 1998. Within the forty transcribed separate activities were informal interviews as well as verbatim accounts of the neophyte principal's interactions with students, staff, fellow administrators, trustees, and the community in a variety of meetings and situations. After reflecting upon the verbatim transcripts and his own induction experiences, the co-researcher wrote of his own sensemaking perspective.

Using Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological research model, invariant meaning units and essential themes were drawn from the verbatim raw data in the construction of
ABSTRACT - continued

my own sensemaking of the research. Four main themes emerged: image management as a prime induction motivator, the identification of and/or influence of significant others, the identification of and/or influence of significant events, and the neophyte principal as role proactive or reactive.

Three aspects of induction became manifest: first, the co-researcher identified those with whom he came in contact as either positive or negative referents. Second, he assigned or reassigned valency to those referents as he moved through his induction experience. Third, knowledge of the task environment was a substantial factor in how the neophyte principal approached his role.

The study’s conceptual and theoretical frameworks were the culminating feature of this research. The theoretical underpinnings of sensemaking, phenomenology, and postmodernism formed the theoretical framework. The research itself was conceptualized from three lenses or position points: The Context, The Location, and The Sensemaking, each of which were subsumed within the over-arching concept of induction.

This study revealed several items of interest. In terms of sensemaking, it appeared that the principal was proactive in the use of image-building through charisma and consideration of others in his movement from outsider to insider, rather than through use of professional autonomy and task-orientation.

Four points became apparent in the research process: One, the degree of centrality is of importance in each individual’s sensemaking of the phenomena and
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ultimately to sensemaking description. Two, immediacy of reflection of the phenomenena is essential to quality of analysis; that is, immediacy is imperative for optimum reflective sagacity. The quality of analysis is driven by depth of reflection. Three, this type of study is too risky to be undertaken as a graduate student in pursuit of degree designation, in terms of the possibility of co-researcher withdrawal from the study. Four, the possibility of ethical repercussions exists as a result of the sensemaking.

This study filled a gap in the professional socialization literature in educational administration, as it addressed the micro-organization, or the self; in terms of making sense of induction as a neophyte principal and as a researcher in anticipatory set to the principalship. As well, the need for more innovative professional development activities continues to exist, but one must consider personal motivation as integral to all professional development. It is imperative for boards of education, universities, and individual taxpayers to be proactive in demanding more than adequate funding for programs and in granting release time for educators so that true leadership activities might be learned and practised for the betterment of the education system and for society in general.

Lastly, the sensemaking of research participants may be compromised in order to placate professional teacher union ethical requirements. As well, the traditional research progression required by ethical protocol in academe do not appear to address the needs of phenomenological methodological research.
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CHAPTER I: THE PROBLEM

The Introduction

Research and practice in sensemaking needs to begin with a mindset to look for sensemaking, a willingness to use one’s own life as data, and a search for those outcroppings and ideas that fascinate. Part of the craft in working with sensemaking is to begin by immersing oneself in a description [...], and then immediately begin to write or observe or reflect to see what associations occur. Whatever those associations may be, they are a plausible platform to learn more about sensemaking.

(Weick, 1995, p. 191)

Early in the morning of August 19, 1997, I arrived at a small rural town in Saskatchewan with the intent of introducing myself to the young administrator who had recently been appointed to the secondary school principalship. This meeting with Tony signified a concrete step in my doctoral program. I was about to observe, first-hand, how a neophyte administrator made sense of his contextual induction process, of moving from the position of newcomer or "outsider" to one of being an accepted "insider" (Horsman, 1995; Hart, 1993; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) in the town, the surrounding community, and the educational organizations within that school division. Tony had eagerly agreed that I be a part of his learning about the principalship because he believed my research could also further his own sensemaking of those unique induction experiences. Thus, we would both be immersed in the specific description of his life, looking at his experience through different lenses.
The socialization of an individual into a specific context involves the process of induction whereby the individual learns the intricacies of that particular organization and its members. Within traditional literature (Schein, 1971a; Feldman, 1976b, 1981; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), the concept of socialization has been viewed as a static model with a definitive beginning and end, both individually and organizationally. However, in the current transitional and transformational literature (Louis, 1980; Jones, 1983; Nicholson, 1984; Brett, 1984), socialization is viewed as a constantly evolving phenomenon; a continuous learning of oneself, of others, and of the organization. At no point in time can I say that I know all there is to know about the organization, as other individuals continuously impact upon my environment and I constantly change my perception of that environment as others impact upon me and I upon them. The environment itself is in a constant state of flux due to ongoing internal and external individuals, activities, and situations, even as I adapt and evolve. The context itself is not static; it is both hermeneutic and postmodern in its evolution.

Berger and Luckmann (1967) postulated that the social processes which are important to collective sensemaking become more explicit when organizations undergo change or deal with crises or threats (p. 156). To the degree that greater uncertainty is involved in the organizational changeover to a new principal, everyone's awareness becomes engaged and people become more active in their sensemaking. Tony's acceptance of this principalship provided me the opportunity to study the sensemaking involved in his own induction at the same time as it afforded me the opportunity to enrich my own understanding of my own anticipatory socialization to the principalship. The
next section defines the crux of this dissertation; that is, it outlines the perceived need for this study through a discussion of The Problem accompanied by a deliberation of The Specific Purposes of the Study.

The Problem

Writers of research methods books (e.g., Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) advance several needs for conducting scholarly research. First, framing the intended research within the extant traditional and educational administration socialization literature led me to believe that there was limited literature available which dealt with the induction of a principal through the eyes of the inductee. There was a need for this study based on a lack of scholarly literature in this area. As an original dissertation problem (Wolcott, 1994, p. 46), this case study was intended to develop "knowledge" through phenomenological descriptions (van Manen, 1990, 1997; Giorgi, 1985; Schutz, 1967, 1970) of the sensemaking (Weick, 1995) that Tony experienced during his induction to the organization, which simultaneously became a part of my own induction experience. In this manner, besides dialogue and understanding, this qualitative study may, in some small way, fill a perceived void and complement the relatively new area of sensemaking literature.

Second, based on my own anticipatory socialization experiences, I believe this study had the potential to lessen my own apprehension as an outsider anticipating a future principalship role, and in so doing, would strengthen my contribution to the profession as a future administrative practitioner. Through the postmodern lens, we each define our own reality, which is comprised of symbols and meaning. As a detached confrere, I
wanted to ascertain the congruence and the dissonance of our individual sensemaking with regard to socialization. I wanted to know what gave definition to the principalship—how a neophyte principal developed a meaning system which enabled him to function within the educational organization. In turn, through the duality of my own role in this research design, this knowledge was meant to further my own understanding of the principalship.

The Specific Purposes of the Study

"The stated purpose of dissertation research . . . is to shed light on some original and significant problem" (Wolcott. 1994, p. 46). The purpose of this naturalistic case study with postmodern elements was designed to provide a phenomenological description of the induction phase of socialization as experienced by a neophyte principal and a researcher within a rural context. The research involved two actors: Tony, the school principal, as the subject or "co-researcher" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 11); and myself in the dual role of primary researcher and participant observer in an anticipatory induction mode. From the perspective of Tony as co-researcher, the central phenomenon explored was: What sensemaking did the neophyte principal develop to enable him to function in the educational organization?

Following Moustakas's (1994, p. 99) methodological procedures, the following issue-oriented questions were posed to construct an understanding of "the sensemaking of a neophyte principal" as comprehended by the inductee: What were the outcroppings and ideas that fascinated Tony during the induction period? What were the underlying themes and contexts that accounted for his sensemaking of those experiences? The
following *topical-oriented* questions were also posed: What experiences did Tony identify as significant, as a neophyte principal? What did he *not* address?

With the phenomenological perspective of experiencing the social world through one's own lens, the sensemaking of the *researcher* became the culminating, over-riding, issue-oriented questions: **What sensemaking did I develop in the context of Tony's experiences, and what outcroppings and ideas fascinated me in terms of Tony's experiences?**

The focus of this study was derived from a meaning context. The meanings that Tony derived from the *induction* experiences are recorded in Chapter V, while the meanings that I derived from Tony's experiences are examined in Chapters VI and VII. Given the specific purposes of this study, the *Background to the Problem* identifies the lenses through which I viewed the research questions.

**Background to the Problem**

Prior to Tony's appointment as principal, staff members working within the school setting had already attributed meaning to their constantly evolving social world within the organization. Individuals may have had overt or covert, innocent or devious agendas in aligning themselves with Tony in the early encounter phase of his induction to the school itself. In dialogue with Tony, these staff members brought their own "outcroppings or ideas that fascinated", to his attention. In turn, Tony selected certain symbolic or behavioural cues which interested *him* from the interests surfaced by those staff members (Weick, 1995, p. 191; Bandura, 1986, p. 29).
Tony may have presented cues which displayed elements of organizational socialization in terms of learning to function within the school site through positional power, or professional socialization cues in terms of personal power in commitment and identification with the larger profession (Etzioni, 1975). The cues may have displayed the lower order professional socialization stages of survival, control and stability rather than the higher order stages of educational leadership and professional actualization (Van Maanen, 1977, p.15), and may have restricted the actions of others or openly facilitated learning and growth for all (French & Raven, 1959, p. 165).

In order to more readily comprehend the direction of this dissertation, I ascertained that the study would be situated through three lenses: through the Sensemaking of the two actors, through the Contextual lens, and through the Location lens. A cursory description of each of these three lenses will assist in understanding occasional references to these lenses in Chapters I through VII.

First, The Sensemaking Lens provides an overview of sensemaking through phenomenological and postmodern underpinnings. Second, The Contextual Lens provides interpretation of the behaviour of individuals in organizations. Third, The Location Lens situates the actors within the study context.

The Sensemaking Lens

The sensemaking lens focuses on how the individual makes sense of his/her role within the organization; that is, the focus was on how Tony and I each made sense of his induction to the principalship within the social context. The lens views sensemaking from the seven properties of sensemaking (Weick, 1995) and from the importance of the
individual (Wallas, 1926). The particular context of this study identified the individual as a newcomer to the organization (Schein, 1971a; Feldman, 1976b, 1981; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), with evidence of newcomer sensemaking found in all forms of culture as text (Trice & Beyer, 1993), with particular emphasis on dialogue and the meaning attributed to that dialogue.

The philosophical underpinnings of the sensemaking were derived from the theories of phenomenology (Heidegger, 1962, 1977; Husserl, 1964; Schutz, 1967, 1970) and postmodernism (Lyotard, 1984). The selection of a phenomenological underpinning focused on the study of experiences and ways in which Tony as co-researcher and myself as primary researcher wove the social phenomena of induction experiences together to develop our own unique world views. There was an assumption that the important reality was what each of us perceived it to be, that there was structure and essence to shared experiences which could be determined (Kvale, 1996, p. 52; Patton, 1990, p. 70).

The selection of a postmodern underpinning to the study focused on the acceptance of multiple voices and multiple meanings, and on the use of signs and symbols as a major source of social construction, with language serving to shape reality. Every experience becomes a form of text (Beyer & Liston, 1992, p. 379), with particular focus on words and dialogue in the organization, with meaning to be uncovered by each of us:

Sensemaking is about the world. And what is being asserted about that world is found in the labels and categories implied by frames. These words express and interpret. These words include and exclude. These words matter. (Weick, 1995, p. 132)
This study viewed sensemaking specifically through the location lens of the organization, while the contextual lens focussed on Tony and myself acting within the organization. Sensemaking in organizational life is distinct "because the job itself is taken much more for granted than the organizational life" (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1992, p. 212, as cited in Weick, 1995, p. 64); because organizations challenge everything and ask for explanations of everything; because socialization is shallower, more transient, and more easily upended by nonconformists and less controlled by seasoned veterans; and because social competence tends to be office specific, local, narrowly defined, and nonpredictive of what will pass as competence elsewhere within the organization (p. 121).

Weick (1995) described seven properties of sensemaking: that it is grounded in identity construction, it is retrospective, enactive of sensible environments, is social, outgoing, focused on and by extracted cues, and driven by plausibility rather than accuracy (p. 17). The statement, "How can I know what I think till I see what I say?" (Wallas, 1926, p. 106) is central in organizational sensemaking as it retains several elements of dissonance theory; namely, justification, choice, retrospective sensemaking, discrepancies, social construction of justification, and action as the occasion for sensemaking. The act of interpreting implies that some form of text is already in existence, waiting to be discovered. Sensemaking, however, is more about invention and less about discovery. "To engage in sensemaking is to construct, filter, frame, create facticity, and render the subjective into something more tangible" (Weick, 1995, p. 14). Although texts and language games are metaphors for interpretation, sensemaking is not a metaphor. It is making something sensible; it is to be understood literally.
"Sensemaking is literally just what it says it is" (p. 16).

The theoretical underpinnings of phenomenology and postmodernism contain the premise that reality is subjective; that our sensemaking, and ultimately, our learning, is defined through all manner of text and through our social interaction with others.

**The Phenomenological Underpinnings**

As I defined *The Sensemaking* lens as having a phenomenological theoretical underpinning, I also accepted the philosophy's ontological premises. Epistemologically, phenomenological philosophy holds that reality is the manner in which Tony and I each made sense of the induction process.

A phenomenological view holds that the meaning I attribute to my personal and professional life is dependent upon the process of "returning back to oneself", of looking at experiences that have already occurred; it is the "reflexive" process whereby I attach meaning to actions through retrospection (Moustakas, 1994; Weick, 1995). As individuals, we have the ability to notice, to scan the environment, and to select cues which pique our interest. This individualistic selection of cues invites the postmodern view that there are multiple interpretations for every phenomenon. Tony and I were not printed templates of each other, but rather, individuals who viewed the critical incident of socialization to the principalship through unique lenses. Mills (1959) pointed out that the most admirable thinkers within a scholarly community do not split their work from their lives. They seem to take both too seriously to allow dissociation, and want to use each for the enrichment of the other (p. 195), thus recognizing the commensurability of multiple realities.
Schutz (1967) believed that only signitive perceptions enable us to understand the experience of another; that they bear directly on our own experiences; that we apprehend the lived experiences of another only through our signitive-symbolic representations:

... whenever I have an experience of you, this is still my own experience. However, this experience, while uniquely my own, still has, as its signitively grasped intentional object, a lived experience of yours which you are having at this very moment. In order to observe a lived experience of my own, I must attend to it reflectively. By no means, however, need I attend reflectively to my lived experience of you in order to observe your lived experience. On the contrary, by merely "looking" I can grasp even those of your lived experiences which you have not yet noticed and which are for you still prephenomenal and undifferentiated. This means that, whereas I can observe my own lived experiences only after they are over and done with, I can observe yours as they actually take place. This in turn implies that you and I are in a specific sense "simultaneous," that we "coexist," that our respective streams of consciousness intersect. (Schutz, 1967, p.102)

I had greeted Tony with a mindset ready to look for sensemaking, to search for "those outcroppings and ideas that fascinate", more than willing to use my "own life as data" (Weick, 1995, p. 191). Events and actions were about to unfold throughout the course of the research to which I would not be able to attribute meaning or sense while I was in the process of experiencing those events. I would live the experiences, and only when I had time and opportunity to reflect on them later in the day or the month or the year would I be able to make sense of what took place during that first day and all the other days that followed.

Thus, it appeared that the phenomenological underpinning was an appropriate lens for Tony to view his own induction experiences; further, it made possible the opportunity for me to view my own anticipatory socialization to the principalship through
phenomenological and postmodern underpinnings.

The Postmodern Underpinnings

Since I had defined The Sensemaking lens as having a postmodern theoretical underpinning, I also accepted the philosophy’s ontological premise of multiple realities. The research was contextually defined with primary focus given to text, particularly dialogue. The focus attended to two actors, Tony and myself, as we each experienced the critical incident of induction through different lenses. Thus, the postmodern underpinnings were recognized as a relevant approach to the research.

In order for me to understand social phenomena from my own perspective as well as to attempt to understand Tony’s perspective implies that I have developed my own meaning system. The manner in which I wove my experiences together created my particular world view, my own understanding of the motives and beliefs behind specific actions: it was an ever-evolving view of my own reality. Socialization is a constant state of flux whereby we all learn and continue to learn; it is a fluid process. It involves Follett’s (1924) notion of "circular response"; the reciprocal creation of each other through social interaction (Armstrong, 1998, p. 38). Naturalistic inquiry views the real world as such a dynamic system that all of the parts are so interrelated that one facet inevitably influences the other facets.

Postmodernism is contextually defined; that is, the study is contextually-bound and structured for the immediate situation (Ritzer, 1992, p. 632-636). Tony’s behaviour had to be studied in situ, "in all the rich confusion of [its] daily existence" (Owens. 1982, p. 6) in order to be understood. The naturalistic approach to educational administrative
inquiry is based on a phenomenological orientation to epistemological issues (p. 18).

Essentially,

one cannot understand human behavior without understanding the framework within which the individuals under study interpret their environment, and that this, in turn, can best be understood through understanding their thoughts, feelings, values, perceptions, and their actions. (Owens, 1982, p. 5)

The postmodern underpinnings recognize being "outside" mainstream research literature: the underpinnings encourage us to become aware of our own sensemaking processes in a substantially different way from other philosophical approaches through favouring localized narratives or accounts of reality (Greene, 1994, p. 448). The use of signs and symbols as text are major sources of social construction and language serves to shape reality (Mitchell, Sackney, & Walker, 1996, p. 51).

As a naturalistic researcher in postmodern fashion, I regarded all manner of texts--gestures, language, and behavioral patterns--as significant descriptive data. The approach yielded a "thick description" (Stake, 1997; Geertz, 1975) designed to transport the reader into the situation with a sense of insight, understanding, and illumination of the facts and events of the case. It was meant to shed some light on the texture, quality, and power of the context (Owens, 1982, p. 8).

The primacy of conversation is strongly recognized within postmodernism. within Gadamer’s (1975) hermeneutical analyses of the conversation, and within Habermas’s (1970) discourse philosophy. In the postmodern approach, language constitutes reality and each communication constructs reality in its own way. The focus on language shifts attention away from the notion of an objective reality, away from the individual subject.
There is no unique self who uses language to describe an objective world; language structures speak through the individual. Language is both the tool of interviewing and the object of textual interpretation (Kvale, 1996, p. 43). Postmodernists recognize texts as the only source of meaning. Every experience, then, becomes some sort of text, its meaning uncovered through the play of signifier and signified... different forms of language can result in different understandings, and may even disclose features of our world previously hidden. (Beyer & Liston, 1992, p. 379)

Phenomenological psychologist and philosopher Merleau-Ponty (1962), whose work has been regarded as a precursor to postmodern thought, emphasized the interrelational nature of knowledge and quoted from Saint Exupery's (1982) *The Little Prince*, "Man is but a network of relations" (*sic* as cited in Kvale. 1996, p. 45 but not found in the original). Knowledge is interwoven in network webs; learning is contextual and organizationally specific.

Socialization is a continuous process wherein there is a shift from the individual to relationships between individuals. When others exerted influence on Tony as a neophyte principal in order to assure that his socialization would occur in a desired manner, the interaction process became important. Our individual sensemaking of the critical incident of induction has a place in postmodern research, as "[t]here must be spaces for life stories to be articulated and listened to, whether or not those stories live up to the narrative standards prized in the West" (Greene, 1994, p. 448). In summary, then, the sensemaking lens accepted both ontologically and epistemologically, the theoretical underpinnings of postmodernism as well as the philosophy of phenomenology.
The Contextual Lens

To provide an understanding of the behaviour of individuals in organizations, a view of socialization within the organizational context was presented through *The Contextual Lens*. The focus of this lens was on organizational socialization, with particular emphasis on the newcomer’s induction phase into the organization. As such, the contextual lens took on a colloquial sense, as it was limited to the profession of educational administration within a Grade Seven to Twelve educational organization within the rural context.

In his critical appraisal of the accepted paradigm in educational administration used to interpret the behaviour of individuals in organizations, Griffiths (1977) argued for a new theoretical perspective:

The concept of role as the set of expectations held for a position has little value in today’s complex organizations. We would be better off if we described behaviours and perceptions and dropped the role spectacles. In calling for dropping abstraction in describing the behavior of people in organizations I believe the phenomenologist to be correct. (Griffiths, 1977, p. 7)

The perspective of early socialization theory (Schein, 1971, 1978; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) emphasized organizational entry and, similar to role theory, focused on expectations. Organizational socialization theory tended to be theoretically based on phenomenological and symbolic interactionist assumptions, in contrast to natural systems’ modelling. Thus, role learning through this lens has been held to be an emergent, recurrent process of appreciating skills, cultural norms, values, and expected behaviours in order to assume a position role (Macpherson, 1984b, p. 61)
such as the principal of an educational organization.

Macpherson (1984b) questioned this managerial focus with its presupposition that rational newcomers enter unfamiliar settings with conscious, sophisticated expectations (p. 61). Other reviewers (Mobley & Meqline, 1973; Mowday, 1979; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979, as cited in Macpherson, 1984b, p. 73) implied the need for a more complex consideration of entry, particularly for an approach which was process-oriented and which dealt with "departure from" as well as "entering into" the organization (p. 61).

Hierarchical, geographic, functional, and product differentiations affect the ways individuals interpret events. Individuals at the pinnacle of organizational hierarchies tend to have expertise related to older, more stable tasks; they are likely to interpret events in terms of those tasks, favour strategies and personnel assignments which will keep those tasks central (Starbuck, 1983). Senior organizational members tend to have simpler perceptual frameworks than subordinates for several reasons. One, they must span several domains of expertise, each of which is complex to specialists (Schroder, Driver and Streufert, 1967, as cited in Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 47). Two, top executives receive a plethora of information from multiple sources, so they experience overload (Ackoff, 1967, p. B147; Hedberg, 1981, p. 22). Three, top organizational people receive a lot of information through intermediaries who filter the information (Starbuck, 1985, p. 366). Four, senior organizational member spokesperson roles force top executives to put relationships and ideas into simply expressed terms (Axelrod, 1976, p. 248; Hart, 1977, p. 117). Repeated successes cause individuals to see themselves as having a strong influence on events, whereas repeated failures may lead individuals to view themselves as
having little influence over events and to blame failures on external causes (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 54).

In review and summary, then, *The Sensemaking Lens* provided a focus on sensemaking through phenomenological and postmodern theoretical underpinnings, and *The Contextual Lens* provided a focus on the interpretation of the behaviour of individuals in organizations. *The Location Lens* situates the actors within the research context.

**The Location Lens**

The terms *insider* and *outsider* have postmodern, multiple meanings within this research; an attempt to assign meaning to these terms is to edify *The Contextual Lens*. With myself as primary researcher and Tony as co-researcher, we displayed uniqueness and commonality in terms of this study as well as within the induction experience. We each were both insider or outsider, dependent upon the context of the situation. How we chose to situate ourselves as insider or outsider involved *The Location Lens*.

The location lens determined how each of us reflected on the incident: we were either located as an insider or outsider to the *geographic community*, to the *educational organization* of the school itself, or to the *profession* of educational administration. During the course of phenomenological reflection in this study, other locations were uncovered as both the primary researcher and co-researcher reflected upon the text.

In the constant interchange from insider to outsider lenses and vice-versa, Tony and I found ourselves in a constant state of flux within multiple realities. This dynamic reflected the postmodern theoretical underpinnings of the research. Since the actors viewed the organization from a sensemaking lens with phenomenological and postmodern
underpinnings, and from insider or outsider locations, The Location Lens was identified by constant flux; it was, in effect, a shifting lens.

I situated myself as an actor in this study in two ways. First, I was the principal researcher who lived outside the geographic boundaries of the community in which Tony resided. This identified me as an actor outside of the context, both in terms of being a researcher and in terms of geography. Second, however, I situated myself as an individual in anticipatory socialization set with a view towards procuring a principalship in the future, so I was an outsider to the profession of educational administration. However, I was also an insider in that this was a phenomenological study, and my own anticipatory socialization made me a participant observer within my own research study as I viewed Tony’s induction experiences and applied his situation to my own anticipatory socialization knowledge.

I situated Tony as an actor in two ways. First, Tony was an outsider in terms of being a newcomer to the profession of educational administration, and in moving into the geographic community from another area of the province. Second, I situated him as the insider in that he was the principal actor in the socialization experience as viewed from my academic research perspective. As such, he was located as the insider to the story, and I was located as the outsider who vicariously viewed his lived induction experience.

Within the geographic community context, the study took place within a largely agrarian. rural Saskatchewan community, situated beside a major highway. This community was large enough to have two schools within its purview, an elementary school housing Kindergarten to Grade Six students, as well as the Grade Seven to Twelve
school of which Tony was principal. The school division board office was located within
the town, directly across the street from Tony’s place of residence. In terms of my own
geographic location, I was situated in a university city and drove out to the field research
site to carry out the research, which contributed to the "outsider" status.

Within the educational organization context, Tony was a young neophyte principal
with six years of classroom experience, all within one rural Saskatchewan Kindergarten to
Grade Twelve school, with a student population of approximately one hundred and ten
students. I am a seasoned classroom teacher with organizational experiences spanning two
provinces as well as international teaching experience. I have worked in schools with
student populations ranging from twelve hundred students to three hundred fifty students,
in urban and rural contexts. My teaching experiences encompass the public school
system, post-secondary adult education, and the university setting, as well as experience as
an educational consultant. Our experiences differed considerably and will be explored in
more detail in the Chapter III subsection, The Research Participants.

Within the profession of educational administration, neither Tony nor I had held a
principalship position prior to this research, so we were both experiencing the
administrative world for the first time. As the neophyte administrator, Tony’s
sensemaking was as an insider, embedded within organizational performance and in his
ability to survive the daily demands of his new and varied environments. Tony was
constantly "under the gun". On the other hand, as the primary researcher who viewed the
principalship through the anticipatory socialization lens, I was not accountable to the
various stakeholders as was Tony; I could afford an outsider, more detached view. I was
in the position of being able to make sense of the process of socialization itself; the
research also afforded me the opportunity to enrich my own anticipatory socialization.
Tony was the actor as co-researcher, whereas I played a bifurcated role as primary
researcher and participant observer. Through observing segments of his administrative,
community, and family induction experiences, I was afforded the position from which to
observe, reflect, and write about sensemaking. Those associations of the neophyte
principal’s experiences became "the plausible platform to learn more about sensemaking"
(Weick, 1995, p. 191).

In summary, The Sensemaking Lens allowed me to view the induction experience
through phenomenological and postmodern underpinnings. The study was viewed
through The Contextual Lens in colloquial terms of the organization itself, and The
Location Lens allowed the actors to view various experiences through insider and
outsider lenses in various situations, through dialogue as text. Since the purpose of this
study was to view the induction experience from both Tony’s and my viewpoints, the
location lens provided a means from which to view the whole research. These three
lenses provided me the "plausible platform" from which to situate the Significance of the
Study to the research community.

Significance of the Study

Within phenomenological research, it is important to state the relevance of the
topic, the anticipated contribution to the profession to emerge from study of the topic, and
the knowledge to be gained by the researcher (Creswell, 1998, p. 176). The following
were primary considerations which gave significance to this study.
1. At the *macro level*, this study has the potential to *contribute to the socialization literature through the phenomenological research lens*. While induction processes have traditionally been viewed through role theory (Biddle, 1979; Biddle & Thomas, 1986), reference group theory (Merton, 1957; Shibutani, 1955, 1961), exchange theory (Chadwick-Jones, 1976), and social learning theory (Rotter, 1982), there appeared to be a general absence of research data pertaining to the *sensemaking* of induction as viewed through the reflections of the *inductee*. This study used phenomenological research methodology (Moustakas, 1994) to observe, collect, organize, analyze, and synthesize data of the sensemaking undertaken by one actor directly involved in the early encounter phase of induction. As such, the study may fill the gap between "other"-directed and participant-centered or *phenomenological* socialization views.

2. At the *professional* level, this study has the potential to advance the literature available in *educational administration*. Within a phenomenological perspective, this study can heighten awareness of the sensemaking of the induction process through the phenomenological lens of two actors: of the principal as principal actor and of the researcher as actor in the bifurcated role as researcher and participant observer in an anticipatory socialization mode.

Within an educational administration perspective, this study of sensemaking and induction might allow senior educational administrators to view socialization practices through the reflections of the newcomers. Reflection upon the neophyte administrator’s concerns might cause experienced organizational members to adjust their current formal and informal induction practices to more adequately address surfaced concerns.
3. At the *micro or personal level* as an educational practitioner in the classroom, this study afforded me the opportunity to learn first-hand about hitherto unaccessible facets of the principalship; it provided valuable insight into the role to which I aspire. As such, the findings of this study may be of interest both to researchers and academics within the Academy as well as to other individuals who find themselves situated as classroom practitioners and who also aspire toward educational administration roles.

4. At the *theoretical level*, this study has the potential to advance the relatively new *sensemaking* (e.g., Ring & Rands, 1989; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Thomas, Clark, & Gioia, 1993; Weick, 1995) literature through individual case study as well as within the specific profession of educational administration.

To summarize, the following contributed toward making this study significant: This study provided an alternative (*phenomenological*) view to the plethora of educational administrative socialization literature. It also has the potential to advance the *sensemaking* literature in educational administration. In turn, this research might further stimulate reflective thought and subsequent action on formal and informal mentorship practices. Finally, this study afforded two individuals the opportunity to reflect on the sensemaking of the induction process in a thoughtful, meaningful manner that might not have otherwise occurred.

**Parameters of the Study**

The parameters of the study are encompassed only by my assumptions, and not by limitations or delimitations which would inhibit the very nature of the phenomenological research methodology. Assumptions are necessary to provide direction for the terms
used, for the scope of the study, and for the potential audience (Creswell, 1994, p. 105).

The phenomenological methodology analysis necessitated that I state my assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation, that I suspend or bracket these preconceptions in order to fully understand the reflections of both Tony and myself, and that I not impose an *a priori* hypothesis on the experience (Creswell, 1998, p. 277).

By applying the *sensemaking* approach, the following assumptions were made in this study:

1. The important reality is what each of us perceives it to be, that there is structure and essence to shared experiences which can be determined (Kvale, 1996, p. 52; Patton, 1990, p. 70).

2. The operant process is sensemaking. This process includes *noticing*, which is perhaps at least as important as *sensemaking* (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 45). As each is dependent upon the other, a distinction between the two has theoretical value (p. 60). It was assumed that noticing and scanning were fundamental to sensemaking endeavours.

3. It was assumed that the following grounded interpretive assumptions developed by Porac, Thomas, and Baden-Fuller (1989) were appropriate for this study:

   (a) activities and structures of organizations are determined in part by micro-momentary actions of their members;

   (b) action is based on a sequence in which "individuals attend to cues in the environment, interpret the meaning of such cues, and then externalize these interpretations via concrete activities"; and
(c) meaning is created when cues are linked with "well-learned and/or developing cognitive structures".

(d) the process of sensemaking is intended to include the construction and bracketing of the text-like cues that are interpreted, as well as the revision of those interpretations based on action and its consequences; it is about discovery, interpretation, creation, and authoring (p. 8).

4. It was assumed that both Tony and I had a taken-for-granted definition of the situation and that, in some process of attribution, our perspectives contributed meaning to that which was experienced or perceived (Macpherson, 1984b, p. 62).

By adopting the phenomenological approach and the highly structured method advocated by Moustakas (1994), the following assumptions were made:

5. The processes of epoche, reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of meanings and essences (Moustakas, 1994, p. 180) provided an appropriate procedure for analysis and organization of the study (Creswell, 1998, p. 175).

6. It was assumed that the exploratory case study using the narrative approach (Stake, 1994; Merriam, 1988) was appropriate for this study.

7. Individuals can verbalize their interpretations and the processes they use to generate them (Porac, Thomas, & Baden-Fuller, 1989, p. 8).

8. It was assumed that sensemaking data obtained from the verbatim raw data were valid. It was also assumed that the conceptual framework was appropriate to accommodate the realities of the context under scrutiny.
9. It was assumed that insights into the nature of sensemaking would be attained by directly soliciting the sensemaking efforts of the principal.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of sensemaking within this dissertation, the following Saskatchewan and/or local educational organizational terms are defined.

**Administrators’ Group** - membership consists of all principals within the school division and the Director of Education.

**Board of Education** - "The Board" is a corporation with powers conferred upon it by the Minister of Education and is responsible to administer and manage the educational affairs of the school division in accordance with *The Education Act, 1995* [S. 85 (1) & (2), p. 49].

**Director of Education** - the Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Education and leader of the Administrators’ Group.

**Board of Trustees** - the "Local Board" is a group of individuals elected within the attendance area of each municipality of the school division to advise the Board of Education with respect to any district or division matters of educational interest. The principal is responsible to make a report of school activities directly to the Local Board: such meetings are usually held on a monthly basis throughout the school year.

**Principal** - the individual who is held responsible for the general organization, administration, and supervision of the school, its program and professional staff and for administrative functions that pertain to liaison between the school and the Board and its officials.
Saskatchewan Education - a governmental body commonly referred to as "SaskEd" or "The Department"; represented through the provincial Minister of Education.

School Council - a school-based structure for parent and community involvement within individual schools. A recently released public discussion paper outlined SaskEd's vision for increased parental and community involvement in Saskatchewan schools to determine what structures and rules were considered important for such a council, and asked for public feedback of the document (Saskatchewan Education, 1997).

School District - consists of any geographic portion of a school division outside of a city, with attendance of each operating school or of operating schools located in the same municipality [The Education Act. 1995, S. 120 (1) - (4), p. 77].

Staff - consists of the principal, teachers, teaching and supervisory assistants, consultants, teacher aides, and support staff within each school.

About the Researcher

As this dissertation was undertaken with a phenomenological lens, its methodological structure demanded a corresponding phenomenological approach. Creswell (1998) suggested that phenomenological methodological structure place "an autobiographical statement about experiences of the author leading to the topic, incidents, [and] that lead to a puzzlement or curiosity about the topic" (p. 176).

This personal reflexivity (Usher, 1996) refers to my own identity as an individual, and holds expressions of personal interests and values (p. 36). Derived from my personal concerns and in adherence to phenomenological method, I provide the following narrative
as the reflection which brought me to this dissertation topic. Although I was acutely
interested in the principalship, it was difficult to arrive at a more narrow topic and
question that had both personal significance and social meaning, two tenets of
phenomenological research:

The question grows out of an intense interest in a particular problem or
topic. The researcher’s excitement and curiosity inspire the search.
Personal history brings the core of the problem into focus. As the fullness
of the topic emerges, strands and tangents of it may complicate an
articulation of a manageable and specific question. Yet this process of
permitting aspects of the topic to enter into awareness is essential in the
formulation of a core question that will remain viable and alive throughout
the investigation. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 104)

I found myself asking some rhetorical questions: At what point did my own process of
socialization or induction commence? Upon reflection, is there truly a starting point to
induction? And finally, although the literature review would articulate some viewpoints
with regard to these rhetorical questions, I debated whether there would ever be a
particular point in time where one could reflect upon the induction phase of socialization
as a past-tense experience and say, "I have been completely inducted".

I need to go back in order to garner your understanding of where I was situated as
a researcher. Being ambitious, my dream of working on a doctorate evolved while I was
still in secondary school, but I dared not share the thought for fear it was beyond my
grasp. Through the support of family and the influence of a female mentor who was both
an educator and family friend, I decided to become a teacher. Over the years, I enjoyed
the teaching experience but always felt confined by the four walls of the classroom; I
sought many varied educational experiences in order to quell the caged feeling within. A
way for me to satiate that feeling of restlessness has always been to reach out, to look
higher and beyond, to try to make sense of the experiences of others, and so add to my
ongoing socialization within the educational organization. Living vicariously through the
educational experiences of my husband, who had been a principal, a superintendent, and
director of education, and in a way, mentored by him, my covert interest in educational
administration had been truly unleashed.

It is difficult for me to define a point in time when this research actually started.
In retrospect, it seems that there were many milestones which influenced me and have
prepared me for this specific study, though I consciously started to think about a research
topic only in the fall of 1995. The question grew out of an intense desire to excel within
the area of educational administration, with particular interest in the principalship for
reasons of more autonomy, status, money, and power. As a woman, "power" is defined
in terms of my desire for personal growth, expressions of creativity, and a broader range
of influence in which to allow the empowerment of others; it is a fulfilment of self-
interests. A final reason was given to me by my dissertation advisor, who so aptly
observed in his succinct, wonderfully down-to-earth fashion: "You are a perfectionist!
You have a fear of failure! You want to do your principalship before the principalship!"

The focus of this study went through a metamorphosis, and hence the postmodern
turn within the conceptual framework. It started out with my anticipatory socialization
desire to learn more about "the principalship". The task, although I did not recognize it
while in the midst of locating a study subject, was to find an individual who would be a
willing co-researcher. I was most interested in the meanings of the experiences for
myself first, then I turned outward and established the "intersubjective validity" by testing my understandings with Tony (Moustakas, 1994, p. 57; Creswell, 1998, p. 224).

It is only now, after having been in the field, that I make sense (Weick, 1995) of one small part of this research, the essence of the study. The phenomenological approach made me see what was otherwise concealed, it took "the hidden out of its hiding", it detected it as "unhidden"—that is, as truth (Spiegelberg, 1982, as cited in Cohen & Omery, 1994, p. 141). The study had elements of postmodernism in it in that every experience was a text, with meaning uncovered by both Tony and myself. We each had different understandings, and the language we each used disclosed "features of our world previously hidden" (Beyer & Liston, 1992, p. 379).

Initially, I had intended the study to be an ethnographic description of the induction phase of socialization, which focussed attention towards Tony as the neophyte principal. The research topic transformation was subtle, but ever-evolving. Only after I had been immersed in the situation (Weick, 1995) did the purpose of the study become clear. As I observed Tony’s experiences, conversed with him about the day-to-day realities of his life, came to know his family, and became part of his administrative existence through interaction with other individuals, I recognized that I had been reflecting on Tony’s experiences through the lenses of my own reality. I was unconsciously adjusting Tony’s situation to my own anticipatory set towards the principalship. The ideas that captivated me triggered an even stronger force than that of "researcher"; I had become an "actor" or participant observer in the study through my own anticipatory set to the principalship.
How Tony viewed his induction experience was similar and yet dissimilar from my own observation of the critical event. How was I to make sense of this? As I became immersed in the situation, it became clear that this was not an a priori study: it was evolutionary in nature. The phenomenological aspect of reflexivity allowed me to deepen the research to encompass the concept of making sense. Ultimately, sensemaking (Weick, 1995) became the foundation of this study and proved to be the cornerstone upon which to study the induction phase of socialization to the principalship primarily for myself, and secondarily for Tony.

Organization of the Dissertation

Embedded throughout this dissertation is my own voice as researcher, using a "narrative" approach. Using phenomenological research methods (Creswell, 1998, p. 176; Moustakas, 1994, p. 180), an Introduction and statement of The Problem is presented in Chapter I, along with the knowledge to be gained by myself as researcher in terms of Background to the Problem. Research relevance was provided by identifying the anticipated contribution to the profession through Significance of the Study. The Parameters of the Study are identified through specific Assumptions and Definition of Terms used within the study. Lastly, the chapter provides an autobiographical statement About the Researcher, which outlines incidents which lead to my curiosity and my experiences leading to the research.

in Educational Administration. The chapter culminates in a Summary of Core Findings and in statements as to how the present research differs from prior research in order to establish the Original Nature of the Study.

Chapter III addresses the Research Design and Methodology through five sections: the Research Design, Research Methodology, Research Participants, Verification of the Data, and Ethical Principles. It identifies the phenomenological model (Moustakas, 1994) as the methodological foundation of the study. The methodological approach addresses data collection, data analysis, synthesis of data, horizontalization and meaning units. It addresses cluster themes, textural and structural descriptions, and advocates a synthesis of meanings and essences of the experience.

Chapter IV provides the opportunity for me to immerse myself in a grounded sense of The Sensemaking Context; that is, to bring the phenomenon alive by assigning a human "face" or element to the observed events. This chapter provides focus to the 908 pages of thick verbatim data description; that is, I identify of some of the content which attracted me within the forty data collection activities observed throughout this research. The extracted cues will provide an overall sense of context for the ensuing sensemaking chapters.

Chapter V presents the Sensemaking of the Co-Researcher. It provides the forum to display Tony's reflections of his own induction experiences through the events that both Tony and I experienced, and through a series of Topical-Guided Interviews.

Chapter VI is the antithesis of Chapter V as it is the Sensemaking of the Researcher, as opposed to the co-researcher's sensemaking as presented in Chapter V. Following a reflective narrative format regarding the Conduct of the Research, the
Phenomenological Model as outlined by Moustakas (1994) is used to identify the Emergent Themes of the dissertation.

Chapter VII continues with my sensemaking, this time through the lens of myself as primary researcher and participant observer, as I present a Perceptual Framework and a Conceptual and Theoretical Framework for this research. It became clear that only after I had experienced the critical incident and had collected the raw data, would I be able to reflect upon the experiences in order make sense of the cues that intrigued me, in phenomenological fashion. Thus, the frameworks were not developed a priori as is prevalent in most research studies, but with phenomenological reflexivity. This chapter also provides a Summary of the Study, my Reflections on the Research Process required for this dissertation, Recommendations for Further Study, the Identification of Personal and Professional Outcomes, the identification of Future Directions and Goals of the Researcher, and closure which speaks of The Essence of the Study and Its Inspiration to me.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Also known as "the inevitable and usually tedious chapter".
(Wolcott, 1994, p. 57)

Introduction

The literature in a research study is meant to describe studies about the problem to date; to position the study to the larger, ongoing dialogue in the literature in order to "fill in the gaps"; and to provide a framework for establishing the importance of the study (Creswell, 1998, p. 95; 1994, p. 20). The following Research Map (p. 33) of extant literature provides a useful visual to depict areas related to the topic being researched as well as to identify where this study fits into the larger literature scenario [refer to Figure 1].

The philosophical implications of the mode of understanding in qualitative narratives appears to have received little attention in research literature. As indicated on the Research Map, an attempt is made to address this perceived literature gap by grounding the study to Phenomenological, Postmodern, and Sensemaking theoretical underpinnings and to Professional Socialization Literature in Educational Administration.

As this research is postmodern in its perspective, the Integrative Socialization Literature which was reviewed prior to writing the dissertation did not directly influence my study, nor did it set out the framework for the dissertation. However, as it elevated my own knowledge level and subsequently intrinsically enriched my own sensemaking
Figure 1: Research Map of the Literature
within this research, it is included in Appendix M. In true phenomenological methodological fashion, the background literature to my sensemaking was bracketed for research purposes.

My own research is situated at the end of the Research Map in an attempt to depict a second perceived literature gap. The phenomenological, postmodern view of this dissertation requires both the inductee and researcher to be introspective and reflective in sensemaking, which calls for the creation of a smaller or micro-organizational level of socialization emanating from educational administration—the self in personal reflection on a phenomenon.

In this chapter, the Conduct of the Research and Emergent Themes and the Summary of Core Findings is presented. Statements as to how the this research differs from other research are presented in the Original Nature of the Study. The first of the four sections within this literature review, the phenomenological perspective, is described next.

Section One: The Phenomenological Underpinning

As phenomenology purports that the individual first must have experienced the phenomenon or critical incident in order to be reflective about that incident, it seemed appropriate for this research to view the theoretical underpinnings of sensemaking through a phenomenological lens. Only upon reflection will the critical incidents be exposed and hence become vulnerable to sensemaking.

The German philosopher Husserl (1859-1938) is credited as the primary proponent of phenomenology. Since then, several writers have made distinctive and significant contributions towards the overall development of phenomenology, using

Phenomenology involves the study of the life world; that is, the world as we immediately experience it pre-reflectively rather than as we categorize, conceptualize, taxonomize, classify, abstract, or reflect on it. It makes "the invisible visible" (Kvale, 1996, p. 53). In contrast to the natural science approach, phenomenologists strive for Max Weber's verstehen; that is, understanding the motives and beliefs behind the individual's actions on a personal level (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 2).

Phenomenology asks, "What is this or that kind of experience like?" (van Manen, 1997, p. 9). It makes a distinction between appearance and essence; it always asks the question. "What is the nature or meaning of something?" (p. 184).

[Phenomenology involves] that kind of thinking which guides us back from theoretical abstractions to the reality of lived experiences—the lived experience of the children's world, the lived experience of schools, curricula, etc. Phenomenology asks the simple question, what is it like to have a certain experience? (For example, an educational experience.) An innocent question indeed. (van Manen, 1982, p. 296)

Phenomenology is the philosophy of understanding or making sense of social phenomena from one's own perspective. Phenomenologists believe that knowledge is
socially constructed and that there are several ways of interpreting experiences by interacting with others (Kvale, 1996, p. 52).

Phenomenology requires a shift from a belief that the researcher's reality is of prime importance to a belief that the realities of others are of equal importance. Reality is constructed by making meaning of the personal experiences of others (Horsman, 1995, p. 21):

Beginning with the premise that reality is a socially constructed entity, the phenomenologist looks in natural contexts for the ways in which individuals and groups make sense of their worlds. The collection of those intact realities (or constructions), and the interpretation of how those realities get constructed (the understanding of meaning making), is the main point of the phenomenologically oriented inquirer. (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990, p. 290)

Van Hesteren (1986) attempted to elucidate the essential nature of phenomenology in his discussion of research and the human science perspective. He ruminated: "I was determined to synthesize various explanations of central facets of phenomenology into a single, comprehensive, and representative account. However, I eventually became acutely aware of the naivité and the futility of such an ambition" (p. 204). He noted that a reciprocal relationship exists between phenomenology and the field of hermeneutics (Ricoeur, 1981, p. 101), that phenomenology has close ties with existentialism (Solomon, 1980, p. xii), and that a close relationship exists between phenomenology and the sociology of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 6).

van Manen (1997) stated that a real understanding of phenomenology can only be accomplished by "actively doing" phenomenology, rather than by theorizing about the basic ideas of phenomenology. He identified eight "characteristics" of phenomenological
research: it is the study of lived experience, the explication of phenomena as they present themselves to consciousness, the study of essences, the description of the experiential meanings we live as we live them, the human scientific study of phenomena, the attentive practice of thoughtfulness, a search for what it means to be human, and a poetizing activity (p. 9).

Phenomenological research involves turning to a particular abiding concern of lived experience; it has been called a turning "to the things themselves" (Husserl, 1964). Thinking about a lived experience or phenomenon is a reflective, thoughtful grasping of what it is that renders the experience its particular significance. In this respect, phenomenological research makes a distinction between appearance and essence; it consists of reflectively bringing into awareness that which tends to be obscure.

"Phenomenology is the application of logos (language and thoughtfulness) to the phenomenon (lived experience), to what shows itself" (van Manen, 1984, p. 41).

In the qualitative research interview, phenomenology focuses on the study of experiences and ways in which the individual puts those experiences together to develop a world view (Patton, 1990, p. 70). Phenomenologists "attempt to gain entry into the conceptual world of their subjects in order to understand how and what meaning they construct around events in their daily life" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 35).

The phenomenological interview utilizes descriptive accounts:

... clear, vivid, faithful descriptions of experiences, of actions, of words, of phenomena—are central to the hermeneutical undertaking. It is here that phenomenology as an appropriate approach, rather than "method," becomes apparent... The phenomenological task, therefore, lies both in the process of description and critical reflection where the primacy of
experience holds sway, and in the attempt to penetrate to the essence of a phenomenon, to the core themes that underlie what is being observed. (Suransky, 1982, p. 36)

Phenomenology also uses holistic analyses of phenomena:

[Phenomenologists] seek to construct descriptions of total phenomena within their various contexts and to generate from these descriptions the complex interrelationships of causes and consequences that affect human behaviour toward, and belief about, the phenomena. (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 3)

While phenomenologists may differ among themselves on specific issues, and although different versions of phenomenology exist, there are several distinguishing characteristics relating to the theoretical underpinnings of phenomenology. Curtis and Mays (1975) stated that being knowledgeable about one's own subjective consciousness is an integral part of knowing one's surroundings. It is imperative that individuals have the opportunity to make sense of circumstances for themselves:

... each of us on reflection discover a self growing out of the past decisions and growing as a planner of the future, a traveller, as it were, constantly challenged to take more interest in the way he is going. (p. xx)

In summary, the aim of phenomenological research is to make sense of our previously lived experiences through explanation and reflection upon those prior experiences. Phenomenologists translate the meaning of these descriptions in order to come to a deeper understanding of what individuals are thinking about and why they do what they do (Horsman, 1995, p. 23).

The focus of this study is to come to a clear understanding of Tony's sensemaking of his own induction process, so that I might learn from his experiences and subsequently incorporate my sensemaking of his experiences into my own anticipatory set to the
principalship. Phenomenology provides a powerful medium to make sense of the research experiences.

Section Two: The Postmodern Underpinning

In review of the Research Map (p. 33) sections, the phenomenological and postmodern theoretical underpinnings provide definition as to how the sensemaking underpinning will be interpreted. Section One described the phenomenological research underpinnings; Section Two will describe the postmodern research underpinnings.

Soviet theoretician Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) viewed the exact sciences as a “monological form of knowledge”, which contemplated things and spoke of them, treating the researched individuals as “voiceless” (Todorov, 1984, p. 18). Greene (1994, p. 426) noted that empiricist research characterized by a single, exclusive way of knowing is increasingly being questioned by researchers such as Clifford (1988), who wrote of a crisis of “ethnographic authority”, of the realization that there is a growing “off centeredness in a world of distinct meaning systems” (p. 9).

Epistemology has been viewed as a normative activity focussed on evaluating discourse in terms of its relation to a trans-historical truth, but this is clearly a viewpoint “nearing its end” (Greene, 1994. p. 425). Objections to totalized, decontextualized research approaches have brought about an interest in the recognition of situated and embodied knowledge. “The point is to open a fresh perspective on epistemology in its connection with educational research” (p. 426).

Lyotard (1984) characterized postmodernity as a disbelief in universal systems of thought and by an incredulity toward metanarratives of legitimation. Postmodernism
espouses no one truth or any single monological description of physical or human phenomena. It questions specialized and technical authorities; it challenges us to be intensely aware in acts of becoming different, to engage in acts of redefining and redescribing ourselves and our contacts with the world. It encourages us to become aware of our own sensemaking processes in a substantially different way from other philosophical approaches (Greene, 1994, p. 440).

Mitchell, Sackney, and Walker (1996) noted that postmodernism rejects as prejudicial representationalism and objectivism, Eurocentric rationality and male-centered theory, and the marginalizing “language games” into which people have been socialized (p. 45). “Decentering” recognizes the marginal and the ex-centric; it discovers otherness and difference. “Individualism is out and the social construction of the individual is in” (p. 46).

Conversation is a powerful process if language is the medium used to create social realities in a postmodern world. In order for harmony and coherence to take the place of disorder and complexity, leaders may need to facilitate the development of meaning and the building of relationships between individuals and their social constructions (p. 53).

The use of signs and symbols is a major source of social construction; language serves to shape reality. Language, and thus reality, is evanescent (p. 51). Postmodernists embrace texts

[a]s the only source of meaning. Every experience, then, becomes some sort of text, its meaning uncovered through the play of signifier and signified . . . different forms of language can result in different understandings, and may even disclose features of our world previously hidden. (Beyer & Liston, 1992, p. 379)
Postmodern discourse is "the search for instabilities" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 53), an activation of the differences (p. 82): "it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable" (p. xxv). Social action is a "language game" in which the participating actors make various "moves" according to recognized rules (Cooper & Burrell, 1988). Rather than consensus as the power house of social action, dissensus continually compels our attention. Agonistics gives drive to social life, so as soon as the element of struggle goes out of the game, the power to motivate human action is lost. Mastery and domination each obtain validity through maintaining a state of continuous difference and provocation rather than from complete annihilation of one player by another (p. 98).

Postmodernism explodes boundaries between disciplines and creates a multi-disciplinary, multi-dimensional perspective that synthesizes ideas and concepts from a wide range of fields. It is contextually-bound in that a theory is created for the situation one is involved in, rather than a grand theory. It is structured for the immediate situation (Ritzer, 1992, p. 632-636).

With the breakdown of global systems of thought in today's world, there is no longer a secure infrastructure to support an objective and universal reality. The postmodern world represents a shift from object and vision to subject and voice (Bergquist, 1993; Gergen, 1992). "The modern dichotomy of an objective world distinct from subjective images is breaking down and is being replaced by a hyper reality of signs referring to other signs, texts referring to other texts" (Kvale, 1996, p. 41). In a postmodern view, each language-game is defined by its own particular knowledge
criteria; no one discourse is privileged. Language is not a representation of the real; rather, it gains its meaning and significance from social interchange (Lyotard, 1984). Although reason resides in our language games, it is illusive and constantly shapes our existence. We depend on others to give us our meaning; text defines knowledge.

Lyotard's (1984) postmodernism advocates multiple, multi-vocal, and intersecting narratives—fragmented accounts, or vernaculars. Judgement can only be undertaken from within the system, never from any standpoint outside the system. Postmodernism embraces methodological diversity as essential and epistemological pluralism as absolute. Certitude of knowledge is impossible to achieve in postmodernism and constitutes a misguided epistemological pursuit. No one discourse can be viewed as ultimately true, no one viewpoint or way of knowing can be trivialized. "Questions which deal with the nature of reality are inextricably caught in a web of circularity or intertextuality, as are understandings of the nature, sources, and validity of knowledge" (p. 47).

In addressing the postmodern construction of knowledge generated by interviews, Kvale (1996), described the conversational, linguistic, narrative, contextual, and interrelational nature of knowledge. It is the pervasiveness of these four aspects of knowledge as expressions of a postmodern loss of belief in an objective reality which is considered to be new to research (p. 45).

To consider the nature of knowledge as conversation, Kvale (1996) suggested that the interview itself be regarded as a dialogue between two individuals about a topic of mutual interest. The interview is interrelational, an interchange of views between two individuals conversing about a common theme. With the loss of confidence in an
objective reality mirrored in scientific models, there is a move toward negotiated
discourse about the meaning of the lived world. The primacy of conversation is strongly
recognized within postmodernism, as well as within Gadamer’s (1975) hermeneutical
analyses of the conversation, and within Habermas’s (1970) discourse philosophy. The
research interview and the philosophical discourse both rely on conversation as
knowledge. Not only do interview texts refer to some reality beyond the texts, the
interviewees’ discourse is of interest in its own right. Discourse analysis may be
regarded as an approach rather than a method because it focuses on the constructive
nature of questioning, transcribing, and analyzing in interview research. In the
postmodern approach, language constitutes reality and each communication constructs
reality in its own way. Thus, language structures speak through the individual. Language
is both the tool of interviewing and the object of textual interpretation (p. 43).

In the open interview, the individual tells stories about his or her life, which is a
shift from modern formalized knowledge systems to the narrative knowledge embodied
in storytelling (Lyotard, 1984). Global systems of thought are rejected and a
renarrativization of culture takes place, with truth to be worked out locally in small
narrative units (Kvale, 1996, p. 43). It is the process that counts, the story that matters.

Wheatley (1992, p. 137) pointed out that the ultimate search is the search for
meaning, yet postmodernity has alerted us to the problem of multiple perspectives. We
each see the world through different lenses, so the meanings one constructs will be different
from the meanings constructed by others. Conversation about our practices, roles, beliefs,
and values can help us to become aware of our personal frames of reference and to confront
the ways in which our mindsets contribute to biases and assumptions. Conversations may allow us to see contradictions between espoused theory and theory-in-use.

Reflection is the process by which we ponder the appropriateness of our practices. The idea of the reflective practitioner (Schon, 1983) has received considerable attention, and the concept has become fairly well operationalized. To Schon (1984), reflection-in-action involves “on the spot surfacing, criticizing, re-structuring and testing of intuitive understandings of experienced phenomenon; often, it takes the form of a reflective conversation with the situation” (p. 42). Reflective practise is critical to the science of the practical; “it is a science which stems from theories of practise and which provides principals with practical as well as theoretical mindscapes from which to work” (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 6). Smythe (1992) suggested that individuals need to shift the emphasis in reflective approaches from how questions to what and why questions, as it is the why questions which have the capacity to move individuals into deeper levels of analysis (p. 294).

Mitchell, Sackney, and Walker (1996) defined discussion as the promotion of personal points of view, and dialogue as the balance between advocacy of personal positions and inquiry into other positions (p. 59). Senge (1990) advocated the use of dialogue as opposed to discussion. Through dialogue and tentativeness, conversation offers an avenue for confronting the complexities of one’s world, for confronting one’s own mindsets, and developing problem sensitivity.

In postmodern thought there is an emphasis on knowledge as interrelational and structural, interwoven in network webs (Kvale, 1996). Knowledge does not exist inside
an individual nor outside in the world; it exists in the relationship between individual and
the world. Lyotard (1991) pointed out that the intentional relation of subject and situation
does not unify two isolated poles; on the contrary, the subject and situation cannot be
defined except in and by this relationship. Merleau-Ponty (1962), a phenomenological
psychologist and philosopher whose work has been regarded as a precursor to
postmodern thought, emphasized the interrelational nature of knowledge, as noted in
Chapter I. There is a shift from the individual stakeholder to relationships between
individuals, such that the knowledge produced by the principal’s reflections and
perceptions of observed and participated-in occurrences will become inter-relational in
the researcher’s written interpretation of the narrative.

Berger and Luckmann (1966) conceptualized the "social construction of reality" with a focus on the interpretation and negotiation of meaning in the social world. An
emphasis is placed on local context, on the linguistic and social construction of a
perspectival reality where knowledge is validated through practice and is dependent of
the values and viewpoint of the researcher. There is an openness to qualitative diversity
and to the multiplicity of meanings in local contexts. Human reality is understood as
action and conversation: knowledge becomes the ability to perform effective actions
(Kvale, 1996, p. 42). Berger and Luckmann’s openness to process and to multiple
meanings allows acknowledgement that there may indeed be elements of their
phenomenological approach to the construction of social reality which could be
commensurable with postmodernism.
In summary, postmodernism is characterized by a move from the traditional, multi-voiced epistemology towards the social construction of the individual. It is distinguished by being different and outside mainstream approaches. It is not enveloped in homogenized accounts of specific phenomena, but recognizes the concept of decentering, of gender difference, of localized narrative, and of situated knowledge.

Postmodernism encourages us to become aware of our sensemaking processes in a different way from other philosophical approaches. Postmodern theory purports that to experience the phenomena in and of itself is its own justification. It accepts every experience as some sort of text, with meaning to be uncovered through the interaction of those who are directly involved in the context, and maintains that language gains its meaning from social interchange. Thus, two individuals who each reflect upon their own social construction of reality and attempt to make sense of the socialization phenomenon are significant in terms of the postmodern theoretical underpinning of this study.

Section Three: The Sensemaking Underpinning

As this dissertation is a case study of one neophyte principal’s sensemaking attempts of his own induction experience coupled with that of the researcher’s anticipatory socialization sensemaking and academic research, it appeared appropriate to rest the foundation of this research upon Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) concept of perceptual filters and Weick’s (1995) organizational sensemaking. The Research Map (p. 33) identified sensemaking as the third theoretical underpinning of the literature review, with phenomenological and postmodern underpinnings providing definition as to how the sensemaking will be interpreted.
Perceptual Filters

Starbuck and Milliken (1988) identified some of the influences on the perceptual filtering processes that executives use as they observe and attempt to understand their environments. They divided their description into four major sections: retrospection, perceptual filtering, influences upon the filtering processes, and living with complexity.

Retrospection

Individuals appear to see past events as more rationally ordered than current or future events because retrospective sensemaking erases many causal sequences which might complicate the present and future (p. 37). Retrospective perceivers are more likely to see bad results if they did not themselves play central roles in the events, and are more likely to see good results if they did play central roles (Nisbett & Ross, 1980).

Perceptual Filtering

The processes which amplify some stimuli and attenuate others, thus distorting the raw data and focusing attention, are defined as perceptual filters:

Effective perceptual filtering amplifies relevant information and attenuates irrelevant information so that the relevant information comes into the perceptual foreground and the irrelevant information recedes into the background [. . .] In complex environments, effective perceptual filtering requires detailed knowledge of the task environment. (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 41)

Executives’ learning occurs mainly during periods of relative stability, whereas strategic skills are tested mainly during periods of change. Perceivers are inseparable from their environments because each is interdependent upon the other, and the perceptions are either validated or invalidated when individuals act on their environments (Ittelson,

Starbuck and Milliken (1988) identified two filtering processes which they felt might be important in understanding environmental scanning and strategy formulation: distortions in noticing and distortions in sensemaking. In terms of distortions in noticing (where to look and what to see), the researchers identified paying too much or too little attention to stimuli with certain properties, and letting some stimuli draw too much attention to themselves and other stimuli evade attention. In terms of distortions in sensemaking (what it means), the researchers identified distortions in framing, in predicting, and in causal attributions (p. 43).

Influences Upon Filtering Processes

The stimuli which one executive filters out may be exactly the same stimuli that another executive receives. Although the same stimuli may be noticed, different frameworks may be used to interpret the stimuli, so individuals may disagree about specific meanings or causes or effects. Starbuck and Milliken (1988) divided perception into noticing and sensemaking.

Noticing. Noticing is the act of classifying stimuli as signals or noise, and is influenced by the perceiver's habits, beliefs about what is, and what ought to be (p. 46). Individuals notice unfamiliar as well as familiar stimuli, and what they believe to be important, desirable, significant, relevant, or evil. Individuals tend to look for the familiar or overlook the familiar (p. 47); they look for what matters (p. 49).

Sensemaking. Sensemaking is the act of understanding, attributing, predicting, extrapolating, explaining, and comprehending. For all of these processes, stimuli are
placed into frameworks which make sense of the stimuli. Similar to the noticing frameworks, sensemaking frameworks reflect habits, beliefs about what is and what ought to be (p. 51). Individuals sometimes see beyond their blind spots when they observe incongruous events which do not make sense within their perceptual frameworks. Sensemaking frames within the familiar (p. 53), within the expected (54), and within what matters (p. 57).

Living with Complexity

Realistic individuals have numerous sensemaking frameworks which contradict each other; the frameworks create many interpretive opportunities. Generally, individuals eventually make sense of almost any situation because of the plethora of possible interpretations (p. 59). Some sensemaking frameworks lead to more effective interpretations than others, but perceivers usually appraise effectiveness only in retrospect. Sensemaking may or may not determine whether individuals respond appropriately to environmental events, as individuals may act first and then make sense of the outcomes at a later point in time (p. 60).

In summary of Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) work on perceptual filters, they contended that noticing may be as important as sensemaking, as sensemaking is so elusive. While sensemaking focuses on interdependencies and subtleties, noticing picks up gross trends and major events. If individuals notice events, they make sense of the events; if individuals do not notice the events, the events are not available for sensemaking (p. 60). Weick (1995) incorporated the concept of perceptual filters within his seminal work of sensemaking in organizations.
Sensemaking in Organizations

Weick (1995) discussed organizational sensemaking along the following dimensions: the nature of sensemaking, seven properties of sensemaking, sensemaking in organizations, occasions for sensemaking, the substance of sensemaking, belief- and action-driven processes of sensemaking, and the future of sensemaking.

The Nature of Sensemaking

In grounding his work, Weick (1995) defined the nature of sensemaking. To make sense of a phenomenon, individuals place stimuli into some type of framework to enable them "to comprehend, understand, explain, attribute, extrapolate, and predict" (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51). Sensemaking is a thinking process which uses retrospective accounts to explain surprises (Louis, 1980b, p. 241); it is a way of understanding how individuals cope with interruptions (Weick, 1995, p. 5). It has also been described as "the reciprocal interaction of information seeking, meaning ascription, and action" (Thomas, Clark & Gioia, 1993, p. 240), which includes environmental scanning, interpretation, and associated responses (Weick, 1995, p. 5). Sensemaking is an individual activity compared to the mutual activity of understanding (Ring & Rands, 1989, p. 342). Feldman (1989) saw sensemaking as an interpretive process which "may result in an understanding that action should not be taken or that a better understanding of the event or situation is needed" (p. 19). Sensemaking is about "authoring as well as interpretation, creation as well as discovery" (Weick, 1995, p. 8). It has aspects of comprehension, understanding, attribution, explanation, extrapolation, and prediction (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51); and focuses on subtleties and interdependencies (p. 60).
Descriptions of the nature of sensemaking that separate it from interpretation are found in the works of Schon (1983, p. 40), Shotter (1993, p. 152), and Thayer (1988, p. 254). The key distinction of how sensemaking differs from interpretation is that sensemaking is about an activity or process whereas interpretation can be a process but is just as likely to describe a product (Weick, 1995, p. 13). Sensemaking implies a higher level of engagement by the actor; it highlights the invention that precedes interpretation. "Interpretation connotes an activity that is more detached and passive than the activity of sensemaking. Sensemaking matters. A failure in sensemaking is consequential as well as existential. It throws into question the nature of self and the world" (p. 14).

Sensemaking is also different from decision making; the sensemaking process is focused on finding out what the decision is really about, rather than what the decision should be. There is a reflexive quality to the process in that individuals make sense of things by seeing a world on which they have already imposed their beliefs. As an act of invention, the artifacts that sensemaking produces include language games and texts, although sensemaking is not a metaphor. It is "making something sensible . . . [it] is literally just what it says it is" (p. 16).

**Seven Properties of Sensemaking**

After Weick (1995) had set the parameters of the nature of sensemaking, he then outlined seven properties which describe the activity of sensemaking itself. The sensemaking process is sequential: it is grounded in identity construction, retrospective, enactive of sensible environments, social, ongoing, focused on and by extracted cues, and driven by plausibility rather than accuracy (Weick, 1995, p. 18).
Sensemaking is *grounded in identity construction*; that is, no individual acts like a single sensemaker. The individual is constituted through an interactive process. The sensemaker is like a puzzle undergoing constant redefinition (Weick, 1995, p. 20): "It is a question about who I am as indicated by discovery of how and what I think" (p. 62).

*Retrospective sensemaking* is derived from an analysis of the "meaningful lived experience" (Schutz, 1967, p. 51). Individuals can know what they are doing only after the action has been completed. Experience exists in discrete events, but we only get this impression by stepping outside the stream of experience and by paying direct attention to it. "We are conscious always of what we have done, never of doing it" (Mead, 1956, p. 136).

To be *enactive of sensible environments* involves Follett's (1924, p. 118) notion of circular response; that individuals receive stimuli as a result of their own activity: "I never react to you but to you-plus-me; or to be more accurate, it is I-plus-you reacting to you-plus-me. "I" can never influence "you" because you have already influenced me [. . .] by the very process of meeting, we both become something different" (p. 62). Sensemaking is "relating"; individuals create their environments as those environments create them. As newcomers experience surprise (Louis, 1980b) in early socialization stages, they start as interpretivists, with hermeneutics glossing over the unexpected (Weick, 1995, p. 35).

Sensemaking is a *social* process, where attention is focused on face-to-face interaction so that joint understanding can be furthered (p. 40). Although symbolic interaction (Blumer, 1969) does not rely upon physical presence, it keeps the elements of self, action, interaction, interpretation, meaning, and joint action in play in the
determination of sensemaking (Weick, 1995, p. 41).

Sensemaking is ongoing. When individuals are thrown into ongoing situations, they "make do" in order to make sense of what is happening. Even though individuals may be immersed in flows, they are rarely indifferent to what passes them by. Emotions affect sensemaking because recall and retrospection tend to be mood congruent. The longer the search for meaning, the higher the arousal, the stronger the emotion (p. 49).

Socialization is focused on and by extracted cues. It is important to pay attention to ways individuals notice, extract cues, and embellish that which is extracted. Context affects searching, scanning, and noticing; that which is extracted as a cue in the first place (p. 51). Context also affects how the extracted cue is interpreted (p. 52). Noticing is a more informal, involuntary beginning to the sensemaking process than is scanning (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988). Noticing is the act of classifying stimuli as noise or signals. If events are noticed, individuals make sense of them; if events are not noticed, they are not available for sensemaking (p. 45). Scanning is more strategic, more conscious, more deliberate, more under the control of preconceptions, and less open to invention than noticing (Weick, 1995, p. 60); it implies more formal and voluntary actions (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 45).

Socialization is driven by plausibility rather than accuracy. It "takes a relative approach to truth. predicting what is interesting, emotionally appealing, attractive, and goal relevant (Fiske, 1992, p. 879). What is necessary in sensemaking is a good story (Weick, 1995, p. 61).
In summary, the nature of sensemaking involves individuals placing stimuli into some type of framework; it is a thinking process which uses retrospective accounts to explain surprises, and is a way of understanding how individuals cope with interruption. Sensemaking is set apart from other explanatory processes and is sequential in its processes (Weick, 1995, p. 18).

**Sensemaking in Organizations**

There is no organizational theory which is characteristic of the sensemaking paradigm, although there are ways to discuss organizations which allow for sensemaking to be the central activity in the construction of the organization and its environment (Weick, 1995, p. 70). At the macro level, sensemaking is either intersubjective, generic subjective, or extrasubjective (Wiley, 1988). *Intersubjective* meaning becomes distinct from intrasubjective meaning when individual feelings, thoughts, and intentions are merged into conversations during which the self is transformed from "I" into "we". *Generic subjectivity* allows individuals to substitute for one another and to adopt each other's activities and meanings. *Extra-subjective* meaning is the generic self replaced by pure meanings, without a knowing subject; it is the level of symbolic reality whereby scripts link the institutional to the action realm (Weick, 1995, p. 72).

**Occasions for Sensemaking**

Given a description of the nature of sensemaking and its seven properties, and the claim that sensemaking in organizations is either intersubjective, generic subjective, or extra-subjective, Weick (1995) then focussed on the various occasions for sensemaking. When individuals reach a dissatisfaction threshold with current conditions, they
experience shock and initiate action to resolve the dissatisfaction. Sensemaking occasions are constructed and become the platform for further construction (Weick, 1995, p. 85). The richness of an individual’s language is a crucial sensemaking resource. It "affords rich reflective thought—the words I say affect the thoughts I form when I see what I’ve said" (p. 90).

Huber and Daft’s (1987, p. 34) three properties of information load, complexity, and turbulence are crucial whenever there is a perception of environmental uncertainty. As information load increases, individuals take increasingly strong steps to manage the load. The load is an occasion for sensemaking because it forces cues out of the ongoing stream. Complexity affects what individuals notice and ignore; the greater the complexity, the greater the search for and reliance on routine. Turbulence is a combination of instability and randomness, and throws individuals back on whatever heuristics for noticing they know best, that are organizationally practised and rewarded most frequently (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 104).

Two types of sensemaking are common to organizations: ambiguity and uncertainty. Ambiguity is when individuals engage in sensemaking because they are confused by too many interpretations; uncertainty is when they do so because they are ignorant of interpretations (p. 91). Prolonged sensemaking may occur when the need for more information (ignorance, uncertainty) is mislabeled as a need for different types of information (confusion, ambiguity) (p. 100).

The basic occasion for sensemaking consists of incongruous events which interrupt perceptual frameworks or ongoing flows (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 52).
The interruption produces arousal, which uses up attention and reduces the cues which can be used for sensemaking, focussing attention on the interruption, and causing the sensemaking to become even more difficult (Weick, 1995, p. 101).

In summary, sensemaking occasions are constructed and become the platform for further construction. Information load, complexity, and turbulence factor into perceptions of environmental uncertainty; and language is a crucial sensemaking resource. Ambiguity and uncertainty are common to sensemaking occasions, while interruptions take attention away from sensemaking.

The Substance of Sensemaking

Sensemaking substance starts with three elements: a frame, a cue, and a connection. The content of sensemaking is found in the frames which summarize past experience, in the cues which grasp specifics of present experience, and in the ways these two occurrences are connected (p. 111).

It is important to understand the sensemaking comprised of ideologies, third-order controls, paradigms, theories of action, traditions, and stories because their content pervades organizations and colours interpretation. Moments of meaning occur when any of the two become meaningfully connected: "Sensemaking is about the world. And what is being asserted about that world is found in the labels and categories implied by frames. These words express and interpret. These words include and exclude. These words matter" (p. 132).
Belief-Driven Sensemaking Processes

In sensemaking, believing is seeing; to believe is to selectively notice (Weick, 1995, p. 133). Sensemaking can begin with beliefs and take the form of arguing or expecting, or can begin with actions and take the form of committing or manipulating. The elements of belief and action are related; the activities of relating are the sensemaking process. The outcome of the process is a unit of meaning, two connected elements tied together by socially acceptable implications (p. 135).

Arguing has individual and social meaning; it is a process by which individuals reason their way from one idea to the selection of another idea (Brockriede, 1974, p. 166). When an act of sensemaking occurs, it can range along a continuum from non-argument to argument. A sensemaking process which unfolds toward the non-argument end of the continuum is that of the narrative (Weick & Browning, 1986).

Expectations are more directive than arguments; they tend to filter input more severely (Weick, 1995, p. 145). When a person compares an event with an expectation, noticing becomes focussed. Events which conform to the expectancy and confirm it make sense; cues which do not fit stand out (Weick, 1995, p. 148). Most individuals cannot afford accuracy; instead, their goal is to establish stability and predictability. The cost of being indecisive in an organization usually outweighs the cost of being wrong. Accuracy is only possible once stability is achieved (p. 153).

Thus, sensemaking processes can be either belief- or action-driven, with belief-driven processes taking the form of argument or expectations. When concerns about sensemaking are paramount, individuals may be willing to trade accuracy for stability.
Action-Driven Sensemaking Processes

Sensemaking can start at any point because beliefs and actions are interrelated. Sensemaking starts with action for which the person is responsible, behavioural commitment, or action which has made a visible change in the world which requires explanation or manipulation (p. 155).

Individuals attempt to build meaning around actions to which their commitment is strongest; the sensemaking focuses on binding actions (p. 158). Commitment focuses the social construction of reality on actions which are high in visibility, choice, and irreversibility. The meaning of the action becomes whatever justifications survive the editing process and become attached to the action (p. 162).

Sensemaking by means of manipulation involves acting in ways which create an environment individuals can comprehend and manage (p. 163). In commitment, the focus is on the action itself, and sense is made when beliefs justify taking that irreversible action; in manipulation, the focus is on the meaningful consequences of the action. Manipulation is an operationalization of the advice, "ready, fire, aim"; it is about making things happen so that the individual can then examine the creation and attempt to explain it as a way to obtain a better sense of what is happening. Commitment makes sense by focussing on why an action occurred, whereas manipulation makes sense by focussing on what action did occur (p. 168).

The Future of Sensemaking

Weick’s (1995) intention was to prime individuals to be more self-conscious about some of the things they and their colleagues do automatically when they are puzzled. His
assumption was that as individuals become more aware of what previously had been mostly automatic, that they will consciously incorporate more of the richness described. As the richer controlled processing becomes more habitual and automatic, he surmised that relational competence should improve, and with it, identity and efficacy (p. 182).

Weick (1995) suggested seven considerations to improve the individual's mindset for sensemaking: One, leaders should "talk the walk"; they should practice what they preach so that others will take the preaching seriously. Two, rich vocabularies give options for construing the meaning of action and are more likely to reveal latent opportunities in what might otherwise appear to be threats (p. 183). Three, decisive individuals take an outcome and retrospectively construct a history which appears to have led directly to it. In this manner, a decision is an interpretive act rather than an act of choice (p. 185). Four, meetings provide the setting where individuals can dialogue, using rich data in order to construct fresh frameworks of action-outcome linkages which incorporate their multiple interpretations (p. 186). Five, verbs capture the action which lays down the sensemaking path and keep things moving. "To change a verb is to take the first step to change a process" (p. 188). Six, shared experiences are encouraged, as commonality is what binds individuals together and makes it possible for each to understand the sense the other has made (p. 189). Seven, expectations filter and provide guidance when individuals need to act quickly. After a situation unfolds, the way it is played out is compared with the expectations. Thus, relevant expectations are uncovered and are available for future monitoring (p. 190).
In summary, research and practice in sensemaking needs to begin with a mindset to look for sensemaking, to begin with a willingness to use one’s own life as data, and to search for those outcroppings and ideas that fascinate (Weick, 1995, p. 191). Starbuck and Milliken (1988, p. 60) claim that we capture the world we get drawn into when we take sensemaking seriously, live it, and reflect on that living. If the topic of sensemaking is to advance, reflection is the best stance (Weick, 1995, p. 192).

In the literature review thus far, the theoretical underpinnings of phenomenology, postmodernism, and sensemaking have been presented. Socialization literature specific to educational administration will be examined next.

**Section Four: Professional Socialization Literature in Educational Administration**

It appears that little is known about the process of professional socialization into the administrative role, or about how socialization may affect a principal’s performance on a variety of role-related responsibilities (Heck, 1995, p. 32; Greenfield, 1985b, p. 115). and even less has been gathered about how rural principals are socialized (Alvy & Coladarci, 1985, p. 40). The research need to understand the viewpoint of the neophyte principal is critical. Estimates are that nearly two-thirds of American school principals will reach retirement age by Year 2000, and it is assumed that many of these positions will be replaced by neophyte administrators (Holcomb. 1990. n.p.; Doud, 1989, p. 12); no Canadian statistics are available in this regard.

Precisely how long the induction period lasts for new principals is open to debate (Duke, Isaacson, Sagor, & Schmuck, 1984, p. 11). Within a few months of assuming their posts, the majority of new principals felt accepted by students and community, and
by the end of the first year, most principals no longer feel like rookies. It is only with central office staff and with peer principals that newcomers continue to be characterized by uncertainty (Duke, 1987, p. 271). Hart (1993, p. 11) observed that while some writers believe teacher socialization begins the socialization process, others argue that educational administration is a distinct profession with its own norms and values.

For the purposes of this study, the principalship was viewed as a distinct profession within educational administration (Hart, 1993). The three perspectives which will be addressed within this section include socialization to the principalship; socialization and role conception including informal and formal socialization studies and administrative mentorship; and a tridimensional model of professional development (Daresh & Playko, 1992).

Socialization to the Principalship

Following a brief mention of organizational socialization and its impact on the socialization of the principal, this section will concentrate specifically on the research of Greenfield (1977), Hart (1991, 1993), and Weindling and Earley (1987).

Wolcott’s (1973) liminal, ethnographic study of a male principal showed how one individual was organizationally socialized by administrative guidelines, peers, and central office personnel. Other studies (Duke, Isaacson, Sagar, & Schmuck, 1984; Greenfield, 1985a; Weindling & Earley, 1987; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley, 1992) describe how principals experienced professional socialization in order to adapt to expectations attendant to their role (Hart, 1993, p. 11).
London (1985) identified three organizational socialization stages in his discussion of developing managers, which Peterson (1986) applied to the professional socialization of the principalship. In the first-year stage, the neophyte educational administrator develops commitment to the district, loyalty to district values and goals, and a sense of personal efficacy. In the second stage of years two, three, and four, the newcomer develops a sense of achievement and acknowledges the importance of his or her organizational contribution. In the third stage at year five and beyond, the administrator requires ongoing collegial contact and continuous reinforcement of his or her organizational efficacy (p. 152).

Greenfield, (1977a, 1977b) posited that socialization to administration is mainly random and informal (1977 b, p. 189; 1985a, p. 10); it occurs over a variable time frame (1985a, p. 12); and it requires individuals to gradually divest themselves of their teacher identities and to move into an educational administration identity (p. 16). Socialization processes generally serve to maintain and perpetuate the current administrative sub-culture within schools (Greenfield, 1985b, p. 111), and principals have not been provided with the professional enculturation or continuing support services which would engender and sustain innovative orientations (Cantwell, 1993, p. 64).

In contrast to Greenfield's (1977, 1985) theoretical socialization research, Hart (1991) compiled a comprehensive synthesis of socialization and leader succession literature and subsequently identified four themes in organizational socialization inquiry: socialization tactics employed by the organization, socialization stages of new members, personal and social contexts which shape the process, and outcomes or effects (1991, p. 453).
Socialization Tactics. Tactics involves the collective or individual socialization context in which the principal finds himself or herself. The social environment may be manipulated in terms of role models and through a sense of place in the system (Hart, 1991, p. 454).

Socialization Stages. Three socialization stages were delineated by Hart (1991, 1993): the encounter, anticipation, or confrontation stage; the socialization adjustment, accommodation, and clarity stage; and the stabilization, role management, and location stage (1993, p. 29).

Personal and Social Context. The social structure is the context of succession, the human system into which principals seek integration. Individuals tend to increase their interactions with those similar to themselves and limit their interactions with those with whom they feel dissimilar (p. 35).

Outcomes or Effects. The cumulative effect of socialization experiences in adult work and professional settings is individual rather than organizational, as each principal’s experiences are unique. Predicted outcomes take place at the personal or organizational level and involve several aspects of the role, and custodial responses are the most static outcome of succession (p. 36). Content innovation outcomes occur with changes in the way the new principal performs the role. In role innovation, the neophyte principal rejects most of the norms governing performance and conduct and makes a genuine attempt to redefine the ends as well as the means (Schein. 1971b).

In summary, Greenfield (1977a, 1977b, 1985b) examined the phases of candidacy to administrative positions and the dynamics influencing the transition to administrative
literature as the basis for her leader succession and socialization research and principal
change in the areas of succession and school leadership.

Secondary Headship: The Weindling and Earley Study

Weindling and Earley’s (1989) research in England and Wales was a major three-
year study which documented the demands made on heads (principals) in their first years
of headship. It described the range of strategies employed to cope with those demands;
identified the requisite knowledge and skills needed to carry out the new role; and
provided guidelines for senior management to train the newcomers in secondary schools.

The study posited seven conclusions and recommendations: efforts to improve
preparation for headship should be concentrated on aspiring heads; providers should
tailor senior management courses more carefully to the needs of Local Education
Authorities (LEAs), heads, and deputies; new heads should fully recognize the
importance of their relationships with senior management; new heads should concentrate
much of their effort in establishing good working relationships with staff; new heads need
to learn more about change theory; LEAs should have a planned induction program for
new heads; and LEAs need to consider ways of improving support for heads (p. 184).

Weindling and Earley’s (1990) follow-up study found that beginning heads were
concerned with the need to respond to external initiatives, to engage in sound
management while providing effective instructional leadership, and to elicit staff support
in enhancing positive public relations. (p. 44).
In summary, indications are that little appears to be known about the process of professional socialization into the administrative role (Heck, 1995), and that the research need to understand the viewpoint of the neophyte principal is critical, given the large numbers of expected retirees within the next few years (Holcomb, 1990). *Socialization to the principalship* was examined through the administrative candidacy research of Greenfield (1977) and the dynamics influencing the transition to administrative work in schools (1985), through the socialization and succession research of Hart (1991, 1993), and through a major socialization study carried out by Weindling and Earley (1989).

**Socialization and Role Conception**

This next section will review *socialization and role conception* of the principal through an innovative rather than traditional, custodial orientation.

The move from the teaching profession to educational administration is a pivotal point in creating innovative leaders; it is at this point that either an ideology of innovation or a commitment to the status quo is developed (Greenfield, 1985, p. 109). Instead of waiting for individuals to self-select administration, educational leaders should be identified and groomed in a systematic way (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988, p. 290). Crow, Mecklowitz, and Weekes (1992) prescribed a number of ways to address this call to reform administrator recruitment (pp. 190-197).

In order to examine the socialization process of developing a conception of role, Crow and Glascock (1995) reported on a study of candidates in a non-traditional principal preparation program with a focus on innovative rather than custodial role conceptions. Individual, occupational, organizational, and societal sources of *role conception* were
identified (p. 23). The three major sources of role conception at entry into the preparation program included pre-socialization experiences, candidates’ previous experiences, and their perception of principals with whom they worked. Principals identified college faculty, their cohort group, the principal internship program, the board of education, and the candidates themselves as other sources of role conception (p. 31). Role conception was also envisaged in the types of administrator tasks considered important, and in the nature of authority and leadership (p. 36).

Neophyte principals tend to have problems with role clarification; that is, they question who they are, and what they should be doing after becoming principals. They have limits on technical expertise and difficulties with professional socialization and socialization to a particular system, as they question what others expect of them (Daresh, 1982; 1988, p. 85). The probability of instructional leadership performance is greater among administrators who have a nurturing attitude toward students, among those with long classroom experience prior to assuming the administrative role, and among female rather than male principals. Instructional leadership is associated with greater formal education, knowledge gained on the job as vice-principal, specific curriculum or policy-related knowledge, and open-mindedness (Leithwood & Musella, 1991, p. 323).

Heck (1995) proposed an exploratory theoretical model of socialization which elaborated on Peterson’s (1986) view that organizational socialization was more important than occupational socialization (p. 152) and on Hart’s (1991) contention that organizational socialization was more important than professional socialization in shaping neophyte administrative performance. The results of his correlated empirical study
indicated that organizational socialization directly affects administrative performance, that
the effect of professional socialization on performance is mostly indirect, and that women
were rated as more effective than men in socialization efforts (p. 31). Heck (1995) found
that support systems, mentoring, and community involvement were likely to add to the
neophyte's chances of successful performance (p. 47).

Ross (1991) advocated that central office administrators should design more helpful
socialization experiences than most that currently exist. He addressed issues of
communication, support of administrators during crises, and the necessity of encouraging
more women to enter into the principalship (p. 13). "Like it or not, school districts are very
much involved in the "training" of principals." (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 260).

In review, research has identified role conception of the principal through an
innovative rather than traditional, custodial orientation (Crow, Mecklowitz, & Weekes,
1992), through a study of candidates in a non-traditional principal preparation program
with a focus on innovative rather than custodial role conceptions (Crow & Glascock,
1995), and through recognition of role clarification problems on the part of neophyte
principals (Daresh, 1982, 1988). Some researchers (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Ross,
1991; Heck, 1995) posited that central office administrators should design more helpful
socialization experiences for neophyte principals, as organizational socialization was
found to directly affect administrative performance.

Informal Socialization

The next two segments address informal socialization and formal preparation for
the principalship. For the purposes of this review, informal socialization included any
activity which did not involve training through university preparation programs, whereas *formal* preparation was considered to be any activity within the realm of academia and which may have been termed *professional socialization* in specific studies. This next segment concentrates on various *informal* principal socialization models and studies.

To explain the career stage development through which a neophyte principal typically passes, Hall and Parkay (1992) designed a model which involves survival, control, stability, educational leadership, and professional actualization stages. The model showed movement from positional power towards personal power, from initially restricting actions of others (coercive leadership) to becoming increasingly open to facilitating growth and learning for all organizational members (p. 352). As well, the eventual level of administrative career development is strongly indicated by the end of the first year (p. 355), and only after a successful administrative foundation has been built can instructional leadership be considered (p. 358).

Augenstein and Konnert (1991) found that more role learning occurred in the encounter rather than in the anticipatory stage and that neophytes learn from significant others both before and after they assume administrative positions (p. 48).

Leithwood, Steinbach, and Begley (1992) attempted to link anticipatory and encounter socialization with instructional leadership in their study of a limited number of Canadian principals who were in both early and later career stages. Their framework conceptualized professional socialization as relationships (superordinates, peers, subordinates, students, and self); the organization (school system policies, procedures and control mechanisms); formal training; and outcomes (image of the principal’s role, skills.
and norms and values) (p. 289). The results identified socialization experiences to be at
least moderately helpful in contributing to instructional leadership (p. 303).

Begley and Campbell-Evans (1992) found that personal motivation prompts
aspiring school administrators to enroll as candidates in preservice training programs,
along with curiosity about the role, a desire for professional development, and for
personal enrichment. Key influences included the challenge of the job, personal interest,
and the lure of added responsibility (p. 287).

Given the difficulty in attracting talented individuals into administration, Bogotch
and Reidlinger (1993) advocated that less emphasis be placed on early socialization and
more on recruitment. New principals were generally satisfied with their jobs, certain
about their role, and did not experience conflict. The authors hypothesized that new
principal concentration on task learning perhaps masks role conflict (p. 494).

Alvy and Coladarci (1985) found that novice principals who came from outside
the school division experienced fewer difficulties as compared to insiders (p. 39). The
newcomers found it most difficult to find time to visit classrooms to help educators
improve instructional practices, to strengthen the instructional program, to advocate use
of current educational findings, and to encourage educators to provide instructional
programs to meet individual student needs (p. 46).

Holcomb (1990) identified proficiencies most essential for success but least
supported by orientation and inservice training: human relations; building rapport with
teachers, students, and parents; building esprit de corps, cohesiveness, and climate;
communication skills; active listening; delegating, decision-making, task analysis; and
time management (n. p.).

In a study of how ten rural principals were socialized into instructional leadership, Hurley (1992) reported that teachers expected principals to be chief disciplinarians, coordinators of student recognition programs, problem-solvers, and classroom instruction supervisors (p. 22). Teachers are likely to be willing to play an active, formal role in socializing the new principal because they have vested interests in the instructional leadership within their own schools. However, staffs should also develop plans for informally socializing the new principal (p. 29). Hart (1993) and Von Villas (1994) noted that the out-going principal has a professional courtesy to help socialize the successor principal into the position.

Neophyte principals experience professional socialization to school administration and organizational socialization to the immediate work place at the same time. The immediacy of organizational socialization often displaces the more carefully structured and learned professional socialization; and informal influences play a more critical role than formal ones (Hart, 1993, p. 12; Duke, 1987, p. 271).

In summary, research on informal socialization activities does not include formal university preparation programs; and tends to corroborate Hart’s (1993) and Duke’s (1987) findings that informal influences play a critical role in socialization practices.

**Formal Preparation**

This next segment addresses formal principal preparation models and studies. Most principals report that experiential learning is one of the most important aspects of job preparation, but that university preparation fails to address issues of practical and

Begley and Campbell-Evans (1992) reported a general shift away from the more informal socialization processes (Feldman, 1989; Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1976), and an increased commitment toward specific and often mandated preparation experiences. Principal preparation programs are now grounded in more than the context-bound practices or theories-in-use (Argyris, 1982) manifested by local practitioners serving as instructors, but the programs also appear to vary widely in their perceived value (Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley, 1992, p. 301).

Most formal preparation programs for educational administrators are considered to be the responsibility of, and are delivered by, universities. However, most programs do not reflect changing societal vision; seldom do they hold relevance to school leadership or for solving practical school problems (Calabrese, 1991; Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1992; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Bjork & Ginsberg, 1995; Maher, 1988).

Greenfield (1988) suggested that new models which acknowledge responsibility, right judgement, and reflection as legitimately and inevitably part of administrative action are needed (p. 154). Leithwood et al. (1996) contended that formal preparation has the potential to foster real-life problem-solving skills for participants. The challenge is in the development of truly effective leadership preparation programs "around robust theories relevant to the current and future work of school leaders and to offer forms of instruction that lead to proceduralized knowledge consistent with such theories" (p. 341).
Maher (1988) found that in-school administrators generally rate their graduate training less favourably than do central office personnel (p. 32). Schmieder, McGrevin, and Townley (1994) asked California superintendents and principals what elements they believed would improve current administrative training programs for principals. Self-awareness was deemed to be the most critical skill, followed by socialization and technical skills. Neophyte principals wanted training programs to include more practical information on current issues and less theory, longer and more rigorous internships, training in conflict management and in human relations, opportunity to shadow a principal, opportunity to more frequently discuss negotiation issues, to offer budget training, and to provide more information on the politics of education. Superintendents believed the biggest challenges for beginning principals to be interpersonal skills, academic and curriculum leadership, managing fiscal resources, and management and leadership roles (p. 285).

These identified critical skills for beginning principals were similar to three of the five stages of professional socialization identified by Parkay, Currie, and Rhodes (1992); namely, professional development, educational leadership, and professional actualization. In the study, both principals and superintendents believed principals must act as visionary leaders rather than engage in behaviours characterized by the survival and control stages. "The luxury of becoming socialized on the job is no longer a reality for beginning principals" (p. 289). Greater collaborative links between university personnel and in-school administrators and between school divisions and universities are critical for a realistic understanding of administration realities (p. 291).
School districts have the professional and ethical responsibility to provide on-site training opportunities for aspiring administrators, because they will eventually become recipients of the trained graduates (Richards & Fox, 1990, p. 28). Spradling (1989) recommended revision of formal induction programs to include pre- and inservice training to help newcomers deal more effectively with time management, and with practice in delegation of authority and responsibility. District offices have the responsibility to develop non-supervisory, mentor-mentee relationships with the new principal. New principals need assistance in budget preparation, staff member selection, student activity planning and supervision, and in dealing with unforeseen teacher turnover, community pressure groups, and unsatisfactory office personnel (p. 72).

Administrative Mentorship

The following subsection examines the concept of administrative mentorship. Mentorship and planned mentoring programs potentially play a role in the development of shared visions and in socialization (Caruso, 1992, p. 38). Mentors act as local guides, as educational companions, and as agents of change (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992, p. 16).

Daresh and Playko (1992) suggested a training model for mentors which reflects the realities of administrative life and prepares experienced practitioners to become effective mentors (p. 124). Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) addressed concerns about selection criteria, training, and support for mentors (p. 308). Kolb’s (1984) four stages of experiential learning (concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation) are all part of the mentorship experience,
and as such, have the potential to become a powerful and significant learning opportunity for both mentor and mentee. A strong mentoring relationship should exhibit qualities of collaboration, initiation, inclusiveness, reciprocation, coaching, modelling, development, and separation (Calabrese & Tucker-Ladd, 1991, p. 68).

The failure of male administrators to serve as mentors for female educators has been used to explain why relatively few women occupy school leadership positions (Duke, 1987, p. 264). In 1991, the British Columbia Principals’ and Vice-Principals’ Association prepared professional development activities geared toward beginning school administrators. The Edmonton Alberta Roman Catholic Separate School District initiated a mentorship program in 1994-95 in response to indicators which projected that eighty per cent of its practising administrators probably will have retired by Year 2000 (Riordan & Hildebrandt, 1995, p. 14).

In Storey and Zellinsky’s (1993) Canadian study, neophyte administrators reflected on events and circumstances which influenced their career move towards educational administration. Their resultant professional development model recognized four stages related to movement: early consideration, application and acceptance; approach or lead-up following appointment; and commencement (p. 8). Many educational administration programs are beginning to include a practicum experience for students to work closely with a mentor (Barnett, 1990; Bass, 1990; Holifeld & King, 1991).

In summary, educational administration literature is replete with research on mentorship, including definition of the role of good educational mentors, strong mentoring relationships, and specific mentorship models (Daresh & Playko, 1992).
programs (Buckner & Jones, 1990; Riordan & Hildebrandt, 1995), and studies (Alvy & Coladarci, 1985; Holifeld & King, 1991; Storey & Zellinsky, 1993).

**A Tridimensional Model for Professional Development**

Given the interest in a redefinition of traditional roles and responsibilities to include mentorship programs, and renewed interest in the delivery of professional development in educational administration (Calabrese, 1991; Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1992; Bjork & Ginsberg, 1995), Daresh and Playko’s (1992) *Tridimensional Conceptualization of Professional Development for Administrators* redefines existing images of professionalism [refer to Figure 2].

![Figure 2: The Tridimensional Conceptualization of Professional Development for Administrators](image)

(Daresh & Playko, 1992, p. 18)

Based on Lortie’s (1975) definition of occupational socialization, which was comprised of formal education, mediated entry, and learning-by doing (p. 57), Daresh and
Playko (1992) advocated that individuals must receive support and preparation for their leadership roles through equal attention to strong academic preparation (formal education), realistic field-based learning or guided practice (apprenticeship and learn-by-doing), and through the personal formation of aspiring administrators who will need to cope with the ambiguities associated with school leadership responsibilities (p. 17).

**Academic Preparation**

Academic preparation, the first dimension of Daresh and Playko's (1992) model, recognizes graduate-level university courses as the primary approach to training educational administrators (p. 24). "Professional knowledge" is essential in order for an occupation to be considered a profession (Goode, 1969, p. 277). Professional socialization occurs through formal academic preparation of context and contact with professors, practitioners, and peers (Duke, 1987, p. 267), although academic preparation is "far from what may be considered a comprehensive approach to the ways in which future administrators are made ready for their first jobs" (Daresh & Playko, 1992, p. 26).

**Field-Based Learning**

"Learning-by-doing" in actual schools comprises the model's second dimension. Educational experts (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; Goodlad, 1984) call for administrative preparation programs to stop teaching about administration and to direct more attention toward helping individuals learn how to administer schools. Preservice preparation programs can be field-based in nature, involving full-time administrative internships, part-time planned field experiences, and course-embedded programs which allow the opportunity to learn by doing (Daresh & Playko, 1992, p. 45). While some
skills and knowledges can only effectively be learned on the job, other skills may be best learned in a combination of formal training and on-the-job learning (p. 44). However, most programs completely overlook personal and professional formation, the third element of Daresh and Playko's (1992) tridimensional model.

**Personal and Professional Formation**

*Personal and professional formation* activities are directed toward helping students to synthesize learnings acquired through academic preparation and field-based learning. Students develop an appreciation of what it means to actually be an educational leader—to understand what control, authority, power, and leadership mean on an individual level. This dimension provides the student with a method of constructing a personal ethical and moral stance which may be used in framing responses to future administrative problems (p. 54).

*Formation* is the critical reflective activity related to communal experiences, and represents "a way in which individuals are able to test some of their fundamental assumptions concerning beliefs and lifestyles" (Warren, 1987, p. 515). It provides a way in which educational administration students come to understand themselves more completely—a way to gain a broader understanding of the social realities of the working world. There are five elements in formation: mentoring, educational platform development, an appreciation of alternative styles, personal reflection, and personal professional action planning (p. 56).

As previously described, *mentors* provide psycho-social support and administrative survival skills (p. 56). An *educational platform* outlines one's own
educational philosophy, beliefs, and values, whereas an individual platform statement helps the formation process by enabling the student to recognize strong beliefs and biases about significant educational issues (p. 60).

An appreciation of different interpersonal styles and how those differences relate to one's own administrative style are important in daily communications and relationships with staff and students; in the creation of teaching and administrative committees, and in school-community relationships (p. 61). Personal reflection may be limited unless specific questions are used to help guide the reflective process; the questions may also help to focus on leadership attributes (p. 3). A personal professional action plan involves academic preparation and field-based learning, blended with mentorship, personal reflection, platform development, and interpersonal style analysis into a single plan of action (p. 62).

Daresh and Playko (1992) also advocated that professional and personal formation should take place while in pursuit of academic preparation, and field-based learning should take place in order to enhance academic learning and to clarify formation.

The Three Major Phases of Career Development

Within the tridimensional model, Daresh and Playko (1992) depicted professional development as a graduated process with three major phases of career development: preservice preparation, induction, and in-service education [refer to Figure 3].

This model depicts the various strengths or emphasis placed upon academic preparation, field-based learning, and professional formation as the individual moves from preservice to in-service education (p. 19). When individuals participate in preservice
Figure 3: Elements of the Tridimensional Conceptualization of Professional Development and the Three Major Phases of Career Development

(Daresh and Playko, 1992, p. 19)

preparation, they generally acquire information about the nature of school management through university classes, reading, or other academic preparation which encompasses most of the learner's time. Academic preparation generally decreases while field-based learning increases as one grows older. Personal formation, however, permeates and remains constant throughout all phases of an individual's career (p. 20).

In terms of an individual moving through professional development stages, the preservice preparation phase includes the recruitment, selection, training, licensure, and initial administrative placement which occurs prior to initial job placement. The individual takes on a new position and a new role definition in the induction phase, and the inservice education phase provides learning opportunities to individuals while engaged on the job (p. 19)
In review, Storey and Zellinsky’s (1993) professional development model took the perspective of school leadership and the beginning principal, whereas Daresh and Playko’s (1992) tridimensional model concentrated upon three types of professional development along with major career development phases.

**Summary**

The distinct profession of educational administration (Hart, 1993) was reviewed within the professional socialization context. The literature tends to categorize induction along the lines of anticipatory, organizational, and professional socialization, along with formal and informal induction processes. The three perspectives which were addressed included socialization to the principalship; socialization and role conception including informal and formal socialization studies, and the move toward more practical, field-based induction programs and mentorships; and a tridimensional model of professional development (Daresh & Playko, 1992).

In reflecting upon the educational administration literature reviewed, there appeared to be no one definition or theoretical model which provides a comprehensive picture of the theory or practice of educational administrative induction. The literature did not provide a phenomenological view of the early stages of socialization to the principalship, nor was there any literature which specifically addressed the postmodern view of the individual and text.

**Summary of Core Findings of the Review of Related Literature**

Following the progression of a comprehensive review of the literature as indicated by the Research Map (p. 33), the contents of Chapter II identified four core literature
areas: First, the *phenomenological underpinning* provided me with a non-traditional methodological view of socialization. Second, the *postmodern underpinning* allowed the context of Tony’s and my own sensemaking processes to be described in a substantially different way from other philosophical approaches, as it recognizes the primacy of reflective conversation as knowledge. Third, both of these theoretical underpinnings provide definition as to how the *sensemaking* underpinning will be interpreted within this dissertation research. Fourth, *educational administration* literature provided background context for the induction events reported within this dissertation.

**Original Nature of the Study**

An overview of the literature has allowed me to identify three emergent perspectives which will be discussed in the theoretical framework encapsulated in Chapter VII: *Sensemaking* through postmodern and phenomenological lenses, the *contextual lens* in terms of the organization, the rural Grade Seven to Twelve school, and the *location lens* of viewing the phenomenon of the induction stage of socialization from Tony’s viewpoint and my own. Weick’s (1995) organizational sensemaking appears to be a seminal work in its specificity to sensemaking theory, incorporating the literature of perception and interpretation in its discussion.

This dissertation provides the opportunity to point research further along a continuum; that is, the literature has provided a means to view induction at the *micro-organizational* level through the uniqueness of the inner reflections of the individual—the self. The Research Map (p. 33) visually has identified this perspective as the last stage of the Review of Literature framework. The *theoretical* framework of this research
encompasses the viewpoints of the sensemaking of two individuals through
phenomenological and postmodern lenses. The conceptual framework of this research
encompasses the viewpoint of myself through a shifting, bifurcated location lens, along
with other perspectives. It follows, then, that this is a study original in nature.
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Each researcher has a particular attitude or orientation to methodology from philosophical knowledge or lack of it that is carried into the work and that implies a certain way the study will be accomplished. Thus the issue of approach affects the research process and the results and, ultimately, its classification as excellent or not.

(Ray, 1994, p. 127)

Introduction

Methodological adequacy must satisfy two criteria: first, to clarify the methods and rules of accomplishing the research purpose and, second, to provide the rationale justifying the appropriateness of that specific path to knowledge (Macpherson, 1984b, p. 68). Both of these criteria will be addressed, albeit in reverse order.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design and methodology used in this study. Section One positions the Research Design, and a discussion of the Credibility of Phenomenological Research will also be undertaken. In this manner, the rationale for justifying the appropriateness of the methodology will be addressed.

Section Two identifies the specific Research Methodology of this study. In subsequent subsections the Phenomenological Model is recognized, including processes and methodology, and use of qualitative research through the Case Study Approach. Section Three discusses the Research Participants in terms of the Participant Selection Process and Participants in Instrumentation, including the Contextual Setting and
Situation. Section Four describes Validation of the Data in terms of Trustworthiness and Phenomenology and Intersubjective Validity. Section Five addresses Ethical Principles. Thus, Section One outlines the research design while Sections Two through Five clarify the methods and rules of accomplishing the purpose of the research.

Section One: The Research Design

The qualitative researcher usually uses a flexible research design which provides the parameters, tools, and general guide of how to proceed; this design is based on theoretical assumptions and on data-collection traditions (Bogdan & Biklen. 1998). However, this design or full account of procedures "is best described in retrospect" (p. 49) after the events have occurred and after the researcher has had time to fully reflect upon the research experience. "[T]he study itself structures the research, not preconceived ideas or any precise research design" (p. 49). Bogdan and Biklen's (1998) advocacy thus provides me the opportunity to reflect upon the evolution of this study's research design.

In retrospect, the research topic was in its embryonic stages at the Comprehensive Oral Examination time, with its title conceptualized as "Crossing Boundaries: The Perceptions of Key Community Stakeholders in the Socialization of a Neophyte Rural Principal". By the time I had participated in Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course, the topic had evolved from the viewpoint of others towards the principal's socialization to a view from the principal's lens regarding socialization to the principalship.

The letters of introduction mailed to Tony and his Director of Education described the proposed research as, "Socialization Sketches of a Neophyte Rural Principal: A
Narrative Case Study" [refer to Appendix F-1 and H]. My sensemaking of the principal’s experience continued to evolve while I collected verbatim data from the field. I had ostensibly identified Tony as the focal point of this study, but after several months of data collection and discussion with my bemused advisor, I recognized that my underlying interest was not so much to learn about Tony’s induction experience as to make sense of the events which fascinated me for my own anticipatory set.

In summary, the title and topic evolved in postmodern fashion as I collected the raw data and attempted to make sense of the events Tony had experienced. The central phenomenon to be explored had moved from socialization to the principalship to a determination of how Tony developed a meaning system which enabled him to function within the educational organization. The focus of the study had moved from emphasis on Tony’s lived experiences to the more over-riding, issue-oriented question of determining what sensemaking I attributed to my own observations as researcher and participant observer of Tony’s experiences. As Bogdan and Biklin (1998) observed, often an individual’s own biography will be an influence in defining the thrust of the dissertation (p. 51).

**The Credibility of Phenomenological Research**

As phenomenology has been identified as a theoretical underpinning to this study of the sensemaking of two individuals, it seemed appropriate to discuss the credibility of phenomenology as method. In discussing the postmodern move towards narrative research, Constas (1998) decried the highly elevated assessment of localized knowledge (petit recit) found in recent educational literature. He believed that a procedural problem exists in using narrative within [postmodern] educational research; that this promotes a
general acceptance of informality in research methods (p. 28). Constas (1998) lauded researchers who displayed an interest in narrative research and who also demonstrated connections to philosophical thought within their practical research applications (p. 29). This research relies heavily upon the philosophical underpinnings of sensemaking, phenomenology, postmodernism, and on the structured research approach of Moustakas’s (1994) phenomenological method.

Although *naturalistic* alludes to ways in which one may seek to examine reality and these ways emphasize the wholeness and phenomenological interrelatedness of the real world, *qualitative* alludes to the nature of the understanding that is sought. The qualitative nature of resulting description enables the researcher to see the "real" world as those under study see it. (Owens, 1982, p. 7)

Ray (1994, p. 130) suggested that in naturalistic inquiry, credibility and affirmation of phenomenological research could be understood by Heidegger’s (1977, p. 115) concept of truth as unconcealment and Ricoeur’s (1981) idea that truth of the text may be regarded as the world it unfolds (Thompson, 1981).

Based on this premise, I consider my descriptions or interpretations to be appropriate, because "the reflective process awakens an inner moral impulse" (Bollnow, 1974, as cited in Ray, 1994, p. 130). Credibility is the "phenomenological nod" where the description and interpretation of experience are something we can nod to and recognize as experiences that we had or could have had (Van Maanen, 1990, p. 27).

The goal of eidetic or *descriptive* phenomenology as a research method rests in the description of the meaning of the experience from the perspective or world view of those who have had that experience and as a result of that experience, have attached
meaning to it. Researchers do not bracket their awareness, only their presuppositions. They reflect on the described experiences, and intuit or describe the essential structures of the experiences under study (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p. 148; Morse, 1994, p. 134).

On the other hand, hermeneutic or interpretive phenomenology as a research method rests on the ontological thesis that lived experience is itself an interpretive experience, that the phenomenological task is one of self-interpretation. Understanding and possibilities are the outcome of interpretations, which are linked to cultural norms. Method is focused on the absolute and exact in the interpretation of meaning. Interpretation occurs in context, and both the subject and researcher are participants in this context (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p. 149).

Pinar (1988) recognized the role of the researcher in determination of meaning. The researcher does not merely mirror what is observed as if it is "out there". To mirror is an error of ethnography; it results from the interest in being scientific. Rather, "[i]t is the researcher's 'eye', [his] capacity to penetrate the surface of situations [...] which makes possible understanding" (p. 142).

In summary, the phenomenological method of this study involves both descriptive and interpretive phenomenology as both Tony and I experienced the induction phase through different lenses. We were constantly challenged to engage in acts of redefining and redescribing ourselves and our contact with the world (Greene, 1994, p. 440) in the postmodern sense. The research method assumed a hermeneutical approach based upon the continuous involvement of Tony in dialogue with me, upon reflection of our own experiences of the same induction incidents, and upon our relation to others within the
consoicate socialization circle. I could only make sense of Tony's experiences through his descriptions, but I could make sense of my own experiences through my own reflective interpretations.

Section Two: The Research Methodology

The concept of a flexible research design was addressed within Section One of this chapter. Procedural dilemmas were identified as a result of choosing a sensemaking approach to the research; the phenomenological approach was advocated as credible research.

In this Section Two, a sensemaking approach is advocated in order to understand the induction phase of socialization from the personal perspectives of a neophyte principal and a researcher. The phenomenological method presented here, with concomitant conceptual and theoretical frameworks as presented in Chapter VII, avoids the Tayloristic basis of structured observation in educational administration (Macpherson, 1984b, p. 58). Phenomenological method takes the essence of subjectivity as its base in order to experience, understand, and create the social world. Macpherson (1984b) contended that the early stages of being and becoming an educational administrator should be described in such a way that the meanings created and how those meanings are reflected in behaviour should be described. He claimed that "there is a need for a grounded model of understanding" (p. 62).

Thus, in this Section Two, the phenomenological model (Moustakas, 1994) as a research technique is described, including subsections on phenomenological processes and methodology. Advocating a qualitative research approach, use of the case study is
also described.

**The Phenomenological Model**

Creswell (1998, p. 69) ascertained that the best procedural discussions of phenomenology were found in Giorgi (1985), Polkinghorne (1989), and Moustakas (1994), with additional remarks in Van Kaam (1966), Colaizzi (1978), Spiegelberg (1982), Dukes (1984), Oiler (1986), and Tesch (1990). As Moustakas (1994) provided the most comprehensive and up-to-date description of the phenomenological model, I selected his methodological approach for my research. His analytical framework directly relates to this dissertation's phenomenological, theoretical underpinning. Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological method was chosen as a viable means of investigating the inner "contours of consciousness" (Freeman, 1980, p. 114). The model identifies processes and methodology steps which will be applied to this research.

**Phenomenological Processes**

There are four processes in Moustakas’s (1994) phenomenological model: *Epoche*, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of composite textural and composite structural descriptions, each of which are described as steps.

*Epoche*. This first analytical step sets aside prejudgments and opens the research interview with an unbiased, receptive presence known as the "phenomenological attitude". This shift in attitude moves beyond the natural attitude with which phenomena are imbued with meaning towards experience which gains a deeper meaning:

*Epoche* is a process that the researcher engages in to remove, or at least become aware of prejudices, viewpoints or assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation. *Epoche* helps enable the researcher to
investigate the phenomenon from a fresh and open viewpoint without prejudice or imposing meaning too soon. This suspension of judgment is critical in phenomenological investigation and requires the setting aside of the researcher's personal viewpoint in order to see the experience for itself. (Katz, 1987, pp. 36-37, as cited in Patton, 1990, p. 407)

This shift does not mean to lay aside one's belief in reality itself in order to do phenomenology. Rather, Époche requires that looking at the phenomenon must precede judgment, and that judgment of what is "real" or "most real" is suspended until sufficient evidence is accumulated. Included are all phenomena of the experience and excluded are metaphysical and reality judgments (Ihde, 1977, p. 36). It is an ongoing analytical process rather than a single, fixed event and "epitomizes the data-based, evidential, and empirical (versus empiricist) research orientation of phenomenology" (Patton, 1990, p. 408).

Phenomenological reduction. This second analytical step expects the researcher to bracket out the world and to bracket presuppositions in order to identify the data in pure form, uncontaminated by extraneous intrusions. This involves locating key phrases and statements within the personal experience which speak directly to the phenomenon in question (Patton, 1990, p. 408; Denzin, 1989, p. 55). The meanings of these phrases are interpreted by both the co-researcher and primary researcher; they are inspected for what they reveal about the essential, recurring features of the phenomenon. A tentative statement of the phenomenon is offered in terms of those features. Constas (1998) suggested that "educational researchers interested in writing narrative accounts must understand the way their own experiences, backgrounds, biases, and subjective views influence the research process" (p. 31). Phenomenological reduction provides a unique way to deliberately identify those understandings [refer to Appendix A].
After the data are bracketed, they are horizontalized or spread out for examination, with all perspectives treated with equal value in analysis (Ihde, 1977, p. 37). After the data have been grouped into meaningful clusters, a delimitation process is undertaken which involves elimination of irrelevant, overlapping, or repetitive data. Invariant themes are identified so that the step of imaginative variation may be performed on each theme.

**Imaginative variation.** This third analytical step involves making sense of something from different viewpoints [refer to Appendix A]. Imaginative variation will be described through the different perspectives of the phenomenon; that is, from Tony’s perspective as co-researcher, and from my own bifurcated perspectives as primary researcher and participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship.

Through imaginative variation, enhanced or expanded versions of the invariant themes are developed (Patton, 1990). Next, a textural portrayal of the themes occurs; it involves descriptions of induction which do not contain the experience itself (for example, feelings of being overwhelmed by information overload may be described). The textural portrayal is an abstraction of the experience that provides content and illustration but not yet essence (p. 409).

**Structural synthesis.** The development of a structural synthesis or the "bones" of the experience comprises the fourth analytical step of the phenomenological model. The researcher looks beneath the affect inherent in the experience to deeper meanings. The true meanings of the experience are described and the essence of the phenomenon is revealed (p. 409) [refer to Appendix A].
In summary, then, four steps are involved in phenomenological research process: 

*Epochen* phenomenaological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of composite textural and structural descriptions. The methodology specific to these four processes will be described next.

**Methodology**

The four process steps provide the basis for the four methodological research steps. These steps include: preparation required to collect the data; collecting the data itself; organizing, analyzing, and synthesizing the data; and the summary, implications, and outcomes of the research.

**Preparation to collect the data.** Interview data are the result of a series of selections made by the researcher both before and during fieldwork. I made decisions about which setting to conduct the research in, who to interview, where and when the interviews would take place, and what instruments to use (Scott, 1996, p. 65). Data collection preparation also includes formulation of the question itself—to arrive at a topic and question that has social meaning and personal significance (Moustakas, 1994, p. 104). As well, a literature review must be compiled, participant selection criteria must be developed, and a set of guided questions for the interview must be discerned (p. 181).

Prior to the interviews, I engaged in the *Epochen* process described earlier so that past associations, biases, "facts", and understandings were set aside in order not to colour or direct the interview (p. 116). Engaging in the *Epochen* process was also necessary during the interviews themselves [refer to Appendix E for a list of identified personal prejudgments of the researcher].
In this manner, then, data collection preparations were ensured. Chapter I formulated the question and defined its terms. Chapter II provided an extensive literature review. Section Three of Chapter III will describe the participant selection process and co-researcher and primary researcher instrumentation, Section Four will describe validation of the data, and Section Five will establish ethical principles considered in this study.

**Collection of the data.** The data were collected by engaging in *Epoch*, by bracketing the questions, and by conducting qualitative research interviews to obtain descriptions of the experience [refer to Appendix A].

I drove out to the school division daily for the first two weeks of school, except for one university orientation-induction day. Throughout the data collection period, Tony kept me apprised of all meetings that he believed were of importance to the research. I asked for photocopies of his daily appointment book jottings in order to ascertain whether there were any other incidents which were of data collection interest to me, over and above Tony's interests. In this manner, we determined which events and days would be most beneficial for me to be present for data collection purposes. I constantly shadowed Tony while I was in his environment collecting data.

The raw data were collected from August to December 1997 and were transcribed into verbatim transcripts by the end of January 1998. Within those transcripts were informal interviews as well as verbatim accounts of various types of interactions with which Tony was involved. Moustakas (1994) suggested that a general interview guide might be used when the co-researcher's narrative has not tapped into the experience qualitatively and with sufficient meaning and depth (p. 116). Broad questions facilitate
the obtaining of rich, substantive, vital descriptions of the co-researcher's experience of the phenomenon. The interview itself allowed me access to Tony's past events; to situations at which I was not able to be present; and to situations where permission was refused for me, as researcher, to be present (Scott, 1996, p. 67).

In April and May 1998, well after the tape recorded meetings and interviews had been transcribed using my field notes as back-up, I again interviewed Tony, in an attempt to achieve more depth to his narrative. Cortazzi (1993) contended that interviews reflect two referential and evaluative functions of narrative: the referential function serves to give the audience information through the narrator's recapitulation of experience. In this manner, I had explained the concepts of sensemaking and phenomenology to Tony so that he could relate those concepts in writing the narrative of his personal experiences. The evaluative function serves to establish positive communication with the audience by highlighting personal involvement, which was encouraged by use of culturally-specific definition and language (p. 44).

In order to achieve more depth in Tony's narrative, I decided to employ the topical-guided interview questions in relation to the verbatim transcript of the new principals' meeting of August 19, 1997. At our November 14 meeting [refer to Appendix D], Tony had indicated that because of heavy time commitments on the job and at home with his young family, the best way for him to reflect on the recorded meetings was to work on the interview questions at his leisure [refer to Appendix L for two examples of verbatim transcripts]. He said he felt he could give the research his best effort if he were allowed to write his reflections rather than to voice them through a tape recorder; he felt
more confident of his writing than of his verbal abilities. I readily agreed, knowing that the phenomenological approach involves the give and take of a collaborative research effort among primary researcher and co-researcher. Thus, the list of topical-guided interview questions were given to Tony, who was encouraged to use it as he reflected upon the verbatim transcripts [refer to Appendix B for the list of interview questions].

In total, I used 43 x 110-minute cassette tapes to tape record Tony's interactions with students, staff, fellow administrators, trustees, and the community in a variety of meetings and situations, along with informal interview dialogues between Tony and myself [refer to Appendix D for a list of data collection verbatim transcripts]. These recordings, along with handwritten field notes of the same experiences, which were used to verify the sometimes muffled voices on the mechanical tape recorder, were transcribed verbatim. "Ideally, verbatim transcription of recorded interviews provides the best data base for analysis" (Merriam, 1988, p. 82).

Polkinghorne (1989) commented that in undertaking phenomenological research, data collection often results in hundreds of pages of written material (p. 50). The recordings produced 908 pages of printed data, and took seven weeks of long days and nights to transcribe. These 908 twelve-pitch pages were reduced to 678 ten-pitch pages before distributing them to Tony for his verification and subsequent sensemaking of the incidents [refer to Appendix L for examples of verbatim transcripts]. In addition, the topical-guided interview responses supplemented these numbers substantially.

In summary, mechanical tape recordings, back-up field notes, informal interviews, and topical-guided interview questions comprised data collection techniques. As data
collection procedures included *Epocche*, bracketing, and interviews through informal means as well as through use of the topical-guided interview questions, I concluded that I had adhered to Moustakas's (1994) data collection methodology appropriately.

Chapter IV will provide a condensed description of the 908 pages of thick data, including some verbatim comments of the incidents which piqued my interest. This opportunity to immerse myself in a grounded sense of the context provides the basis for making sense of the content Tony considered worthy of sensemaking in his own Chapter V and for my own sensemaking in Chapters VI and VII.

**Organizing, analyzing, and synthesizing the data.** This methodological step instructs the researcher to follow one of two modified methods of data analysis [refer to Appendix A]. I selected Moustakas's (1994, p. 122) modified Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen analysis approach to organizing, analyzing, and synthesizing data [refer to Appendix C].

I knew that the 908 pages of verbatim raw data had to be congealed into a manageable work load for sensemaking purposes. My first stint at organizing the data involved recording the events in longhand and by audio tape recorder at the research site. By being a participant observer, I was able to mull the events over and over again in my mind. The handwritten notes provided valuable support to the audio tapes as I transcribed and thus revisited the data again. After completion of this arduous task, I read the transcribed data from clean copy and highlighted topics which piqued my interest for the first time in written format. I pencilled comments at the side margins to further clarify the highlighted material.
Next, I skimmed margins of the 908 pages and made a list of the pencilled comments; the list provided the rudimentary meaning units of the experience. I honed the list yet again, then clustered the meaning units into themes. I went back into the 908 pages and selected verbatim examples which rendered vivid descriptions of the texture of the experience. This was the manner in which I was able to reflect upon the descriptions and to thread them into my own sensemaking of the experiences.

Although phenomenological inquiry focuses on the structure and essence of the experience, descriptions of experience and interpretations can be so intertwined that, in reality, they often become one (Patton, 1990, p. 69; Merriam, 1988, p. 35). Thus, the phenomenological perspective can mean either or both a focus on what individuals experience and how they interpret the world, or a methodological mandate to experience the phenomenon being investigated (Ray, 1994, p. 131; Patton, 1990, p. 69). In the first instance, I was able to interview Tony without actually having experienced parts of the phenomenon myself, but I was brought into awareness through Tony’s experience. In the second instance, participant observation or first-hand experience in the world was necessary. Both instances were used in this research: the general interview guide had been used to enrich Tony’s reflective responses to the verbatim transcripts, and I had been a direct participant observer in some of Tony’s induction experiences.

The goal of eidetic phenomenology is description of the meaning of an experience from the perspective of those who have had that experience and, as a result, attached meaning to it. This meaning is described through Moustakas’s (1994) modified method of analysis and is presented in Chapter VII. To be consistent with phenomenological
writing, this dissertation was written from a personal narrative point of view. In this manner, both Tony and I were able to write from the ideas that fascinated each of us.

Having experienced first-hand the events outlined in Chapter IV, Tony wrote of his own sensemaking perspective in Chapter V. He reflected upon the verbatim transcripts and his own experiences using the supplied topical-guided interview questions. His sensemaking was described in regular type-font, with his after-thoughts or "reflections on reflections" presented in italics within his own discussion.

Chapter VI presents my sensemaking of Tony’s Chapter V reflections through the lens of an individual in anticipatory set to the principalship as well as through the lens of a primary researcher. Reflections on the verbatim raw data were also included within the sensemaking of Chapter VII.

Summary, implications, and outcomes. Chapter VII comprises the culminating step of this dissertation. The final step in the phenomenological model summarizes the study and relates it back to the literature review, to possible future research, and to personal and professional outcomes [refer to Appendix A].

Using the lens of a primary researcher, the study’s conceptual and theoretical frameworks became the culminating feature of this research. Because these frameworks are the result of my own sensemaking of the research topic, they were presented in the final chapter, separate from the traditional methodology format.

In summary, Moustakas’s (1994) phenomenological model includes research processes and methodology. The purpose of the research was to elucidate the essence of the sensemaking of the induction phase of socialization to the principalship as described
by both Tony and myself. As the research questions were based on both Tony’s and my own sensemaking, a phenomenological analysis of the verbatim, transcribed meetings and interviews appeared to be an appropriate methodology for this study.

The Case Study Approach

Within this subsection, the distinctive features of case study research approach will be defined and the rationale for choosing such an approach will be discussed.

*Case study defined.* Generally, case study grapples with phenomena in real-life contexts. It recognizes that the complex nature of phenomena diminishes the degree of control which can be exerted by the researcher. Case study relies heavily on qualitative data, it incorporates multiple sources of data as a means to acquire and corroborate observations regarding the phenomenon, and it aims to provide a detailed portrait of the particular (Stake, 1997, p. 401; Patton, 1990, p. 384; Yin, 1989, p. 14; Merriam. 1988, p. 32; Lofland, 1971, p. 102). Case study allows the researcher to "search for an understanding of the particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity" (Stake, 1997, p. 405). It is one of the most popular and respected forms for studying educators, and researchers appreciate the deep, self-referential probes of problems (p. 401).

Merriam (1988) espoused a pragmatic justification for case study which emphasizes the applied nature of research (p. 20), although she acknowledged that the qualitative research paradigm draws heavily from the philosophical orientations of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and theory of tacit knowledge. Case study is "interpretation in context" (Cronbach, 1975, p. 123), "primarily an interpretive instrument for an idiographic construal of what was found there" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 189). If *verstehen*, or meaning
experienced in the situation, is postulated, "then the idiographic position becomes not only tenable but mandatory" (p. 216). Case study is "an ideal design for understanding and interpreting observations of educational phenomena" (Merriam, 1988, p. 2). Research which is "focused on discovery, insight and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied [my italics] offers the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge base and practice of education" (p. 3).

These descriptions of case study appear to dovetail with Weick’s (1995) claim that "sensemaking is about authoring as well as interpretation, creation as well as discovery" (p. 8), and with Schutz’s (1970) concern about what the social world means for the individual observer (p. 44).

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) likened the general design of case study to a funnel, with the beginning of the study at the wide end. The researcher scouts for possible locations and individuals who may be the subject or data source, finds the location, and then casts a wide net to judge the feasibility of the site or data source for study purposes. The researcher looks for clues on how to proceed and what might be feasible to undertake within research parameters. The researcher collects, reviews and explores the data; makes decisions about where to go with the research, how to distribute his or her time, who to interview, and what to explore in depth. The design is continually modified and procedures are selected as more is learned about the topic. From its broad exploratory beginnings, the researcher moves to more directed data collection and analysis; and in this manner, the work develops a focus (p. 54). The pragmatics of my research appear to adhere to this approach.
Rationale for the approach. The guiding rationale for my choice of the case study approach to this inquiry was provided by the nature of the research problem as outlined in Chapter I, by my perceived extent of control over actual behavioural events, and by the nature of the phenomena under investigation (Yin, 1994, p. 4; Merriam, 1988, p. 32).

From the perspective of Tony as co-researcher, the central phenomenon to be explored was: How did the neophyte principal develop a meaning system which enabled him to function within the educational organization? With the phenomenological perspective of experiencing the social world through one’s own lens, the sensemaking of the researcher became the culminating, over-riding, issue-oriented question: What sensemaking did I attribute to my own observations as a researcher and participant observer of Tony’s experiences?

Case study is the most appropriate strategy for investigating research problems which are framed primarily as "how" questions, which do not require control over behavioural events, and which focus on contemporary events (Yin, 1994, p. 4). Tony’s use of the topical interview guide (Moustakas, 1994, p. 116) to articulate his reflections satisfied the first of Yin’s (1994) criteria. The second and third criteria were satisfied by the very nature of the research itself. Therefore, case study was selected as the appropriate research approach.

Case study may also be exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory in nature (Yin, 1994, p. 4). Exploratory case studies examine a topic relative to which there has been little previous research and which are designed to lead to further inquiry. The focus may be on specific individuals, events, or processes (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 395).
Sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995) is a relatively novel concept within contemporary research; consequently, I extrapolated that it would also be new to the profession of educational administration. To the best of my knowledge, no prior studies have investigated the relationship between sensemaking and induction to the principalship. Thus, this case study explores uncharted terrain. This case study is also characterized by thick description:

[t]hick description is more than mere information or descriptive data: it conveys a literal description that figuratively transports the readers into the situation with a sense of insight, understanding, and illumination not only of the facts or the events in the case, but also of the texture, the quality, and the power of the context as the participants in the situation experienced it. (Owens, 1992, p. 8).

The fourth phenomenological principle of Moustakas’s (1994) model is the commitment to descriptions of experiences rather than explanations or analyses:

In descriptions one seeks to present in vivid and accurate terms, in complete terms, what appears in consciousness and in direct seeing–images, impressions, verbal pictures, features of heaviness, lightness; sweetness, saltiness; bitterness, sourness; openness, constrictedness; coldness, warmth; roughness, smoothness; sense qualities of sound, touch sight and taste; and aesthetic properties. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 55)

Ihde (1977) noted that the first operational rule of phenomenological research is to describe in a rigorous way, rather than to explain. Explanation is excluded in description of the phenomena: any sort of idea, concept, theory, or construction that attempts to go behind the phenomenon, or accounts for it in terms of other than what appears is excluded. "[T]his seems terribly simple until it is actually tried" (p. 34). The researcher should produce
a report that gives an accurate, clear, and articulate description of an experience. The reader of the report should come away with the feeling that "I understand better what it is like for someone to experience that." (Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 46)

As actors in a postmodern fashion, Tony and I were always in process, creating ourselves. Descriptions of the self do not appear as a solidified essence but as something fluid and in process. The research design and methodology allowed me to continue to create myself and my own anticipatory socialization experiences through Tony’s experiences. The most appropriate vehicle to achieve thick description appeared to be through the exploratory case study.

To summarize, the sensemaking and phenomenological underpinnings of this study provided the guiding rationale and philosophical base from which to establish the appropriate research methodology for this study. The exploratory case study provided an approach to describe how both Tony and I each made sense of the world, and in so doing, how we each developed a world view.

Section Three: The Research Participants

This research involves two primary participants: Tony as co-researcher and active participant in the induction phase of his own socialization to the principalship, and myself, as primary researcher and participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship.

This section involves participant selection criteria, including my attempt to locate a co-researcher through the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course using specific co-researcher criteria. The co-researcher and primary researcher are described through a section entitled participants in the instrumentation, and the geographic, school, and administrative setting
are described within the *contextual setting and situation* subsection.

**The Participant Selection Process**

The location of data sources can be critical (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 52). As my most recent teaching experiences have been rural in nature, it appeared logical to study socialization within that familiar venue, and because I perceived my own career advancement to be within the rural, rather than urban, context. I also knew that travel time had the potential to become burdensome in terms of dragging the research out, and that it might limit my access and therefore my involvement in the study. It would be difficult to spontaneously jump in and out of the field if the data source was not near my principal residence.

I deliberately chose not to select a co-researcher with whom I had previous personal acquaintance, as this would add another level of complexity to the study. To become a primary researcher meant more than learning specific skills and procedures; it involved changing my way of thinking about myself and my relations with others (p. 61). I decided to work with someone with whom I had no previous association.

My criteria were simple, I thought: I was searching for a female neophyte principal of a Kindergarten to Grade Twelve rural school who displayed an interest in my study, who was someone I could relate to, who was articulate, who appeared to display a reflective practitioner stance, whose family would be directly impacted by her socialization to the principalship, and whose position was located within a reasonable driving distance from my principal place of residence.
The search to find such a co-researcher commenced with my attendance at the July 1997 Saskatchewan Principals' *Short Course*, which was the only formal province-wide induction program available to neophyte principals. Even with the elimination of gender and grade-specific selection criteria restrictions, my week-long search to locate a preferred candidate during the Short Course was unsuccessful. My search widened to the broader educational community in an attempt to maintain the remaining selection criteria elements.

The difficulties I experienced in the co-researcher selection process brought to mind Lofland and Lofland (1995), who considered the outside researcher role to be more difficult than the inside role, simply because the outsider needs to seek admission to a setting for the purpose of observing the setting or to access to an individual for the purpose of interviewing that individual, whereas the insider already has that admission established. They also noted that gaining entry to a setting is greatly expedited through contacts already established (p. 38).

I networked with professors, colleagues, friends, and Short Course group leaders to locate someone who could link me to a possible co-researcher. My own group leader continued to display an interest in my research topic, even after course completion. Her school division was geographically situated one hour away from the city, along a major traffic route. She indicated that she had hired a male neophyte principal of a Grade Seven to Twelve school in the springtime, but that he was currently upgrading his own educational qualifications at summer school in the United States, and had not enrolled in the Short Course. Thus, my access to the research setting was expedited through my
Short Course connection with this Director of Education. This relationship facilitated removal of a research entrance barrier and by late July had led to the location of a possible co-researcher.

The potential co-researcher appeared suitable for my research purposes as both he and his family had not yet moved into the geographic community; thus, it provided the beginnings of a rich data base from which to draw responses for this research. After repeated attempts to contact this neophyte principal, I finally made a telephone connection on August 18, 1997. Tony had just moved into town that week, and through his Director of Education, he had been initially apprised of the possibility that I would contact him.

Tony appeared eager to participate in my research, and invited me to drive out to meet him the next morning in order for him to find out more about the research and to get to know me. I readily agreed, and after meeting with him at his office, I asked him to consider the study's potential significance to him in terms of whether or not he wanted to become involved in the research. Upon reflection of the initial dissertation topic of socialization to the principalship (which has since grown richer because of the research experience itself), he enthusiastically agreed to become co-researcher of this study. First, he regarded my presence in his school to be of collegiate dialogue value as he entered the profession of educational administration. Second, he believed his participation in my study would enable him to glean research information which he could later apply to his own professional development endeavors. Third, even though this activity was not of his own making, he expressed a desire to be of assistance to me as I had deliberately requested his participation as a fellow educator.
After meeting at Tony’s office, we walked over to the board office and met with
the Director of Education to inform her of Tony’s initial decision. The search was over; I
had located the most suitable and likely co-researcher for the proposed research.

**Participants in Instrumentation**

This subsection describes Tony as co-researcher and myself in the bifurcated role
as primary researcher within the research setting and as participant observer in
anticipatory set to the principalship. It is important to situate Tony as an educator, family
man, and community person in the event that these roles impact upon either his or my
reflections later in the research.

**The Co-Researcher**

As an educator, Tony assumed the principalship with six years of Saskatchewan
classroom experience, three of which included “acting principal” designation. He had
also been a Saskatchewan Education pilot teacher of the Grade Ten English curriculum.
Tony had taught all six years in one rural Kindergarten to Grade Twelve school with a
student population of approximately one hundred and ten students, although he himself
had grown up and taken his public and post-secondary education in Regina. In reflecting
upon Tony’s high school experiences, we discovered that we had actually attended the
same secondary school, albeit years apart. Tony majored in Curriculum and Instruction
for his Bachelor of Education degree at the University of Regina and is currently enrolled
in graduate school at San Diego during the summers, where he pursues class work
towards a Master of Arts with a focus on Educational Leadership. Tony had also played
a leadership role in his previous teacher union local.
As a family man, Tony was thirty, married, with two young daughters aged four and one-and-a-half, when he accepted this principalship appointment. At commencement of the research, he and his wife were expecting their third child in early February 1998 (at time of writing, however, Tony has become the father of a third daughter). Tony’s wife occasionally acts as substitute teacher within the school. She grew up and attended public school in the neighbouring area, and worked in the town restaurant as a teenager; her family continues to farm in the area. Tony, however, was new to the geographic area. Tony’s parents are divorced; he is in constant contact with each of them, as well as with his spouse’s family.

To date, Tony has devoted most of his energies toward the school and his family, although he participated in some community curling bonspiels and his wife occasionally teaches Sunday School at one of the local churches.

The Researcher

I have conducted the research in a bifurcated role: as a primary researcher and as a participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship.

As primary researcher. As an educator, my twenty-plus years of classroom experience have included teaching at two large Grade Eleven-Twelve secondary schools in urban British Columbia with student populations of over eleven hundred students each, at two large Kindergarten to Grade Twelve rural Saskatchewan schools and one Grade Six to Twelve rural school with student populations ranging from over three hundred to six hundred and fifty students. My post-secondary teaching experiences have included instructional time at a technical institute and sessional lecturer experiences within both
provincial universities as well as at a community college. I had also taught in India under the auspices of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation.

I obtained my Bachelor of Education with Distinction, Post-Graduate Diploma, and Master of Education from the same university as Tony, although my doctoral studies were situated in Saskatoon. I majored in curriculum and instruction for my first two degrees, and in educational administration for my other experiences. Also, I had extensive experience in numerous teacher union positions, had participated in several government curriculum initiatives, and had been seconded as a consultant to the provincial Department of Education.

As a family person, I am a middle-aged widow with no children, with strong ties to my immediate family; I also maintain connections with my spouse’s family. My community involvements have been completely curtailed in order to complete the doctoral studies.

As participant observer. Early literature definitions of observation were provided by Junker (1960), who outlined a four-fold typology of observational roles: the complete participant, the participant as observer, the observer as participant, and the complete observer (p. 35); inherent in this continuum was the degree of overt or covert observation displayed by the investigator. Gans (1982) identified participant observation as a type of formal arrangement in which the investigator is emotionally distracted: "It requires the surrender of any personal interest one might have in the situation in order to be free to observe it" (p. 54).
More recently, McMillan and Schumacher (1997) identified five research roles appropriate for various types of studies: observer, participant, participant-observer, insider-observer, and interviewer. Within this research, as a participant observer, I did not have an established *a priori* role, but rather, I created my role for the purpose of data collection (p. 437). Lofland and Lofland (1995) defined *participant observation* as the process in which an investigator establishes and sustains a multiple-sided and long-term relationship with other individuals in their natural setting, for the purpose of developing an understanding of that association. Classic participant observation "always involves the interweaving of looking and listening, of watching and asking, and some of that listening and asking may approach or be identical to intensive interviewing" (p. 19).

In this respect, participant observation becomes part of the interview process. As Ely (1991) pointed out, "[a]n attitude of curiosity and a heightened attention are required in order to attend to those very details that most of us filter out automatically in day-to-day life" (p. 42). Participant observation, then, "cannot be divorced from looking, interacting, and attending to more than the actual interview words" (p. 43). Wolcott (1995) distinguished between the participant observer who passively accepts what comes along, as compared to the interviewer who aggressively seeks information by "getting nosy" (p. 102). In this respect, in the act of asking topical-guided interview questions of Tony, I moved from passive observer to interlocutor, because I deliberately intruded onto his scene by imposing what I wanted to know, into the observed situation (p. 102).

Spradley (1980) likened participant observation to what we do when we encounter an unfamiliar social situation. The distinguishing feature of being a participant observer
in ordinary life as compared to one in research requires a shift of attention, which may be shown in a variety of ways:

The role of participant observer will vary from one social situation to another, and each investigator has to allow the way he or she works to evolve. But as your role develops, you will have to maintain a dual purpose: You will want to participate and to watch yourself and others at the same time. Make yourself explicitly aware of things that others will take for granted. It will be important to take mental pictures with a wide-angle lens, looking beyond your immediate focus of activity. You will experience the feeling of being both an insider and outsider simultaneously. As you participate in routine activities, you will need to engage in introspection to more fully understand your experiences. And finally, you will need to keep a record of what you see and experience. These six features of the participant observer role distinguish it from what you already know as an ordinary participant. (Spradley, 1980, p. 58)

This quote speaks clearly to this particular research, as it defines participant observation, identifies the researcher as both an insider and an outsider, and recognizes the need for introspection, or as Weick (1995) would call it, sensemaking. The phenomenological concept of bracketing speaks directly to taking on "the other" (Ely, 1991, p. 49), as it requires that I work to become aware of my own assumptions, preconceptions, and feelings and that I then strive to put them aside in order to be receptive to what it is that I am attempting to understand.

Atkinson and Hammersley (1994) observed that participant observation is not a particular research technique, but a mode of "being-in-the-world" characteristic of investigators. They noted that all social research is a form of participant observation and that we cannot study the social world without being part of it (p. 249). In a similar vein, Wolcott (1995) maintained that in its broadest sense, participant observation is such an all-encompassing term that it can refer to virtually everything qualitative researchers do in
pursuing descriptive inquiry. In a more narrow sense, participant observation is the complement to interviewing rather than being inclusive of it; its essence is captured in the phrase "being there" (p. 95). I considered my presence as participant observer at the research site as different from any other researcher’s "being there". As well, my participant observation of Tony’s induction actually became my own induction by virtue of viewing myself not only as a researcher but as an educator in anticipatory set to the principalship.

However, observation is not something which can be taken for granted by the researcher; it does not just happen naturally or without effort: "[a]n attitude of curiosity and a heightened attention are required in order to attend to those very details that most of us filter out automatically in day-to-day life" (Ely, 1991, p. 42). During the data collection time frame, I was intensely immersed in Tony’s world so that the culture of his setting could be comprehended by myself. Part of that enlightenment involved me acting as a participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship as well as in my role as researcher; my awareness was heightened by my desire to learn as much as possible for my own experiences.

The Contextual Setting and Situation

Within the category of description, Peshkin (1993) included processes, relationships, settings and situations. systems, and people. As objects of description, the subcategory of settings and situations seems "to collapse in that all situations occur in a setting of particular characteristics, and there is no setting of any interest to social researchers unless there is something called a situation" (p. 25). This subsection will describe the contextual setting surrounding the induction situation.
**Geographic setting.** Most of the research took place in the Grade Seven to Twelve school within a rural Saskatchewan town which is situated along a major highway route. Tony's home is situated directly across the street from the division board office; the school is a block away from the board office, where the administrators' meetings were held. The Kindergarten to Grade Six school was located a mere twenty feet away from the south entrance of the school, in a separate building. Most days, Tony would drive his truck to school and would park it directly in front of the main school walkway. The community itself is listed as one of the "top sixty" communities in Saskatchewan in 1995, with a partial shopping center designation (Stabler & Olfert, 1996, p. 14). My criterion for site selection was minimal; all that was required was that the principal chosen for the research be geographically located in a rural setting, as the rural (as opposed to urban) setting most closely matched my own career experiences and aspirations.

**School setting.** The age and experience distribution of the twelve teachers was as a bell curve, with two strong end-career female teachers, four strong mid-career male and female teachers, with most of the remaining teachers in experienced but early-career stages. save one neophyte female teacher new to the province. In addition to Tony, two of these teachers were new to the town and to the school. All except one either lived in town or in the surrounding rural communities. Student demographics showed most to be of Caucasian descent; most students were bused. The secretary, teacher-aide, and caretakers had been in their positions for a number of years.
Administrative setting. The administrative group consisted of five principals from the various towns in the school division: one was a end-career male with extensive administrative experience within the division, a second young male was in his third year of the principalship, the third mid-career male had previous administrative experience. This third member, Mortimer, had been hired at the same time as Tony and was also new to the division. The fourth member was an experienced, female elementary school principal at mid-career. Tony rounded out the complement of principals, having succeeded to the position after a mid-career female principal. The female director of education was a dynamic end-career individual.

In summary, the setting for this case study was a school in rural Saskatchewan where the situation was the experience of one neophyte principal and one researcher each involved in sensemaking during the induction phase of socialization.

Section Four: Verification of the Data

Naturalistic research includes characteristics of trustworthiness, use of ordinary language, and a report that is well-organized (Owens, 1982, p. 16). This section will address traditional concepts of trustworthiness, but perhaps more importantly, will focus data verification in terms of phenomenological understanding.

Trustworthiness

The term trustworthiness refers to the degree of confidence which can be placed upon the findings of the research. Guba (1981) contended that procedures which are credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable must be used to ensure research
trustworthiness, and so it is that credibility procedures are outlined next.

**Prolonged On-Site Data-Gathering**

An extended period of time immersed in the situation is important (Owens, 1982), as it provides time to enter the research site, to learn the language, to become accepted and trusted, and to become relatively unnoticed when collecting data. Time is necessary to enable the researcher to shift from early impressions to deeper levels of understanding (p. 14).

The criterion of a prolonged research engagement had been more than surpassed. My data-gathering ended because Tony believed the phenomenon of induction itself had ended, and because I recognized that there was a significant reduction in the number of activities which appeared to be non-repetitious. Verbatim data collection took place over a four-month period, commencing from August 18 to November 14, with the topical-guided interview questions extending into May 1998.

**Persistent Observation**

As I became more familiar with Tony’s responsibilities and with the research setting, observation became more focussed. I concentrated on recording areas of interest to both Tony and myself, rather than recording the activities of the whole day, as I had done at the onset of the research in order to get the full flavour of Tony’s job activities. The prolonged research engagement ensured persistent observation of Tony’s activities.
Member Checks

The process of member checks is the most important means available in order to establish research credibility; it corroborates data, information, and perceptions with relevant others (Owens, 1982, p. 15).

Use of the unstructured interview fares well when compared to other data collection techniques in terms of the validity of information obtained, as there is ample opportunity to ask questions and to probe for clarification appropriate to the respondent’s involvement, knowledge, and status (Merriam, 1988, p. 86). The interview also provides for “continuous assessment and evaluation of information by the inquirer, allowing [him] to redirect, probe, and summarize” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 187). During the data collection process, I requested Tony’s feedback regarding the probing questions I had used during our informal interviews and invariably asked him whether he had any additional comments he wished to make.

Tony was given copies of the verbatim transcripts throughout the data collection process. He was asked to read them and to discuss any concerns he had about the method of reporting and of the transcripts themselves. An example of a verbatim transcription of the New Principals’ Meeting [Appendix L] was attached only after securing verification of its accuracy from the individuals involved.

Tony was consulted on an ongoing basis about the direction of the research. A final member check was made when Tony was given a copy of the final draft of his chapter to read. He was asked to indicate his confirmation of the accuracy of analysis and
interpretation through a sign-off form [refer to Appendix K].

**Thick Description**

During prolonged observation, I conducted member checks, collected referential materials, corroborated information, and triangulated in order to develop thick description. Thick description is not an easy task (Owens, 1982, p. 15), and as such, has been accorded specific discussion within the *case study approach* subsection of this chapter.

**Triangulation**

Triangulation is a strategy whereby data are collected from a variety of sources to cross-check the information received from an individual source. Patton (1990) described *methodological* triangulation as the collection of data using more than one technique. In this study, triangulation was achieved through the use of informal and topical-guided interviews, observations, tape-recordings and field notes of meetings and other interactions with Tony.

**Peer Consultation**

Peer consultation occurred at all stages of the research in collaboration with my research advisor; the co-researcher was consulted on an ongoing basis during the data collection process. Tony's Director of Education served as a consultant, especially during the early stages of data collection. The proposal defence also served as a formal consultation with my committee members.

**Audit Trail**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that an audit trail be carefully maintained throughout the course of a naturalistic study to ensure that the research processes were
appropriate and that the results were reasonable and credible (p. 122). The list of data collection activities [refer to Appendix D] provides an index of sorts to the audit trail. As well, during the course of the study, Tony was in possession of a duplicate set of the verbatim transcripts in order to reflect upon and respond to the recollected experiences at his leisure.

Transferability

It was necessary for me to be rigorous in my analysis of the phenomenon so that its basic elements could be identified as being common to other neophyte principals, as this assumption of essence provides the philosophical basis of phenomenology (Patton, 1990, p. 70; Eichelberger, 1989, p. 6). I assumed a commonality in the induction experience and rigorously used bracketing to search for the commonalities. This is the only way this study might be related to, and integrated with, the work of other researchers who may chose to study the same phenomenon at a later time. On the other hand, each individual has a unique set of experiences which are treated as truth and which determine that individual’s behaviour. In this regard, truth and its associate behaviours are unique to each individual.

In summary, credibility procedures were adhered to, using concepts of prolonged on-site data gathering, persistent observation, member checks, development of thick description, triangulation, peer consultation, and an audit trail. Transferability was assured through rigorous analysis of the phenomenon. Dependability and confirmability were ensured by collecting the data as stated and by providing the co-researcher with a copy of all verbatim transcripts for his own sensemaking analysis.
Phenomenology and Intersubjective Validity

Phenomenologists view standards and verification as mainly related to researcher interpretation. To illustrate different conceptions of verification, neither transcendental nor existential phenomenologists place substantial emphasis on verification beyond the perspective of the researcher. For Moustakas (1994), "establishing the truth of things" (p. 57) begins with the researcher's own perception, of seeing things as a solitary self:

However much we may want to know things with certainty and however much we may count on others' experience to validate our own, in the end only self-evident knowledge enables us to communicate knowingly with each other. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 58)

Thus, one must reflect on the meaning of the experience for oneself, then turn outward to those being interviewed in order to establish "intersubjective validity" (p. 57). This is a process whereby I presented myself to Tony and Tony presented himself to me; there was an interchange of perceptions, feelings, ideas, and judgments regarding the nature of reality. A continuing alteration of validity occurred as we articulated and described our experiences. Reciprocal correcting of reality took place in social dialogue and conversation.

However, if I were to go beyond Moustakas's (1994, p. 110) phenomenological model for verification purposes, I might consider his discussion of Humphrey's (1991) informant feedback in his study of "searching for life's meaning". Humphrey (1991) requested that each participant examine the unified description of the search for life's meaning and make corrections in the description. By doing this, Creswell (1998) noted, Humphrey (1991) looked more closely at his own fear of the existential void. In this manner, judging the veracity of a report falls to the phenomenological researcher as well
as to reviews by other researchers outside the study (p. 208).

Dukes (1984) also went further than Moustakas (1994) and looked at verification in the same manner as did Humhreys (1991). For Dukes (1984), distinct procedures exist for verification of data and include the lens of both the researcher and outside reviewers. First, the data may be submitted for confirmation to a different researcher who looks for identical patterns. Second, an outside reader can recognize the logic of the experiences and how it matches his or her own experiences; Dukes (1984) referred to this as the "eureka factor" (p. 201). Third, further verification occurs through "rational analysis of spontaneous recognition" (p. 201) where the researcher asks whether the patterns fit together logically and whether the same elements could be arranged to constitute an entirely different patterns. Finally, the strength of the results depends in part on whether the researcher can subsume them under other data. The experience of frustration, for example, provides some light on similar experiences such as handling discipline problems. Outside researchers who would have an understanding of phenomenological method to verify my processes include my advisor and other members of my dissertation committee.

Creswell (1998) maintained that the criteria which should be used to judge a phenomenological study have not been clearly delineated in the literature (p. 208), but he judged that Polkinghorne (1989) came closest when he discussed whether the findings could be considered "valid" or not (p. 57). Polkinghorne (1989) identified five questions researchers might ask themselves in conducting phenomenological research:
a. Did the interviewer influence the contents of the subjects’ descriptions in such a way that the descriptions do not truly reflect the subjects’ actual experience?

b. Is the transcription accurate, and does it convey the meaning of the oral presentation in the interview?

c. In the analysis of the transcriptions, were there conclusions other than those offered by the researcher that could have been derived? Has the researcher identified these alternatives and demonstrated why they are less probable than the one decided upon?

d. Is it possible to go from the general structural description to the transcriptions and to account for the specific contents and connections in the original examples of the experience?

e. Is the structural description situation-specific, or does it hold in general for the experience in other situations?

(Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 57)

To Polkinghorne (1989), validity referred to whether or not an idea is well-grounded and well-supported. He asked, "Does the general structural description provide an accurate portrait of the common features and structural connections that are manifest in the examples collected?" (p. 57).

In summary, as this study deliberately follows Moustakas’s (1994) phenomenological method, I adhered to his stance on intersubjective validity and attempted to supplement it with the added rigour of Humphreys (1991), Dukes (1984), and Polkinghorne (1989).

Section Five: Ethical Principles

Ethical principles are an inescapable reality in case study, as the case features social life in all its particularity. Case studies allow judgments to be made in relation to particular circumstances and they allow more of the complexity of educational processes to be portrayed than in other types of studies. This subsection will discuss the principles
of general ethics, informed consent, level of reciprocity, and security of raw data.

**General Ethics**

This study maintained the necessary ethical standards of mainstream field researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 44; Moustakas, 1994, p. 109; Simons, 1989, p. 117; Eichelberger, 1989, p. 36; Tuckman, 1988, p. 14). On July 28, 1997, I requested permission to carry out this research through letters of introduction to Tony and to his Director and Board of Education [refer to Appendix F-1 and F-2]. Tony confirmed his involvement in a letter to me dated August 20 [refer to Appendix F-3]. Informally, the Director granted me such permission and a formal motion approving this research was passed at a Board of Education Meeting on August 19, with written confirmation dated August 25 [refer to Appendix F-4].

The design and process of data collection was completely open for discussion. Tony contributed his ideas on how he could most effectively record his reflections on the raw data, and of his reaction to and interaction with the topical-guided interview questions. The study permitted alternatives in response to Tony's ideas and suggestions whenever needed, for accuracy and comfort. Because minimal risk was involved in terms of the well-being of the co-researcher, the need for terminating an interview never arose. Because the interviews were conversational and open-ended, misconceptions were clarified as they occurred and open disclosures were accepted and supported. The importance of self-reflection in data collection was emphasized so that the co-researcher knew his contributions were valued as new knowledge on the topic and as an illumination
of meanings inherent in the question. Tony also reviewed, confirmed, or altered his own research data to correspond to his perception of the experience (Moustakas, 1994, p. 110).

At no time was Tony exposed to risks which were greater than the gains he might derive from this study. At no time did I relay any information about individuals which I had heard about through my contact with Tony to others, nor did I share any information with individuals at the research site who could choose to use the information in personal or political ways.

Anonymity, one of the conventional codes adopted in social research, is rarely applicable in case study (Simons, 1989). In a closely documented case describing the complexity and idiosyncrasy of the case, key individuals will always be identifiable, at least to those within the case (p. 117). In studies of stable communities, Lofland and Lofland (1995) contended that pseudonyms are unlikely to prevent others from recognizing, or at least making fairly accurate guesses about, "who's who" (p. 43). "The most desirable option is to disclose the identities of both the case and the individual[s]" (Yin, 1994, p. 143), as disclosure produces two helpful outcomes: first, the reader may be able to recall any other previously learned information about the same case while reading and interpreting the case report. Second, the case could be reviewed more readily if citations could be checked and appropriate criticisms could be raised about the published case.

Tony was interested in maintaining his own identity within the printed text, as the research pertained directly to him and to no one else, although he did have cause to reflect
upon his impact on others and vice versa. For Tony's and my use only, the verbatim transcripts used everyone's actual initials so that we could remember the conversations most clearly in order to make sense of the incidents in later reflections. For the purposes of supplying examples of verbatim transcripts within the attached appendices [refer to Appendix L], all individuals, save Tony, his family, and I, were assigned pseudonym initials. Any allusion to others' conversations and interactions with Tony within the final narrative has been protected by anonymous nomenclature.

My choice in allocation of time spent on data collection was made in context of the research itself. I had only a hunch as to how long it would take to collect the raw data, although I knew that I wanted to complete the process in a manner which would allow me ample time to analyze the data and to conclude the study adequately. I gauged when I would finish the raw data collection by adherence to my sensitivity of the data saturation point. "The trick is to find that point and bow out" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 62). I found that point in two ways: First, I chose to let Tony be a part of my point of discovery; it was he who signalled when he believed there was very little "new" for me to learn in late November. Second, I knew that in the case study approach, the subject matter continually changes and that there is always something new to learn. However, through my own sensemaking of the situation, I adduced that I was at the point of diminishing data collection returns for my efforts. I knew that research flexibility included definition of a finishing point in order to commence the analysis and to complete the study within my self-imposed time frame.
Informed Consent

Tony entered the research project voluntarily; I thanked him for agreeing to become involved by writing him a confirmation letter [refer to Appendix G]. Initially, I discussed the nature, purpose, and requirements of the research with both Tony and his Director of Education. However, during the data collection period, the research methodology become more solidified and I was able to give Tony more information about the research process, data collection, and primary researcher and co-researcher on-site involvements. Tony consented to participate by signing a research release agreement [refer to Appendix H], and the University of Saskatchewan’s Advisory Committee on Ethics in Behavioral Sciences Research endorsed the Application for Approval of Research Protocol [refer to Appendices I-1 and I-2].

Tony invited my university advisor to accompany me to his school on two separate occasions. During those two meetings, Tony clarified what both we had agreed would be his obligations as co-researcher of the study; the meetings provided Tony with an added level of comfort to this rather non-traditional research approach. Together, we devised a way for Tony to record the sensemaking of his own induction experiences. In his enthusiasm to be a research participant, he also used the meetings as an opportunity to discuss the possibility of linking his own post-graduate research studies to the verbatim raw data collected for this dissertation.

As well, Tony invited me to meet with his family on several occasions as a means of observing his family life and how it impacted upon his administrative life. His
openness to the research also permitted me to observe him in professional development social activities. He informed me of, and invited me to, any educational events in which he was involved, and in so doing, granted me permission to learn more about him. In terms of this qualitative research, our relationship was ongoing; it evolved over time, and so became more like a friendship than a contract (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 43). Tony had a voice in regulating the relationship as he continuously made decisions about my participation in his administrative life.

Tony granted me permission to "shadow" him at school, at any meetings where he was expected to participate as school administrator, and at professional development activities. He knew that I would record his conversations and interactions with others through the use of a tape recorder and field notes. Either he or I commenced meetings with others by stating that I would be recording for research purposes and we asked if there were any objections to this procedure. Only once was there an objection, and after clarification of the purposes for tape recording, the objection was withdrawn. In observing protocol with a new group of individuals, sometimes it was not appropriate for me as an outsider to immediately launch into my reasons for being at the meeting. Whenever that occurred, either the Director or Tony would clarify recording issues, depending on who was leading the meeting. Whenever sensitive issues were raised for discussion purposes at administrative or staff meetings, the Director of Education or Tony were attentive and requested in advance that I not record the conversation; I always respected the request and did not record in any manner.
Level of Reciprocity

Initially, I was concerned about taking more from Tony than I gave him in return; that Tony would not benefit from participation in the research, other than to acknowledge that research improves the larger world (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 46).

Filling out required forms may help you think through some ethical issues and dangers but it is no substitute for evaluating and being in touch with your own values, for continually taking your subjects’ welfare and interests to heart, and incorporating them into your practice. (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 47)

Unlike most research subjects, though, I recognized that Tony had the opportunity to write and talk about the sensemaking of his own life. With Tony as co-researcher, we were more like partners in the study. As such, I relinquished my jurisdiction and authority as narrator in Chapter V, as it provided a suitable venue for Tony to reflect upon his own sensemaking. In fact, then, Tony had the opportunity to gain from his own sensemaking of the induction experience, although it cost him in terms of time and effort. I offered my services as "acting principal" so that some day-time could be freed up for Tony’s reflective writing purposes, but while appreciated, Tony conceded that the offer was too administratively difficult to accommodate.

Security of Data

Common research practice is to store the data in locked files and to destroy them after a specified time following research completion (Simons, 1989, p. 124). As the collection of verbatim data progressed, both Tony and I began to appreciate the usefulness of specific meeting transcripts as refresher guides for certain administrative procedures. As well, during the course of the data collection period, we speculated
whether or not Tony could use the meeting transcripts to further his own research interests at some later date. In the spirit of level of reciprocity, it seemed appropriate to offer the innocuous public meeting transcripts to Tony to retain for his future use.

As such, I made the ethical decision to store all cassette tape recordings and hard copies of verbatim transcripts which relate to matters of individual reflection in locked files for five years following successful dissertation defence. After that time, all tape and disk recordings will be destroyed or erased, and hard copies of verbatim transcripts which relate to matters of individual reflection will also be shredded and destroyed.

In summary, several ethical principles had field work applicability and were adhered to within this research: general ethics, informed consent, level of reciprocity, and security of raw data. As well, research objectives were communicated, and the privacy of all individuals was safe-guarded, save Tony and myself, whose private reflections formed the foundation of this research. I had also promised to make a copy of the dissertation available to Tony. As well, the Ethics Committee of the College of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Saskatchewan accepted this research proposal.

Summary

This Chapter III proposed a Research Design and Methodology which provided the means by which the social reality and everyday events of Tony’s world could be "peeled back" (Macpherson, 1984b, p. 72) to expose the essence of the phenomenon. Phenomenology is a methodological approach which makes us see what is otherwise concealed. It is taking the hidden out of its hiding (openness), and detaching it as "unhidden"; that is, as truth (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p. 141; Spiegelberg, 1982, p. 316).
Section One provided Research Design thoughts which laid the foundation for identification of the phenomenological method through a discussion of the Credibility of Phenomenological Research. While Chapter II identified phenomenology as a theoretical underpinning, this chapter identified phenomenology as a research method.

Section Two discussed Research Methodology through identification of the Phenomenological Model (Moustakas, 1994). The exploratory Case Study was identified as an appropriate study approach.

Section Three described the Research Participants through detailed accounts of the Participant Selection Process and the Participants in Instrumentation.

Section Four described strategies which ensured Verification of the Data through Trustworthiness and Phenomenology and Intersubjective Validity.

Section Five addressed Ethical Principles through General Ethics, Informed Consent, Level of Reciprocity, and Security of Data.

In the succeeding chapters, Chapter IV focuses upon The Sensemaking Context. Chapter V presents the Sensemaking of the Co-Researcher, Chapter VI describes the Sensemaking of the Researcher, and Chapter VII outlines the Perceptual Framework, the Conceptual and Theoretical Framework, and addresses Reflections on the Study. This next chapter, then, provides an essence of the forty separately recorded verbatim transcript events which comprised immersion within the research context.
CHAPTER IV: THE SENSEMAKING CONTEXT

If events are noticed, people make sense of them; and if events are not noticed, they are not available for sensemaking.
(Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 60)

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide focus to the 908 pages of thick verbatim data description; that is, to identify of some of the "outcroppings and ideas that fascinate[d]" (Weick, 1995, p.191) me within the forty separately recorded verbatim data collection activities observed throughout this research. This chapter affords me the opportunity to immerse myself in a grounded sense of the context. The extracted cues provide an overall sense of context for the ensuing sensemaking chapters.

Researcher and Co-Researcher Introductory Meetings

This section describes elements of my first telephone conversation with Tony as well as an overview of my initial meeting with Tony at the research site.

Introduction via Telephone

My initial contact with Tony as the study’s neophyte principal was by telephone on August 18, 1997. He told me there were so many new things in his life: completing a class at an American university over the summer, starting a new job, and settling down with his young family in a new town. Along with the news that he and his wife Sandra
were expecting the birth of their third child in January, Tony believed that his involvement in a research study would also be new and exciting. At close of conversation, Tony invited me to meet with Mrs. CDOE, his Director of Education, the next morning.

**Initial On-Site Meeting**

On August 19 I drove out to the research site and found Tony attempting to sort the mail on the floor; he admitted that he didn’t know what else to do. We walked over to the Board Office to meet with Mrs. CDOE, who was pleasantly surprised to see us despite a 9 a.m. board meeting.

Later, Tony reflected upon the events which led to his decision to apply for, and to subsequently accept, this new position. He situated himself and his family in relation to the local community. He described the particulars of his interview, his impressions of Mrs. CDOE, his predecessor Mrs. AprioriPrinc, of several teachers he had met the day of his interview, and of "this sort of feeling of discomfort" over the impression he might have made with Mr. TeachOne, a hiring committee member.

Mrs. CDOE had previously identified Ms. TeachTwo as "your biggest helper". Tony affirmed, "I would have been completely lost without her". Amid his accolades of Ms. TeachTwo, Tony worried, "gee, I’ve got all this work that I need to do, although I don’t know what any of it is". As he pinned his Record of High School Standing on his bulletin board, he said, "I can be in complete ignorance for a couple of days". He was exasperated by not knowing how to use the photocopier or the multi-line telephone. He mused.
I need to make a good first impression on the teachers . . . or like, I feel I need to do that . . . and I feel that way with students, generally.

Tony alluded to an awareness of some difficulties which existed between teachers and local community members:

... the relations between the staff and the community [is the weak part]. [. . .] and so if there's a problem there, making it right, it should be initiated by the teachers and I think that my job is to, um, help with that initiation and I could be with the teachers and I think that the teachers could make it very easy for me or could potentially make it really, really hard . . .

Subsequent Events

Through my bifurcated lens, the following compendium provides an overview of the majority of Tony's experiences from late August to late December 1997 [refer to Appendix D for an abbreviated list of the observed events].

New Principals' Induction Meeting

Mrs. CDOE had set aside the morning of August 20 for an induction meeting with Tony and the other principal new to the division, Mortimer. A tall stack of loose papers approximately two feet in height was given to both of the new administrators. After the meeting, Mrs. CDOE invited us to lunch at the local restaurant. On our walk back to the school afterward, Tony admitted that he recognized "signs of difference between Mortimer and me". He felt positive about the induction meeting:

I felt good that I was able to insert the phrase situational leadership when we were talking. I saw that [Mrs. CDOE] nodded and smiled and agreed. It made me feel good. She recognizes that I know theory.

Tony discussed two separate incidents which had occurred the previous day, after I had left him. First, when Tony had arrived at home the previous afternoon, he found a
"church lady" having cake and tea with his wife, Sandra. "Initially, I was a little irritated because I thought that it was somebody who was just coming to rubberneck". The church lady tipped Tony off about "general problems that were associated with grad last year".

Second, "Number Two Lady" arrived on Tony’s doorstep mid-afternoon, while Tony was playing with his daughters.

[She] had quite a bit negative to say. Initially I tried to make small talk with her, but because she was, ah, you know, it seemed that every, every little bit of small talk was just another area that I didn’t really want to be talking about [...] no sort of agreement to, ah, in terms of the content of her tirade . . .

Tony also attempted to discern individuals whom we might know in common. He discussed meeting with the principal of the neighbouring elementary school, instances where there had been an uncomfortable indication of age, and the previous day when a staff member visited in Tony’s office longer than Tony was comfortable.

Administrators’ Group Meeting

Tony and Mortimer were greeted to their first administration meeting with friendly laughter and camaraderie. Mrs. CDOE handed out stacks of papers to complement the Director’s Report; several division and provincial forms as well as information circulars were disseminated. Tony and Mortimer were also invited to attend the division-wide New Teacher Orientation. The group discussed school division issues, the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course, locker searches, administration of medications to students, in-school suspensions, and managing public money, among other topics. Tony inserted a few humorous comments whenever possible, along with the other administrators.
Back at school, Tony met with the secretary for the first time, wrote a whiteboard "welcome back" message to all staff, a note to the caretakers, and talked to the telephone repair man before leaving for the day.

**First Staff Meeting**

Tony had purchased donuts and had made coffee for his first staff meeting on August 25. He exhorted everyone to peruse the agenda inside their binders, and to introduce themselves. He commented, "I believe that schools are as much a place of socialization as a place of academic learning [. . .] my goals are to help you learn".

Tony discussed procedures and routines and eliminated the previous year's Monday morning staff meeting requirement amid staff cheers. Several procedural decisions for the year were initiated by staff members; Tony generally deferred to staff opinion. Some of his comments:

- I'm not sure, you know . . .
- I accept that you people are all busy. I'll do my very best to be out there . . .
- Do you think that will work? (addressed to Ms. TeachTwo) . . .
- I don't understand exactly . . .
- I'm not as well-versed on it as I should be . . .
- So I will do my very best to make the photocopier a priority . . .
- Ah, well, I need some advice there . . .
- OK! Ms. TeachTwo is, ah, spurring me along here!

Tony referred to Ms. TeachTwo numerous times throughout the meeting. Mrs. TeachThree, an outgoing, experienced, informal staff leader, voiced her opinions throughout the meeting and unofficially appeared to determine when breaks would occur.

At the end of the meeting, Tony invited everyone to his house for a Friday evening barbeque. Lunch time discussion at the local service station restaurant centered around
staff vacation activities, including Tony’s body surfing adventures.

**Staff Improvement Leadership Planning Meeting**

That same afternoon, the school leadership team of five planned its staff presentation regarding selection of school priorities for the ensuing year. Generally led by Mr. TeachOne, committee members discussed how the staff would be divided into smaller discussion groups. Tony advocated the use of Force Field Analysis as a means of moving towards specific goals; however, the group decided that his procedure was too complex and too time-consuming for staff purposes.

Committee members moved off-topic to discuss the concept of teachers being "outsiders" to the local community, no matter how long individual teachers had actually resided within the community. The point of contention was "Black Thursday", so labelled by teachers who had attended the previous spring’s division rate-payers’ meeting. Mr. TeachOne told Tony, "we can do fantastic things and they can’t see it because their frame of reference is somewhat different from reality. Their only view is negative." When Mrs. TeachThree pointed out that she was glad she lived in another community, Tony commented: "It has to affect you. If you could fix it somehow . . ." to which Mr. TeachOne responded, "we’re just depressed".

Tony privately commented about the plethora of paperwork from central office, stating, "in that sense, I’ve been socialized." He was excited; the day had gone well:

I actually was able to answer a couple of questions and feel pretty good about that, and got a couple of laughs and a couple of smiles and, ah, a couple of comments.
Staff Improvement Meeting

Prior to the morning staff meeting, Tony voiced concern about the impression the graffiti on the school sidewalk might project to teachers who were expected to attend the division-wide in-service day. He was also concerned about being overly informal with staff members the previous day, then compared himself to his previous administrators.

Two division board members welcomed the staff back for another school year then left the meeting. Tony talked about the graffiti to staff members, and about wanting to install a voice-mail telephone system. He volunteered to be the recorder for the ensuing large group discussion and to record the staff’s proposed environmental tasks and instructional tasks for the year.

Division-Wide In-Service Day

On the August 27 in-service day, Tony humorously commented on the sidewalk graffiti to the audience, then introduced Mrs. CDOE. Along with the other principals, Tony introduced his staff members to the group.

Asked previously by Mrs. CDOE to lead a small group in-service session, Tony discussed elements of the new curriculum with his four group members. In turn, they quizzed Tony about his impressions of the staff and school. He talked about his four years of principal-designate experience and about his mentor, a female administrator. He also discussed the possibility of instigating a Meet the Teacher Night pot luck dinner.

Tony was asked two questions point-blank: how old he was, and whether or not he had any children. Considerable discussion ensued as Tony described his concerns about being young, a family man expecting a third child, and a neophyte principal.
After the in-service, Tony met with two Student Representative Council (SRC) students in order to plan the first-day assembly. At the end of the day we drove to a local gas station restaurant to attend the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation local union meeting. Tony stayed for the "welcome" dinner; I drove home.

First Day of Classes

The school day commenced with morning announcements led by Tony, followed by a brief home room period and a student general assembly. Tony introduced the staff and SRC members, then participated in a "yelling contest" with each grade level prior to assembly dismissal. He raced around the school in an attempt to visit each home room prior to the first scheduled class of the day. In each classroom he made similar remarks:

I’m excited to be here. This school is really great. The teachers are dynamic and really organized. Sandra, my wife, has been welcomed by the community. I’m big on school spirit. Let me know if you think of anything . . .

In a few classes, students asked Tony his age. Within each of his own classes, he talked about himself and his family for the majority of each class period:

I believe that I have a responsibility to answer all of your questions as best I can. Please don’t be shy and ask me whatever you want. Um, if it’s something that’s so grossly personal that I don’t want to answer it, I’ll tell you that.

He attempted to connect with his students through ascertaining threads of relationships with others or through familiarity of geographic location:

I met you at the restaurant last week . . .
Did you mow my grass? . . . did your mom mow my grass?
I got married, ah . . . to someone who comes from a farm . . .
Sandra grew up on a farm that is about twenty miles from here . . .
[My wife] actually worked with the dealership here . . .
Sandra's brother actually worked at the [name] elevator... [My dad] did lots of work with community pastures... Do you have a sister? A brother? Is your brother [name]? Would you be a niece or some connection to [name]? I was going to ask you if you're [name]'s daughter... I have met your mom at the store one time... I was born in [nearby town]... There's a PFRA community pasture around here somewhere? Oh! Excellent! Then my dad would know your mom or dad!

Second Day of Classes

The structure of Tony's August 29 classes was similar to that of August 28. Tony was questioned about his age; he told stories about his personal life and career path.

Tony was keen to meet my university advisor and had invited Dr. Scharf to the school that Friday afternoon. Informal discussion centered around Tony's age, his concern about the myriad of paper flow from central office, his involvement in this research, and how Tony believed himself to be socialized:

I feel and I think that's ah... I feel like I do know an, an awful lot in that regard [...] I think I have a pretty good feel for the politics of the teachers and um, of whether there are any sort of agendas and um, you know, that's after five days. Now, maybe I'm naive and maybe I don't. Maybe a week from now I could look back and say, "geez, I really... last Friday, I didn't know diddle about that and I've learned an awful lot in the last week" but right now. I feel pretty good about that [...] but I feel like I have sort of a good, general feel for the kids already, after a day and a half. [...] I know them in a sense [...] I guess I haven't had any personal interaction with the community, although I've had lots of advice about the community, so I feel like I know, from second-hand, quite a bit.

Tony walked over to the school board office to ask Mrs. CDOE about specific school and division procedures and to extol the virtues of Ms. TeachTwo. In turn, Mrs. CDOE asked Tony how he felt about his first week, and about his perceptions of the first-year teacher.
Third Day of Classes

Tony attempted to settle into a routine with his first period class. During second period, he met with the Special Education Regional Consultants in collaboration with the Special Education teacher and aide; specific student cases were discussed. Third period class was somewhat similar to first period; that is, Tony identified students by geographic location and told personal stories. He also explained his marking system to the students.

At noon hour Tony observed the SRC meeting, which was led by Ms. TeachTwo. He talked about changing the gymnasium seating plan for general assembly, as he had some misgivings about the first day’s assembly structure. After discussion of school dance procedure, Tony introduced the concept of a community-school pot luck dinner.

After lunch, Tony met with the Regional Child and Youth Counsellor; discussion centered around specific students. Tony met with the teacher-librarian during the second-last period of the day, so that she could show Tony the computerized library system.

During Tony’s last period class, he privately commented about Ms. TeachTwo:

If you want a general observation, it would be that I am feeling like I have been totally comfortable following whatever advice I get here and um . . . just because she’s been so helpful and it seems to be genuine help with no agenda.

After school, Tony held an informal meeting with the neophyte teacher and her teacher aide. He described the intricacies of a particular novel passage which might be useful in the teacher’s class. Discussion then turned to the teacher’s concern for one particular special needs student. The teacher aide explained the use of a Social Skills game which might be used for several students. After this meeting, Tony met with the parents of
another student to discuss their sports coaching concerns.

**Meetings of the Day**

Tony invited me to his home on September 8 for a family dinner prior to giving his first presentation at the local trustees' meeting. The elementary school principal presented her hour-long report. Then, at 9:15 p.m., it was Tony's turn. He discussed his preference of holding a Meet the Teacher Pot Luck Night at the end of the SRC Spirit Week; the trustees supported his plan. Tony reported on the monetary state of the SRC, then the trustees told Tony how to run the canteen at the school dance.

The chairperson told both administrators that the local trustees wanted to meet all of the new teachers. The elementary principal readily agreed to the chairperson's desire to know "academically, what they are doing, as well [...] and what their objectives are and that type of thing". Tony also agreed to this arrangement. Next, the trustees told Tony of their plans for running the school awards program and of finding sponsors for the school dance, which staff members traditionally do not attend. The trustees went into closed session at 10:30 p.m.; both administrators were asked to leave the meeting.

In a telephone conversation with me on September 11, Tony indicated that even though he was sick, he went to school, and he attended a volleyball practice with his four-year old daughter. He planned to attend the SRC dance even though no other staff member would be there. He intended to personally telephone each family to invite them to the pot luck dinner. He said that he was looking forward to taking his family to Mrs. CDOE's home on Friday for dinner, along with Mortimer's family.
Administrator/Secretary Computer In-Service

An in-service session was held in the computer lab at Tony’s school for all principals and their secretaries on September 12, in order that they might learn the new administrative record-keeping system. A computer consultant had been contracted to deliver the in-service; Tony operated the keyboard while his secretary watched him.

SRC Treasurers’ Meeting with Professional Accountant

As advisor to the SRC, Ms. TeachTwo led the audit meeting with the two student treasurers and the local accountant; Tony observed. The accountant was concerned about huge losses of canteen money in previous years. She taught the students how to properly maintain the records while Mrs. TeachTwo apprised Tony of his administrative responsibilities. Tony laughed and said, "Trouble-shootin’ TeachTwo here!".

Meeting with Director of Education and Select Teachers

On September 17, Tony received a telephone call from Ms. TeachTwo, who had been in a car accident with three students while driving to an SRC conference; luckily, no one was injured, but the car was a write-off. Tony was concerned that community members would first hear of the accident on the television news before arriving for the pot luck dinner; Ms. TeachTwo assured Tony that the parents had been contacted.

Afterward, Tony met with Mrs. CDOE, two teachers, and one aide who were responsible for some special needs students. Discussion centered around specific interventions and delivery of the school’s Social Skills program. The meeting adjourned when Nicole, Tony’s four-year old daughter, enthusiastically greeted her father.
Meet-the-Teachers Pot Luck Dinner

The dinner was to commence at 5 p.m.; Tony’s wife Sandra set up the beverage table in the gymnasium. Tony greeted community members at the main entrance holding his youngest daughter Kim in his arms. While people lined up for the buffet, Tony stood at the bleachers with Kim; no one ventured to talk with him. Mr. TeachOne commented to me that it was the best community turnout he had ever seen, but pointed out groups of individuals to be wary of. Tony selected a vacant table for his family and me; no other staff members, trustees, or community members joined us.

As people were eating, Tony moved to the microphone, briefly provided background information on himself and his family, then asked staff members to stand as he introduced them. Tony described their individual school assignments, their extra-curricular involvements, their family status and/or connections to the community, and "something interesting" about each of them. Then he introduced the present SRC executive members as well as division and local board members to the audience.

That’s all we have for the program. Um, I would invite you to stay and visit with the teachers and with each other and enjoy second and third helpings of everything. Um, make yourselves at home, and whenever you feel like it, go home. But don’t feel like we’re chasing you out at all because we’re not in a hurry and ah, we’ve our families, and we’d like to meet you. Thank you very much!

Immediately following dinner, community members left the gymnasium while Tony extended good-byes at the door. Staff members did not help with clean-up; very few talked to the community members. Sandra and I cleaned up with a few students; other students set up the volleyball nets for evening practise.
New Principals' Meeting - School Start-Up and Supervision

The purpose of this September 18 meeting was for Mrs. CDOE and the division Curriculum Coordinator to discuss "how things were going" for both Tony and Mortimer. Conversation centered around administrative duties and division activities. Tony had noticed that local board members had difficulty discerning the difference between Work Experience and Junior Achievement; he suggested Ms. TeachTwo come to the next local trustee meeting to clarify issues. He brought up a timetabling concern; Mortimer had a solution for Tony which Mrs. CDOE heartily endorsed.

When Mrs. CDOE asked Tony what particular things had "gone well", he replied:

Ahhhh. Just in general? The staff has been great. The kids are perfect. Nearly without exception, perfect. And um . . . and the parents are positive. [...] and the secretary’s been fantastic [...] she is a whiz. She’s really good. Yeah.

Mrs. CDOE asked for Tony’s observations of specific teachers; she suggested the group brainstorm ways of helping Tony to deal each the situation. Mortimer suggested some solutions to which Mrs. CDOE and the Curriculum Coordinator responded positively. Tony initially resisted the solutions, but Mortimer reiterated his suggestions with Mrs. CDOE’s endorsement. Tony also discussed other situations with Mrs. CDOE and the Curriculum Coordinator; Mortimer offered some solutions.

Mortimer apprised the group of the intricacies of the month-end electronic transfer of data to Saskatchewan Education. Mrs. CDOE discussed the division’s supervision policy and accompanying administrative binder developed by the Administrators’ Group the previous year. Mortimer suggested alternative methods of
supervision which Mrs. CDOE agreed were valid. As the meeting ended, Mortimer commented on the superior quality of the binder contents; Tony thanked Mortimer for his advice. Mrs. CDOE addressed Tony:

Don't ever under-estimate the advantage of having a fresh perspective, too. Sometimes, and I know, Mortimer, that you would agree with me . . . that that really gives you confidence. You know, when somebody has an idea that is different, it's good! Like, it's useful!

The meeting ended with an informal discussion between Mrs. CDOE and Mortimer about professional ethics, implementation of School Councils, and the role of local boards.

Social Skills Meeting

The primary purpose of this September 18 meeting was to identify students who might benefit from the school's Social Skills program. The experienced teacher aide had background information on individual students that the new Special Education teacher wanted to learn; Tony's role was as an observer to the discussion. The secondary purpose of the meeting was for the teacher aide to describe the Social Skills program to both newcomers.

After the meeting, two staff members voiced their concern to Tony about the well-being of a Grade Seven student whose father had committed suicide on the weekend. Tony had been apprised of the situation on Sunday morning; Ms. TeachTwo expressed dissatisfaction at not being told about the situation earlier than Monday morning. Tony asked, "what are we getting the sub to do?"; Ms. TeachTwo identified two possible teacher coverages for the funeral day.
Tony and I left the school to pick up his young daughters; we returned to watch the volleyball game. A few parents watched the game from the bleachers while his daughters played quietly in front of us; Tony reflected upon some of the events of the last few days.

**Administrators’ Group Meeting**

The September 26 meeting commenced with a presentation from the Regional Health Nutritionist and Regional School Nutritionist, followed by an extensive Director’s Report. As usual, the meetings were conducted amid much laughter. Mrs. CDOE described SaskEd’s public consultation initiative regarding School-Community Councils. Consensus was that a separate administrative meeting would be held with division board members in order to plan information delivery to the general public.

Mrs. CDOE also informed the administrators that I had agreed to make a presentation on October 21, 1997 to members of the Board of Education about the status of School Councils across Canada. The secretary interrupted the meeting to place a surprise birthday cake in front of Mortimer, who had already taken some good-natured "ribbing" for his Spirit Days attire. Mortimer informally led parts of the meeting when he talked about the planned administrators’ group retreat, electronic registration for students, and Junior Achievement. Tony questioned about appropriate supervision procedure to follow for students who chose to go downtown for lunch and about secretarial protocol for rotating substitute teachers within the division. He also participated in a discussion about Course Challenge Credits. Mrs. CDOE concluded the meeting by handing out Stephen Covey’s *First Things First Every Day* book to group members in anticipation of our attendance at the September 30 Steven Covey Lecture in Regina.
Principal-Parent Meeting

After classes on September 29, Tony met with two sets of parents with regard to a harassment incident. As Ms. TeachTwo had witnessed and documented the event, she remained "on call" in the general office while Tony privately dealt with the parents, without researcher observation. Tony wrote letters to all parties involved but decided not to include the information in student cumulative folders, hoping to "keep it personal".

Third Staff Meeting

Tony relied on the information received at the Administrators’ Group Meeting as the basis of his October 6 report to staff. He told staff that "the Board lets people know who is getting the awards", but requested guidance "as far as putting the awards thing together because I've never done it before".

Some staff members voiced concern about a new student who was not "fitting in" before discussion moved on to the rumoured arrival of a Young Offender student. Tony affirmed the arrival and divulged the student’s background to staff. Ms. TeachTwo fielded questions from staff members then stated: "you know, we have violated a legal issue! Don’t take anything out of this room!". Tony disagreed that it was a violation, stating that the staff had a right to know background information. Ms. TeachTwo contradicted Tony and admonished staff to keep the information private; she sporadically warned staff about the breach of information throughout the remainder of the meeting.

Other staff meeting points of discussion included a concern for smokers in the parking lot, the compromised safety of students who use their own names on computer chat lines, and the problem of messy classrooms at noon hour. After the staff meeting,
Ms. TeachTwo again discussed her concerns with Tony regarding what she perceived to be a "severe breach of information".

**Administrators' SSBA Professional Development Program**

The Administrators' Group participated in a professional development retreat pertaining to "The Law" on October 16 to 19, sponsored by the Saskatchewan School-Based Administrators' (SSBA) subject council. Day One topics included conflict management, natural law and justice, and *The Education Act*. Day Two topics included Parent Councils, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the *Saskatchewan Human Rights Code*, *The Criminal Code*, *the Child and Family Services Act*, and the *Young Offenders Act*. Participants also participated in a question-and-answer session with Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation lawyers. Day Three focussed on changes to the various *Acts* and on case study discussions.

Tony asked advice from the group with reference to the staff meeting discussion about the Young Offender at his school and whether or not it was appropriate that staff be made aware of conditions of parole for safety purposes; he also asked about the concept of student restitution for acts of vandalism. He readily conversed with the group about being able to identify and act out various leadership styles necessary for immediate situations. Mortimer, a participant in Tony’s group, also offered advice.

**Teacher-Principal Professional Development Interview**

On October 21, Tony met with Mrs. TeachFour in order to discuss her professional development plans for the year:
I have to admit I’m a little awkward about this. I don’t know. I did Mr. TeachOne’s yesterday. He brought in a sheet. I said to Patricia... we talked about it and that was all, and boy, that was fast!

As a senior teacher, Mrs. TeachFour was eager to practise peer cognitive coaching techniques. Tony readily admitted that he knew very little about cognitive coaching but was willing to learn:

It would be really good if I could get somebody in to watch me teach. That’s something that I flounder with a little bit, here, because there is nobody who is going to come and watch me [...] would you be willing for me to share this peer cognitive coaching with you? And would you come and watch me, too?

Mrs. TeachFour explained her portfolio assessment methods and identified some special needs students. They also discussed guest presenter possibilities for in-service days.

After Mrs. TeachFour left Tony’s office, I offered to put Tony in contact with one of my peers who had extensive knowledge of peer coaching; he appeared keen to connect. I also lent him two books from my professional collection: one on peer coaching, the other on portfolio assessment.

Administrators’ Group Meeting

The October 23 meeting opened with a discussion of supplemental examinations followed by the Director and Curriculum Coordinator reports. Tony volunteered his impressions of the Administrators’ Curriculum Fair while Mortimer talked about the Internet Workshop at his school. The division was in the process of computerizing its report card system, and as Mortimer had worked with the same program in his previous school division, he was able to caution administrators of potential problems and offered possible solutions. He also discussed his experience with Junior Achievement while
Tony attempted to stave off a nosebleed. During the Regional Director's report, Mortimer raised questions concerning contagious disease procedures.

**Administrator-Board Public Discussion Paper - Planning Meeting**

The purpose of this October 29 meeting was for Mrs. CDOE, the administrators, and board members to plan their local community presentations for SaskEd's Discussion Paper on School Advisory Councils. While Mrs. CDOE presented to the group, Tony maintained relatively steady eye contact with her. Then the ad hoc committee broke into smaller community groups to plan their presentations. Tony participated fully in the philosophical discussion and in the pragmatic presentation plans; he also volunteered to be the group recorder. Digressing from the topic at hand, Tony regaled the group with his concern about what to charge community members who wanted to rent the gymnasium or the library; one board member collapsed in gales of laughter which then affected the whole group for the remainder of the planning time.

**Saskatchewan Education Discussion Paper - Public Meeting**

The evening public meeting was held in the school gymnasium on November 12. In addition to a number of local and division board members, administrators, and staff, ten community members and one student attended the meeting. Tony and the elementary school principal presented an overview of the Public Discussion Paper to the audience. When a community member asked Tony to read the contents of the transparency aloud, Tony joked, "if you were a Grade 9 class, I'd say, 'Does your mother know you need glasses?'". The Local Trustee Chairperson presented her concerns to the audience, and then the group was divided into smaller groups to answer each of the nine questions on
Tony joined one parent group for discussion purposes while the elementary school principal circulated among all groups. Following a wrap-up session, a core group of individuals stayed behind to continue the discussion; Tony participated in that discussion.

**Division Amalgamation - Planning Committee Meeting**

Along with Mortimer, Tony represented the Administrators' Group at the November 13 Division Board ad hoc Committee Meeting regarding amalgamation discussions. The board members apprised new members to the group of ongoing discussions with other school divisions and the pros and cons of joining each division. Tony and Mrs. CDOE acted on my behalf to alleviate one board member's concern that I was an "outsider" and might divulge amalgamation discussion particulars. A committee member asked Tony for his reaction to the SaskEd Public Meeting and asked Tony to share his transparencies for the next group presentation. Tony discussed his reactions and readily handed over the transparencies to the committee member.

Both Tony and Mortimer remained relatively quiet throughout the initial amalgamation discussion and resultant plans for a public information meeting. However, both administrators offered suggestions pertaining to the logistics of dissemination of amalgamation information through newsletters and about the difficulty of holding a public meeting during the winter examination week. Mortimer asked several questions and entered into the conversation probably as much as did Tony.

**Dissertation Research Meeting**

Tony invited Dr. Scharf to visit him once again prior to the Christmas season.

When Dr. Scharf asked Tony how he was doing, Tony replied,
Good! It's been a tiring week. I was telling Patricia yesterday that this, ah, ... as far as socialization goes, I ... I feel in some ways that I'm getting there!

The first point of discussion was about Tony's sense of how successful the SaskEd Public Discussion meeting on School Councils went, and on his sense of local amalgamation issues. Tony and Dr. Scharf discussed the possibility of using the raw data from this research for Tony's own research some time in the rather distant future. They also discussed the possibility of Tony enrolling in a class or two at the University of Saskatchewan and of transferring the credits to his American program. A final conversation point was for both Dr. Scharf and Tony to discover people they might know in common.

I turned the conversation towards my concern for the time line needed for submission of Tony's written reflections and verbal responses to the topical-guided interview questions. Tony commented:

I'm ready to do that for a week. Run across Murray's mountain tops. And I'm going to do that for a week. Ah, two weeks. [...] I guess I need ... the amount of time I have will kind of dictate how far down the mountains I can get.

Summary

My formal field research time spanned from August 18 to December 21, 1997. There were numerous telephone contacts and topical-guided interviews throughout this time and in the following year as I sifted through the 908 pages of verbatim data and worked through Tony's writings and comments. This chapter has provided an overview of the observed research activities; Chapter V presents Tony's sensemaking of these events.
CHAPTER V: SENSEMAKING OF THE CO-RESEARCHER

The little girl had the making of a poet in her who, being told to be sure of her meaning before she spoke, said, "How can I know what I think till I see what I say?"

(Wallas, 1926, p. 106)

Introduction

In reviewing the visual representation of my review of extant literature, the Research Map (p. 33), I was reminded that while early socialization research focussed on the individual’s passive or reactive entrance into the organization (Inkeles, 1969; Child, 1954; Aberle, 1961; Schein, 1968; Feldman 1976, 1981; Van Maanen, 1977), later research recognized that the individual is not necessarily acted upon, but is proactive and interactively involved in his or her own socialization (Schutz, 1967, 1970; Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Greenfield, 1977). Indeed, the transitional and transformational research (Louis, 1980; Jones, 1983; Nicholson, 1984; Brett, 1984) identified surprise and sensemaking as pivotal to the socialization process.

Typically, however, most socialization literature has been written through the lens of the researcher, rather than from the position of one who experienced the phenomenon of induction himself or herself. Even Wolcott’s (1973) liminal ethnographic work of attributing meaning to the principal’s behaviour was defined through the lens of the researcher rather than directly through the principal. As Macpherson (1984b) advocated,
"[t]he appreciation of behaviour and perspectives must now move to the existential meanings of the administrators themselves" (p. 64).

The purpose of this Chapter V is to provide a forum for Tony to reflect upon his perceptions and to make sense of the induction events which had occurred previous to, during, and immediately after my sojourn into his social world, through his own narrative. In this chapter, Tony describes the events leading up to his principalship interview, his subsequent acceptance of the job offer, the geographic move into the community, and his role as neophyte principal of the local Grade Seven to Twelve school. My efforts at data collection elicited forty separate verbatim raw data transcripts for Tony to draw upon in his reflections for this chapter [refer to Appendix D for a chronological list of the meetings]. The phenomenological method will be utilized in Chapter VI to analyze Tony's sensemaking of his experience as presented in this Chapter V.

Sensemaking is about justification, choice, retrospective sensemaking, discrepancies, social construction of justification, and action as the occasion for sensemaking (Weick, 1995, p. 12). Tony's thoughts justified his earlier words recorded in the verbatim transcripts; he chose which words to focus on and which thoughts would explain those words. Tony looked back at what he had said earlier, from a later point in time when the meetings and activities had been completed, and felt a need to see what he had said in the transcripts whenever a comment did not make sense. As well, Tony invoked the thoughts he had been socialized to label as acceptable. It was his acts of speaking and writing within this chapter that initiated his own sensemaking process (Weick, 1995, p. 12).
In terms of the technicalities of presenting this chapter, three computer fonts were used: This "regular type" font was used for Tony's initial sensemaking; the boxed, **bold italicized** font was used whenever Tony reconsidered his initial reflections of the incident, and the *regular italicized* font was used on the few occasions when I required voice within this chapter.

Sentences and topics which were determined to be of a sensitive nature were vetted (or "sanitized", as Tony would say). These sections are identified as square bracketed or boxed [vetted] comments. I also took license in inserting some headings and side-headings similar to the topical-guided interview questions that Tony followed, for general readability purposes. No attempt was made to edit or to correct the grammatical structure of Tony's reflections.

**The Narrative Voice of the Neophyte Principal**

*Due to his perceived time constraints at school and the obligations of his family responsibilities, Tony expressed the desire to "write things down", rather than to reflect upon his experiences orally. His first written submission of his initial feelings, attitudes, and sensemaking of specific incidents was prefaced by the following:*

```
Pat, I feel like a kook writing all of this, but I think that there are some things here that influence everything I do, including things I do at work. I am afraid that it sounds like some psychiatric report, but I don't know how you will get this information otherwise.
```

**Perceptions of My Family**

I think that both my nuclear and extended family has influence on me in the sense that I want them to perceive me as successful and independent. This is the extent of the
professional connection I feel I have with my grandparents and my aunts and uncles, although this desire is stronger with one uncle, [name], who is the Director of Education in [geographic location]. I am influenced personally and professionally in a variety of ways by my nuclear family, both present and past.

**Sandra, my wife:** Sandra and I have been married for six years and we have two children, Nicole and Kimberley. Sandra has a B.S.A. [*Bachelor of Science in Agriculture*] and worked until Kim was born, but has chosen to work as a homemaker since that time. I feel that Sandra wants me to be successful in my career and that she is willing to sacrifice her own professional life over the short term in favour of my career and the needs of our children. I feel that my relationship with Sandra has suffered as a result of my work, both now and in the past, but I feel that this is something that both she and I are willing to accept. In particular, I feel that Sandra is sometimes unhappy with time I spend with the students and staff at school that she feels is unnecessary in terms of the responsibilities of my job. During our time in Town ABC, Sandra has indicated that she dislikes it when I do something that takes away from family time and that she perceives is done by me only because I am concerned with political image. I feel that Sandra is always supportive in general, even when she disagrees with me over a specific issue. One political thing that she and I have been involved in is her substitute teaching.

**Nicole and Kim, my daughters:** Although they are too young to really influence me intentionally, Nicole and Kim have definitely had an impact on the decisions that I have made around my career. One of the things that was important to me was that they not be moved from school to school as I changed jobs. I think that this is especially
important at certain ages, and I recognize that movement like this can be especially
difficult if the child has to attend the school where the father is the principal. In addition,
we wanted to live in a community that was large enough to offer some diversity and we
recognized that our former town was simply too small. This issue did not lead us to
Town ABC, but it did serve as a measuring stick when we were considering the move.

Roger, my father: My father is a hard-working man who was seldom home when I
was a child. As a result, my mother did the majority of the parenting in our home. As a
child, I often felt as if I was disappointing my dad, and I still have times when I recognize
that I am seeking his approval. Sandra says that these times seem to be more often than I
perceive them to be. Interestingly enough, when I do receive approval in the form of
recognition that I am doing well in my career from Dad, it makes me feel really
uncomfortable.

Sharon, my mother: Mom is a highly academic person who has made it apparent
for as long as I can remember that schooling is important as an end in itself. I find myself
seeking her approval in the same way as I do with my dad, but I get it much less often.
Although I realize that this is part of her personality, I still make a point of letting her
know when I am doing something unusual. I think that mom is pleased that I made the
decision to become a principal, but she has never said it in so many words. One of the
first things I thought of when Mrs. CDOE [Current Director of Education] phoned and
offered me the job was that it would be really exciting to tell Mom that I had accepted it.

Melanie and Rosemary, my sisters: Melanie was an exceptional student when we
were kids, and is a successful lawyer today. She is a miniature version of my mom. and I
have many of the same feelings about her. I always want her to realize when I am doing well, and I think this is because of my low achievement as a child in school as compared to her very high achievement. I feel like I always knew that I was as smart as she was, and now I want her to see the same thing. I don’t think that it ever crosses her mind, because she never pointed out our differences even as a child, but this desire still serves to motivate me to a certain extent. Rosemary, on the other hand, was less academic, although she regularly did significantly better than I did at school. I feel closer to Rose than I do to Melanie, mom, or dad, and interesting enough, I don’t feel the same pressure to prove myself with her.

My Background

I was born on 25 December 1966 in Outlook, Saskatchewan, and lived in Regina during my childhood. I attended Dr. George Ferguson from kindergarten to grade eight, and Central Collegiate from grade nine to grade twelve. After I graduated from grade twelve, I attended Saskatchewan Technical Institute (STI) and earned a pre-employment certificate in Radio-T.V. Electronics. While I was at STI, I joined the Naval Reserve, working full time during the summer and one night a week while I was attending classes. After graduating from STI, I worked at an automotive company that sold and serviced electronic automotive repair equipment, for 16 months until June, 1987. After another summer working full time with the Reserves, I began taking classes at the University of Regina in the fall of 1987. I graduated with a B. Ed. Sec. in April, 1991, and accepted a teaching position at my former school in the [Former] School Division. I worked in my former town until June, 1997. During my time there, I began working on my M.A. in
Educational Leadership through San Diego. In May, 1997, I had accepted the position of Principal at this High School, and I began working here in August, 1997.

Several people influenced my life in general and as an educator and school administrator. Other than my family, my life was influenced by:

Mr. ElePrinc. Mr. ElePrinc was the principal at Dr. George Ferguson Elementary. I visited him on a regular basis because I was daydreaming during class or because my work was incomplete. Mr. ElePrinc was kind and spent most of our time together listening to me; when I was in grade four, I considered him to be a friend.

Mr. CentralTeachOne. Mr. CentralTeachOne was my social studies teacher at Central Collegiate in grades nine and twelve. He told excellent stories about people and events in history. I remember students laughing in his class, and thinking that he was a good teacher. I attempt to recreate two of his stories for my own students each year.

Mr. CentralTeachTwo. Mr. CentralTeachTwo was my French teacher in grades nine through twelve at Central Collegiate. He dealt poorly with non-academic or unmotivated students, and spent more of his time shouting than teaching.

Mr. Loud. Mr. Loud was my boss at the automotive company. He was a negative man who was very vocal about his opinions about women and ethnic minorities. He made it clear that one of the conditions of my employment at the company was that I keep his personal van clean. I spent as much time doing this for him as I did doing my duties at work.

Mr. ElePrinc and Mr. CentralTeachOne were positive influences in my life, and I thought that I would like to be like them on many occasions. Mr. CentralTeachTwo and
Mr. Loud were negative influences in my life, and I thought on many occasions that it was unfair that they were in positions of power over people. Mr. Loud had a great deal to do with my decision to return to school in 1987, because I couldn’t imagine myself subordinate to a person like this for the rest of my working life.

Other than my family, my life as an educator and administrator was influenced by:

**Mr. FDOE.** Mr. FDOE was the Director of Education of my former school division. He always forthright with me, and earned my respect as a person who gave good advice whether it was asked for or not.

**Mr. FirstPrinc.** Mr. FirstPrinc was the principal at my former school for the first year of my employment there. With his subsequent return to the classroom as a full time teacher, I learned much about the pitfalls of small town politics from watching him.

**Ms. SecondPrinc.** Ms. SecondPrinc was the principal at my former school from 1992-1996. In 1993, she asked me if I would act as the principal designate in her absence, and from that time forward she included me in her decision making processes at school. From Ms. SecondPrinc I learned how to make good use of small town politics. As well, she modelled professionalism with teachers, students, and the community.

**Ms. ThirdPrinc.** Ms. ThirdPrinc was the principal of my former school in 1996-1997. In this position she was effective yet uninvolved.

Each of these people was a positive role model in some way. I saw different styles of leadership from each of them, and I think that my own style is derived from all of them. I try to be as much like Ms. SecondPrinc as I can. I try to avoid the political blunders that Mr. FirstPrinc made, and I am conscious of how people feel when I am
assertive. I understand the importance of being involved in the school rather than simply being employed by it.

Application for the Principalship in My Former School

In May, 1996, I learned that Ms. SecondPrinc was leaving my former school, as she had accepted the position of Principal in another town. Sandra and I considered whether I would apply for the job [while I was a teacher] in my former school, and in the end decided that it would be worth doing even if I only got an interview. The thought that I might not even get the interview concerned me, but I sent my resume in anyway. As I was in the process of creating the resume, I talked to Ms. SecondPrinc and she was surprised to learn that I had even considered not applying. She said that she just expected that I would and that she thought that Mr. FDOE felt the same way. This meant a lot to me because of the respect that I felt for each of them. I felt like I must be ready if both Mr. FDOR and Ms. SecondPrinc thought that I would apply.

I applied and was interviewed, along with a man from Alberta and a woman, Ms. ThirdPrinc, who eventually accepted the position. The interview went well, and I felt like I answered the questions appropriately. When I was given the opportunity to ask questions of my own, I asked the two members of the local board and the division board member who were present if I could count on their support if I were offered and subsequently accepted the position. Each of them answered yes, and I went on to ask if they perceived that I would have the support of the community. None of them would answer this question, and I let the silence hang for ten or fifteen seconds until Mr. FDOE finally interrupted and went on with the interview.
Later that night when Mr. FDOE called on the phone to tell me that the job had been accepted by a different candidate, he simply said that he thought I had made an error in judgement in telling the students at the school that I had applied for the job. Mr. FDOE also said that I had done well in the interview, and he indicated which questions I had answered perfectly and which I might want to reconsider. At the end of the conversation, he said that in ten years my resume would be [comment vetted by Tony]. I took this as a sign of ongoing support from him.

The silence after that interview question bothered me, because I had been one of two teachers who shouldered most of the extra-curricular load at the school. I think that Mr. FDOE was likely right when he said that my telling the students had been my downfall, as there were the usual two or three who didn’t agree with discipline or other decisions. On the other hand, I had had an acrimonious relationship with the wife of the Division trustee since their youngest son finished high school, and I was worried that this might have played a role too. I determined that the two things I could do to prove her wrong were to support Ms. ThirdPrinc, who turned out to be a perfectly good principal [vetted comparison made by Tony] and to get a different job at some time in the future. At this time, Sandra and I decided that I would begin my M.A. and that, if the perfect job came open in 1997 I would apply. If nothing happened that year, I would be a bit less choosy in 1998, keeping in mind that Nicole began Kindergarten that fall.

I am glad now that I didn’t get the job in my former school for a couple of reasons. The first is that I would not have applied for the job here and the second is that I am afraid that the baggage of six years of teaching might have caused me problems. If I
were to make a recommendation to someone else in my place, it would be to apply out in
order to make a fresh start rather than attempting to advance within the same school. I
think this is especially true in a small town setting like my former town.

Application for My Current Principalship Position

I found the ad in one of the provincial newspapers on a Friday in May and brought
it home to Sandra, who says that I looked pale when I walked in the door. We had been
talking about our plans only the night before, and it seemed like it had fallen in our lap!
It took me a week to decide to apply and to get my resume updated.

We defined it as a "perfect job". I think the two factors that were involved
were that Sandra is interested in going back to university and pursuing a
second degree, and so it would put her closer to the university, where she
wants to be, and the proximity to the farm and to Sandra’s family, you
know, were so [good].

When we decided that I would apply, I realized that I would have to tell Mr. FDOE,
Ms. SecondPrinc, and Ms. ThirdPrinc, because they were my references on my resume.
Each of them said that they would be happy to provide me with a reference, and each of
them wished me luck. Mr. FDOE promised to call Mrs. CDOE and put in a good word
for me, and I learned later that he had. The only other person I told about the application
was the Supervisor of Student Services in my former school division. She was a good
friend and I felt like I needed to tell someone!

The Friday after I first saw the ad, I hand-delivered my resume to the Division
Office in this current town. I asked for Mrs. CDOE at the receptionist’s desk, not really
expecting that I would be able to see her. The secretary went into the back and returned
with Mrs. CDOE, who said that Mr. FDOE had called her and that she would definitely
be interviewing me. Mr. FDOE had obviously given some information, because Mrs. CDOE knew about my work with the English Language Arts 10 pilot and my involvement with the local association in my former school division. We talked for half an hour in the lobby of the division office while Sandra and the kids sat in the truck outside. At the end of this time, Mrs. CDOE asked me if I would like to see the school. Of course I said yes! Mrs. CDOE called the principal, Mrs. AprioriPrinc, to ask if she would show me around.

My first impression of the school was that it wasn't great from the outside but seemed nice enough on the inside. Mrs. AprioriPrinc was polite but brisk, and I felt intimidated by her immediately. We walked up the east hall and around by the library. In the library I met Mrs. TeachFour [mid-career] and Mr. TeachFive [early career], who were fooling around on the computer. They broke the ice and took away some of the tension I was feeling with Mrs. AprioriPrinc, which was good. Then Mrs. AprioriPrinc and I walked past the Industrial Arts room to the computer lab, where I said something about computers being under-utilized in schools. She said something like, "Not here . . . Power Point and other applications." I smiled and nodded, as I had never heard of Power Point in my life. I thought, "oh, brother, now she's going to go and tell everybody that ah, I had this one clod in who said that . . ." At this time I felt pretty inadequate.

After I left the school, Sandra and I stopped at the realtors to get a listing of houses for sale. At this point we didn't seriously think that I might get the job . . . it was more like wishful dreaming. I was too shy to go into the realtor's building because I knew that the question of why we were considering moving might arise, and I was scared
it would look bad if I was already looking for a house. Sandra went in instead, and we drove around and looked at three homes that were listed.

Mrs. CDOE called me on Tuesday of the following week and asked me if I would come for an interview at 3 p.m. on the following Friday.

The Interview

My interview was on the Friday after I dropped off my application at the school board office at 3 p.m. Ms. SecondPrinc had a theory that most school divisions interviewed the best prospect last and the second best first, and I was excited because I thought that I must be the last one because of the time. When I arrived, I learned that I was the first one to be interviewed and that they would be interviewing five candidates. I was discouraged and wondered if I was being interviewed only as a courtesy to Mr. FDOE. The interview lasted only half an hour, and Mr. TeachOne [mid-career and principal designate] seemed antagonistic throughout.

He’s a teacher. He’s the Phys. Ed. teacher. He was part of the interview team, which was very interesting for me and somewhat intimidating, in the sense that I knew, whatever I answered, I . . . I have to stick with that now, because . . . because he heard it all, so it was . . . which was OK, but, ah, I hadn’t expected a teacher to be there, so it was . . . I don’t know if "aggressive" is the word, but I . . . I . . . I was . . . I felt intimidated by him.

The question that he asked that sticks most in my mind went something like this: "Do you have what it takes to make unpopular decisions?" I do remember a couple of instances where everyone laughed, and I remember one male board member in particular chuckling at something I said. These moments were good in terms of helping me to relax. The only point where Mr. TeachOne seemed the least bit impressed was when I said that I
had been awarded a McDowell Foundation Grant that I would be leaving behind for the
other English teachers in my former school division if I accepted the position.

This is a tangent, but I don't think it deserves a page of its own. The week before
my interview, I had applied for the position of vice-principal at another town. On
the Wednesday or Thursday before this school's interview I had been invited for an
interview in the other town on the Saturday morning at 10:30. At the time I didn't
think that the timing of the second interview would make things awkward, because I
was sure that I would know about the job here on Friday night. As it turned out,
though, it was very awkward; I knew that I wanted the job here, but I was afraid to
turn down the job in the other town if it was offered to me. The interview in the
other town felt even worse than the one here had, but mostly because the principal,
who was also new, was an English teacher and the school already had an English
teacher. I had visions of teaching 70% of the time in a completely new subject area.

That night Sandra was attending the graduation at another town, so we met in one
of the towns and exchanged vehicles. I didn't know what to think at this point, and I
went home and waited for Mrs. CDOE's call. In both cases that I applied for positions in
the former school division, I was contacted on the day of the interview and told the
outcome, and I thought that this would be the case everywhere. Thus by late Friday night
I was very discouraged because I had heard nothing. On Saturday after I returned from
my interview in the other town, I phoned Mrs. CDOE. She told me that the Board hadn't
decided, but that if I were offered the job in this other town, I should take it. Shortly after
this the Director from the other school division phoned to tell me that another person had
accepted the other town's position. Although a part of me was disappointed, another part
was relieved because I still had faint hopes about this job. I phoned Mrs. CDOE again on
Sunday, and she told me that the Board was doing background checks and that she would
let me know. There was nothing in her tone that led me to believe that I had been the
candidate whose background was being checked. By this time I was feeling like the
amount of time that had elapsed between the interview and the offer (to anyone) was
unfair to all of the candidates.

When I still hadn’t heard by the end of the school day on Monday, I knew that the
offer must have been made to another person. I was very surprised when Mrs. CDOE
phoned after 9 p.m. and offered me the job. I asked if it was okay if I called her back and
told Sandra, who had been sitting beside me during the call. We decided that I’d better
call back quickly, and I called Mrs. CDOE back about three minutes after she had
originally called and accepted the job. Both Mrs. CDOE and I were almost giddy on the
phone, which made me feel very welcome. The first thing we did after I talked to Mrs.
CDOE for the second time was call my mom. When I was dialling I was exuberant, but
this quickly waned when I talked to mom because it seemed like her reaction was one of
concern rather than excitement. The next day I was excited again to tell the teachers and
students in my former school, and I was especially eager for the people who had
interviewed me the previous year to find out, although I had no desire to tell them myself.
There were lots of high and low emotional points between Friday’s interview and
Tuesday morning when I told the people at school.

Sandra and I had spent the entire evening prior to the call convincing ourselves
that staying in my former school was likely the best thing for us anyway, and the offer
felt awkward because of this. One of the things that had concerned me before the offer
was made was the potential that Sandra’s younger brother or his wife might learn of my
application through a female board member of this division, who was a friend of my
sister-in-law when she and my brother-in-law had lived in here before. It seemed really important to me that nobody learn about the application than the people that I had already told; the whole thing felt very much like a personal failure.

**Teacher Interviews and School Visits Prior to the Summer**

I was here three times between my interview and the summer. The first two times were for teacher interviews, first for the grade seven position that was eventually filled by Ms. TeachSix [*early career*] and then for the Resource position that her movement created. My recollections of these interviews were that they were interesting but that I was really out of my league. I remember trying madly to think of a question to ask the applicants when it was my turn to ask questions, and every time passing because I was afraid that my question would tumble out the wrong way. Despite this, they were exciting for me and I felt a great deal of compassion for the interviewees after my own interview. An interesting aspect of these interviews was that [*comment vetted by Tony*] the tone of the pre-interview session was that the interview was foreboding.

*I didn’t think until I was typing this about how frustrated I felt when I wondered if I was in a similar position during my interview.*

During these interview sessions it seemed more important to me that I seemed in control and knowledgeable to the male board member, the female board member [*a friend of Tony’s sister-in-law*], a second female board member, Mrs. CDOE, and a female local trustee than it did that we hired good teachers. I was very uncomfortable when one of the candidates for the resource job asked me a question about philosophy, because it put me on the spot in front of them. Especially awkward was that I knew that they had asked me
the same question three weeks earlier when I had been "studying" for the interview, and I couldn’t remember what my answer had been!

I went to the school on one of these interview days and met with Mrs. AprioriPrinc. She wanted to know what I wanted to know, and I admitted that I didn’t really know what to ask. She had a list of things to tell me and I suggested that we might go through them because she obviously felt that they were important or she wouldn’t have written them down. It didn’t take long for me to become really confused. I met most of the staff that day, but I don’t really remember any of the conversation. I do remember being nervous, especially around Mr. TeachOne.

I was in Regina at the Provincial Track and Field Meet with some of the kids from my school, and Mr. TeachOne was there with an athlete from this school. And, I saw him sitting there as I was walking with Nicole to go and get ice cream or something on a blistering hot day and so I stopped and said "hi" and asked, you know, who he was here with and, you know, we had a brief chat and Kim was screaming in her stroller because she was getting uncomfortable, which, in terms of reflection, was uncomfortable for me because, here I was with this guy who had been a little bit intimidating in the first time and now it was now a month down the road and I had been given . . . I had the job and here I was with this ah, screaming, sort of awkward, personal part of my life . . . it was connecting into the professional part and that is something that is um, a little difficult for me sometimes. The different sort of groups in my life. When they come together I don’t know . . . you know, I can be a pretty good dad or I can be a pretty good teacher, but sometimes it’s hard to mix those two together, and I felt uncomfortable that day because I thought, "hmmm, now Kim is crying, she is crying and this guy, who is a little intimidating anyway . . . is thinking, oh, you know, oh, look, he’s dragging this kid around the field and she’s crying and she should just be going into some air-conditioned place where it’s cooler" . . . and so I’m sure there’s no measuring of parenting skills going on from his point of view, but in my mind I was thinking, you know, "boy, first impressions are . . . are continuing to be a bit shaky on this particular point". Anyway, so he said that he was here with someone. I think it was high-jumping maybe? I don’t know. Yeah. I’m not sure. Anyway, then, on the day that I came to
do the timetable, I saw Mr. TeachOne again, and I asked how that person had done, and wouldn’t you know it, I remembered the wrong sport. I said, "how did your high-jumper do?" . . . [and he responded], "I didn’t have a high-jumper." . . . Given this sort of, feeling of discomfort that I had had previously . . . that’s where that is right now, and I haven’t had any other contact with him since.

Mrs. AprioriPrinc took me outside to where most of the students were participating in a track and field day and introduced me to some of the girls, which was nice because of the informal setting.

The third time I travelled here between the interview and the summer was in early June, when I met Mrs. AprioriPrinc to work on the timetable. This was a nice meeting as I was feeling less intimidated by her, and it was the first thing that I had really been able to contribute to.

Because I had done the timetable in my former school, I was quite concerned about the timetable here, and I knew that it was cause for grief among many teachers, and I didn’t want to be getting here this week and not have it done and then struggle with getting it done. So, I came and Mrs. AprioriPrinc and I did the timetable together. And she had it mostly put together when I got here and I was a little disappointed in that because I would have preferred to have, you know, done it right from scratch, because I’m . . . I’m . . . I know that at the end of the semester I will have to do it again and I’m really leery about that day because it’s not really hard I don’t think. It might not be as hard as the one in my former school, but it’s something that I want to get right because, you know, if there’s any way I can throw every person in this school into confusion it would be screwing that up.

We completed most of the timetable and I bought Mrs. AprioriPrinc supper to thank her for all of her help. While we were working on the timetable, Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s husband arrived. My impression of him was that he was [vetted comment] and that he and Mrs. AprioriPrinc [vetted comment]. When we were having dinner, the second female board
member and her kids were also at the restaurant, and I visited briefly with them.

**First Conversation with Patricia - August 18**

This is going to be a bit of a letdown, but other than the content of our conversation, I really only remember two or three impressions: The whole idea of your study seemed interesting. I was happy that Mrs. CDOE had suggested my name. It made it seem like she had been thinking about me at least one day during the summer. I was glad I didn’t want to say no, because I thought that would not be a very good beginning for the relationship between Mrs. CDOE and me. It was nice to have someone to talk to who wasn’t connected with the school. It still is! 😊 [Tony’s drawing].

**Researcher and Co-Researcher Introductory Meeting - August 19**

I had driven out to the town early in the morning, intent on a full day’s work with Tony in our first in-depth interview. When I arrived, Tony was busily sorting the summer’s stack of mail into “teacher piles”, as he indicated that he didn’t know what else to do. We walked over to the Board Office, a block away, to meet Mrs. CDOE. Tony did not know that she was about to enter into a day-long board meeting, so was only able to spend about ten minutes with her. Mrs. CDOE introduced me to her staff and nearby board members. Tony quickly outlined three questions that concerned him: she answered and then asked him how he and his family had been "settling in". On our way out of the office, Tony briefly discussed the possibility of borrowing the secretary’s hedge clippers for the day, he found out where his school mailbox was located, and collected the mail. We walked back to the school for the tape-recorded interview. As we walked back, Tony waved at all the passing cars. He indicated he did not know any of the people he was
waving at: "I just think it's important to have a friendly appearance."

**How People Saw Me**

The most important question to me at this point was how people saw me, because I was really concerned that I made a favourable first impression on everyone, but especially on people that I would see only occasionally. I felt like these people held a lot of control in terms of community feeling towards me.

*Tony reminisced about introducing me, as researcher, to two female board members in the parking lot outside of the board office.* I’m not sure if this fits in here or if it brought me closer, but I felt the same need to appear knowledgeable in the parking lot with the first female board member [the division board member who was his sister-in-law's friend] than I did when we were interviewing for the teaching jobs in the spring.

**How I Saw People**

*In terms of the outcroppings which piqued Tony's interest, he made reference to a number of staff and division members in our introductory discussions.*

*Ms. TeachTwo. This teacher had ten years' teaching experience:* I got here about 8:30 and she arrived at the same time ... I was carrying in a stack of boxes with all my stuff in it and as I was carrying it in, Ms. TeachTwo showed up and helped me carry the rest of them in, which was nice for my back and was a nice gesture. And then, she said that ... she asked me if I needed anything, and I said, "well, I. I don’t know what I need because, you know. I don’t really have any idea of what I’m doing." And so you know, my plan was to sort of chip away at whatever I could see that needed to be done and wait until jobs fell on me ... and she said, "well, are you interested in knowing about the ... about the case load that I have and how that will work?" and I said, "Sure." And so we sat in her office ... and just talked about everything from first day staff meeting to the professional development model that they use here and um, some, um, some problems that she thought would maybe come up at the first staff
meeting that I might want to think about. She gave me some suggestions about sort of what . . . which way the staff would lean on those problems, and they struck me as very genuine suggestions and not something that was promoting an agenda for herself . . . and she took the supervision schedule and the staff room clean-up schedule and you know, just the sort of small things that would have needed to be done and offered to come another day this week if I wanted her to do anything else.

Later on, Ms. TeachTwo was the subject of discussion again:

The other thing that Ms. TeachTwo said, that it's . . . that [early dismissal] was a problem last year, and I can appreciate that it was. It's that the Grade 7, 8, and 9 students had to come to school right until the last day of school, even though their marks had been turned into the office two days before that . . . and yeah, I believe that rules, it's more the discipline than the academics. A rule is that either, it is not possible to enforce or tremendously difficult to enforce, [it] just makes more problems than it solves.

Mrs. CDOE sent me a fax in the spring; [it] was a list of all the teachers and . . . two or three anecdotes on some of them . . . and Ms. TeachTwo's anecdote was, "your biggest helper" . . . and I told Ms. TeachTwo that yesterday and she seemed very flattered by that . . . Boy, it would have been, well, I mean, I am lost now, but I would have been completely lost without her [yesterday].

Mr. TeachOne. The description of my meeting with Mr. TeachOne describes my feelings as I remember them [as indicated in the verbatim transcript].

. . . [it's] not confrontational, not unfriendly at all, but given this sort of feeling of discomfort that I had had previously, was another . . . [Ms. TeachTwo had talked to Tony about other teachers and their color-coded personality inventories] . . . it's the one where you you classify people as blue, green, orange, or something . . . Mr. TeachOne is orange, which is the off-the-wall sort of crazy person and I would have said, as green, as focussed, and organized and driving as a person could be, so that's really interesting, because obviously, I'm wrong with that impression and . . . I say that because it's really limited and it's all based on nervousness on my part. Um, and ah, so it will be interesting to see that orange come out and the green go away in time here.
Mrs. CDOE. I appreciate Mrs. CDOE’s interest in Nicole and Kimberley. I always feel a bit awkward telling anyone that Sandra is pregnant, and I felt this here too. I don’t think this feeling was any stronger with Mrs. CDOE than it would be with anyone else.

In general, Mrs. CDOE is not intimidating for me. Personally, I don’t think ... although, in a sense that she is my new employer, there is that factor. She is always rushed for time and that is a little unnerving for me. You know, it’s not something that really bothers me, but I would ... I don’t feel like I’m being “put off”, but that’s sort of, you know, I’ll say something and probably what I need is a couple of minutes for somebody just to chat about it and then it won’t be a problem, and ... well, "don’t worry about that until after the next thing". And so that’s a real ... it’s not a problem at all, but it’s something that does make me feel a little bit uneasy and it has, you know ... it’s more than just today, it’s every day. After we hired the people last year, I would have liked to just have sat down and just discussed it as a little bit in general about the hiring process and the people and ... I don’t know if you could call that a sort of "debrief" maybe? But I feel like that’s something, or, I felt, then, that that’s something I would have liked to have done and, you know, she didn’t have time. She was off to something else, and I appreciate that she is tremendously busy, but ... but that’s an instance where I was a little bit uneasy because, well, what else can you do?

The feelings I expressed about Mrs. CDOE’s rushed nature [in the verbatim transcripts] are accurate, and I would say that I still feel this way sometimes. It would be nice to be able to just sit down and talk with her, but except for a couple of occasions, I haven’t been able to do this.

Central Office Staff. Both secretaries seemed important as far as the first impressions went. I wonder if this is because of a stereotype [comment vetted by Tony] that secretaries have the power to set a negative tone about a person in a community.

I still feel like this to a small extent with one secretary, although I don’t about the other secretary, who I talk to on the phone more often.
I was really surprised that Secretary Treasurer and the secretary were allowed to smoke at the District Office. I have strong feelings about this, and, interestingly, they are the two who I feel least comfortable around at the office. The one female board member seemed like a key person to me. She seemed particularly astute at the interviews (both mine and the teachers) and my sister-in-law had told me that she was very musical. I think I associate the fine arts with intelligence.

---

*I think I remember being less concerned about Computer Consultant than the others. His role seemed a bit nebulous to me then—maybe he was less important as a result.*

---

**The Researcher.** I was excited for Pat to meet my family, which was normal. I am sure that the reason I was so willing to help you was that it was something that I had control over. There were so many things that were in the process of being done that a new start seemed appealing to me. My photocopying of my resume and cover letter was something I could do, when I was surrounded by things that I didn’t know where or how exactly to start.

You know, an experienced person [*the researcher*] watching an inexperienced person. It might be interesting to see how many things I do that you know, ah, are mistakes from the beginning, and how they play out, and how I weasel my way out of them. You know, because those things are certainly going to happen and I’m going to make those errors.

*These reflections, submitted by Tony, proved to be his only written contribution to the research. Although Tony intended to provide his own written reflective narrative of the verbatim transcripts, he admitted that he had been unable to find the time to provide further writings for the research, even though I had provided him with the topical-guided*
interview questions as an aid for his reflective sensemaking.

The Topical-Guided Interviews

When I suggested we revert to an oral interview approach using the topical-guided questions, Tony readily agreed. What follows, then, was Tony’s sensemaking of the verbatim transcripts through tape-recorded interviews in mid-May of 1998.

Researcher and Co-Researcher Introductory Meeting - August 19

You know, the whole thing is fascinating for me, and as I read the verbatim transcripts, I’m recognizing things that I didn’t know then that I do know now.

The Telephone

In terms of the introductory meeting between you and me, the first dimension intimately connected with the experience that stands out with me is the phone and how the phone wasn’t working that day, and that sense of futility as I tried to make it work and realized that it wasn’t going to work. It didn’t mean anything to me, beyond the fact that the phone didn’t work. I can hypothesize and say that, honestly, maybe it represented the whole school here and not knowing how it worked, but I don’t think it meant that. That day. It was frustrating that it kept ringing, and I guess that I thought that whoever was on the other end of that phone, if they knew that I was at school, it must have been somewhat annoying for them. So there was a sense of the public relations that had to be fixed; not being very well served by my abilities with the phone.

The Timetable

The second dimension is the timetable. I talk about doing the timetable in here and believed, in the beginning, that [the timetable] was really important and that it go
well, because, from my perspective, watching the principal in my former school, it was sort of *the* thing that you had to do. The discipline of students and working with teachers and serving people in whatever way you had to serve them was something that I thought I could probably do, and I think *anybody* could probably do to a lesser or greater extent, but I knew that if the timetable was done poorly, it would affect every person in the school in a bad way. If it was done well, then it would be sort of as it had been before. So I saw the timetable as being very important. And the former principal and I had done that and I was glad that we had, but then I had to do it again in January.

**Significant Others**

**Mr. TeachOne.** The third dimension is the male teacher who was at my interview. He was not really aggressive, but not necessarily passive, either. I saw him as someone who must be fairly important, because, otherwise, why would he have been at the meeting? And so I thought that it was important that the things that I had told him in the meeting that I would do—were done. And I had this sense that I couldn’t remember at *all* what I had told him. I had thought about things and what I would do when faced with certain situations—and so that was a little bit awkward for me. When I first came here, I thought that probably this teacher would be the person who I would need to get on my side, somehow. I think, in his own way, that teacher has been on my side all along, and certainly was on the former principal’s side, all along. He is a very supportive teacher who has an odd personality, and I’ve heard other people say, since, that the first impression of him can be one of arrogance or over-bearance. Somehow negative. And I can see why people would say that, and I’ve said to people, "well, that may well be that
he seemed that way, but he will turn out to be super-organized, super-professional, and a little bit different, but just different." Not in a bad way. So that has turned out well, and he has been very supportive. He has given me lots of good advice and I've felt comfortable taking it sometimes, and not taking it other times. And I have become very comfortable with him. I know that just in the last week or two here, that there have been times when other people have not been really comfortable [with him]. [Identity of speaker vetted by Tony] has been the example. He said something, and she has thought, "well, gee, you know, it is quite offensive that he says that in that way", but for me, it is just the way he is. He doesn’t mean any harm and he says what he believes, in a very blunt way. He is not daring you to disagree; it is just how he says it. So that teacher is one.

Ms. TeachTwo. The other person that comes to mind is the female teacher whom I first met. She was really a big help to me the first day when I came here. She helped me to set up and was doing some work. We sat down for probably two or two and a half hours and talked about some of the things she thought needed to be done at the school. She talked about her job and what she did and what she had done and she talked about the staff meeting thing and thought that maybe the teachers would like fewer meetings. She was very welcoming and friendly and professional. I appreciated that; it kind of gave me something to do, because I was here with a ton of work to do but I didn’t really know how to do any of it. She was able to break down some of the big things into smaller things and I was able to get to work on those, and they led to other things. I guess, for somebody reading this in the future, who is going to be a first-year principal, I think that a person like this lady is important to get you started. Because it wasn’t really hard after
I started, but getting started was tough. And when you, as researcher, came in on the 19th of August, I think I was sifting through a box of mail. It may have been important to whomever was sending the mail, but it wasn’t urgent, and probably most of it wasn’t important, but it was all I could think to do. To put off everything else, I had a box of mail that I could be in "control of". Something very administrative.

The Director of Education. In terms of people and incidents, I guess there is the sense here that I was a little bit worried about the Director of Education and her being "busy". I have, at this time, had already had the experience that I would want to go and talk to her about something and just have a talk. That the talk was not completely task-oriented was my hope, but once she had given whatever advice she had given, that was the end of it, and on to something else she went. I was a little uncomfortable with that, because I didn’t think there was any real relationship-building happening there. It was, "you deal with it". She was nice; a very nice, kind woman, but I would have liked to spend some time sitting and visiting and she didn’t have time for that, and that still is something that only happens on her terms. When she has the time and it is scheduled, we sit and visit. If it is not in her book, then I can ask the question and she will answer it, but that’s all. It is to the point where, on Seinfeld, the other night, they said, "the worst thing you can do is to call someone on a cellular phone from the car." What that says, is that you are a low priority. You are not calling from home. You are sticking them in, when you have a moment. And the Director of Education does that to me all the time. And she is always out of range, so when her phone does that [cut out of range], and yet I know that I can still understand what she is basically saying... if it’s not something that is
important to me, [comment vetted by Tony]. I guess there are two sides to the cellular phone thing!

So, the Director of Education is someone who has definitely stood out and has been really a wonderful teacher as I have been learning here. She will give me a little bit of guidance but then not any more. So then, I need to get out there and figure it out.

When I ask her questions, she will answer, but nothing more. There is no background or rarely anything like that. So I have the answer but usually have to go figure out why the answer is what it was, anyway. I don’t know if she does that on purpose or whether it is because she is busy.

The Number of Staff Meetings

The other incident that stands out is that when I had met with Ms. TeachTwo previous to the researcher and co-researcher meeting on August 19, we talked about the number of staff meetings that the former principal had held. Ms. TeachTwo’s point was that the staff felt that there were too many staff meetings and too much time was devoted to meetings. I felt a couple of things about that:

I couldn’t imagine knowing enough to fill all that meeting time with worthwhile things, and second, I thought that by chopping some of those meetings, that was something that I could give to the staff that would be an initial, politically positive thing that wouldn’t be to the detriment of the kids. The staff didn’t want to do it, so if I could say, "Well, OK, you don’t have to do it anymore", that would make them feel involved—it would satisfy a desire of theirs. And I thought that was probably important; that there was some sense that I was doing things for them—that I was serving them. And I guess, as the
year went on, it became a little more firm in my mind, maybe, that I think that’s the appropriate role of the principal. It is to serve the needs of the teachers and the students and the parents and the community and everybody else. On the other hand, I’m not going to serve them if it is going to make the experience of the students go to hell. So, I had to find something. I thought that it was a good opportunity to do something that the teachers would want me to do and it would make them feel like this was going to be a good relationship with this new principal and that wasn’t, at the same time, bad for the kids. The staff would think I was a little bit unlike the former principal. I might have had a sense, then, that the former principal was more controlling than what the teachers maybe wanted in a principal—so, less control, less power-mongering, and more collaborative.

With any of these things, if they hadn’t have worked out, it would have been an negative initial impression of me. I would have thought, maybe . . . knowing these people here, though, I’m not sure it would have been negative. Maybe they would have just said, "oh, well, it didn’t work, so you have to do it again". I was very concerned about everything seeming to work. I didn’t care, really, to be the best principal on earth, but it is important to me that people have the sense of me being competent so that things were OK at least. I think, and still believe this, that if you are starting something new, once you gain that sort of sense that people think you can do it, you have to work pretty hard and be pretty bad before you will lose that sense. I think the opposite, too, that if you are bad at the beginning, I think it is a pretty long haul to "get good". So I do think that the first impression—the first week, or month, or meeting, or whatever—that’s what is really, really important.
How This Research Affected Me

In terms of how the introductory meeting between you as researcher and me as co-researcher affected me, it gave me the motive and opportunity to reflect a little bit, and I wouldn’t have done that, otherwise. I would not have seen reflection as a priority. I would have thought of things as I was walking home or I would have chatted to my wife about things, but there would have been no formal thinking about events. I would not have done even what I am doing right now [the topical guided questions]. I would not have tried to put it all together and thought about it at all in a short period of time. Little bits of it would have come back to me as I was doing other things. So, it affected me in the sense that I did reflect, and I wouldn’t have reflected, probably, if it weren’t for you as researcher, being here. The experience of the introductory meeting.

In terms of changes that I associate with the introductory meeting experience, it was certainly nice to have someone here who was outside of the school and who I thought, if I couldn’t get advice from that person, at least it would be someone I could talk to, and through speaking, my thoughts would maybe become a little more clear to me. There are no "negatives" to this research, but I feel a certain sense of guilt in stuff that I have not done in terms of the study, that I wanted to get done. Part is hassle as far as some of the "extra" stuff. The time factor in terms of trying to fit it in, although I don’t think it is as much my time as it is the sense that your research was important but not urgent for me to do this. This is my sense. It is certainly not urgent compared to stuff at school and stuff at home, and so this project (and a couple of other things) have been consistently pushed to the bottom of the pile. I guess one of the negative things this research shares with those
other things is that sense, that when I go to sleep at night, "dammit, those three things are
still all there and I haven’t done anything at all, and they are going to be there tomorrow
and I know darned well that when I go to sleep tomorrow night, I’m not going to have
anything done at all on them, because I will have done other things."

The things that I have put to the bottom of the pile tend to be fairly major and
important enough to me that they haven’t disappeared, and I haven’t said, "forget it". But the research is not, in my mind, urgent. And then, I recognize the sense of increasing
urgency for you and not a corresponding sense of increased urgency for me, just because
I had other things that were still more urgent. So that was a very awkward thing. For
example, I will have a little note on my desk and it will sit there for two weeks until it is so
stale that I think, "well, they must have figured it out" and into the garbage it goes . . . Over
all, though, in reflecting about the introductory meeting, there were no negative changes.

The experiences with Ms. TeachTwo and the Director of Education were both
positive experiences in terms of their affect on me. I felt good that Ms. TeachTwo was
willing to help and accept me, after they had [experienced] this other principal, who I
didn’t really know very well. I was really happy that the Director of Education is really
always so positive about everything. That made me feel good, initially. In fact, initially,
it made me feel really good because I didn’t have the sense that she was positive about
absolutely everything, good or bad . . . and I have that sense now. I could be dragging
some kid down the street by his or her hair and the Director would find some good in it.

At the beginning, when the Director of Education talked about what a wonderful
teacher I was, and what a wonderful this and a wonderful that, I felt very good, because I
felt that was an absolute assessment. I thought, "well, that's nice that she thinks that".

And I still think it is nice, but now I think more that it is nice in terms of Mrs. CDOE being a nice person and I know that I need to not take as absolute truth, the things she says, that are positive. If she ever says something negative, that is absolute truth. But she often says positive things because she is a positive person. When I think about the incident, I think less favourably about it than maybe she has reported. I am more critical now and I am more apt to question something that she says that is really positive, just to make sure that it is really positive. So I have learned that, through my relationship with her. I'm not sure other people view her in the same way. I know another teacher on staff who sees her exactly as I do; we've chatted about it. That's what's nice about her—she's always positive.

The initial experience with Mr. TeachOne was not negative, but it made me uneasy. I was nervous and found myself . . . when I would speak with him, in the beginning . . . for example the day of track and field in Regina, when I bumped into him and Kim was screaming in her stroller. I found myself really feeling like I needed to make a good impression on him, moreso than on the other teachers. I think this is just because of the air that he has about him. I think that I'm probably the type of person who, when somebody seems like that, I try to appease, and endear myself to them [sic].

If I were the same kind of person and had been quite blunt and assertive and not confrontational, really, but leaning that way, I don't know how it would have went [sic] with him. You know, there might have been a different outcome. And now, I am entirely comfortable with him.
How This Research Affected Significant Others

Myself. The experience of our introductory meeting as researcher and co-researcher did not affect significant others in my life; it was just a meeting that you and I held. We sat there and visited and that was the end of it. After the meeting, I talked with my wife about the research and the Director of Education also knew that we were doing the research. So, they were definitely significant others. The research didn’t affect them, though, even in the long term.

My Family. The research has only affected my family in that you were able to come and have dinner a couple of times and that was really nice. The process of making friends is distinct from this. If you had lived down the block from us, and if there would have been anything that led us to be working together, then that process would have happened. You were at my house on the days that you had supper because of the research—because you were dropping something off or picking something up. You certainly could have dropped it off and picked it up and I could have turfed you out the door—there is more of a sense that [your presence] has affected my family; that we have you as a friend, that we didn’t have before. It only affected the teachers and students at school in the sense that, from time to time, they said, "Well, where is that lady? You know? The one that followed you around? Are you done with that?" There is no deep affect of this research on anyone, at all.

The Director of Education. My wife immediately liked the Director of Education and knew that I liked her. I think she was happy that Ms. TeachTwo had helped me out because I probably seemed a little less stressed at home, and she knew that, to a certain
extent, Mr. TeachOne made me a little bit uneasy, but I don’t think those things affected her any more than my day-to-day job did. And I don’t know that any of the other things in her affected my family or not.

Thoughts and Feelings Generated by This Experience

This is a good question. The phone, the timetable, the number of staff meetings, the female teacher, the male teacher, and those things, I would say . . . if I had to summarize our Introductory Meeting, it would be these things. Some of those are at the dimension of you and I, as researcher and co-researcher, just talking. Like the phone. That doesn’t have anything to do with those other people. The timetable and the staff meetings take on both dimensions though, in that they have to do with those other people like Mr. TeachOne and Ms. TeachTwo and with you, because I’m talking to you about them.

My First Impressions of Ms. TeachTwo. I had circled a line which struck me on this transcript [on Page 6] in talking about Ms. TeachTwo who helped me out on August 19, which said, "it struck me as very genuine suggestions that she is making, and not promoting an agenda for herself". I circled that because I see now, her agenda . . . but I didn’t see it then, and I don’t know, really, if I can define it?? But it’s a first-impressions agenda that may be the same as mine. It is important that the first impression be a positive first impression, and thus, a helping first impression. Interestingly, I think. that mine is still "helping" and hers isn’t, as much. So, although it’s not going in the other direction. but there’s less dedication, I think, right now, to helping me than there was initially. And I think that is because there’s the perception that I had the impression. So I see that agenda a little bit better now.
My Sense of Uneasiness. Before we go on, there's another thing I circled, too. I didn't mention it before, but we talked about the sense of the Director of Education being "rushed" and my sense of uneasiness with that. I was at a Cognitive Coaching Seminar about a month ago. We were talking about rapport. "Rapport" is how you sit and how you listen intently to the other person. And I realize that Mrs. CDOE's problem is that she breaks rapport as soon as she is done. My problem with Mrs. CDOE is that she breaks rapport in the sense that she talks and looks at you and sits like you or stands like you, until you are done the topic, and then she turns away. She doesn't do it physically; she does it verbally. That's no big deal. She doesn't do it deliberately. I'm thinking that some day, I may even tell her that she does it. The avenue to that may be next year, because she has asked me to do some Cognitive Coaching stuff with the other principals . . . and she might read it in here, too!

Later in the Administrators' Meeting on August 21 [Page 28], Mrs. CDOE says, "I think that's a fair criticism in some cases . . . I do, like, I think I'm inattentive." And she's talking about when people make complaints to the Board and the Board says, "well, how come we haven't heard about this before?" But that just struck me as I read this verbatim transcript, as being an interesting connection to this business of Mrs. CDOE changing rapport and changing the subject, and that inattentiveness.

My Report Card. You picked out my report card as being important, hanging on the wall [in your description of my office] and I didn't. I think the reason it's not important is because it's been hanging on the wall in my classroom for five years, so this isn't anything new and it's nothing . . . maybe it is important. Certainly, the time I spent
in the Navy is *very* important today, but it’s hanging on the wall in my office, and it’s hanging on the wall in my classroom, too. In the sense that it has new-found importance because of this new job—no, but I guess if it hadn’t have been important, I wouldn’t have put it back on the wall, it would have stayed in the box. *Something* made me put it up there—maybe familiarity, so that my office was like my classroom was. There’s a public relations thing there, too—a student relations thing, with relation to the report card. Because I want . . . and maybe it goes back to people’s impressions of me and that being important to me. I want them to see me as not some academic, because I’m *not*. I would rather they see me as somebody who is much like them, who had to struggle through high school and who did OK and not OK, depending on what the subject was . . . and who can relate to them and maybe help them from the same perspective.

**Awareness of My Bodily Changes**

In terms of the bodily changes or states that I was aware of at the time . . . I think of physical changes. Whenever I am doing something that is new or involves people that I am a little uneasy with, I feel nervous, and that manifests itself as a flutter in my stomach and a feeling of being a bit agitated. I don’t ever feel like I’m starting to sweat. I don’t ever feel sick to my stomach. I don’t really have any other feelings that anything is changing, and so while I may be nervous, that’s it. That happens before lots of things. It happened before the first staff meeting. It happened before the first day of school. It happened before my interview. It happened before the night that I met with the parents. It happened when I had, just a couple of weeks ago, a Board of Review with the division board because I kicked a kid out of school. It’s the same feeling every time. It happens
the first time I do something and it's nerves. And that's really the extent of bodily states. If I'm public speaking, my hands shake, but I can't think of a time that I have really experienced this. The only public speaking I've done, I guess, is in front of the kids the first day of school. I did that in front of 180 kids, but that's not real public speaking, because you're walking up and down and you're teaching, really. So, you are moving your hands. There is no sense of that. The only other night would be the night the parents came for the pot luck supper at the beginning of the year— at the Meet the Teacher Night—and that wasn't really public speaking either, because I said a little bit about each of the teachers, but I was moving again. I'm not really nervous. Little butterflies, but that's all.

I think I have shared all that is significant with reference to the introductory meeting experience with you as a researcher and in terms of my reflections with events that occurred leading up to my employment.

**New Principals' Meeting - August 20**

If I were to think of the dimensions, incidents, and people intimately connected with the New Principals' Meeting on August 20, I think this one is quite a bit simpler than the other one [*the Introductory Meeting*] because there are only two things that stand out for me as dimensions. I guess. The first one is the regular occurrence of the sort of suggestion from the Director that the other new principal, Mortimer, is the experienced administrator and I am not. The second one is about the amount of paper flow. I'll deal with the Mortimer issue first. [*After discussing the Mortimer and paper flow issues, Tony also identified his third issue of "building relationships".*]
The Other New Administrator and Me

I remember at the meeting, thinking, that I felt uncomfortable with the suggestion. It is interesting, as I read through this, I see why I was uncomfortable, because I circled, "Do a little overview of the region which Mortimer will be familiar with, but Tony, you may not" [verbatim data Page 3]. It draws a distinction. Then, [verbatim data Page 6], "Mortimer, you will be familiar with this, and Tony, I am sure you will have had a chance to read it, but it is basically . . ." That's about The Education Act. Then, [verbatim data Page 9], "Now, this may be a little harder for you, Tony, because you will both be new". That's talking about a new first-year teacher and me . . . but the new thing is there, and then later on that page, "I'll probably be meeting with you, Tony, every couple of weeks" and then it goes on, "We'll go over this every couple of weeks and adding and taking away and so on. Probably, Mortimer, this is all old stuff, so you know, we . . ." and it kind of trails off.

I think I stopped circling there, but it was a regular reminder that I was really new, and he was just "new". And I was uncomfortable with that, I can remember. So that definitely stands out.

How the Differentiation Affected Me. This differentiation affected me. It certainly has put me a little bit on my guard with Mortimer, and I'm far more apt to share questions with any of the other principals than I am with him, because I don't want to reinforce that sense that there's that difference between us. So, I don't know if that's a change really, because it's not moving from one thing to another, because I didn't know Mortimer before.
Vetted comments pertain to Tony discussing his feelings about Mortimer in context to other members of the Administrators' Group. Tony shared how the group relationship impacted upon his own subsequent interactions with Mortimer.

So that's a connection to Mortimer that is definitely there and is still there. It's not there for the same reasons now, but that's because of some difference that's hard to quantify. But it's still there. I'll tell you what happened.

Vetted comments pertain to a specific incident which directly involved Tony and Mortimer. The relayed incident was Tony's attempt to describe how the relationship had implications for his position as a neophyte principal.

There! Sanitize away! *This comment indicated Tony's permission to include a description of this incident in some form, within this chapter.*

**How the Differentiation Affected Significant Others.** As far as the Mortimer thing went, I don't think that the experience affected significant others in my life. Sandra knew that I was a little bit uneasy [*vetted comment*], but again, that didn't affect her, any more than my day-to-day school stuff.

The Director of Education is a significant other, too, but I don't think it affected her in any way. Really, to a great extent, it was *she* who was affecting *me*, because it wasn't as much that Mortimer was ... Mortimer wasn't standing there saying, "I've got lots of experience and this guy doesn't". It was the Director of Education who was making that distinction and I don't think she meant any harm by it. Interestingly enough, two weeks later, when one of the teachers here was struggling with her Grade 8 English class in terms of classroom management, I talked to Mrs. CDOE about it, and then had
the chance to be in the same room as Mrs. CDOE and Mortimer. Mrs. CDOE asked Mortimer to give me advice about that. That was irritating for me because if we go back to this idea of what other people thought about me, it was important. I didn’t need the other three principals thinking that I needed Mortimer’s advice about anything. I would happily have been collaborative about that entire group and to try to figure something out, but that was such a strong distinction in front of those other people about who was the advisor and who was in need of advice. That was something I didn’t care for.

Feelings Generated by This Experience. In terms of the feelings generated by the Mortimer experience, I was irritated by the frequency of the comments made by the Director at the time, and felt a little bit challenged by that and looked forward to a time when I did something that was right and that Mortimer didn’t do, and interestingly enough, as far as the high schools in the division go, I think Mortimer and I have been [comment vetted by Tony] consistently on the ball here, all the way along, in terms of getting stuff in at the right time and getting things done in the right way. And so I haven’t had the chance yet to get something done that he hasn’t gotten done, [comment vetted by Tony]. I don’t think the other has happened yet, so that’s good. But it was the first point where I felt . . . I don’t know if I felt like I was inferior, but I felt concerned that there was that perception that I might be. And I didn’t care for that at all.

Thoughts That Stood Out. The thoughts that stood out for me weren’t negative towards Mortimer personally, but they were negative towards the situation and the way it had sort of evolved at the meeting. I would like to think Mortimer is oblivious to this, because that would be more positive. If he was aware, then, if the rules were reversed
and I was aware, I would hope that I would say something to diffuse that, and to say, "Well, experience is one thing, but [comment vetted by Tony]." You know? Like, I hope I could find something about myself that would bring me to the level of the person or make the person feel at ease, anyway. Or make the attempt, if I was aware of it. So I hope that he wasn't aware of it. I don't know if he was or not... As far as the Mortimer incident goes, I think I have shared all that is significant.

You know, in terms of the "state" that I was aware of at the time, I remember that by the end of this New Principals' Meeting, I was getting overloaded and I was starting to day-dream. Other than that, nothing.

The Deluge of Paper Work

The other thing I noticed, though, is the deluge of paper work here. In some ways, the stuff I got was positive because it gave me some sense of what I needed to get done, whereas before, I knew that there was a lot of work to do but I didn't know where the starting point was, and that's why Mrs. TeachTwo was helping me. So this was good because at least it gave me a chance to see some forms for the first time and I could at least know that they were in a stack somewhere and I could go back to them. There was far too much paper work, and I didn't understand. I understood hardly any of what Mrs. CDOE was saying about the stuff, and she said, that day, that it was probably true, that "you won't remember any of this but at least you will have it". So there must be some benefit to that. I think though, and I thought then, that it would be more effective if they would cut that down somehow. Hand over the Policy Manual and the Procedures Manual and then have maybe a third little binder or something that had a sort of summary of the
rest of the stuff in it. Not that we would read on our own, because I don’t think that would do me any good, but she could go through . . . that would be organized. Because it was so disorganized. It was just sheet after sheet after sheet. You know, by the time I got to the fifth one, I couldn’t remember what the first three were, and they kept coming.

**How This Experience Affected Me.** The large amount of paper work affected me in a positive way, because it got me going and I was able to go back and look at some of those forms to get started with things. In a negative way . . . and I didn’t feel "hopelessness", but certainly, if I were apt to feel hopelessness, that’s the time that I would have felt hopelessness because I thought, "Good grief. It’s the 20th of August. I’ve got four days to know all of this stuff!" And interestingly enough, most of it, I’ve never looked at again. I’ve looked at it as I have needed to and I have done things that are other than what the school division policy has said—just because I didn’t realize there was a school division policy for those things—and when I realize that there’s a policy, I just go in and look at what it is and start doing it the way the policy reads. Once or twice I’ve had to call Mrs. CDOE and tell her that I’ve deviated a little bit from the way it is supposed to be, and I told her what I had done in case somebody asked, so there’s that trail there. But, really, that flood of paper, for me, was to a great extent, a waste. And then we got some of it again the next day, and I’m assuming that next year—or this year in August—we’re going to get some of it again. And so that means that a lot of the stuff I got last year was photocopied, organized, and it is going to go into the garbage. And that’s the only steps that will happen with it, because I certainly won’t want to keep it around next year, when I get a whole new batch.
In my former school division, they had a good policy manual that was short. They’ve got one here that’s a three-inch binder. The one in my former school division is just a spiral-bound thing that was maybe three-quarters of an inch thick. I think they have more comprehensive policies here, but I haven’t used them, so is it a "make work" project? I don’t know; maybe it is. It seems to me that it must be easier to follow than what they have here.

**The Photocopying Fiasco.** The other comical thing is this photocopying fiasco here. They *copy.* At that New Principals’ Meeting, I got twelve copies of every month-end form, so that I didn’t have to photocopy them at school. Give me the master thing and let me worry about it. And then can you imagine all the time it takes, over at the office? And how many sheets get chucked and how many people just photocopy one when they need it? It is inefficient, is what I think it is. And it was daunting for me as a starting administrator. Just that pile of paper that was literally more than a foot tall.

**How This Experience Affected Significant Others.** Did this deluge of papers affect significant others in my life? Now here’s one for the phenomenologists in the crowd... I suspect it affected *you* as researcher, because you’ve asked me several times about getting copies of some things, and you’ve said several times that it was interesting to see what happened. I hope it affects you in the sense that you take my advice and say, "to hell with it" when you get it, and kind of learn as you go. You know, really, I’m trying to think of a policy. Something to do with kids misbehaving on the bus. Well, I don’t know what the policy is, but when somebody *comes* and says, "kids are misbehaving on the bus", then I look it up.
Student discipline—well, you know, there are in-school suspensions. You are supposed to write a letter regarding that. And I should have known that—common sense would say that you have to do that, but the first couple that I did, I didn’t write a letter. I just talked to the parents on the phone. Realizing that, "Gee, there’s got to be more of a concrete trail here. I should be doing something". And I didn’t do it, until one day I was browsing through the policy manual and I saw the thing and thought, "well I can’t put this off any more. I have to write letters when I do this". Certainly, nothing bad happened to me this year as a result of my ignorance of the policies. You know, if the Director of Education had not liked me, or if the Board of Education had not liked me, then they probably would have had grounds for running me out a couple of times. So I guess there would be that concern, but you know, working with people who are genuinely collaborative and wanting to help me learn, it’s been no trouble at all.

So, it didn’t affect significant others. Sandra knew that I got this big whack of papers that I didn’t know what was on them.

*Feelings Generated by This Experience.* The feelings generated by the paper experience were good and bad, as I’ve already said. The thoughts that stand out were. certainly then, were "Geez, I’ve got a lot to learn" and now, looking back, the thought I have now is, "I didn’t have to have that thought!" I still have a lot to learn, but as time and the situation presents itself, I’ll learn it. But it’s not the type of stuff you can study and learn and then hold it in your brain for when you need it. I’m sure that the senior principal in our school division knows it all, but it’s just because he’s done it. I suspect he’s done it because it’s his style. He’s done it his way, and then has been told, "you’ve
got to do it this other way because that’s the policy” and that’s how he’s learned about the policies. Whereas, you know, someone more like the female principal here does it because they have a situation and they look at the policy manual and they deal with the situation as they are supposed to. Either way, they learn, and then it’s probably in their working memory. But for me to go through all of those policies and to go through all of the clauses and sub-clauses and order and you know, I’d never be able to do it, so why bother? Wait until it happens.

*Awareness of My Bodily Changes.* The bodily changes or states that I was aware of at the time with the paper... it was *heavy* when I carried it back to the school! That’s all that is significant with reference to the paper experience... So that’s it for Mortimer and the paper [*experience*].

**Building Relationships**

The third thing in this one is the whole idea of building relationships. I talked a little bit of my discomfort with the Director of Education. She wants to get the business done and not worry about relationships, and I made a couple of attempts in this one, at moving from the business to the personal, in an attempt to build relationships.

The first one is about the New Principals’ Meeting, on Page 4 at the bottom [*verbatim data*], where I say that my uncle used to work in [*a specific Saskatchewan city*]. There’s nothing for me to be gained in offering that information, except that it gives me a chance to talk and for them to talk about family and for there to be some connections beyond what we are doing right now. And interestingly enough, and I wrote this somewhere... my uncle offered, on a couple of different occasions, to help me out if
I wanted to get a particular job, and it was just terribly important that I never use that help. I think that’s a lousy way. [Comment vetted by Tony.] I’m not interested in getting either a teaching job or a principalship and ever having to worry about somebody saying, "Well, wait a minute! Didn’t your uncle call the office beforehand?" And you know, there’s still a danger of that. When I say this, there’s the potential for Mortimer to think, "Oh, well, that’s how he got the job!" And whenever anybody thinks that you have an uncle who is a director, there’s that. There’s an underlying fear, for me, that says that. It’s important to me that I’m independent of that. It happens that way with my mom and dad and with my wife’s mom and dad, too, even when they are trying to buy us stuff. I feel like I have a pretty strong feeling about that.

But, at this point, in this New Principals’ Meeting, I was willing to take that risk, just to try to build a relationship there. Reading from the verbatim transcript on Page 3, I said, "My uncle works in that area and his name is So-and-So"... and Mortimer says, "I’ve known [him] since..." and Mrs. CDOE interrupts and says, "Oh, yeah, I know [my uncle]. I didn’t know that. It’s a small world. I’ll just go through the material in your package."... you know? Let’s get back to business. She never came back to it.

Later [verbatim data, Page 5], Mrs. CDOE is talking about the other principals. "[Another principal in our school division] is quite a young principal and also a good administrator. I think you will have different contacts but everyone will give you as much..." and I break in and say, "Yeah, actually, I know [him] because we played volleyball together and stuff like that"... and I have the elementary school female principal all lined up with my wife... you know, I’m trying to do this "making friends"
thing. You know, I'm just ready to start talking relationships and then the Director says, "That's good. OK. And after this, you'll see the stuff on the next pages. You might want to bring this along with you on the first day." So that is what I am talking about when I talk about the director. And I mean, it was a long meeting; it was good that she kept us going, because if she would not have, I would have talked until midnight and we wouldn't have gotten anything done... but that is the essence of our relationship unless she plans for it to be otherwise.

And you know, I sat in her hotel room one night in Saskatoon and talked with her for five and a half hours--we visited, very personal, drank beer--because that was personal time. And we went to her house for supper and the kids swam in her hot tub and made a shambles of the place and she was just like a grandmother to them and that was personal time. And you know, it's there. She thinks it's important, too. She just does it in a very planned way and I tend to do it every time I have an interaction with someone. I try to work that in a little bit.

Mrs. CDOE says, "it's good to have a good secretary. Yours is an excellent one, Tony" [verbatim data, Page 14]. And I say, "If she can work the phone!", and Mrs. CDOE says, "Oh, yeah" and I say, "I don't know. I had the division office secretary phone fifteen times after you left yesterday and I couldn't answer the phone once", which is my attempt to provide some humour and to say, you know, "let's talk a little bit about my trials and tribulations that have nothing to do with the meeting" and Mrs. CDOE says, "Yeah. Now we'll deal with Caretaking and Maintenance. Oh, we have the most wonderful caretakers, especially Mortimer." She ignored me and that's OK. I'm not
losing any sleep over that but maybe if I were a different person . . . if I were a little less OK with myself. She’s not seeing that I have a need there. And so it’s interesting.

**How This Experience Affected Me.** So in terms of how to build relationships, how did this experience affect me? I don’t see that Mortimer foiled those attempts to build relationships at all. He was just there; he wasn’t very active. So again, it’s back to Mrs. CDOE. It affected me. I certainly had a feeling like I wanted to work more on that and that it wasn’t an opportunity being given to me. It has affected me less and less as the year has gone on, because I see that’s how she is. And I see her doing it. If I’m meeting with her and another teacher about something—she does it to everybody—and other people have learned just to kind of smile and to tune in to which way the conversation is going now and then join back in when they’ve caught up, and that’s what I do now, too. And so it has affected me less and less as I have understood more about how she is and as I feel less and less of the need. I feel like she knows me a little better all the time, so I don’t need to work on that relationship so much any more.

**How This Experience Affected Significant Others.** Did my attempts to build relationships affect significant others in my life? More so than the other ones, it had an affect on Sandra because I did feel frustrated a couple of times and would go home and say *something*. I didn’t say or feel anything negative about Mrs. CDOE, but I think that I did say something like, "I wish we could sit down and talk" and if you want to be phenomenological, the person I could do that with and who was a mentor for me as much as any other person on earth, was Ms. SecondPrinc in my former school, and I could *always* go in there and shut her door and sit down. It didn’t matter *what* she was doing,
we could talk for an hour and a half about nothing and I'd get up and leave, knowing that she now had an hour and a half more work to do because I just used up an hour and a half of her time. I did that once every two or three weeks, probably, and she appreciated doing it with me, because it gave her a chance to talk about nothing, too. And so when I see . . . when I'm looking for a mentor, and I see Mrs. CDOE—that's the role she fills for me--I'm looking for someone I can do that with. Ms. SecondPrinc had time because our concerns were common. Mrs. CDOE and I have common concerns, but only to a certain extent, and then she has . . . Think of the map of two circles as sub-sets. She's got a set and I've got a set and there's that little moon-shaped thing in the middle where they meet, but when I get out in here [Tony gestures to the non-common area of the imagined circle] then that's a waste of her time, and she's got all of these things to worry about [Tony gestures to the second non-common area of the second circle], and doesn't worry about it. You know, Ms. SecondPrinc and I . . . the circles were a lot more in common.

So as far as affecting significant others, that was a tangent about Ms. SecondPrinc that I use, but it's true. It probably did affect me more. Sandra knows how close I felt to Ms. SecondPrinc and just the absolute faith that I had in her, in the sense that I could say anything and do anything at all, and it was just her and I [sic] talking. So if I was mad at a kid or if I was doing something poorly and knew darned well that it was being poorly done, I could go in and say to her, "I'm doing this really poorly" and never have any concerns about that at all. I feel like Mrs. CDOE's personality is such that I could do that, but it is a very rare occasion that we get deep enough into the conversation to allow me to do that.
Feelings Generated by This Experience. The feelings generated by my relationship-building attempt experience [include] a little bit of frustration, a little bit of wanting to fit in and not being about to crack through there. It's the "outsider". Now I can joke about it with Mr. TeachSeven, another teacher on staff, and I'm on the inside with him, because he sees it, too. When Mrs. CDOE told him, last week that another town was going to call and offer him the job he applied for because his resume was so good, and because the director was so impressed, he came in and laughed about it and said, "That's never going to happen!" You know, maybe they are wanting to have a look at him, but you've got to take it [the compliment] with a grain of salt.

Awareness of My Bodily Changes. In terms of bodily changes or states that I was aware of at the time, I suppose there is that sense of talking to somebody and then BANG! and it's going in the other direction. You know, you feel a little bit hanging? Without a video camera here, I don't know how I can say that in words so that it is really clear, but the sense that the conversation has very unexpectedly changed and I don't really know where it's going now . . . but I know it didn't get as far down the road that we were on as I had wanted it to. That sort of feeling. I think this is all that is significant with regard to building relationships.

Public Relations

There is one other item regarding our meeting on the 20th of August. And that is [where] Mrs. CDOE says, "so you ask, how much of the job is public relations? The answer is every part. You are under the glass." [verbatim data, Page 11]. And as far as a dimension, I think that is absolutely true. I know it is pretty self-explanatory.
How This Experience Affected Me. How it affects me, I guess, is that I am always aware of that.

How This Experience Affected Significant Others. This is something that makes Sandra mad, some days, because she sees me at the restaurant tuning my kids in, and sometimes correctly perceives that I’m doing it not because I believe it is in the best interests of the kid, but because I want that kid to be good because there’s somebody else looking. I certainly see that it is terribly unfair to Sandra and to my three young daughters and to my family and to Sandra’s family. You know, I hear about some bone-headed thing that a family member does and if it is close to this town, I think, "Oh, no!".

Feelings Generated by This Experience. It’s back to other peoples’ perceptions. Other people’s perceptions are going to make me or break me here, and it is not as important now as it was at the beginning of the year. Three years from now, it is going to be even less important, but it goes back to, “What’s the first impression?” If it is positive, you can screw up an awful lot and still stay positive. If it’s negative, you can be an angel and it may still be negative. I think the community is happy with us and I think they couldn’t care less if I’m an effective principal or not, because I think they are happy with us. I think they are happy with us because we are friendly and I make a point of getting people cups of coffee and saying "hi" to old ladies on the street. You know?

I try to come and to be seen at school events or community events. I use the kids that way. I’m ashamed to admit it, but I’ll bring Nicole and sit and watch a volleyball game and she likes coming because she’s with me—and I like having her there because I’m with her . . . but there’s a bigger issue, and that is, you know, "Oh, so he even brings
his family over to the school thing!" and that is not my motivation, but it is always there. Always the sense. "Well, you know, I can make a point here by doing this", or if I just go and work at the Grad's Car Wash for half an hour. As long as two or three people see me there, I can go to the auction for the rest of the day and it doesn't matter, because I’ve been there for half an hour and there's that sense of, "Oh, well, he came and washed cars", you know, "and he got dirty!"

I think that there's a real sense in a simple, farming community, that if you can get a simple person doing a job like this, maybe you are better off, somehow, than getting some sophisticate. And I think that the most sophisticated of us can be simple, and the most simple of us could probably be sophisticated. You know, I just need to be simple. And if that means offering every person who walks through the door a cup of coffee when I know darned well they don't want one and they're not going to have one, [that] they're just coming in for five minutes to do something. If I offer it, even if I know it's not made in here, sometimes, I've made the offer and they'll go away thinking, "Oh, well! They offered us a cup of coffee! He's just like the guy you'd have sitting around the kitchen table at home." And so Mrs. CDOE is right on the money [verbatim data, Page 11] when she says, "Every part is public relations", because I think it is.

I'm trying to think of a time when I had to do something and a parent didn't like it. Suspension or . . . I guess I can finesse my way around a confrontation and I can make a parent who should hate what I'm doing . . . except if I can draw on some other things that have happened in the past or some other comfort things. You know, "Sit down and let me get you a cup of coffee" and "Oh, sure, I'll run back and get the spoon and some
sugar for you and I'm kicking your kid out of school and how's the crop doing? Do you have it all in the ground?" And that's public relations. And Mrs. AprioriPrinc here would have said, "Your kid's made poor decisions today. He's out of school for five days. We'll see him when he gets back." And Mrs. AprioriPrinc is effective, but the kid is still out of school for the five days . . . and the parents, if they come with me and if I do it right . . . and I don't know if I do it right all the time, but if I do it right, the parents think. "What a nice guy! He kicked my kid out of school for five days!" And you know, it sounds so silly, but it's so true. And they will say I'm a good principal, and I'll do the exact same things that the former principal, Mrs. AprioriPrinc, did.

With staff, it's the same issue. I put up a thing in the staff room the other day that said, "If you had the ideal teaching load—the classes exactly that you would want to teach—pick them. You need to pick this number of periods (most of them are thirty-five because we have thirty-six periods in a week), write them down. I'll be looking at this tonight when I start to work out the teacher work loads for next year. WHOA! They just thought that it was Christmas time. The best thing on earth! They'll teach exactly next year, what they taught this year, because there is no way that we can really work it. You know, I might be able to move something from this person to this person and then something back from this person to the first person. So if it is the case that one teacher wants Biology and the other one wants History and right now, it's opposite, I can make that switch. It's the same number of hours in the week; it's easy to do. Maybe I can make it better for them. The likelihood is that I cannot, but that perception . . . "Oh, we've never done this before!" And I told them (I was pretty up-front with them), and I
said it might not make any difference, but just the opportunity to do that. I’m sounding like I’m giving lip-service to collaboration and I don’t think I’m doing that, but I think that even when you know somebody can have a really limited impact on something, it still is good to let them have whatever limited impact it is.

When we hired this guy last week for another teacher’s job, I had two kids in Grade Eleven who are on the SRC. They stayed after school and waited for these interviewees and after every interview, I brought them over and these kids showed them through the school. Then I told them that they were the first people, then, who knew who we had hired, and they got to go and tell all their friends, "Oh, it was Number Three, you know!" The students had no influence on anything, but they had the sense that they were a part of the process and I hope it works the same way for them—that they have some ownership in this new teacher as maybe it did last year that Mr. TeachOne who interviewed me, had with me.

I think that you [refers to the researcher], as an upcoming administrator, need to find every opportunity for kids who volunteer to be on the SRC to get perks, because it is a crappy deal. They do all the work in the school and they really get nothing out of it. And so when we do the interview for the next teacher vacancy coming up next week, it will be on a school day in the afternoon and those two kids, for darned sure, will get the afternoon off of school. While everybody else is working, they are going to be showing interviewees around the school and having a good time. And that, to me, says, "Hey, you volunteered. You’ve done all this garbage for the SRC. Here’s a day off school and yeah, I’ll photocopy all the notes and make sure you get everything. You don’t have to
do any work." So there's some reward for them, too. But that's public relations. Those
kids will go home and tell their parents, and their parents will tell and they will say, "Oh,
well, you know!" Well, you know, maybe it's lip-service to that idea of collaboration,
but it's political and it goes back to what Mrs. CDOE says: "everything's political".
You've got to work the angles. Ms. SecondPrinc knew how to work the angles. Learn
from my former principal. She did everything that was good and everything that was bad
that every principal does, but she inspired confidence in herself and her school as she did
it. Even when people wanted to do the opposite of what she wanted, they would agree
with her, because of how she worked the angles. She was just very good at it.

I think this staff relations thing is major sensemaking for me. Definitely, it is
important because I think it is important and it has had an impact on me. Of all the things
this year, that's probably the only thing that Sandra has been really irate about from time
to time. That I am making family time political. "And be damned if I'm going to let you
get away with it" kind of thing. And so as we talk about something about my job that has
increased strain as far as my marriage goes, that's it. It hasn't increased it a whole lot.
but for brief moments, it has. and that is something that I wasn't as concerned about when
I was teaching.

You know, all the other things are all the same. I don't spend any more time at
school than I did last year. I'm not doing nearly as much extra-curricular stuff because
everybody else was all gung-ho to do it. So, in my former school, I did volleyball the
first day of school until November, two nights a week and every weekend for two and a
half months. So I can do an awful lot of administration in that time and still get to watch
some volleyball.

The heaviest load for me is the teaching load. I have been an appallingly poor English teacher this year because I've done the administration stuff first. There's going to come a time when I will have to let the administration stuff go for a while and get back to the teaching because it is not very fair to the poor kids in Grade Ten. But as far as the administration paper work goes, it hasn't been bad, I don't think. The secretary does a lot and she probably does a lot that I don't even know she does, so that's good. The "Month End" [Report] is a bit of a hassle every month because it involves quite a bit of fiddling around but we've got it all set up on the computer now, so I e-mail it every month, so I can do it at midnight or Sunday or whatever. I just e-mail it whenever it is done and it goes. In fact, I don't fill in any month-end forms at all, by hand. It is all just on a template in the computer and I slip it in, which is very nice. I just use the one from the last month. One thing, I've got "Events from Month Past" and "Events from Month Coming" so I just click, drag, copy and the month-past is the month-coming and then I just edit it and fix it up. It's much better that way.

Mrs. CDOE had said that she would come and see me every two weeks. She has not. Not a sign of her, unless it is something that she needs to do. Just to just come down and sit and talk about how it is going. It just hasn't happened. Part of me wishes that she would have. That would take me back to the relationship-building. Part of me feels good about that because if she thought she needed to be here, she would be here. Because she isn't here. I'll take that as a compliment.
I felt good when Mrs. CDOE mentioned something about situational leadership [verbatim data, Page 39]. I would fit that in with the whole idea of Mortimer and me being somehow subordinate there. The reason I think I feel good about that is that it is something that I knew, and [comment vetted by Tony]. I don’t know if it is important in the big scheme of things, but I doubt that anybody else knows what situational leadership is. However, it gave me the opportunity to say something about what I knew and that was good.

Administrators’ Group Meeting - August 21

This day-long meeting was held at the Board Office and involved all members of the administrative group as well as some Central Office and Shared Services personnel.

The Other New Administrator and Me

There’s an underlying sense, for me, of the Mortimer thing, here again, and my trying, if not to appear as an equal to the rest of the group here, then at least to appear like a competent subordinate in some way. There’s only one item of note [verbatim data, Page 8] where Mrs. CDOE says, in talking about termination of employment, "I know that termination of employment, for Tony’s benefit, must be completed for any teacher who ceases to be employed . . ." and no mention of Mortimer there. There are quite a few other times, though, in this meeting, where she says, "for Mortimer and Tony’s benefit" and so I appreciated that. It is interesting for me that the tone seems to be different here than in the meeting the day before. So I don’t know if she has realized (probably not) probably, it is more just because there are more people at this meeting, so she’s doing more general talking. I can remember feeling uneasy about my appearance in front of the
other three division administrators vis a vis the Mortimer thing. It’s in front of the other principals now, so there’s a bit of that added dimension there.

At the top of [verbatim data, Page 26], we are volunteering for committees and the other young male principal volunteers first for Transfers, and the senior male principal volunteers for Evaluation and also volunteers for Conservation. I think, there, [refers to verbatim transcript] the female principal and Mrs. CDOE are discussing in low tones. I think when that happened, the female principal was volunteering for Evaluation. And every time [refers to Mrs. CDOE’s response]: "Volunteer? Yes, OK, good. Next one. Volunteer? Yes, OK, good. Next one." And I say, "I could do Restructuring?", and Mrs. CDOE says, "OK. Is there anybody else? You might need more than one person." [Paragraph vetted by Tony relates to his desire to work alone on this committee]. I thought, "Here’s an important committee and [vetted comment]."

Feelings Generated by Knowledge of an Informal Pilot

Mrs. CDOE is talking [verbatim data, Page 5] about the pilot teachers in the division. I don’t know where it comes up, but at some point in time, Mrs. CDOE had told me that there had been somebody informally piloting the Grade Ten English in the division and I felt irritated at that. I think maybe it’s because I’ve been indoctrinated by Sask Education a little bit in the previous year when I was piloting the English Ten into the thought that really, there were only the formal pilots and that was it. Anybody else doing it was "illegal" or whatever. I don’t know how strongly I believe that, but it certainly was there. That thought that any sort of informal piloting was "bad" had been drummed into my brain by the folks at Sask Education, to the extent that we were not
allowed to copy anything from the pilot curriculum. It was really quite a deal. There’s no mention of it in the transcript, so I can’t remember when I first heard about that, but I do know that it is something that stands out for me, and I thought, "Gee, that person shouldn’t be doing that, and Mrs. CDOE should know that the person should not be doing it." So, it didn’t really affect me in any way in this business of the informal pilot. It certainly didn’t affect any significant others. I had feelings of unease, I guess, because I didn’t think they should be doing that. I suppose, maybe, too, I was wanting to be the expert in the field here, and that’s a place where I would have been more expert than anybody else in the division. So, if someone was informally doing it, I thought, "Oh, great. Now there’s somebody else being expert when it could have just been me." There were no bodily changes or states, and that’s really it about the informal pilot.

I asked if there’s a Day Two scheduled for inservice of the English Ten Curriculum [verbatim data. Page 6], and there isn’t. The Curriculum Coordinator says, "My guess is that it is in the winter". I think I asked that question more to raise the awareness of the people around me that I knew something about that [the curriculum] rather than that I really wanted to know, because I didn’t really want to know at that point. So it follows the same trend as the situational leadership because it was something that I knew and I just wanted to make sure that everybody knew that I knew.

The Professional Development Fund. On [verbatim data. Page 10], we were talking about the school division where I came from, and that it had decentralized professional development funds at the school level. Again, it’s the situational leadership. English Ten, and my knowledge of some other policies that maybe would be good
options that other people did not have knowledge of. And I didn’t bring that one up, so I was happy when Mrs. CDOE brought it up, because that was recognition that I knew something about something, and that was good. And I talked a little bit about that afterwards in the meeting and it was nice that I was able to talk about that.

So as far as the English Ten question that I asked, and this business about the professional development fund . . . that experience did not affect me, but the feelings generated were positive, I think, because I felt like I was good at something, or knew something about something. I already knew that I knew those things, so I think that the positive thing was that other people then knew and I wanted them to know. I wanted to be seen as someone who was going to be effective, so that was good. Neither of those things affected significant others, and there were no bodily changes.

Home Schooling by [identity vetted]. On [verbatim data, Page 16] is the discussion about [profession vetted by Tony], and about one particular individual who is home schooling a kid. This is a guy who worked in another town that I know of. This was an opportunity where I felt like, [comment vetted by Tony], so I felt like I had some insider knowledge from my last job on him, and it was knowledge about someone who was aspiring to be a [profession vetted by Tony]. So I felt, in a sense, like this individual. He was to me, as I was to Mrs. CDOE. There was some gratification in being able to talk with Mrs. CDOE about someone who was in that same position, in front of all those other principals, and especially in front of the elementary school female principal, because she obviously had some real concerns his kids and the whole home schooling situation. And so I felt like that was a bit of a "new school division" connection that I had, and I wanted
to have those types of connections. The experience affected me in the sense that I went home and told Sandra, "Do you remember that [individual's profession vetted by Tony]?" because Sandra had met him one day at the school in the other town. Since then, it has affected me, because [relationship with others in town vetted by Tony], and I didn’t realize this. She’s quite an annoying woman and so that’s an interesting connection. And the other connection is that [relationship with staff member vetted by Tony], and [s/he] is very hesitant to admit it. So there have been lots of connections since that time, but at the time of this meeting, it was really just that he was some guy from town here and that I had some knowledge of him.

"Black Thursday"

Tony wanted to know more about "Black Thursday", a public ratepayers' meeting held earlier in the year, in which Town ABC ratepayers rejected a Board and teacher proposal to instigate a four-day student work week. All other towns within the division had approved the proposal, but this meeting reportedly engendered a very heated and acrimonious discussion among ratepayers. During the August 21 teacher planning committee meeting, Tony was apprised of "Black Thursday" from the teachers' viewpoint.

The following verbatim explanation provided the background for Tony's subsequent reflections.

Teacher #1: . . . this is part of the problem. The people who are the parents in this community now . . . this school was an awful place to be in the 1970s—things were shit. Absolutely . . . so they have a very, very, very negative view of the high school. Because we can do fantastic things and they can't see it because their frame of reference is somewhat different from reality. Their only view is negative . . . We’ve invited the parents . . . absolutely. We have people who have hated school . . . we try, but
parents say, "I don’t blame my kid for being bad—I hated it, too". So what can we do? We keep trying and hope for the best. Up until Black Thursday, I thought that each year progress was made, but then that, ah . . . that public forum that allowed people to stand up and publically announce that "we hate the teachers, we hate the school and you’re a bunch of freaking idiots" . . . and the rest of the people were going "Whoop! Whoop!", you know [. . .] One person stood up and said, ah, "Somewhere," she said. "somewhere, somewhere else, they’re doing this and it turned out to be quite positive". In other words, she was speaking for . . . um, the next day at work she had three other people pull her aside to say, "What the hell’s wrong with you?" and chewed her out. She realized, "why do I want to live in this community?" and they left the community. [Four community members] gave her shit.

Teacher #2: And she was speaking from experience.
Teacher #1: But until you have heard this . . . she could not believe . . .
Teacher #3: I’ll just do my job.
Teacher #1: You get to leave and go to another community. We have to live here.

Tony: It has to affect you. If you could fix it somehow, in some way make it . . . then the discipline problem would go down. And ah, you’re, you’re . . . you’ve got positive connection with parents more often than the negative . . .
Teacher #3: Yeah, I know.
Teacher #1: We’re just depressed.

How This Experience Affected Me. That is important to me; it was certainly important to me then, because I knew that was something that the teachers were upset about, here. I know that Mrs. CDOE had said that what is really important is public relations and Mrs. CDOE had told me previously that that was what I needed to focus on.

Getting things right, there. I knew, or had a sense, that the main snag between the community and teachers was this meeting that had happened, so anything about that is very important to me. And that affected me . . . maybe not the experience of talking about it at this Administrators’ Group meeting, but that issue affected me, because every time it came up, I came to be very careful about what I said . . . about being very neutral
and trying to learn an awful lot before I bothered to try to say anything about it. That is a change that I have associated with the experience. I would respond to a comment about that ratepayers' meeting in a different way than I would respond to a comment about another issue, because I realized it was very touchy and wanted to respond appropriately.

**How This Experience Affected Significant Others.** It affected significant others in my life by coming back to the public relations thing with my family. That affected teachers, too, here--Mr. TeachOne, especially, and my perception now of what happened in that meeting was that there were two or three very vocal, very negative people, and nobody stood up to refute what they had to say, which, I think, is a shame, but it wasn't as big a deal as what some of the staff members saw as a huge deal. There were a lot of people who lost quite a bit of perspective and said, you know, that it was a negative meeting. In retrospect, it doesn't sound to me, now, that it was [*a negative meeting*]. It sounds to me as though there were two or three dopes who were very negative. I think it is important that teachers see that there are *three* people being very negative and one hundred fifty people keeping their mouths shut. If they were all negative to you, they would be talking. I haven't said anything to staff and I haven't needed to because it hasn't been an issue and the staff feels generally that things are better, and I know that because that's on the survey that Mrs. CDOE did in February. That's one of the things that came out of that survey. Maybe it just means there hasn't been a ratepayers' meeting; I don't know--but it is perception. It goes back to levels of perception.

**Feelings Generated by This Experience.** The thoughts that stood out . . . I guess I was feeling then like this community of Town ABC was going to be a really tough
community to crack. You know, they said the idea had gone over very well in [the other three towns in the division] but [not in] our Town ABC . . . and Mrs. CDOE had made a couple of mentions about, "Ah, you don’t really have any discipline here, but there might be a little bit in Town ABC". Sandra had said that ABC High School was really the toughest, roughest high school, and my wife’s mom and dad had been openly concerned when they found out that I was going to be the principal here. There was an awful lot of advice that I had had about how much of a public relations nightmare Town ABC was and so this was another little bit in that whole puzzle and my experience, so far, is that it hasn’t been, but who knows. Maybe I can’t see the forest for the trees, but in general, those are my thoughts.

We had, at our inservice day in April, a director from another school division, who came and talked about the four-day school week and boy, it sounds good to me, too. The people who were negative in Town ABC were negative because they perceived it as more time off for teachers. Or, that’s the story, anyway. The first, to be brutally honest . . . the first reaction I had when I heard her talk was, "Boy, would that ever be nice for teachers", and I think that it sounds like it would be good for lots of other people, too, but just strictly for the teachers. Discipline-wise, the way they have it set up in that other school division, it really eliminates a lot of discipline like skipping and being absent from school. They say it is an absolute requirement that you be there from Monday to Thursday, because you can go and get your tux and get your teeth fixed and get everything else on Friday. So they have absolutely no tolerance for people who are missing school for any reason from Monday to Thursday and they just make that a policy.
They say, "You’ve got a day a week", and so there’s a lot of ambiguity here about what is skipping and what is not. When a parent says it is OK, is it OK? Even if they are going to do something that is totally not OK according to the policy and according to The Education Act? It removes a lot of that ambiguity, that four-day week. So I see it as something that I would love to have, for me... not for the kids; for me it would be nice. And I think, too, it would be good for the kids.

Public Relations

Mrs. CDOE is talking about the relationship’s basic approach to education [verbatim data, Page 42] and how important it is. Then she says something about "women rise to the top of their field and it says that now there is much more opportunity because people all want relationship-based leadership and that’s why more women. Women traditionally are more relationship-oriented. They are not saying men aren’t, but women are." I believe that I am very relationship-oriented, and I believed it then, so that was good news for me, because, in that sense, in the context that she was saying it there, I am more like the woman she is describing than I am like the man. I recognize that, and so if that is what she is looking for, that is what she is getting, and that is good. [Sentence vetted by Tony.] Did that zip through my mind at the time? I’m not sure about the [identity vetted by Tony] part. But I do know that I thought, "Yeah, that’s good, because that’s me" and all this other organizational stuff is not as much me.

Other than what I’ve already talked about, the Administrators’ Group Meeting was a replication of the New Administrators’ Meeting. I did feel better, though, about some of the things that we talked about here, because we had talked about them the day
before. I felt like I had a fresh sense of what it was, and I didn’t say very much here, but I
at least felt like I knew, a little bit, about what was going on and so, in terms of how the
experience affected me, I guess that was maybe a positive self-concept, positive self-
esteeem thing. Positive general thoughts, although I can’t think of any thoughts in
particular. Generally, I felt like some of the stuff we went over, and then again today, at
least I had a sense of what she was talking about, the second day.

The First Full Staff Meeting - August 25

This meeting took place on Monday at 9:03 a.m. in the staff room; the afternoon
was set aside as individual teacher preparation time.

Feeling Like the Expert

The other thing is, I was pretty heavy-handed a couple of times here, much more than other times. I was talking about the staff room and [that] the things said in the staff
room stay in the staff room. I did that because of some advice that I’ve had about the
secretary’s confidentiality, and that’s why I had the meeting in the staff room. You know,
I can think of only one other time this year where I have been this directive with teachers,
and it was just this past Friday. We were talking about discipline and I was tuning in a
little bit more than I usually do, so that is interesting. Somewhere inside of me, I think
that I needed to have the power and I would not have thought that was really like me.

The other thing was that I talked about the teachers’ mailboxes, too. I emptied out
all of those mailboxes at the bottom of Page 4 [sic] and dumped everything out of their
mailboxes and said, "Keep the mailboxes clean". I put it more nicely than that, but it’s a
fairly strong message for me.
Feelings About Extra-Curricular Time Commitments

One of the things at the meeting that was really important for me was the extra-curricular stuff. I was concerned because I feel like the principal is the person who gets stuck when teachers are unwilling to do extra-curricular things. I didn’t know how willing the staff was going to be, and I knew that I wasn’t going to have time to do thirty-five sports teams and I also knew (and this maybe goes down to the experience affecting significant others) that Sandra would be upset if I were doing thirty-five extra-curricular things. She wasn’t feeling well, and you know, we’re going to have the baby and so I was really concerned about that and just delighted that it went as quickly as it did. And I remember that awkward silence at the end when we needed a Junior Girls’ Basketball Coach and a Senior Boys’ Volleyball Coach. I remember how relieved I was when the male teacher who hired me said, "I’ll do the Senior Boys’ Volleyball", because that would have been right off the bat and it would have been a huge time commitment and I just didn’t think I could do it.

Mrs. TeachThree and Me

There are a couple of times here when Ms. TeachTwo and Mrs. TeachThree [the senior female teacher] cut me off as I am speaking. And I don’t remember feeling any negativity about that. I don’t remember feeling that it was a real challenge. As I read it now, interestingly enough, next year, if there is a huge staff change, I would accept that from Mrs. TeachThree and I’m not sure I would from Ms. TeachTwo. I might respond in such a way that I was a little bit directive with Ms. TeachTwo, but I would let Mrs. TeachThree do exactly the same thing. In fact, I would hope that she would. I think it’s
because I have gotten to be so comfortable with Mrs. TeachThree that I see her as someone who always provides some humour and she provides humour by being kind of gruff. She is one of the most committed teachers [to] the kids in the school here and is very, very professional, and at the same time, when she sees there is some problem, she comes and says, "I think this is a problem. Here are maybe a couple of solutions." She has been fantastic. I picked her out. We are going to a retreat in June—the School Improvement Retreat—and we were to pick one member of our staffs. I didn’t have to think for more than a second before I chose Mrs. TeachThree, because she is just so obviously the right person for that. She has universal respect of the kids, universal respect of the teachers, a ton of experience, and she can sway anybody; she’s a leader—and she’s a leader for every other teacher. There is not any other teacher who is a leader for every other teacher. She is the only one who could sway every teacher on staff. You know, there are some who could sway the younger ones, and some who could sway the not-so-young ones, but she sways everyone and does it with good grace and tact. She’s a lot like me except she’s a little more gruff. I tell you, I think the world of her.

Mrs. TeachThree left the first staff meeting without me sort of giving her permission to. I felt a little irritated as I read that, you know. I don’t remember feeling threatened in any way that day, because everybody laughed when it happened, but I read that and thought, "Oohhhhh." But you know, when she does stuff like that, everybody laughs and it just puts everybody at ease. I think it would happen exactly the same way, even now, because she does that all the time. The other day, I had a bunch of Tupperware here, and I was busy talking to somebody and it was quite a serious thing, and she moved
over and said, "Get your damned Tupperware out of the thing!". She told me, one day after I got my hair cut – in the hallway, in front of a whole bunch of students, "You look like Gumby with your hair like that!" . . . because my hair is strong and it kind of sticks up and goes like this!" [Tony gestures]. The kids laughed; I laughed. She’s just really good. She doesn’t come across to me as a mothering type. I think of her as a peer, but a very experienced peer. When I think of mother, I think of someone who leads me, and I don’t think she leads me, although she certainly influences me when she stands up and disappears from the meeting . . . then I stop talking! She will advise, advise, advise, and then I will decide. She will do what I decide, and I really appreciated that, because she could be terrible, you know. If she was doing stuff like that and was serious about it, then it could be a huge problem. And I had it in my power to make it a huge problem. Like, if I had said, "Sit down! We’re not done!" You know, that would have been a bad move, because I think that her and I [sic] would have worked through it, but if she is leading everybody else, you know. I see her as absolutely benevolent; nothing bad—not one little bit bad. Positive. And when she’s not positive, she’s still a team person. She has turned into, without a doubt, my biggest supporter.

The invitation to the barbeque at my house . . . it was important that people came and did that. That’s what Ms. SecondPrinc did at the beginning of every year, and that’s a great idea.

Really, the whole meeting was giving information and figuring out that extra-curricular stuff, and that was all.
Division-Wide In-Service Day - August 27

All teaching personnel in the school division reported to the gymnasium of Tony's school that morning. After an initial "welcome and introductions" by Mrs. CDOE, each principal was requested to introduce his or her staff members to the larger audience. Then the large group broke into individual subject-area meetings. Tony had been asked by Mrs. CDOE to do an in-service presentation pertaining to the new English curriculum; four English teachers attended his presentation for the remainder of the day.

The Importance of First Impressions

The single incident that stands out most in my mind from that day is that I introduced the staff people here, without any crib notes, and [comment vetted by Tony]. And I remember thinking how important that was— that I be able to do that without any reference. That was after Mrs. CDOE had said that we should either write it down or maybe we could ask another member of our staff to introduce people. And I thought that it would be crazy to pass up that chance to speak in front of this large group when that was the day that most of them were going to see me for the first time, and form their first impressions of me. And I wanted them to see me as someone who is standing up and speaking to them and providing them with information, not as somebody who was sitting there and doing nothing. And I think maybe that related back to the time I had spent as the STF President of the local association at my former school division, because I had quite a few chances to speak in front of the entire teaching body of the school division. I had some positive vibes from those people about the kind of work that I had done. I wanted to re-establish that identity as quickly as I could, and it was the perfect
opportunity to do that. So, I was very nervous that day, and as I was sitting in the audience, waiting for my turn, I was going over and over the people's names again and again because I didn't... Gawd forbid that I forgot somebody's name, or left somebody out and didn't realize it. The way I introduced them was that I started at Grade Seven homeroom teachers... and I knew how many homerooms there were, so I just went up, Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven, Twelve, like that, and knew that there was one extra teacher, the new out-of-province teacher, so I tacked her on at the end. It was just very, very clear... the planning that I had to do that, and I had to take that opportunity. Other than that, I didn't care how the day went. I presented a session to English teachers that day and I didn't care one little bit in comparison to how important it seemed like it was going to be to stand up in front of all those teachers and get all the names right.

Building Relationships

There is a definite attempt to build relationships in the same way that there was the day that Mortimer and Mrs. CDOE and I met, only, this time it was with that whole teaching body. I said, "You can see our resident graffiti artist was at work on the sidewalk outside. You will notice they wrote some grad stuff." You know, the idea—the humour, the laughter, the acceptance is all sort of moulded into one, and so that seemed very important to me. It was a connection to the graffiti, which is still out there on the sidewalk, and which I think is just such a terrible first impression to this school. I knew everybody walked over it and I knew that some of those people were new teachers, so they had never walked over it before. I wanted to talk about the graffiti, to make it seem a little less negative, and at the same time, I wanted to start with something that was
funny, and so I thought that it was there. I can remember being pleased; it brought a
chuckle . . . because if that had fallen flat, the rest of it would have been terrible. I was
really lucky, because I think, looking back, that every first experience was positive here.
First experience with the kids, the teachers, the school division teachers, board members
. . . I think there was laughter at every level, right up to this Board of Review this past
week. There was laughter when my gum fell on the table! I don’t know if I created that
or was lucky enough to have that happen, or a combination of the two is certainly the
case, but everything was positive. I really think it was.

If the year had started off and everything would have been negative, I suspect that
I would have been finishing now and I would have had a month to go and would be
looking for a job somewhere else. Because it had to work. I didn’t suspect that I would
lose my job, but the possibility was always there. I thought that I was ready to be a
principal and that I was alright, but the possibility that being released might happen was
always there, and still is, you know.

Mrs. CDOE came and met with me to talk about how I’m doing, because I asked
her to do that, because I had had no feedback at all, even up to February. I was unwilling
to sort of bank everything on saying, "No news is good news" theory. I wanted her to
come and say, you know, "You’re doing OK; you’re doing OK; you’re doing OK", or
"This is a problem; this is a problem; this is a problem", so I knew where I had to do
some work. Mrs. CDOE did some formal supervision of me, and it was a terrible
lesson—absolutely terrible. Kids were out of control and I was unprepared! [Tony
groans]. She told me she was coming in, beforehand, and it was just bad turning. You
know, I was in the middle of something that wouldn’t have been very good to watch, so I
kind of changed the lesson and the kids weren’t ready for the change and it caused a
disaster. I’m doing Macbeth now, and I would like to get her back in during Macbeth
here, sometime, just so she can see a decent lesson.

Other than that first day of inservice, there was really nothing. We had that
official thing in the gym and then we went to the subject area thing. I had done that
inservice twice before. There were only five people there, and it was just very collegial
and I didn’t really feel like I needed to be a real leader there because there were people
there who had taught English for years and years and years.

First Day of Classes - August 28

Tony’s day commenced at 8:00 a.m. with a variety of main office activities.
During Period One home room, Tony circulated to each classroom to welcome students
back for another year. Formal classes started with Period Two; his classes for the day
included English 10B, English 10S, and Computer Literacy 9L.

The Importance of First Impressions

Really, every class was the same. I did the same thing—I introduced myself and
talked a little bit about my family and where I was from and tried to take attendance and
that was really all of it. I’m not sure that is really my initial contact with kids.

Meeting the Students in Assembly. If I keep thinking about the important first
impression, the first impression was in the gym in the morning and I felt like that went
OK, but there was quite a bit of talking in the gym that morning. It wasn’t the most
disciplined thing and you know, I didn’t want that. I didn’t want that. I didn’t want it to
be a free-for-all right from the get-go, but it went alright. I introduced all of the teachers
and there weren’t any kids yelling out expletives or anything like that, so that was good.
Then, I guess, when I went from classroom to classroom, it was good. That was really
my first exposure to all of those kids and I thought that went over really well.
Interestingly enough, I didn’t get to either of the Grade Nine rooms that morning, and I
never did get to them. I taught both of those rooms of kids, so eventually I did get to see
them, but didn’t ever get that initial blurb in about school and me and stuff like that.

So, as far as incidents that were connected with that first day of classes, in the
gym with the whole student body was something that was important. It affected me
because it made me think, afterwards, that I wished that it would have gone better
because of the student talking, and I realized that it wasn’t anything to do with me, or it
was just the physical setting of the gym with all of those kids in it. I did see, then, in the
subsequent visiting of the home rooms, as being really important, to establish that no-
talking sort of mutual-respect relationship there. I was nervous. Terribly nervous before
the gym thing, but it was one of those situations where it was just so far beyond my
control that it almost took the nervousness away because I just knew it was going to
happen, and good or bad, it was going to happen. I just had visions of something not
going well and just didn’t know how I would deal with that. I think probably that those
things go well all the time. The first day of school and kids are curious. Keep it short,
you know. But, when I was Johnny-on-the-spot, I was worried about it. In terms of
bodily changes, I was nervous.
So, then I went and saw all the kids in the home rooms, and I thought it was generally positive and there wasn’t really anything that came up. There was one of the Grade Twelve guys who asked me how old I was. I said, a couple of times, you know, that the question made me a little bit nervous because I was young and I thought that it led to less respect. I thought there was the potential to be problematic if they found out I was only thirty. And the other thing was that one of the kids stuck his tongue out. It was just a test in Ms. TeachTwo’s classroom . . . and it was a pretty small test, and I ignored it. Those kids have both turned out to be pretty fantastic kids and I have good relationships with them, so I am glad I didn’t get all heavy there, because I think that would have been the wrong decision.

**Meeting the Students Within My Classes.** As far as the classes went, I thought it was important to introduce myself and the family and to talk a little bit about me. I remember that I had so much on the go from the days before that, that I wasn’t really prepared to teach English, so I had to cobble something together as far as a lesson went, and that just happened to be the natural content to cover. I knew it was important to tell the kids about me because they would be curious, and I think I wanted them to know a little bit about the odd things I had done, to be a specific person. I wanted to be an individual and not a principal, necessarily. I guess maybe it is a parallel to my attempting to build relationships with Mortimer and Mrs. CDOE and then again with the humour on the first day I wanted to be a person. And that was their first impression of me, so it was important to me.
Meeting with My Director and the University Advisor - August 29

Eager to meet my university advisor, Tony invited Murray to drive out to the school in order to discuss the intricacies of this research, as well as to find out more about the possibility of linking his own research interests to this study. After our meeting, Tony also suggested we walk over to visit Mrs. CDOE at the Board Office, where he would join us, after teaching his last period class.

Thoughts On Being Socialized

There were really only two things that I identified [in meeting my advisor, Murray]. One is a dimension [verbatim data, Page 21] where we are talking about where I'm socialized. I said, "I am socialized" at that point. I don't know if I thought or saw as clearly, then. I don't think I probably did. But just after the talking that I have done with you as a researcher, today, I think I see that to a great extent, I was socialized at that point, because I had my first experience with an awful lot of things here. I say, on the 29th of August that, "I have a bit of the picture. I feel like it's not going to be long until I'll be able to say, OK, I have a general feel for the job and the community [...] after two days with the kids and five days with the staff."

So, I haven't had the meetings yet—the local board meetings and the sort of regular staff meetings as opposed to the beginning of the year staff meeting, but I do think that if you were to draw my learning curve [...] which, I think, the amount I learn corresponds with how much I feel socialized, because how socialized I am, I think, relates to how expert I feel with stuff [...] and you know, at this point, I didn't feel expert by a long shot, but I felt like I sort of had a sense of how things went. You know, that basic sense, then,
I thought I could survive with that. This is not going to be that bad and I can survive it.

**My Knowledge of Others**

Then, on the next page, [verbatim data, Page 22], Murray identified four things: community, school, teachers, and kids, and I ran through some of that; that I knew somewhat of the teachers. Murray didn’t think that I would know of their politics, and I said that I thought I had a sense of what that might be and I think I did, maybe with the exception of Ms. TeachTwo, a little tiny bit. But to me, "politics" implies intent, and I don’t think that she . . . she’s a little bit immature in some ways. I don’t think she intends to do that, you know; it is personality. And that was a little hidden from the beginning from me, but it has evolved now.

For the rest of them, I sort of knew what kind of people they were. At this point, on August 29, I knew somewhat of the kids, a little bit of the school, and a little bit of the community. The first impression, I think, had been formed with all of those groups. Community maybe a little bit less, but school, teachers, and kids—it had been there.

**How This Meeting Affected Me.** This meeting with Murray affected me because it made the whole study a bit more clear. You and I had talked quite a bit about the struggles and non-struggles about how you were going to put it together and whether you could give advice or not, so it made things a little more clear for me that way because Murray was a person in authority. At least, when he said he wasn’t sure how it would work, I felt like, "OK, that lets you off the hook a bit", because he’s supposed to know, so if he doesn’t know, then you can always say, "Well, this character didn’t know, either, and I’m just the student here". I guess that was positive. I don’t know if Murray is
supposed to play a role in my socialization, but, being able to say that "this professor from the University of Saskatchewan is going to come to the school today . . ." I felt some pride. I was glad that he came and I certainly told Mrs. CDOE and the other people that he had been there, so that was good.

How This Meeting Affected Significant Others. It [Murray’s visit] affected significant others in my life. Like, the teachers know about this guy Langlois and the report [The 1991 School Finance and Governance Review by Consultants Langlois and Scharf], so here was this guy in the school and they knew who he was, so I would say that it would have some sort of effect on the teachers. I don’t know what effect it would have on the teachers, but it would seem to me that if I were a teacher and if this character who had written this report who had been in the news a few years ago, showed up and went to chat with the principal . . . I would think, you know, "Gee, this is interesting", anyway, if nothing more than that. He seemed like a nice enough guy and so that was good.

Feelings Generated by This Meeting. At the very end at the last part of our meeting together, I did what I do with Mrs. CDOE and Mortimer and with the Principals’ Group and everybody else. The business with Murray was all done, and so I tried to get into the conversation and it was by asking him if he had a son named Dave Scharf who was in the Navy in Saskatoon. And that was a deliberate attempt to just visit and all this other stuff was done; I just wanted to build some more relationships there. That was the only other thing I picked out of the whole thing. There is lots of interesting stuff there, but I see this meeting as being quite distinct from my learning about the job, because this was learning about the study:
We want to find out how you're learning... your situation and learning and to the role of the principal... like how are you, in fact, striking your psychological contract? How you learn. [Page 20]

I learned to be socialized to a lesser extent by watching Ms. SecondPrinc, and to a greater extent I learned by doing. I didn’t learn very much at all from listening to Mrs. CDOE as she explained all of that paper work. I didn’t learn much from looking at the paper work. I certainly learned this job and started learning this job long before I came to Town ABC and I think that was just by watching and having experiences. Do you learn the job of principal of a high school, or is that something that happens after you have a sum total of life experience and then you decide that you are going to apply for this job and you are hired? And then doesn’t that total life experience... altogether, isn’t that the role you assume? Because that has got to determine what role you take as principal—the life experience. Whether you are a Mrs. AprioriPrinc or a Ms. SecondPrinc or a Tony Principal or a Mrs. CDOE Principal?

I learned a lot about being a principal when I was in the Navy, but it had nothing to do with school. I mean, I learned about organizing and delegating and people who I thought were effectively using high-stress places and people who I saw who were very ineffective. I feel like I’ve learned about kids and especially kids who were academic strugglers when I was a kid, so how did I learn?

After I got here, I learned by doing, but before I got here, I learned by all of the things I have done because a principal is a little bit of a leader and a little bit of a talker and a little bit of a mother and a little bit of so many different roles. That’s why I think experience is one of the things that must make a good principal and not just teaching
experience but life experiences because you have more sense of a whole bunch of
different roles. Well, maybe you have more ability to make sense because of all the
things you have done in the past. You know?

Like, if I would have started off as a principal and not taught for those years in my
former town? Then I would not have had the chance to have a kid to tell me to Fuck Off
and to deal with that kid in the right way or the wrong way. If I had dealt with that kid in
my former school in the right way, I learned; if I dealt with him in the wrong way, I
learned. So, I am better able to say, "this is the type of principal I want to be". I am
better able to say that now, because I have had lots of good and bad principals. So, I am
better able to make sense of whether what I am doing is the right thing as a principal
because I can see a little bit, in my mind's eye, what the principal I want to be looks like,
and I can measure.

I can say, as I often do, "what would Ms. SecondPrinc do?". It doesn't happen
very often any more, I guess, that I get thinking that way about things, but I know that
whenever I am planning for a parent meeting or for anything that has to do with
community relations, at some point in time, I always think, "OK, is there anything that
Ms. SecondPrinc would have done that I haven't already done?", because if there is, I
need to do it just to make sure that this comes off OK.

In terms of the public relations thing, that's particularly strong with Ms.
SecondPrinc and Mr. FirstPrinc, because I saw one do it so well and one do it so poorly.
It is just really clear to me that if I'm going to have any success at all, it has to be one
way and not the other, and that wouldn't be clear if I hadn't seen it previously. One, for
sure, is thinking about "what would so-and-so do?" and that has been a very good measuring stick for me, and it wasn’t even in the years Ms. SecondPrinc was there, but it certainly was in the first year that Mrs. ThirdPrinc took over from my favourite former principal, and this year it has been that way, too. I have talked to Ms. SecondPrinc on the phone two or three times this year and I haven’t really asked for her advice at all, but I have tended to describe what is happening here and she has described what has happened there. In her descriptions, I can still sense what she is doing and that is learning for me, too. Even when I don’t ask for her advice, when I describe something that is here, by the way she says, "Oh, yeah, yeah" . . . that’s enough for me to think, "OK, I’m on the right track" or just the tone in her voice makes me think, "Oh, oh!" So that’s interesting, even from another small town in Saskatchewan, she can influence me.

I am at a point right now where I know about kicking a kid out of school for more than three days. I know the whole routine; exactly what has to happen, and I can give it to you verbatim. But I don’t know anything about doing that and then having a kid expelled by the Board because that has never happened. By the time the 29th of August hit, I felt like I knew the school day, the school routine, the daily routine—and that’s the same now as it was then. I knew the teachers’ routine a little bit, hallway supervision, computer room supervision, the secretary’s hours, how the computer worked in the office, where my folder was, the password to get onto the Internet, all the students. Even though I may not have known all of their names, every time, BANG!, but students in the classes I taught, I had a general sense of who was in Grade Nine and who was in Grade Ten and who was in Grade Seven.
I can't think of what else, but husbands and wives of the teachers, family life of
the teachers, some of the kids of the teachers. I had a sense of certainly of Mr.
TeachEight and his wife and their kids; a good sense of Mr. TeachOne and his wife—even
though it was a bit of an odd thing, because I had a sense of that from other people
before, and saw that first-hand [Mr. TeachOne has now separated from his spouse]. Even
though Mr. TeachEight and his wife were unable to come to the barbeque, I had a sense
of them and of his wife even though I had never met her.

So Murray's point of "I know" . . . is the senior male principal of the next town
"there"? He's been a principal for how many years? I don't know if he is [there] because
I know that I've heard that principal say, "I don't know". When do you know enough to
say, "I know"? I'm not sure if I ever will. But I know, as I said before, I know enough,
now, and I know that I can learn the things that I don't know.

So it comes back to the definition of socialization and on the 29th of August I didn't
think I was socialized, even though I said I was. I said I had a bit of the picture. I
wouldn't have said I was socialized on the 29th of August, but when I look back on it now
I see. If you think of a school as a big circle, I had only a very sketchy sense of it, but I
had pretty much the whole circle sketched like a spider-web almost. So, ever since, I've
been filling in more of the lines. I don't know, but I had quite a good sense of it even then.

One of the things that should be interesting is how you define socialization. I don't
know how I define it; I don't know that I could. Your definition of it will be interesting
because Murray said there are degrees. Murray skirts it. He doesn't talk about
socialization. He talks about the socialization process, and he says it right here
says, "there are increments". I think the inference is that there may never be an end to that process, right???. So it is like a learning curve. It goes up and goes quite steep and then it flattens, but does it ever stay flat?? Like, it gets more flat, but I think you must always be learning more and so his increments get smaller in time but do they ever get to zero?? Like, that's the point where you are socialized, then—when you are no longer learning.

The most senior principal in our school division has been learning all year long, and he's been a principal for thirty years. So, you know, am I going to . . . this is more about life, maybe, than about a job, but I'm going to learn about being old when I'm old. So I'm going to learn about being a fifty-year old principal in twenty years. And I will have a different relationship with kids then than I have now, because I'm only ten years older than they are. And I can say, and I can run around with them on the floor hockey floor and not die of a heart attack. That's something that will change, and so I will have to change to suit that physical change, and that means I'm going to have to learn how to do it in a way that is better for kids. So no, I'm never going to be socialized, and Murray said it right there on that page.

I thought that socialization meant something different on the 29th of August than I do today. My researching friend [Tony chuckles] is partly responsible for that, because we said, from the beginning, that we would finish when we said I was socialized. And so we finished at some point that I thought I was socialized enough to say that I was socialized and now we've been done, as far as the data-gathering goes, for several months. So now, I'm not scared that you are going to show up on Monday morning with your tape recorder again. I saw socialization, then, as something that was tangible
because you and to a certain extent Murray, seemed to think it was tangible. However, when I read carefully here, Murray does not say it is tangible here. I think that I see that it is not, or you may be able to measure it but you are never going to be able to measure it entirely. I will be definitely socialized at the point when I die, you know, so then it’s immeasurable, right?? And I will presumably learn about life and me and how I relate to others . . . and how I relate to others is part and parcel of being a principal and so it’s going to go that long.

Reflections on [Seven] Meetings - September 3

The day commenced with teaching the English 10B class. At 10 a.m. Tony met with the regional Special Education Consultants, the special education teacher and teacher aide. Next, Tony taught his English 10S class. At 12:10 p.m. he attended the SRC executive meeting, and at 1:00 p.m. he met with the regional Child and Youth Counsellor. He then taught his English 10B class again. Next, he met with the teacher-librarian, followed by a meeting with his first-year out-of-province teacher. At 4:00 p.m. he met with one student’s parents who were concerned about their child’s progress.

The Importance of First Impressions

On [verbatim data, Page 41], I had said that Mrs. CDOE had said, instead of using the whiteboard for communication that I start a binder so that I could record everything I wrote down and everything that was written down in response to it, so that I had a permanent record. I said that I wished that I had started that at the beginning of the year, because now I had started using the whiteboard and did not want to change, two days into it because I would look like I didn’t know what was going on.
At that point in time, my concern with the whiteboard was that, if I wrote something up there and it was up there for long enough that I thought everybody knew about it and then it got erased, and then somebody said that either they didn’t know about it or that it was never up there, I would have no evidence that it had been up there? I didn’t think that was going to happen, but I was concerned about it happening, the 3rd of September.

I’m not the least bit concerned about that happening now. I’m still concerned that every now and again I’m going to forget to write something on the whiteboard or somebody is not going to see it, but it doesn’t seem to be nearly as big a deal to me now. That they might not see it and so might not know about something. It’s not going to be the end of the world, probably, because the initial impression is formed and so now if I screw up, I screw up. But then, on the 3rd of September, if I screwed up, then it would have been quite a big deal, maybe, and that’s a negative. I didn’t want to seem wishy-washy but was concerned, you know, "what happens if it comes up?" and I get into some big argument and I have no evidence.

**My One Screw-Up**

For what it is worth, I can think of only one time, all year, that I really screwed something up. That was a lunch meeting that the whole staff was supposed to have with Mrs. CDOE and I didn’t get it written up clearly on the whiteboard, and Mr. EightTeach was supposed to go home and make lunch for his kids that day and he was quite upset that he hadn’t known about it and he had to go rushing around. That was later, though. It took a long time to get to the point where I felt comfortable with Mr. TeachEight. I’m not sure if it set me back with him, necessarily, but I felt like the rest of them had all sort
of accepted that I was here and I was going to be alright. I wasn’t lighting the world on fire but wasn’t going to be a disaster, either. I think they felt that much sooner than Mr. TeachEight did. I do feel that it set me back with Mr. TeachEight, and I’ve worked harder on that relationship with him, ever since, in an attempt to make sure it improves.

Administrator/Secretary Computer In-Service - September 12

School division principals, school secretaries, some Central Office personnel and Mrs. CDOE met at the computer classroom in Tony’s school for a Friday afternoon in-service provided by an external computer consultant. At this meeting, the intricacies of the newly installed division-wide administrative computer system package were unveiled.

Building Relationships

The only thing was in terms of relationship-building when I was keyboarding and you and the secretary were commenting on my keyboarding technique. The other principals were there and some of the other secretaries, and it didn’t seem very light [humourous] for some of them. It was important that it was light for me and for my secretary, and it was, and that was good. That’s what I remember about that. My secretary so obviously had an understanding of how the program worked. It was really a pointless afternoon for me because she could have taught it as well or better than the city fellow they brought in for the seminar.

Meet-the-Teachers Pot Luck Dinner - September 17

At 5:45 p.m. that Wednesday, students and parents arrived for the school-initiated pot luck dinner. Tony’s wife and young daughters were also present: he greeted parents at the door carrying Kim in his arms. Following the buffet dinner, Tony introduced the
staff members and SRC executive members; the gathering ended at 8:00 p.m.

The Importance of Introductions to the Community

It was important to me that I have the chance to introduce all of these people, especially the new people. It was important to me that there was a large group in terms of people intimately connected with the experience, or whether it was a dimension. As far as dimensions go, first of all, it was a large group of people at this pot luck dinner. I didn’t want to have just ten people; I was very happy that there was a large group. Secondly, it was important to me that I introduce the new teachers, because I thought that was important for their well-being in the community—that they were immediately visible and I said some things about qualifications and stuff. It was important that the school be portrayed in a very positive way, because it was the first time the community had been in to the school. I had no sense of how that would go. All I knew about the community being in the school was this meeting that happened last year, and this dinner was good in all those ways.

How This Experience Affected Me. Over all, the global experience affected me in a positive way, I think, because it went well. Certainly, I felt more comfortable with the community at large, I think, when I was done this, because again it was the first thing, the first time with the community. So I had the first time with all these other things and now it was the first time with the community.

How This Experience Affected Significant Others. It affected significant others because I had the chance to introduce Sandra and the kids and they were there and talked to people and were part of the whole thing, and that’s something that they did an awful lot of in our former town; they were really a part of the school. I knew they wanted to be
part of the school again, so it was positive for them, too.

**Feelings Generated by This Experience.** Other than that the event was good and it was working out well and I was glad that it did work out well, I don't know if there was any other specific feelings. I do know I was nervous when I introduced the teachers. I had made up a little sheet beforehand that the staff had to fill out with their information on it. With one of the new female staff members, Mrs. TenTeach, I didn't have something written down about her husband, so I had to ask her in the middle of the introductions. And I had to ask her if that was right. So that was not a negative thing, but it was a thing.

**Awareness of My Bodily Changes.** Bodily changes, I was nervous and felt the public speaking thing, but no more than I always am.

**New Principals' Meeting on School Start-Up and Supervision - September 18**

At 3:30 Thursday, the two new principals met with Mrs. CDOE and one Central Office member to discuss the events of the past weeks. Specific attention was given to one neophyte teacher on Tony's staff who had experienced opening-week difficulties: the small group discussed supervisory tactics in this regard.

**The Other New Administrator and Me**

There's not a whole lot here, except for the continuation of my communication with Mortimer. The best example on the whole thing is [on Page 9] where he suggests that these guys [students] are causing some trouble for my new special education resource teacher... and I say, "Um" and Mrs. CDOE says, "Oh, that's a great idea", and the central office person says, "Oh, I could do a lot better" and then I say, "maybe" and then I go on to say that I think it is a shitty idea in not so many words. I argue a little bit here.
I say that they are not kids who have been identified as being in learning resource, and Mortimer says, "well, they do have behaviour problems" and Mrs. CDOE agrees with Mortimer, and I say, "well, they don't have behaviour problems". Mortimer says, "yes, they do. Look at this." And then we sort of leave it and never do come to any sort of agreement about it.

This is after Mrs. CDOE asks Mortimer and I [sic] if it would be OK to brainstorm about the situation with the beginning teacher and the problems she is having. And even there, my answer is, "well, yes, I guess, if it’s only for us." [Four sentences vetted by Tony.] But this meeting here is the last time I was feeling specifically uncomfortable about something, as far as Mortimer went, anyway.

It [the discussion] affected me because it made me angry. I don’t know if I changed, because it was already there. Certainly, the feelings of irritation were pretty strong, to the point where I argued my case a little bit, and I think that’s probably the first time... certainly the first time with Mrs. CDOE. I didn’t think anything was a bad idea. I just didn’t like the way it was coming across. I guess that may be something. There might have been a bodily change, actually. Sometimes when I realize that something is going to be irritating to me, I sort of get a prelude to that irritation. I don’t know if it is tense muscles or what it is. I can remember when Mrs. CDOE asked that, thinking, "Oh, no!" My response illustrates that a little bit, because it wasn’t a very enthusiastic response. The Director said, "Tony, I want to know if you are comfortable if we brainstorm a problem about the new resource teacher." And I say, "I think so, as long as it is just us." Well, as far as the enthusiasm of my reactions to Mrs. CDOE goes, that's low. I remember
that point and thinking, "absolutely not! I don’t have any interest in doing this at all".

I said that I didn’t know if the middle years’ classroom was ever going to be this teacher’s niche. I think that what I meant there was that I don’t know if she is going to be able to handle the middle years classroom, but I didn’t want to say that there because I felt like Mrs. CDOE was developing some pretty serious misgivings . . . or maybe not misgivings . . . but she was being very serious about the whole issue and I wasn’t going to pull the plug, certainly. I think, now, she [the neophyte teacher] is fine. It took her a while to get control of her emotions. I’m not sure that Grade Eight English is the best pick of subjects. If she were to do Enriched English or Enriched Art or something like that, she would be fantastic. She is incredibly good at record-keeping. So, you know, it is the standard deal in rural Saskatchewan. It may be not the best match.

Social Skills Meeting - September 23

The special education teacher and teacher aide met with Tony to discuss the composition of the school’s ongoing "Social Skills Program" for at-risk students.

Feelings About the Parent Who Committed Suicide

On [verbatim data, Page 5] I said, "The jerk committed suicide", but I have some strong feelings about suicide. I have seen the results of suicide on people who are close to people who have committed suicide and have some pretty strong feelings about that being a very selfish act. So the plans went awry and the scheduled talk didn’t happen is maybe the essence of things, but I do think that anybody who is going to do that to himself and who has a little girl in Grade Seven . . . you know, I think the jerk part fits pretty well as far as I’m concerned.
Selling Our House

That was just the day before this suicide thing. Selling our house in the former town was the major stress that we had, right from the get-go and that we would not be able to sell the house. It was something that was really starting to bother both of us, and so it was very nice when we sold it, to know that it was sold. Our house in the former town was paid for, so it wasn't like we had to pay anything on it, but we had spent however many years that we were there, thinking, "Well, we will just pay this sucker off and then we are good to go, and it's an investment". Our concern was, now we are starting all over again, if we are stuck with this house for the next twenty years, it is going to be worth nothing. You know, we wanted to build a garage and wanted to pay for the summer that I spent in San Diego and really, the capital for all of those payments was in the house. So it would have jammed us up, you know, not really in the long-term, but in terms of immediate cash flow. The sale of a house is a pretty big deal and so we were very glad that it happened. Sandra was especially concerned about that, so in terms of how an experience affected significant others, she was very affected by the sale of the house, and moreso by the lack of sale before that. I think probably the reason for that is because she tends to do all of the financial stuff so has a better handle on how broke we were. It really was a big, big issue and we had looked at a whole bunch of different options and really, none of them were any good so we were stuck. We were really stuck and were glad to see these folks come out and take it over.
Administrators' Group Meeting - September 26

All members of the administrators' group were present at the Board Office for the Friday afternoon meeting. Two guest speakers from the regional Health Board made a presentation before commencement of the regular meeting.

[Entire heading and subsequent paragraph vetted by Tony]

Feelings About Being a Principal

I just mentioned that I felt pretty happy with being at this meeting as one of the principals and having these people from the Health Region present to us. I was principal at a high school and I thought that it was maybe just a little bit better than being a teacher! The status. And I don’t feel like that very much. at all, but I do remember just a little bit of a sense of status.

The only two times I had a sense of status was then, and if I’m talking to a car salesman. They always ask what you do for a living, and I think if you say you are a brain surgeon, they are a lot nicer to you than if you say you drive a back hoe. And I’m sure that’s because of that perception of salary there, and so I always feel good telling a used car salesman that I’m a principal because I feel like maybe they are more interested in being nice to me. How’s that for weird?

Teacher-Principal Professional Development Interview - October 21

Tony asked Mrs. TeachFour, a senior teacher on staff, to meet with him regarding her targeted yearly professional development plans. Mrs. TeachFour requested that Tony use the “peer cognitive coaching” approach to supervising her throughout the year.
The Idea of Cognitive Coaching

A dimension [of interest to Tony] that is there a little bit is the idea of Cognitive Coaching. It is something Mrs. TeachFour is interested in and it is something that my mentor at San Diego suggested that I get involved with, last summer. So I made the connection with Mrs. TeachFour and said, "I don’t know anything about Cognitive Coaching and I have people telling me this is something I should learn" and then I asked her some questions about what format it took between her and Mrs. AprioriPrinc, here. So, there’s definitely a connection in terms of the content between something that happened before ABC High School and this day on the 21st of October. I don’t assign any meaning or any thoughts or feelings. The experience didn’t affect any significant other except with Mrs. TeachFour, I suppose, because she had to come and do it, and she seemed comfortable and happy to do it and to share it with both of us. There were no bodily changes, and no changes that I associated to that experience.

I did decide, though, that I should look into Cognitive Coaching a little bit more, and I had the prompt from another Saskatchewan administrator who was also in San Diego for the summer, to look into it. So this other administrator’s prompt and then Mrs. TeachFour saying she was interested, I suppose, pushed me a little bit towards my own professional development in terms of this Cognitive Coaching thing and doing that. I’m doing this "Changing Mindsets". It’s a six-day seminar at the STF, two days in April that I’ve done, two days in May that I have to do, and two days in October. I don’t know that I would have gone to that, except that it seemed to be three things. It was important to Mrs. TeachFour. The Saskatchewan administrator who was down in San Diego thought
it was a good idea and I trust what she says. It’s one of the tracks on the teacher evaluation system here and I didn’t know anything about it, so I thought that maybe I should. Those are the connections there.

As far as new things and socialization, this 21st of October meeting wasn’t anything else. I’ve done classroom observations and I’ve done observation sheets that I share with the teachers. I’ve written some letters of reference based on my classroom observation sheets. So, in that sense, I have done some supervision. All I am required to do for the Track Four teachers is to write a letter that talks about them during that school year. So, I’ve done it for some and I haven’t done it for others, and I need to do it for all of them.

Summary

The purpose of this Chapter V was to provide a forum for Tony to reflect upon his induction experiences; it represents the total extent of his reflections. It was at this point in the topical-guided interviews that Tony indicated he "saw nothing new" to attribute to his sensemaking of the verbatim raw data.

In this respect, Tony commented on thirteen activities which intrigued him, out of a total of forty separately recorded verbatim transcript activities which took place from August 19, 1997 to May 17, 1998 [refer to Appendix D for a chronological list of Data Collection Activities].

Chapter VI presents my phenomenological analysis of the sensemaking of Tony’s induction experience through my shifting lens as an insider and outsider, and through my bifurcated lens as a researcher and participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship.
CHAPTER VI: SENSEMAKING OF THE RESEARCHER

And I do want to get to the argument, but before we get to the argument, I want to get to the description, because I think that looking at the world the way it is, is preeminently important and the necessary basis for carrying on the argument.

(Greenfield as cited in Macpherson, 1984a, p. 4)

Introduction

A year has passed since I first arrived at that small rural Saskatchewan town with the intent of learning more about the principalship through Tony's induction experiences. As Tony worked diligently to bring closure to his first administrative year, I attempted to make sense of my own anticipatory set to the principalship.

I operated this research on the assumption of paradigm commensurability, as the research was not focussed as a purely phenomenological study, but rather, as an exercise in utility wherein the methodology was used for a specific purpose. This study provided me the venue to maximize my own learning for pragmatic in-school purposes as well as to contribute to the academic literature research base. I was curious to know about the incidents which were of interest to Tony, and the themes and contexts which accounted for his sensemaking in relation to my own sensemaking of the same events.

Phenomenology is a philosophy of experience that is descriptive in purpose, with the nature of individualism being the central focus of its perspective (Macpherson, 1984b,
p. 61). This rather postmodern perspective in the advocacy of turning to the meanings of the administrators themselves rather than to the lenses of others, provided me with the incentive to present Chapter V through Tony’s own sensemaking descriptions. In contrast, Chapter VI is the antithesis of Chapter V, as it describes my sensemaking through the bifurcated location lens as a primary researcher and as a participant observer, as opposed to Tony’s sensemaking of the induction experience. This Chapter VI presents my sensemaking of Tony’s induction experience through phenomenological analysis, which, intrinsically, became my own experience.

**Conduct of the Research and Emergent Themes**

As Weick (1995) stated, "part of the craft in working with sensemaking is to begin by immersing oneself in a description", and so it was that my career interests took me to a rural school division where a neophyte administrator had just been hired to a principalship role. The verbatim data were collected by shadowing the principal from late August through late November 1997. It was only by stepping away from the research site that I was able to make sense of the conduct of the research.

As the research progressed, it became apparent that my primary interest was my sensemaking of the field experience rather than in socialization per se. A theoretical framework was drafted to incorporate sensemaking (Weick, 1995), phenomenology (Schutz, 1967, 1970), and postmodernism (Lyotard, 1984) ideology. As well, three perspectives emanated from the literature review which eventually formed part of the conceptual framework: sensemaking of the phenomenon, the organizational context of the research, and the location from which the research would be viewed.
Research continues to unfold the human story. My dissertation task is to extend the evolutionary literature process to recognize the complexity, variety, and uniqueness of the individual in idiosyncratic sensemaking of socialization experiences. The examination of uniqueness is essential in order to describe and to inform practice. It is necessary in order to move educational administrative thought further along the research continuum by providing aspiring administrators as well as others involved in the socialization process more opportunities to recognize ways of becoming successful; that is, through the reflections of one who has "gone before".

Tony's sensemaking was situated in Chapter V. This Chapter VI presents the events and ideas that piqued my interest as a participant observer and primary researcher. Only after making sense of Tony's induction experience and intrinsically, my own anticipatory, lived socialization experience, will it be possible to construct the conceptual and theoretical frameworks as presented in Chapter VII.

This Chapter VI is a result of the methodical process of investigation advocated by Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological research model. Based upon a desire to understand the investigated phenomenon, the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data were found through bracketing the central phenomenon: **What sensemaking did the neophyte principal develop to enable him to function in the educational organization?** Culminating, over-riding questions were also posited: **What sensemaking did I develop in the context of Tony's experiences, and what outcroppings and ideas fascinated me in terms of Tony's experiences?** Using Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological research model, invariant meaning units and
essential themes were extracted from the verbatim raw data.

The Invariant Meaning Units

Thirteen descriptive units relevant to Tony's sensemaking as a neophyte principal during the induction phase of socialization were extrapolated from an analysis of the verbatim raw data and are listed below.

The events and ideas that captivated Tony are encompassed in his reflections regarding specific individuals in relation to himself. The nomenclature of these individuals have been recorded with anonymity, with the exception of Tony's family members: (1) Ms. SecondPrinc, (2) Mrs. AprioriPrinc, (3) Mrs. CDOE, (4) Mr. TeachOne, (5) Ms. TeachTwo, (6) Mrs. TeachThree, (7) Mortimer, the other new administrator, and (8) Tony's own family members. Tony's reflections also concentrated on the need to create impressions with (9) the students, (10) the staff, and (11) the community. Tony considered (12) his age to be a factor in the administrative role. He also reflected upon (13) the quantity of paper flow.

Although it would be of interest to report on each of these units in detail, for purposes of parsimony only the emergent themes will be described next.

The Emergent Themes

By being open to the reduction method within phenomenological research, I was able to identify linkages among the units which eventually formed the thematic invariants of the study. Four main themes emerged, each of which provides an elaboration of an essential aspect of the phenomenon under study. The themes are illustrated with quotations from Tony's Chapter V narrative as well as from the verbatim raw data.
Although the themes are not exhaustive of the sensemaking of a neophyte principal as co-researcher, nor of my own reflections as a researcher and participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship, the themes do allow for a phenomenological, systematic investigation of the induction phenomenon. In this manner, the incidents and ideas that intrigue me also address a portion of the dissertation problem; that is, what experiences did Tony identify as significant as a neophyte principal, and what was not addressed?

The analysis of data is presented through the parameters of the following extrapolated themes:

1. **Image Management as a Prime Induction Motivator.** This theme examines Tony’s concern about how he wanted to be perceived by significant others in the role of principal; that is, the extent to which Tony was ego-controlled and other-controlled. In my capacity as researcher and participant observer, several comments and actions carried out by Tony became manifest within this theme and are identified through the sub-themes of identity construction and types of influences.

2. **The Identification of and/or Influence of Significant Others.** This theme addresses the individuals whom Tony singled out as being significant to him. Tony constantly scanned his environment and appeared to notice individuals whom he believed might impact either negatively or positively upon his life. Most of the individuals Tony identified appeared to be those whom he recognized might impact upon what he perceived to be his "image". This identification occurred through Tony’s own Chapter V narrative as a co-researcher and through his reflective responses to the topical guided
interview questions. Thus, in my sensemaking, Tony appeared to identify significant others in relation to particular events and/or emotions. Significant others were also identified in terms of their influence on Tony.

This theme also allowed me to identify significant others whom I believe influenced Tony, whether or not Tony identified them as being significant.

3. **The Identification of and/or Influence of Significant Events.** In a similar vein to Theme Two, this theme examined significant events as experienced through Tony’s sensemaking as well as through my own lenses, whether or not Tony had identified those events as being significant. It again appeared that Tony scanned his environment and noticed or addressed events which he believed in some way affected his image.

4. **The Neophyte Principal as Role Proactive or Reactive.** This theme deals with my own sensemaking where I identified significant individuals and events which contributed to Tony being proactive or reactive in specific circumstances.

*Theme One - Image Management as a Prime Induction Motivator*

Image management appeared to be the most important motivator for Tony. He directed his own image management in his principalship tasks within educational circles or when he was publicly seen with his family. Within this theme, image management is viewed through identity construction and types of influences.

**Identity Construction**

This subtheme discusses how Tony managed his image through identity construction. By virtue of the fact that Tony chose to live within the community, he needed to be accepted by those with whom he associated and interacted. Consequently,
Tony’s performance or "action" was the result of how he thought others viewed him, and the result of his perception of their degree of acceptance of him. This action-driven process involved Tony actually being the neophyte principal with a high emphasis and objective on "looking good" to others who might possibly have influence in creating his own image.

While I gathered the verbatim raw data from Tony’s experiences, I constantly attempted to make sense and to analyze the process of Tony’s induction in my own way. In making sense of one’s lived experiences, the individual maintains an image of self in relation to others. As Weick (1995) stated, "people do not have much to start with when their goal is to "get to know" some other person, or setting, or job. Their expectations are a force that shapes the world they try to size up" (p. 148). Thus, Tony’s preliminary assessment of self became the initiating or focus point from which all other interactions occurred.

When Tony and his family moved to Town ABC, image management was a prime consideration in creating his own role as principal. As a researcher, it appeared to me that Tony controlled or managed his own persona so that others viewed him in certain ways (which will be addressed later in this discussion) both inside and outside the organization. Tony wanted others to view him as a friendly, charismatic sort of individual who could solve problems in a positive manner.

As Weick (1995) stated, "sensemaking is an active process" (p. 162). The result of sensemaking, however, may be displayed in an individual emitting either overtly proactive, reactive, or passive stances. I noticed that most of Tony’s actions were dependent upon the image he wished to create for himself in the eyes of others. Tony
controlled or managed his own persona through the actions he overtly displayed in
dealing with what he or others identified as significant issues, or with individuals he
believed to be significant to his own movement from organizational outsider to insider.

Upon entering the organization, Tony presented himself as one who valued
charisma; that is, he measured his consideration of others as a highly positive attribute.
He wanted to project an image of being friendly and "normal" and adopted a demeanour
that bespoke, "I'm just like you". He wanted to be seen as young but mature, as a non-
drinker, as being able and "on top of things", and as one who knew administrative theory,
among other attributes. He wanted others to see that that women played an important part
in his personal and professional life. To Tony, first impressions were important. To be
accepted by others was Tony's prime motivator:

I knew it was important to tell the kids about me because they would be
curious, and I think I wanted them to know a little bit about the odd things
I had done, to be a specific person. I wanted to be an individual and not a
principal, necessarily. I guess maybe it is a parallel to my attempting to
build relationships with Mortimer and Mrs. CDOE and then again with the
humour on the first day I wanted to be a person. And that was their first
impression of me, so it was important to me.

In attempting to make sense of Tony's actions, I recognized that the image I
wanted to project of myself as a neophyte administrator differed significantly from that of
Tony's projection of self. Tony appeared to project himself as primarily relationship-
oriented and task-reactive, whereas I saw myself as primarily task- or role-oriented with
relationships developing as an off-shoot of the task itself.

It appeared to me that Tony's strategy in moving from organizational outsider to
insider varied significantly from what I perceived my own strategy might be. Tony
operated proactively through his persona; that is, through his charisma and consideration of others in order to build political image. On the other side of the spectrum, I sensed that I might operate proactively through role; that is, in initiating structure through expertise in order to build political image. This understanding allowed me to question whether or not there is a point where an individual makes a choice in selecting image management or role-oriented strategies while involved in movement from outsider to insider.

Tony’s predecessor, Mrs. AprioriPrinc, showed high skill in initiating organizational structure. Because the organizational structure was firmly in place through Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s efforts, Tony’s strategy as a neophyte administrator was to associate with what already existed (strong organizational structure) in order to concentrate on building his own image. In effect, the school and community difficulties encountered by Mrs. AprioriPrinc in building the strong organizational structure provided Tony with the foundation upon which to build his own image. As a successor, Tony had the luxury of concentrating on image management, which in turn resulted in the vestige of surface competence.

It appeared that Tony saw himself as a "people person", capable of solving problems through charisma rather than through the knowledge that comes with formalized study. Tony made it clear that academic study, for him, was not a top priority for job competence. For Tony, assessment of competence appeared to be through image rather than through effective schools literature or measured levels of student achievement; in this sense he was role-reactive (Hall, 1993, p. 203). Tony’s criterion of success was personal acceptance; that is, in being viewed as a family man and in being strong in
"people" skills. On the other hand, my criteria of success is more in keeping with concentration on conceptual skills and formal research, and where acceptance of me by others occurs primarily as a result of adherence to task.

In attempting to project a specific image as a neophyte administrator in a new setting, one has the opportunity to act in a proactive or passive manner. Tony did not want to be viewed as a principal in terms of one who exercised authority. To exercise authority would be to invoke strategies which denote negativity, and, at all costs, Tony wanted to avoid negative reactions to his actions. He saw himself as being accepted by students and staff in situational leadership settings. These settings provided him a form of leadership without risk of being in conflict with students, staff, or community.

Through charisma, Tony was active in promoting an image of self and school, although he appeared to be passive in building strategies which would identify him administratively in the role of principal.

Tony was not interested in attending the five-day Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course the summer that he took the job, or in enrolling in the Short Course the following summer. Instead, he devoted his summer solely to family. The image building that this action portrayed had immediacy of perceived acceptance by the local community (and family) rather than that of gaining long-term task knowledge and administrative contacts through attendance at the Short Course.

Tony was concerned about constructing his own identity and image within his peer group as well as with the public. During his first day at school, Tony commented that by sorting the mail, he "looked like a principal" doing an administrative task. Tony
was also concerned about maintaining a certain image in his first meeting with the other administrators, and in ongoing conversations with Mrs. CDOE. At the administrators’ group meeting, Tony took care to use the term "servant leader" whenever it contextually fit the conversation, as he believed it would be indicative to others of his knowledge of current educational administration research.

As Tony walked down the street, he waved to passers-by in vehicles even though he admitted he did not know them; he considered it important to be seen as being friendly to everyone. Tony was also concerned about the graffiti on the main walkway of the school and the negative image it evoked to all educators who arrived for the first division-wide inservice of the year.

Tony also defined his job spatially. For example, he lived only two blocks away from school, yet he drove his truck to school. I sensed that by parking his vehicle in front of the school every day, Tony publicly signified the amount of time he spent on the job beyond designated school hours.

As researcher, I compared Tony’s image-building actions to my own image-building. It appeared to me that Tony’s actions were highly concentrated upon the outward vestiges of public image. On the other hand, my performance or "action" involved the high emphasis objective of completing the data collection research task within a specific time frame, with relatively little consideration of others in Tony’s realm. Unlike Tony, I was not overly concerned as to whether or not I was accepted by those in his community, other than by Tony himself and to a certain extent, Mrs. CDOE, both of whom had the power to terminate my research within that school division.
In action-driven processes, therefore, I considered myself to be primarily task-oriented, whereas Tony appeared to be consideration- and acceptance-oriented. I tended to view "task" as a way of attaining consideration and acceptance from others, whereas Tony acted in such a way that consideration and acceptance provided the means of getting to, or perhaps even defining, "task".

Although both Tony and I were involved in identity construction, we operated from different locations and with differing levels of concern. Although I revered task orientation over consideration and acceptance, it occurred to me that task orientation might be secondary to consideration and acceptance in terms of moving from outsider to insider in a successful induction process. As researcher, then, I specified identity construction as a thematic focus. Sub-themes included how Tony saw himself at the job interview, with the researcher, with the public, with Mortimer, with Mrs. CDOE, and with staff members. Identity construction also occurred through age, through career status, through family connections, through the "normal guy" image, and through geographic placement. Lastly, I considered the types of influences that Tony encountered and which impacted upon his induction experiences.

As I collected the verbatim raw data and scanned the environment in which Tony acted, I noticed that Tony "read" other people constantly. I sensed that it was important for Tony to be seen in a positive light by significant others and that he located himself through his relationships with others. Other people's perceptions of Tony appeared to be important to him. This was clearly the case in his application for this job.
The job interview. Tony had told staff and students in his former school that he had applied for the principalship of that school, but then found out that he had not been successful in attaining that position. Perhaps embarrassed by having to deal with the aftermath of not getting that job, Tony was adamant that no one should know he had applied for this Town ABC principalship until he had actually attained the position:

One of the things that concerned me before the offer was made was the potential that Sandra’s younger brother or his wife might learn of my application through Board Member #1, who was a friend of Sister-in-Law, when Sister-in-Law and Brother-in-Law lived in Town ABC. It seemed really important to me that nobody learn about the application other than the people I had already told; the whole thing felt very much like a personal failure.

After Tony secured this career position, in mid-August he moved his family into town. He met me as researcher just one day after obtaining keys to the school.

The researcher. It was important for Tony that even I, as an outside researcher, view him in a positive light. He considered the possibility of making mistakes during his first year in the principalship. He wanted me to think well of him. During the formal portion of our introductory interview, he commented:

Um, I was going to ask if you would have any use, um, or if it would be helpful if I, ah, gave you some names of people who could give you some background on me from their perspective . . . or it’s more me and my perspective, eh?

Prior to recording the formal interview, Tony and I walked over to the board office, where we met with Mrs. CDOE for approximately ten minutes, then we walked back to the school. Even in this short time frame, Tony was conscious of his appearance to the general public.
The public. When we walked down the street, Tony waved at all passing cars to engender a visage of friendliness. Tony’s perceptions of what other people might think of him also crossed over into his home life when he considered having one alcoholic beverage:

Last night when I got home, I was thirsty. And I was so flipping hot. And I thought about having a drink [of beer] . . . if it happens and they [students] can smell it, then, Ohhhhh, no! And I’ve never . . . I’ve never ever worried about that and I’m sure that it won’t happen now, but . . . so that’s interesting that that’s . . . my freedom was restricted by me as a result of what I thought.

The other new administrator. Mortimer was an experienced administrator who was hired to the division at the same time as was Tony. Initially, when Tony saw the New Principals’ Meeting Agenda:

I went into an internal tail-spin. On the agenda, printed at the right-hand margin were the names, "Mrs. CDOE / Mortimer / Mrs. CDOE / Mortimer/ Mrs. CDOE / Mortimer", so I became uneasy. I thought, "I don’t want to be a subset of a subset! If there’s something I’ve missed . . .

Tony’s first thought was that he had missed his chance to demonstrate his ability to Mrs. CDOE, and that he didn’t even know he had missed the opportunity for agenda input, as Mortimer’s name was already on the New Principals’ Meeting Agenda. He wondered how Mortimer had arranged to be on the agenda with Mrs. CDOE, and then realized that the printed "Mortimer" must have referred to another "Mortimer", not the Mortimer sitting across the table from him. "Pretty weird" was Tony’s final comment on his stress level at his internal distress.

In scanning the environment, it did not take me long to notice that Tony inevitably measured himself in relation to Mortimer. I sensed Tony’s strong feeling of
competitiveness as he compared himself to Mortimer in various situations. On the other hand, Mortimer appeared oblivious to Tony's discomfort, as Tony hid his feelings well. Perhaps part of Tony's discomfort was related to the fact that Mortimer discussed provincial educational politics with Mrs. CDOE with relative ease, and that he displayed a breadth of knowledge in various curriculum content and administrative areas in ways in which Tony could not compete as a neophyte administrator.

Tony not only located himself frequently with others, but he located or "placed" others within his purview rather quickly. In acknowledging one senior student who had been rather disrespectful by sticking his tongue out at Tony, he commented:

I think the first hour determines then who you will become. And I was never going to say that to her before because that's very frightening, because boy, if you blew it, then you have thirty years of hard times coming. But I really believe that. That you can make your success in the first hour and that defines what happens for the first day, which defines the week, and then the year and then the first five years and then the comfort years and then you retire. . . . So, I think it's interesting. So this guy is going to help define my work for the next thirty years.

Tony was also concerned about other people's impressions of the school, particularly in connection with some graffiti which was painted on the school's central sidewalk. As Tony's school was to be used as the division-wide in-service meeting place in late August, it was important to him that the graffiti be removed prior to that meeting:

I just think this graffiti on the front side walk is as . . . as damning for this school as anything could be because it is the first thing that everybody sees. I think of these teachers. I think of a new teacher . . . one who can come tomorrow, for the first time ever, to ABC High School, and gets out of her car and thinking, "if I were here, I would be getting mugged" or something.
Discussion ensued about how to remove the graffiti before staff arrived the first day, and before the division-wide in-service. Having other people think well of his school was important to Tony. The graffiti was not removed prior to the in-service, though, and Tony was embarrassed enough to mention it at the general assembly:

    In an attempt to make everyone feel at home today, you can see our resident graffiti artist was at work on the sidewalk outside [laughter] but you will notice they wrote some grad stuff on the program? So they got it backwards . . . a welcome montage and a welcome to everyone to ABC High School.

A year later, however, the graffiti was still displayed on the sidewalk. Tony admitted that there were other, more pressing matters to be addressed in his role as principal than the old graffiti markings.

Mrs. CDOE. Tony’s need to impress his new Director of Education was evident in his reflections of the New Principals’ Meeting of August 20:

    Mrs. CDOE gave positive impressions. She was relaxed. I was relaxed. I feel good that I was able to insert the phrase "situational leadership" when we were talking. I saw that she nodded and smiled and agreed. It made me feel good. She recognizes that I know theory.

    I felt good when Mrs. CDOE mentioned something about situational leadership. I would fit that in with the whole idea of Mortimer and me being somehow subordinate there. The reason I think I feel good about that is that it is something that I knew, and I am willing to bet that Mortimer probably didn’t know. I don’t know if it is important in the big scheme of things, but I doubt that anybody else knows what situational leadership is. However, it gave me the opportunity to say something about what I knew and that was good.

Further, at the regular Administrators’ Meeting on August 31, Tony asked the group whether or not a Day Two session by Saskatchewan Education had been scheduled for his subject area. Later, Tony admitted to me that he had full knowledge that no Day
Two had been planned, but that he wanted to impress Mrs. CDOE with his awareness of curriculum pilot projects.

Tony also recognized the significance of first impressions, particularly with regard to his own staff members.

Staff members. After the first full staff meeting, Tony worried about how his actions might be perceived by others and confided to me:

As I was lying in bed last night, I was thinking of... there were times when I was probably too informal... more informal than I would have liked to be... I do think that there needs to be some sort of distance... um... distance in terms of ah... because there may come a day when I need to do something or um, change something that none of these people will like... and I always want to be friendly. And I want it to always be casual. Um, I feel like there's a distinction somehow between "friendly" and "formal" or "friendly" and "informal". And I don't know exactly what that is but I know there are a couple of times last night that I thought ah, you know, that maybe that was a... that was something that I shouldn't have um, sort of "poking fun at" myself? I feel like, if people poke fun, I can laugh and that's fine because that's friendly. But for me to be... I need to choose very carefully what I initiate...

Again concerned about how others might perceive him, Tony felt it important to rigidly adhere to any verbal directives or decisions he made with regard to staff. He did not want to be seen as one who changed his mind after he had made a decision, even if he might be uncomfortable with the initial decision some time later:

Mr. TeachOne was [...] part of the interview team, which was very interesting for me, um, and somewhat intimidating um... in the sense that I knew, um, whatever I answered, I... I have to stick with that now, because... because he heard it all, so... um, which was OK, but, but ah, I hadn't expected a teacher to be there, so it was ah... it was... um, and he asked a couple of questions, and um, I had um, thought that he had seen um... I don't know if "aggressive" is the word, um, but I, I, I was, I felt intimidated by him... um and ah, I can remember... he asked something and I don't recall what it was... and I said something that was
quite informal, and everybody else chuckled and he said, "But seriously..." and sort of repeated the question. And I thought, "oh... you know... so, so there was ah, definitely a *feeling* that I had that is connected with Mr. TeachOne the first time I met him.

Later, Tony affirmed my perception that other people's impressions were important to him by stating, "I need to make a good first impression on the teachers... or like, I feel I need to do that and I feel that way with students, generally."

As an administrator, I understand that it is important to select certain issues upon which to act; that is, to select choice issues which hasten one's movement from outsider to insider. I perceived that one way that Tony thought he might be able to display a proactive stance and thus garner staff approval fairly readily, was to obtain a better photocopier for staff members. One late afternoon prior to the full complement of staff and students being at the school, two photocopier servicemen appeared at the office door with a temporary photocopier replacement. Mr. NineTeach smiled and asked, "Tony, do we have a new photocopier?" Tony laughed, "Yeah! I... it's my one and only success story so far!" Mr. NineTeach jokingly replied, "Yea! Heart be still!"... and then was brought back to fiscal reality when Tony mourned, "but it's only a loaner."

... this business about the paper and the photocopier. I *really* think that that's the *Stone Age*... so that's becoming my issue of choice. And I think it's the issue of choice with the teachers, too. Or it could be an issue of choice, and so if I could... if I can ah, "skutch" the system there a little bit, then that would be good for everybody.

Tony attempted to gain staff acceptance politically by trying to replace the old photocopier with a new one.
During his first full day at the school, Ms. TeachTwo aligned herself with Tony, stating that she believed there had been an over-abundance of staff meetings during Mrs. AprioriPrinc's tenure. She also commented that there had been problems with the middle years students' examination timetable at year-end. Tony reflected:

One of Ms. TeachTwo's pieces of advice for me yesterday was, "that’s way too many staff meetings" . . . and I agree with her . . . and Ms. TeachTwo said that she was sure it [the timetable] would come up at the first staff meeting, and even Mr. NineTeach said [it] . . . you know . . . if there's a little something I can give the teachers, it's philosophically sort of consistent with what I believe . . . um, it's ah . . . the students will love me for it . . . it's a good political move, really . . . um, and I don't think it's a bad scholastic move, either . . . it's a . . . what I think probably happens is it puts them [the students] in a bad mood, it puts teachers in a bad mood, and it probably created some hard feelings that will extend into this year."

Perhaps Tony thought his acquiescence to specific teacher wishes would place him in a positive light with those and other teachers as well as the students, thereby hastening his move from outsider to insider. His comment that, "students will love me" attests to his concern for acceptance and a positive public image.

At the first full staff meeting on August 25, my perception was that Tony appeared to be rather transparent in his attempt to garner staff approval of the move to fewer staff meetings:

I'm really an informal agenda person. . . . um, as far as staff meetings go. um, I've talked a little bit with some of you about what has been done in the past. My understanding is that you've had a . . . an early dismissal on the first Monday of the month and a long staff meeting and then a shorter staff meeting on other Mondays and then a meeting on Friday to talk about um, case stuff and um . . . I . . . I'm not well enough organized for you to have all of those meetings. I'm sorry. So, um . . . so if it will work for you, um . . . what I would like to propose is that we have a staff meeting monthly on the first Monday and we have early dismissal . . .
Tony's use of "I'm sorry" prompted me to think that his comments were a tongue-in-cheek comparison of himself to Mrs. AprioriPrinc. Although everyone knew staff meetings were necessary, Tony's edict engendered positive support to a staff already loaded with other commitments. Tony's statement was, in effect, a statement of administrative strategy in terms of letting everyone know that he did not view himself as having the same administrative characteristics as his predecessor, Mrs. AprioriPrinc. Tony's edict provided evidence that his strategy was one of charisma and consideration--of influence and politics--over administrative authority and role. Tony also commented that his first staff meeting went well:

I feel, ah . . . excited that it's done and that it went well and I actually was able to answer a couple of questions and feel pretty good about that, and got a couple of laughs and a couple of smiles and ah, and a couple of comments.

Tony also perceived staff-community relations to be of significance:

My impression of the school is that it is a well-organized school with poor community relations . . . my strength is, I think, that I have people person skills and so I think I can get pretty well, in terms of that, and ah, the organization's already here, and maybe I can sort of . . . slide, and rely on all the good work that Mrs. AprioriPrinc did in that sense, for a while . . . and if I can do some positive stuff that will get the staff liking the community and the community liking the staff and everybody sort of all happy with one another, that might be . . . that might be something I could do and it's something that is needed.

The second day Tony was in the school, he wrote two messages on the large whiteboard in the staffroom. The first was a phrase, "Welcome back!", and the second was a directive to the husband and wife caretaker team: "Please switch teacher nameplates on [Rooms X and Y]." When I commented on his method of letting the
caretakers know of his wishes, Tony replied, "I want the caretakers and staff to know that I know where everyone should be." He thought it was important that other people knew he was "on top" of things.

Tony's concern about being "on top" of things stemmed in part from his discomfort at having a youthful countenance and of attaining a position of authority at what he perceived to be a relatively young age.

**Age.** On August 26, at the first teacher in-service, Tony was questioned by one of the teacher participants about his age. After admitting, "I'm thirty", Tony said:

> You know, what I'm worried about for the next day and what I think about the last day... And a week ago, I said to Patricia... um, damn it, I think I said on my first day... and I'm uncomfortable about that because I feel I'm not being taken seriously. But *surely* no one's going to come right out and say, "how old are you?" [*everyone laughs and talks*].

Tony pinpointed "two or three instances" where there was "an uncomfortable indication of age". When Mrs. CDOE took Tony, Mortimer, and me out for lunch the day of the New Principals' Meeting, we went to a local restaurant where the table placemats depicted Chinese horoscope signs. We each read our horoscope sign aloud, amid conversation. Later, Tony described his nervousness of having to divulge his age:

> I said I was born in 1966. I'm young. Therefore, is it something to be nervous about or unfair or morally wrong that I'm in this position of responsibility at a young age? What will they think of, "this young scruff coming in"... in the Town ABC context, I think of the lady who withdrew her child from the school to go to a city school, and of noon hour at the restaurant, and of Mortimer [*who obviously looked older and who had more career experience than did Tony*].

I want to be... I know I look young to some and not to others. Some might think I'm 30 or I'm 38. Things are hard for us. I have a 1.5 year old daughter and a 4-year old daughter and Sandra's expecting again.
With young children, being born in 1966 . . . when people ask, "when did you graduate? . . . or, "how many years have you taught?" . . . I don't want to be pinned there yet. The first impression is that I should be the principal of the high school. Period. Not that I am a 30-year old, that I've taught six years.

He remembered the parent who had pulled her child out of the school in order for the child to attend a private school in another city:

[she had] quite a bit negative to say about, ah . . . principals . . . and, ah . . . talked about one principal who was a good principal who had . . . you know . . . lots of parents had gotten together and had asked [X] to come back . . . and, um . . . commented that, ah . . . she hadn't realized that I was as young as I was . . . and was expecting somebody with grandchildren . . . and she said that if I . . . if I make it through the year, I'll be OK.

In further assessment of the situation, Tony remarked, "that's neither saying that I'm not going to or that I'm going to light the world on fire, [it's] somewhere in between." In this respect, my perception was that Tony saw himself as being competent, rather than one who would be an outstanding administrator. It was important for Tony to be seen as a "nice guy" more than it was for him to be viewed as one who had high administrative skills or aspirations.

Tony also took delight in telling participants about his efforts at trying to look older, perhaps as a means of gaining acceptance through humour:

I pride myself . . . um, I spent the whole summer getting IDs . . . because I went to school in San Diego for the summer? And so I couldn't buy beer. I had to get a passport to buy beer. So that was a success story for me this summer. I had to get ID . . . [and I have a wife and two children]

By commenting on his difficulties in obtaining alcohol, Tony let it be known that he had cosmopolitan experiences despite his youthful appearance, and that he was proud of looking young and of being a father and husband at the same time.
Career status. Tony was adamant that he "make it" on his own good name. Although he was the nephew of a well-known Director of Education in the province, he steadfastly refused to ask his uncle for help in obtaining a principalship. He did, however, use his uncle as identity placement with Mrs. CDOE at the New Principals’ Meeting when he acknowledged that his uncle worked in a particular school division which came up in the conversation. Both Mrs. CDOE and Mortimer knew Tony’s uncle.

In a round-about way, Tony actually invited comments about topics which caused him consternation. He talked to each class at great length about his personal history, and thus located himself contextually via age, in conjunction with career status.

Tony  OK. Other things. Is there anything you want to know about me?
Student  How old are you?
Tony  How old am I? I’m thirty!
Student  Have you ever been a principal in another school?
Tony  I have never been a principal, but I’ve been an Acting Principal.
Student  Sub? Substituted?
Tony  Substitute principal is almost what it is. Yeah.
Student  When the principal’s gone, then you’re it.
Tony  Yeah. You know, Mr. TeachOne here does that.
Student  And that’s what he is.
Tony  He’s Acting Principal. But has never been a principal.

Tony was obviously proud of being a principal at a young age. He was also proud to locate himself as a father of two young daughters, in expecting a third child, and as a husband.

Family connections. Tony positioned himself through his family connections to the local community. In all classes, Tony told the students that his wife had grown up on a farm about twenty miles from town, that she had attended school in the adjoining town, had waitressed at the local restaurant, had a degree in agriculture, had worked the geographic
territory which encompassed a dealership in town, and that her family still farmed within
the region. He also made connections by noting that his wife’s brother worked at the local
UGG elevator a year ago. "So I have some connections to Town ABC."

Tony saw telling stories of his career background as yet another means of gaining
acceptance with the students. In this way, he linked his career to family status:

Tony        I was in the Navy.
Student     Cool!
Others      Cool!
Tony        Yeah, it was pretty cool [many voices] . . . No, I wasn’t
            like a Navy Seal.
Student     Did you have a gun?
Tony         Yes, I’ve shot a gun.
Student     Cool!
Student     Did you have a machine gun?
Tony         Guns, yes. Yes, machine guns [...] Actually, I met
            my wife there [Canadian city]. My wife was a
diesel mechanic and the first time I ever saw her she
was crawling out of the engine room on a patrol
boat and she was all covered in grease! Ha! Crazy!

The images portrayed by Tony allowed students to see him in situations other than
educator-related. It appeared important for him to be viewed as a "normal guy".

The "normal guy" image. Tony’s conversation was riddled with "normal guy"
anecdotes, which I sensed to be an attempt to engender student trust in him:

Student     I have to pass by your house every day.
Tony         Well, make sure you do. Please. What were you saying
            back there? [student conversation continues]
Student     You were mowing the lawn and I said "hi"!
Tony         Oh, well, when you yell, yell loud! When you’re going
            by my house, if I’m out there, make sure you yell and if
            you are biking by and it’s really hot and you want to stop
            and have a glass of coke, stop!
Many         OK! Sure!
Tony  Because if I’m mowing the lawn, if I can avoid cutting the lawn, I will!

As a "normal guy", Tony spent the summer with his immediate family in San Diego, where he attended graduate school. He told the students:

We lived in kind of a neat little apartment with a pool and palm trees and ah... we spent lots of time at the beach and I actually got to surf this summer and I had never done anything like that before. Um... and I learned that when you go out into the wave and the surf, your chest gets sore and that day it felt like I was stiff across—what are those? Pectoral muscles? That I was stiff here, as if I had been lifting something heavy? And it’s from the waves kind of crashing into you that make you sore. And it was really cool. And I wasn’t very good at it but it was still fun.

Furthering his "normal guy" image, Tony commented:

It terrifies me when I have to speak in public. If I have to speak at a grad or something, in the gym, when it’s full of people and especially if they have those speakers. I hate it. My knees knock. Ah, rate is something that I have to concentrate on, on days like that. Because I get going a million miles an hour and ah, and then, you know, if I’ve got a ten-minute speech and it lasts a minute-and-a-half... no one understands it... ah, I say a joke and nobody laughs, I get even more nervous. I go even faster. I say the next joke; they don’t even know what I’m talking about.

In yet another way of constructing his identity and in an effort to gain acceptance with students, Tony described his mother’s academic achievements:

My mom is fifty-eight or something like that and she just finished her Master’s thesis this summer, which, I felt, was really cool because I can’t imagine being fifty years old and going back to school... and she gets six weeks’ holiday from work and she burned up all her holiday time and sat in front of her computer for the whole time and worked on this thesis book. Scarey. That’s something I’m not sure I would be able to do.

The interesting part of this conversation is that Tony alluded yet again to the age factor while he aligned himself with students in terms of gently poking fun of his mother working through a holiday in order to further academic aspirations. He did not
acknowledge, in comparison, that he himself had experienced a working holiday.

Tony constructed yet another facet of his own image by displaying his high school report card on his office bulletin board. It seemed that Tony wanted to portray himself as a "normal guy" by showing he had not achieved high grades in his secondary school years. By his gentle, humorous depreciation of his mother's work ethic in attaining a post-graduate degree, and in describing his parents' pressure on him to attain further education beyond senior matriculation, he located himself as being somewhat other-driven:

When I was done [high school], I knew that I wanted to go and take some post-secondary education, but I was a poor student, and I didn't have the average to go to university and ah . . . I didn't think that I really wanted to go to university, anyway. I'm not sure if I really wanted to go anywhere, but I got pressure from my mom and dad, ah . . . to go. So, I thought, "well, OK". So I had some friends going to [campus] . . . and I went there and took Radio and Television Electronic Servicing. And I was a TV Repair Man for a year. That was kind of cool, but it was sort of a lonely existence, stuck in a room with broken TVs . . .

**Geographic placement.** In conversing with students, Tony also located himself geographically in connection to other community members:

Where do I live? Um . . . you know where [family name] used to live? [several students affirm: discussion: many voices] . . . well, do you want to know anything else?

In perhaps an effort to move from outsider to insider status with students, Tony conversed with students [*all names are pseudonyms*] in such a way as to let them know he was aware of their placement in the community:

Tony So, ah . . . Evan. You have a looooong last name with an awful lot of [voice muffled] in it. Can you say it for me? [Alexa pronounces the name]. Welcome Evan! [voice muffled] Sharon . . . how's your dad? Is your mom Lorena?
Like, who’s that guy with the green hair? [students call out, many voices] . . . like with dark hair? Blonde hair and the colour comes out? Dark hair and dye it and um . . . but don’t tell him about that . . . [calls out the next student name] . . . do you have a sister, Mickey?

Male
No.

Tony
Do you have a brother?

Male
Yeah.

Tony
And is your brother Taylor or Jim? [student replies] . . . Ashley? . . . now, would you be a niece or some connection to [voice muffled]? A niece? . . . Wendy Hollinger . . .

Female
I’m here.

Tony
Welcome! I don’t know . . . I was going to ask you if you’re Glen’s daughter.

In order to place himself within the community, Tony tied a segment of his English lesson to a form entitled "My Life". He told students a myriad of details, including where he had been born (in rural Saskatchewan, not far from Town ABC), particulars of his education from early childhood to post-graduate school, of how he became a teacher, of his varied work experiences, of his extended family, and of his immediate family. In a lengthy description, it was interesting to note the number of times Tony connected personal associations to the school’s geographic area. In a description of his father, Tony remarked:

. . . And um, Dad is retired, but he was an engineer and he worked for PFRA for many years and I think there’s . . . there’s a PFRA community pasture around here somewhere? Maybe some of you guys with a farm background . . . you live there? Oh! Excellent! Then my dad would know your mom or dad!

Tony also admitted that growing up in a city and living in rural Saskatchewan were two very different experiences. He told students that he wanted to know more about farming and agriculture:
Tony: One of the things about that is that I hadn't ever been to a small town before I started teaching, to live. And ah, it was a real culture change.

Student: Do you like it?

Tony: I love it. Absolute love it.

His comments about small-town living appeared to be sincere, and probably helped somewhat to move him from outsider to insider status with the students.

In summary, it is my sense that Tony's identity construction occurred through the job interview, through the researcher, the public, Mortimer, Mrs. CDOE, staff members, age, career status, family connections, the "normal guy" image, and geographic placement. Tony's image management was also influenced by sustaining, sporadic, or unique circumstances.

Types of Influences

Sustaining, sporadic, or unique influences. In induction, influences may be sustaining, sporadic or drifting, or unique in circumstance. This subtheme describes the impact of specific individuals on Tony's life, which subsequently affected his perspective as an administrator.

It appeared to me that Tony concentrated significantly on identity construction as a means of moving from outsider to insider. He constantly located himself in relation to others. In this respect, the influences were sustaining. Tony compared himself to his sisters and talked about his parents' reactions to his decision to become a principal. He talked about his family and the impact the principalship would have upon his wife and children. He talked about his administrative peers and superiors, his students, and the community at large in relation to his coming on staff as a young principal. He also
positioned or compared himself to me as a researcher. He strongly used Mrs. CDOE, his wife, his family, and his staff as indicators for judgements of his own success.

Female influences. I also noticed that Tony looked to the females in his life as being his strongest indicators of success. In terms of his own family, Tony appeared to be most heavily influenced by the sustaining influence of his wife, and by the influence of his mother and sisters rather than by his father and other male family members. It is my sense that Tony identified the male figure as initiating structure, whereas he identified the female figure with charisma and consideration. In terms of political image, it was important for Tony to be viewed as one who possessed what might be identified as the "female" trait of consideration over all else.

Tony was sensitive to his wife’s concerns about how he acted when he believed other people watched his actions as principal and as a father of young children, while in the public eye:

In particular, I feel that Sandra is sometimes unhappy with time I spend with the students and staff at school that she feels is unnecessary in terms of the responsibilities of my job. During our time in Town ABC, Sandra has indicated that she dislikes it when I do something that takes away from family time and that she perceives is done by me only because I am concerned with political image.

Tony looked for advice and direction from the women in his life; they provided his reliance structure. His wife was his sounding board. For example, he tried to find an innovative way to introduce his staff members at the division-wide in-service day:

I was wanting, thinking of doing it in a way that was like a guy I met this summer would do it? . . . He was a vibrant, noisy kind of a wild and whacky guy and he could pull [it] off . . . he could pull off noise in class every time and not look like a fool. And um, Sandra said, basically,
"don't be silly!" Um, "you know, you need to do it but ah, it's silly to try to do it like him because it won't work". And she's right!

In vetting his chapter, Tony was concerned that some thoughts he had expressed in the verbatim raw data be deleted, as the words might be misconstrued without his accompanying gestures and laughter with which they were originally stated, and Tony might be viewed in a way which he could not control. Tony asked his wife to confer with him in making decisions as to which phrases or sections should be deleted or retained; she readily complied, and Tony agreed and/or deferred to her judgments.

It also mattered to Tony that his mother did not unreservedly rejoice that he had obtained the principalship position:

I think that mom is pleased that I made the decision to become a principal, but she has never said it in so many words. One of the first things I thought of when Mrs. CDOE phoned and offered me the job was that it would be really exciting to tell Mom that I had accepted it.

Tony stated: "I find myself seeking her approval in the same way as I do with my dad, but I get it much less often." It was important to Tony that he appear successful in comparison to his sister, whom he saw as a successful lawyer:

I always want [sister Melanie] to realize when I am doing well, and I think this is because of my low achievement as a child in school as compared to her very high achievement. I feel like I always knew that I was as smart as she was, and now I want her to see the same thing. I don't think that it ever crosses her mind, because she never pointed out our differences even as a child, but this desire still serves to motivate me to a certain extent. Rosemary, on the other hand, was less academic, although she regularly did significantly better than I did at school. I feel closer to Rose than I do to Melanie, mom, or dad, and interesting enough, I don't feel the same pressure to prove myself with her.
It was also clearly important for Tony to create a good impression with Mrs. CDOE at all times. In vetting his chapter, for example, image management was again evident in that Tony was uncomfortable with the tone that he believed some of his statements implied within the verbatim raw data. Tony requested that some of his own phrases be expunged in an effort to control his own image. Tony's need for female approval was affirmed when he carbon copied Mrs. CDOE in his letter to me as researcher (Appendix I-3) in explanation of his vetting of the raw data, even though Mrs. CDOE had no direct input to this research.

Tony constantly attempted to make connections which would identify him more closely with his new community. Whether those connections were made so that he himself could feel more comfortable within his new surroundings, or whether those connections were made so that others knew he "belonged" to that new community remains uncertain. Whatever the case, Tony relished in the fact that he had established connections between a few members of the educational community and his own family. He found out that his mother had dated the husband of Mrs. TeachThree (Mrs. TeachThree's husband coincidentally happened to be the principal of a neighbouring school), and that one of Tony's sisters had attended high school with one of that principal's staff members. Tony used this nugget of information to entertain his staff members when they all went out for lunch to the local gas station during the first day of school. In my recording of the verbatim raw data, I had observed the socialization efforts on Tony's part and had recorded:
There was much ribbing with Mrs. TeachThree about how Tony could have had Mrs. TeachThree’s sister as "mom"; Mrs. TeachThree said that Tony was lucky to have another mom! Much laughter from staff members around the dining table.

Tony was also strongly influenced by many of the female educators he encountered throughout his career. His positive role model in terms of the principalship was Mrs. SecondPrinc, while his Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation role model, although sporadic in influence, was a female Executive Assistant. He was influenced by women whom he considered to be unlike him, and he attempted to learn from their dealings with others in order to better himself. It appeared to me that it was of paramount importance to Tony that he look good in front of his current director of education, Mrs. CDOE. Tony tried to use phrases such as "situational leadership" in an effort to impress Mrs. CDOE.

Tony also leaned towards associating and conversing with female board members rather than with male board members. Initially, Tony saw the children of one board member as possible playmates for his own children. He knew the interests of that board member and saw them as being closely aligned with his own interests. At staff meeting breaks, Tony tended to casually converse more frequently with female rather than male staff members.

From the onset, Tony was tremendously influenced by a female member of his staff, Ms. TeachTwo. Tony had outwardly relied on Ms. TeachTwo for corporate memory in a sustaining way early in the year, but found himself moving away from Ms. TeachTwo and more towards Mrs. TeachThree as the year progressed. Perhaps Tony recognized Ms. TeachTwo’s idiosyncrasies more clearly over time, and that she had perhaps aligned
herself with Tony for personal gain.

Initially, Mrs. TeachThree came across as more intimidating than Ms. TeachTwo. Ms. TeachTwo was the first individual Tony had encountered when he entered the school and was the female with whom he joked and made mention of most frequently in staff meetings. Ms. TeachTwo was closer in age to Tony and had ten years of teaching experience, whereas Mrs. TeachThree had a daughter who was three years older than Tony. Mrs. TeachThree had a wealth of teacher experience compared to Tony’s six years as a teacher, was very outspoken, and was married to another administrator within the division.

As Tony scanned his own environment over the course of the year, he was able to locate individuals more accurately in terms of their helpfulness to him. He became less intimidated by Mrs. TeachThree’s demeanour and relied more heavily on her advice over that of Ms. TeachTwo, whose helpfulness waned as the year went on.

Tony was disappointed when his mother did not unreservedly congratulate him on attaining the principalship, but instead worried about his ability to take on such a time-consuming task with a young family at hand. Tony’s constant efforts to use the right educational phrases and jargon with Mrs. CDOE, and his concerns about how Mortimer was able to converse with her so easily further indicated his reliance on approval from Mrs. CDOE as his superordinate.

The primary female influence in Tony’s world was his wife. All educational activities were linked to the fact that he had familial obligations to fulfill, and that educational obligations had to mesh with the family activities. In this manner, Tony elected not to continue his post-graduate work the summer of 1998, but to spend time
with family. Tony generally drew the line at 5:00 p.m. most days, recognizing that his wife needed help with two pre-schoolers and a newborn baby. His evenings were taken up with family time; school work only occurred after the children were in bed.

In being invited to their home on a few social occasions, it was evident that Tony also respectfully regarded his wife as a fellow educator as well as his soul-mate, and so dialogued with her on several educational matters that occurred throughout each day. Sometimes Tony deferred to his wife's judgment, other times he held his own convictions.

The other new administrator. Tony privately and rather constantly measured himself in comparison to Mortimer's outward actions. In my sensemaking of various situations, Tony acted and reacted to Mortimer without Mortimer ever outwardly knowing that Tony was clearly obsessed with the comparisons. I sensed that there was a strong element of personality difference involved from Tony's view. At no time did Tony overtly indicate his strong feelings about Mortimer in comparison to himself; he was professional at all times. However, there is absolutely no doubt that Mortimer influenced Tony's emotions significantly; Tony was involved in his own private battle of one-upsmanhip with Mortimer. For reasons of professional ethics, it is inappropriate to discuss nuances of behaviour with Tony in relation to Mortimer. Suffice it to say that Tony was highly ethical in his conversations with me at all times. However, within the neutral confines of this document, he was also open and honest in terms of his assessment of the other new administrator in relation to himself:

I'm glad Mortimer's not so obviously-incredibly-outstanding that I paled in comparison. I feel good about tomorrow [meeting the other administrators] . . . I want to fit in.
In summary of Theme One, I have identified image management as a prime induction motivator for Tony. This image management occurred through identity construction and through the various types of influences in Tony’s life. The content of the three remaining themes are subsumed in some respects, under image management. Theme Two addresses the identification of and/or influence of significant others, whereas Theme Three addresses significant events. Theme Four identifies the neophyte principal as either role proactive or reactive.

*Theme Two - The Identification of and/or Influence of Significant Others*

It appeared that Tony was influenced significantly by others in his life. Those whom I perceived to be significant within Tony’s induction experiences include Mrs. SecondPrinc, Ms. TeachTwo, Mrs. AprioriPrinc, Mr. TeachOne, and Mrs. CDOE.

*Mrs. SecondPrinc.* Tony had high praise for the influence that Mrs. SecondPrinc had upon him as a teacher, and now as an administrator:

*She was* always friendly and always a little bit formal. And ah, to the point that by the you know, by the time we had worked together for four years, um, we were very, very good friends. I would consider her, you know, a really close friend. And um, and at times, you know, I was able to kind of poke fun at her about being straight but she wasn’t really straight at all, but that was . . . but I don’t know if she did it on purpose [. . .] it was the recipe for success for her. Because even when people were, you know, when everything was going great she, um . . . she was just like, exactly like one of the group, and when she was having to do something that was unpopular, it was because she was . . . it had nothing to do with that relationship, so she was . . . I don’t know if you would call her a mentor . . . she certainly was . . . I don’t know if she still is, but um, certainly ah, someone who had led me by experience and if I could be like her, I’ll be OK.
In fact, Tony maintained contact with Mrs. SecondPrinc throughout the whole school year and the relationship continues to this day. Tony referred to his relationship with Mrs. SecondPrinc at the division-wide in-service:

If I could be anything like her, I’ll be fine. Um, and ah, she was really good because she, ah, you know, she let me dabble around in things . . . and so not all of it is really shocking change. Some of it is [in discussing the move from classroom teacher to administrator].

Tony also used his relationship with Mrs. SecondPrinc and her administrative style as a measure against Mrs. ThirdPrinc.

Ms. TeachTwo. Hedges (1992) suggested that every neophyte principal should have someone he or she could trust, someone with which to share frustrations, fears, and anxieties (p. 161). Tony’s primary "significant other" staff member initially proved to be Ms. TeachTwo, commencing with his first day in the school.

According to the verbatim raw data, at the first staff meeting, Tony referred to Ms. TeachTwo in jest more than sixteen times in connections totally apart from the business discussions of the day; Tony did not refer to any other staff member with this frequency. His confidence in Ms. TeachTwo was bolstered by the fact that Mrs. CDOE had endorsed this teacher as one who was "your biggest helper":

... and so we sat in her office, which is down the hall ... from about 9:30 until after noon and um, and um, just talked about everything from first day staff meeting to the [professional development] model that they use here and um, some um, some problems that she thought would maybe come up at the first staff meeting that I might want to think about ... um ... she gave me some suggestions about sort of what ... which way the staff would lean on those problems ... um, and, ah ... and they struck me as very genuine suggestions and not something that was promoting an agenda for herself.
Ms. TeachTwo talked to Tony about what she considered to be an excessive amount of staff meetings held by the former principal:

[O]ne of Ms. TeachTwo’s pieces of advice for me yesterday was, "that’s way too many staff meetings" . . . and I agree with her . . . The other thing that Ms. TeachTwo said, that it’s . . . that was a problem last year, and I can appreciate that it was, is that ah, the Grade 7, 8, and 9 students, um, had to come to school right until the last day of school, even though their marks had been turned into the office two days before that . . . it just seems like a recipe for problems, to me.

It appeared to me that Ms. TeachTwo, among others, might be targeting Tony for personal gain. Reflecting upon this possibility, Tony disagreed. Later in the year, however, Tony moved his reliance on Ms. TeachTwo over to Mrs. TeachThree. In effect, Mrs. TeachThree became Tony’s in-school mentor.

**Mrs. AprioriPrinc.** After being hired to the position, Tony visited the school and talked with Mrs. AprioriPrinc. He found the experience intimidating:

I remember, um, ah, I remember thinking that I . . . I remember thinking that I had seen people at my old school coming in because they were having interviews, and I remember thinking, "gee, I want to ask good questions here because ah, here I am, in the school, and you know, I might even get this job, and so I need . . . ." One of the things I said that Mrs. AprioriPrinc disagreed with . . . I said something about computers in the lab, and something to do with, really, they were used mostly in the school ah, for word processing, and she disagreed quite vehemently with me, so [TB laughed] . . . so I went, "oh, brother, now she’s going to go and tell everybody that, ah . . . I had this one clod in who said that ah . . ." Um, Mr. TeachFive and ah, . . . I think he was a first-year teacher last year, a very young guy, and very, very young looking . . . um, and Mrs. TeachFour is the um, is the um, at least I think she’s the oldest teacher on staff . . . and one of the other times I was here that, um, that it must have been a terrible first impression . . .

Tony reflected on his feelings about Mrs. AprioriPrinc, who had a reputation of being very competent (and who displayed what I labelled as high initiating structure):
I'm easily intimidated. Mrs. AprioriPrinc terrified me. She's taller than you, not big though. She is kind, nice, friendly. But so professional. She exuded professionalism and confidence. My knees were like doing the funky chicken at graduation.

After the New Principals’ Meeting, however, Tony gained a measure of confidence that he could tackle the paper work without using Mrs. AprioriPrinc's files, as Mrs. CDOE had supplied similar, updated files for each of the principals.

Mr. TeachOne. Initially, Tony felt uncomfortable in dealing with Mr. TeachOne, who had been on the selection committee for his interview. That feeling did not dissipate when Tony met Mr. TeachOne for a second time, at a city track meet. With Kim crying in her stroller, Tony noted, "first impressions are... are continuing to be a bit shaky on this particular point".

Mrs. CDOE. Tony was not intimidated by Mrs. CDOE, but he was unnerved by her "busy" demeanour and did not feel comfortable in requesting conversational time with her:

After we hired the people last year, I would have liked to just have sat down and just use it as a little bit in general about the hiring process and the people and ah... I don't know... if you could call that a sort of "debrief" maybe? [...] she was tremendously busy, um, [...] well, what else can you do?

In summary of this theme, it appeared that Tony was influenced by those who had more experience than he had and who were older than he was. Tony was also influenced by significant others within his personal life.

Theme Three - The Identification of and/or Influence of Significant Events

Some events triggered Tony's sensemaking so strongly that he alluded to the events at various points throughout the induction period, as opposed to a one-shot notice
on Tony's part. These events included moving into town, the quantity of paper flow, and the staff-community relationship.

**Moving into town.** Of significance in Tony's induction experience was the fact that Tony and his family had moved in town very close to the school opening date. Because of this, he was left with little time to become familiar with the school, the staff, the students, and the community. Tony's first time in the school as the neophyte principal occurred only two working days before he was to meet with Mrs. CDOE for the induction meeting, and five working days prior to the full staff complement returning to work.

Hall and Mani (1992, p. 60) noted that during the summer time prior to school opening, most principals develop a direction, priorities, and agenda, as there are many things to learn. Taking time to study the school, to review policy books, to compare and compile data on student performance, and to review faculty and staff personnel files is critical for success. Those first few days in August could have been a key time for Tony to learn about policies, the budget, and to become familiar with issues, strengths and deficiencies within the school. The summer months would have been the opportune time to build a strategic perspective and to grasp the reins before being subjected to close scrutiny by staff, students, and community members. Tony's activities might have included spending time at the school in the rather innocuous task of using keys to open every door and to explore the school. As it was, Tony was frustrated at his attempts to get into the school:

I was quite concerned when I got here yesterday because I didn't have a key to this office and the janitor had the key, because there's only one master key . . . and so I thought, you know, "gee, I've got all this work that
I need to do", although I don’t know what any of it is . . . um, and I want to be sure that I can get that key soon . . . I don’t want to spend three-quarters of the day looking for the caretaker.

A second aspect of this significant event was that Tony did not know what the administrative role encompassed in terms of defining his work within the new school. The day of my first interview with Tony, I found him immersed in sorting mail into distinct piles on the floor of his office.; he considered sorting mail to be an administrative task. His mail-sorting motions were a response to the role ambiguity (Kottkamp & Travlos, 1986) he felt in his first days within the school setting and prior to the New Principals’ Meeting, where he had received the voluminous stack of paper.

That same day, Tony admitted that his level of technical expertise hampered him from efficiently answering the telephone or from operating the photocopier; however, he relished the freedom this lack of expertise initially allowed him:

... so I can be in complete ignorance for a couple of days and not know the phone [system] . . . I'm not feeling terribly stressed because, when you leave, I don’t know what I’m going to do! I'll probably go get another cup of coffee! I think I might change this blue [bulletin board] paper because it's so badly faded . . . it's a make-work project.

A third aspect of this significant event was that Tony readily admitted to his lack of expertise. Of Mrs. CDOE, in reference about the status of a division maintenance employee, he asked:

There was this guy, ripping apart the school! I met Sam in the boiler room. Should he be checking in with me before he does any work at school?

To me, as a researcher, he stated:
Any suggestions or advice or anything at all that you have, I would appreciate. On the other hand, I'm prepared to flounder along and do things right and do things wrong... you know... an experienced person watching an inexperienced person... it might be interesting to see how many things I do that you know ah, are mistakes from the beginning... and how they play out... and how I... how I weasel my way out of them... you know, because those things are certainly going to happen and I'm going to make those errors.

At the staff meeting, he indicated:

Um, I know there's a binder in here. Ms. TeachTwo told me once how it works. Mrs. AprioriPrinc told me once how it works. I'm still not sure that I know exactly how it works. Ms. TeachTwo, would you tell me, and for [the other three new teachers]'s benefit, again, exactly what this is?

In perusing the division directive regarding course instructional plans, Tony stated:

Um, I... I... I'm a little unfamiliar with how this works, but ah, I think this will be OK... you don't have to do anything with it once you've got it... I don't want you to give me any course instruction plans, and if you choose not to make them, then that's OK.

Tony also encouraged staff members to guide him in the determination of his administrative tasks. Mrs. TeachThree, the senior female teacher, asked,

[W]hat are you going to do for [an] agenda, Tony? Like, are you going to make one up yourself or are you going to... or do we just add to it?.
[Tony responded.] Yeah, I think what I'd like to do is... is have a fairly standard agenda and um, that would involve... Mrs. TeachAid and Mrs. Sec having them in here at staff meetings... or for a portion of staff meetings?

Contrary to Tony's enthusiasm to include the secretary in staff meetings, Mrs. Sec only attended the first meeting. She had decided that she did not want to attend the meetings and Tony acceded to her wishes.

Other staff members assisted in leading Tony through his first staff meeting. Mrs. TeachThree prompted Tony by directing, "If there's a dead silence, Tony, you just move
on and come back to it." When Mrs. TeachThree decided to openly tell the whole staff she was going to go to the washroom, her actions prompted the staff to break for coffee, even though Tony had not led the meeting in that direction. Later, Mrs. TeachThree prompted Tony again:

> When we come back after lunch we are just going to be working in our classrooms and then whatever and then you’ll call the MCI? Yeah, let’s finish it off, and then we will have the whole afternoon.

Tony agreed by stating, "OK. Let’s go ahead."

After a staff discussion regarding the school lunch time policy, Tony’s directives to the staff were nebulous:

> Well, I think we save the book and I think we need to encourage students to use it and try and ... and, ah ... guide them that way and at the same time understand that probably kids won’t do it generally. I’d ... I’d be scared to pitch the book, because I think that’s probably necessary as part of the bureaucracy. ... if it speaks to everyone, I think we need to keep the book ... ah, try to encourage the kids to use it and don’t lose sleep over it.

**The Quantity of Paper Flow.** At the New Principals’ Meeting on August 20, Mrs. CDOE distributed a pile of documents for both of the new principals and then proceeded to explain each document. For Tony, this "paper flow" was daunting:

> I was um, was pretty stressed out when I got home, that day ... you know, the paper had got [sic] to the point where there was so much of it that I didn’t know, you know ... *[I was feeling]* positive on the outside and negative on the inside was maybe what I felt *(August 25 MCI, p. 10)*.

The amount of paper remained a source of consternation to Tony, even months after the August meeting:

> I got enough paper *[from the New Principals’ Meeting and Administrators’ Group Meeting]* that both of us had to carry it *[back to the school]* the first day and I carried it alone the other day ... binders and binders and binders
and binders . . . and I understood . . . um, none, specifically—and some because I . . . as it was being reviewed, you know, about a page every five seconds . . . um, because I had sort of recognized the general premise from my other school division where I had seen the principal doing things that were, that must have been the same. . . . I don’t know if at one point that becomes data, because at this point I haven’t read any more of it. So you know, the only significance of that paper is that I’ve carried it from the division office to here and I’ve put it in the filing cabinet. . . . and some of it, I’ve read. And maybe that’s significant because, you know, I’ve actually used the Policy Manual on a kid today and that was the first time that had happened and um, you know, slowly, when somebody asks where something is, I’ve got an idea if it’s in the desk or filing cabinet or book shelf. Um, but the vast majority of that paper [has remain unseen] and so no connection to me, except that it was heavy!

Tony compared the stack of paper with a "Principal’s Planner" that was used in his former school division:

Afterwards, I thought--and this is quite a while afterwards--I thought I wished that they had a Principal’s Planner . . . it’s got one copy of every form, and the principal gets it at the beginning of the year and takes it back to the school and when they [sic] need one of these forms, they photocopy it . . . that planner represents this whole drawer of my filing cabinet and that whole foot of paper . . .

When asked how he expected to deal with the stack of paper, he stated that he was not going to deal with it:

Not yet, but some day, yes, I think. And not because I feel intimidated by it. I don’t feel like I have time right now? And by next year, I’m going to know what the deal is--[I’m going to] put that foot of paper [aside] and [I] will file it and it won’t give me stress, I don’t think. So in that sense, I’ve been socialized, you know . . .

In terms of the pile of paper, I know that when I go [to the meeting] next year, I will have the same two feet of paper and I know that a foot of it is copied stuff that just goes in the desk drawer. And I didn’t know that, this time. You know, I thought that every single sheet of that paper I had to do something with, between now and the thirtieth of August.
The day after the New Principals’ Meeting, Tony received a Welcome-to-the-Division telephone call by the neighbouring school principal. In an attempt at humour, Tony again relied upon his charisma in alluding to the quantity of paper which had been given to him earlier:

Well, ah, I’ve got about fifteen feet of paper and I understand just three inches of it. So I’m getting there!

A significant aspect of this descriptive unit is that the contents of the paper flow appeared to play no part in Tony’s induction experience. Tony did not consider that scanning the documents in order to obtain content knowledge might be viewed as a means of becoming more familiar with the organizational structure of his new division, or as a means of hastening his movement from outsider to insider status in terms of his own induction into the division. Rather, he was imbued with a pragmatic sense of purpose in that the papers would be used as source documents only when he could not attain knowledge acquisition on a particular subject by any other way. Tony’s environment was rich with access to information, but he chose not to notice it, and relegated the paper to a filing cabinet, saying, "alright, that's for later". Tony’s response also signified his strategy of dependence in relying upon Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s highly organized administrative structure to carry him through the events of the day.

When it was pointed out to Tony that he appeared to be "running the race and was all over the horizon"; he readily concurred. He had consciously decided, "I'm not chasing [the paper flow]". In this manner, Tony exemplified role overload (Kottkamp & Travlos, 1986), and had deliberately closed the gates on the amount of information he
was willing to absorb at that point of his induction experience. Tony's actions also indicated an avoidance of attempts to gain administrative expertise and a reliance upon his predecessor's organizational structure.

Tony expressed a concern for others whom he perceived as being similarly awash with volumes of paper:

Sometimes I think that some of the stuff . . . like, I winced when I saw the forms that Mrs. TeachAid had . . . and Mrs. CDOE [had] about the Social Skills? They're just forms, but they're more forms. All the forms are the same, and sometimes I think, "Gee. That's maybe the creation of a little bit of work. All these different forms . . . to prevent the information . . . the same information . . . having it go 'round five different ways.

Tony's actions and sensemaking with regard to the paper flow incident triggered other thoughts for me in terms of my sensemaking with regard to induction. Does a neophyte principal deliberately choose to interact with the whole environment within his or her administrative purview, or is the neophyte in some way limited to dealing with individuals who interact with him or her with specific role prescriptions?

In response to this question, I sensed that the manner in which Tony interacted with his environment was for him to place limits on, or to control his own environment. Mrs. CDOE had assiduously provided a quantity of paper information for Tony in an effort to ease his induction into administration and the school division. Either consciously or unconsciously, however, Tony had decided that one way he could control his environment was to deliberately set aside the paper information until he chose to deal with it on his own terms.
In the literature review, not once did I encounter any studies which recognized the quantity of paper flow at job commencement as an induction factor, nor did there appear to be any study which traced the paper flow once it was received by the newcomer. In this respect, one might consider the impact a plethora of paper would have on a newcomer, and how the newcomer might incorporate the paper flow in movement from outsider to insider.

The Staff-Community Relationship. Staff members commented on what they perceived to be a particularly abrasive ratepayers' meeting the previous spring. As a result of this meeting, the relations between staff and community were less than pleasant. In assessing his own personal attributes in relation to this incident, Tony surmised that his strength resided in his "people skills".

It appeared to me that one of the strategies in Tony's sensemaking of the role of the principal involved developing a congruence between himself and being seen as a catalyst in solving major community problems. Tony's strategy was to have everyone like each other. He wanted to project a mode of cooperation with community members and saw this incident as an opportunity to move from outsider to insider with staff members:

I had not really [heard it] from Mrs. CDOE or from [female] at the Division Board or from anyone on the local board, but there is a sensitive area, and once I heard it from Mrs. ApiorIPrinc and Ms. TeachTwo said it again yesterday . . . that it had been something that was, you know, really, really hard . . . for . . . for some of the teachers. She said it was especially hard on Mr. TeachOne [ . . . ] and so if there's a problem there, making it right . . . it should be initiated by the teachers and I think that my job is to um, help with that initiation and I could be with the teachers and I think that the teachers could make it very easy for me or could potentially make it really, really hard . . . but one of the professional obligations between teachers and principals is that they can make that attempt . . . at the community . . . and that's a challenge as far as the teachers are concerned.
Concerned with what appeared to be a poor community-staff relationship as a result of the ratepayers' meeting, Tony mused to staff members:

I wish we could all be insiders. I'm not sure if that . . . but you know, if we're not, I don't think, certainly . . . if I could do something, I would love to make a difference there!

In a reconciliation attempt, Tony encouraged the staff to participate in a September "Meet the Teachers Pot Luck Dinner" which was held in the gymnasium. By welcoming members of the community into his own school environment rather than by extending himself out in the community, Tony continued to control his own environment. Stories of the ratepayers' meeting provided Tony with one of the myths of the organization (Trice & Beyer, 1993) that creates culture or a tone. This myth became a role prescriber for Tony in that he was able to turn the low teacher morale into a public relations event, and the pot luck dinner became an explenium for image building purposes.

In his role as newcomer, it was important for Tony to project a specific image for himself; that is, one of cooperation and charisma. Although deliberately proactive in his choice to invite community members to his environment, staff was not as enthusiastic about the dinner as was Tony, given their background experience at the previous ratepayers' meeting. Although Tony was viewed as "inviting" to the community through instigation of this dinner; he was also viewed as being "protective" by the staff, in that he did not prolong staff exposure to the community to include an open house after dinner. Thus, he was able to continue his move from outsider to insider with both community and staff members by avoiding rancour on either side.
In looking more closely at events which occurred at the dinner, though, several thoughts occurred to me as researcher. Tony had been proactive in inviting the community to his domain; however, he maintained control over his persona through the image he desired to project through his actions as a family figure even within the school setting. Throughout the evening, Tony either carried one of his young daughters on his arm or had the other daughter by the hand, which deliberately controlled the level of conversation one might pursue with the neophyte principal. By choosing to seat his family at a table where no one else had elected to sit, Tony continued to control his environment. No other community or staff member sat at his table; almost all of the teachers sat together rather than to intermingle with community members or with Tony’s family. After dinner, Tony used the microphone to introduce staff members and quickly concluded the evening by thanking community members for coming to the dinner. He therefore confined the extent to which he could converse with community members and kept his own uncomfortableness to a minimum within the public setting.

In contemplation of my own anticipatory set to the principalship, my probable tendencies in a similar situation would be to extend Tony’s plans to include an open house immediately following dinner. Whereas Tony obviously relied upon charisma to create a political image, I probably would rely more heavily upon past expertise and knowledge as a means of moving from outsider to insider. It is not as important to me that I be seen as a friendly outgoing sort of personality, as it is that I be perceived by others as doing a highly credible job of the administrative tasks at hand. Thus, the image Tony wished to project to staff and to community may be different from the image I
would want to project in similar circumstances.

In summary of this theme, Tony was concerned with image management even in his outward motions of moving into town, with the quantity of paper flow, in learning the role of the principal, in and the staff-community relationship which impacted on Tony and his family as community members.

Theme Four - The Neophyte Principal as Role Proactive or Reactive

At this phase of the research, I believe it appropriate for me to define a conditional statement relative to my analysis of this theme; that is, my sense of whether the neophyte principal displayed role proactive or reactive behaviours. As a researcher, I had the luxury of viewing Tony’s actions in a detached, academic manner. I was able to scan his environment fairly readily, and subsequently noticed several incidents worthy of reporting within this dissertation. I did not have to live within Tony’s reality or within his educational and geographic community. I was at liberty to observe Tony in action. to leave his professional world, and to return to my academic pursuit of encapsulating my sensemaking of the neophyte principal’s experiences within this tome. It was my scanning, noticing, and sensemaking which would carve out the themes for analysis.

I reflected upon certain events which occurred during the research and surmised that Tony tended to display reactive or non-actor role functions in a number of situations. As corroborative evidence to support this observation, I examined several specific instances in Tony’s lived world. These instances included moving into town, Tony’s first day in the school, student assembly on opening day, the research and Tony, the local board meeting, money management through the Student Representative Council, teacher-
principal professional development interview, and Tony’s professional development plans.

Moving into town. A day or so after Tony and Sandra had moved into town, a
neighbour from across the street came to visit as Nicole and Kim were playing in the
front yard. This community member had one child who had graduated from the local
high school and another child who boarded in Regina while attending a high school there.
According to Tony,

Well, she didn’t come out and say it, but I think that the reason ... I think
that if I would have asked her why the kid was boarding, she would say,
"because the [local] school isn’t up to the standards that her [child] needs", then
she mentioned something about poor computer classes in the past and
um ... had quite a bit to say about um ... without naming names in most
cases ... um, quite a bit negative to say about, ah ... principals [...] ini-
itially I tried to make small talk with her, but because she was ah ... you
know ... it seemed that every ... every little bit of small talk was just
another area that I didn’t really want to be talking about. Eventually, I
started sort of watching the kids run around on the lawn, keeping them
from killing each other and the lady and [my sister-in-law] visited kind of
thing, and I ... I listened and kept my mouth shut. Um ... I did my best
to respond in very politically neutral ways ... you know ... to nod and do
um humm’s ... but no sort of agreement to, ah, in terms of the content of
her tirade and no ... no ... really no attempt to disprove anything she was
saying, either.

Given that this woman deliberately indicated to Tony that she was so unimpressed with
the local school that her child now boarded at and attended a school in Regina, I asked
Tony how he planned to act or to respond to this community member’s conversation:

Avoid her! [TB laughed] I feel like I have to do very little because I’m not
going to be specifically connected with her, because there aren’t any kids
in the school and um ... you know ... she’s not a member of any ... any
group that I know of ... that I’m going to have to make some official
connection yet, so ...
Tony knew that the community member’s child was external to, or a non-member of, his school. It appeared that the mother’s perceptions of the school were of no concern to Tony. His reaction suggested that her disapproval and/or altercation with the school had occurred in the past, and that he consciously decided he would only deal with events which occurred during his tenure at the school.

From my sensemaking of this incident, I believe Tony acted in a reactive rather than proactive administrative manner. Instead of viewing the conversation with this community member as an opportunity to be proactive by discussing his own appointment to the principalship as a leadership change in instructional direction, or by inviting her to set up an appointment with him to more fully discuss her concerns in an attempt to address public impression, Tony deliberately chose to avoid entering into dialogue with this community member because it was "safer" to do so than to get enmeshed in controversy at the commencement of his principalship.

From my perspective, Tony missed an opportunity to slowly change public opinion towards a more positive attitude of the school and its staff members. As well, it became a missed opportunity for Tony in suggesting the parent might re-consider enrolling her child at the school. In a sense, his reaction gave impetus to the community member to reaffirm her impression of the school and its environs. Tony controlled his environment and any possibility of conversational discomfort by choosing to withdraw from the conversation to play with his children. He avoided an opportunity to display administrative expertise. This incident showed that Tony acted from a location which avoided conflict and thus, he remained high on charisma, whereas I might have attempted
further dialogue with the woman, thus inviting adherence to initiating structure.

First day in the school. When Ms. TeachTwo offered to help Tony by asking him if he "needed anything" on that first day, his response was, "well, I, I don't know what I need because, you know, I don't really have any idea of what I'm doing." Later on, Tony again reflected on his response to Ms. TeachTwo with me: "[a]nd so you know, my plan was to sort of chip away at whatever I could see that needed to be done and wait until jobs fell on me . . ."

My first meeting with Tony took place the second day that Tony was in the school. As Tony didn't know what else to do with his time, he sorted the mail. He told me that he was waiting to attend the New Principals' Meeting led by Mrs. CDOE, so that he could learn "what to do" in order to commence the real task of administration. If Tony had been a more seasoned teacher moving into the principalship role, or had taken the Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course, there would have been a number of items he could have addressed prior to attending the New Principals’ Meeting. In this respect, then, Tony appeared to be reactive rather than proactive as he attempted to discern "what to do next".

The New Administrators' Meeting. The feelings engendered by the quantity of paper generated at both the new administrators’ meeting and the first full administrator’s meeting prompted Tony to provide the interview response comment, "[But] for me to go through all of those policies and to go through all of the clauses and sub-clauses and order and you know, I'd never be able to do it, so why bother? Wait until it happens."

Planning for new teacher induction. In scanning the experience levels of Tony's staff, I noticed that one young neophyte teacher had just moved into the province from
Eastern Canada; it was her first time away from her familial home and home province. A second teacher, although a Saskatchewan person, was also new to the geographic area. She "had her plate full", as she was not only planning for her second year of teaching, but was anticipating her wedding ceremony following the first week of school-opening.

In my assessment of the situation, and as Tony was himself a newcomer to the division, I had hoped that he might be sensitive to the needs of newcomers both new to the profession and to the school, and to instigate some form of planned induction meeting time with them. The hiring of neophyte teachers to Tony’s staff provided him with the opportunity to be administratively proactive; however, through his passivity in not initiating an induction meeting between these new teachers and himself, it became a missed opportunity to expedite both his and their movement from outsider to insider. A proactive stance would have provided professional and personal support to the new teachers by enabling them to feel more comfortable with, and less isolated from, the rather daunting interaction of seasoned staff members bandying about and interacting with each other at the first full staff meeting.

The first full staff meeting. When I asked Tony whether or not he had set his agenda for the first staff meeting, he replied,

I think I need to wait. I think I need to get to this um, Principals’ Meeting, because a lot of stuff for the staff will come out of that.

As a result of this orientation, Tony’s first staff meeting consisted of dissemination of information or "administrivia" obtained directly from Mrs. CDOE, rather than any format which might have imbued Tony with an administrative personality distinct from Mrs.
AprioriPrinc’s initiating structure.

This event and others provided the opportunity for Tony to display a proactive leadership role early in the school term. However, in my sensemaking of the events which occurred in Tony’s early days with staff members, Tony displayed a reactive mode and reliance on others in several instances, one of which is identified below:

... Um, Mrs. Sec, tell us a little bit about "Clearance and Contact". Are those one and the same? And just for [the new teachers] and myself, tell us a little bit about how the parental process is involved.

Although Tony had acknowledged the school secretary by asking her to describe the "parental process" in front of seasoned staff members and newcomers alike, and thus, she might be viewed somewhat as an "expert" by this inclusion, I sensed that Tony’s comments might also be indicative of non-action in terms of acquainting himself with school procedures prior to staff meeting day.

When Tony outlined Mrs. CDOE’s expectations regarding individual teacher course instructional plans, he admitted to staff that he was unfamiliar with the development of such plans:

Um, I didn’t realize until last week that The Education Act specifies that every teacher has a yearly plan—an outline for every topic—for every course that they teach? Um, and you just have to have it. It doesn’t have to be ... you don’t have to do anything with it, once you’ve got it. So, that’s kind of defined by The Act. Um, I ... I don’t want you to give me any course instruction plans, and if you choose to make them, then that’s OK [...] I’m afraid that I neither have the expertise nor the time to really understand it right now. It’s something that, five years down the road, I’ll know a little bit more about curriculum and I’ll take a look at those. But it’s time for you and it’s time for me to do the plan. If it’s of benefit to you, do it. By all means.
This situation called for Tony to exercise direct authority in stipulating that teachers must submit teacher-made instructional plans for the year to the office, but Tony chose to avoid that administrative authority. Not only did he allow staff members to opt out of making year plans, he also gave them misinformation in stating that The Education Act required such a submission.

It is probable, however, that Tony believed his directive gave staff members the professional autonomy to decide whether or not teacher year plans were relevant to each of them. In one sentence, he told staff members "if you choose to make them" [*the year plans*], and in another sentence he stated, "it's time for you and it's time for me to do the plan", sending a somewhat mixed message. By allowing staff members such wide latitude in terms of choosing whether or not to submit year plans, Tony perhaps calculated that he might garner staff approval more readily by such a comment; that this leniency would help to "prove" that he was different from Mrs. AprioriPrinc. In effect, Tony used Mrs. AprioriPrinc as his negative reference index.

This incident also prompted me to recall the research of Seashore Louis and Miles (1990), who found that strategic planning which is school-focused and administrator-dominated, is the most successful ingredient for school success (p. 107). From my perspective, Tony could have made this occasion an opportunity to actively and positively encourage school-wide teacher adherence to the development of instructional year plans. However, he chose to shift this professional development opportunity to the discretion of individual teachers, thereby leaving the problem of adhering to year plans to other people. Tony's opportunity to engage in a leadership role in terms of strategic
planning became a reactive or non-actor administrative response, but it allowed him to build upon his image management as a charismatic leader rather than one who might initiate structure.

In viewing Tony’s decision through the researcher’s lens rather than through the participant-observer lens, it was entirely probable that Tony operated under the premise that he had to work with this staff over an extended period of time, and that it was important for him to build the foundation for long-term agreement with, and acceptance from, the staff in a charismatic manner, whereas I, as researcher, did not have to do so.

**Student assembly on opening day.** Although Tony believed the student assembly to be of importance to him, the procedure itself was a repetition of previous first-day assemblies. In reviewing the proposed assembly procedure prior to the opening day for students, Tony commented at the staff meeting:

> [M]y understanding of what has happened in the past ... there has been a general assembly pretty quick [sic] off the bat and a period of time with homeroom so we can stop and then regular class. I think that is a good idea, and ah, what I would like to do is just check with what you’ve done before ...

After the student assembly had occurred, Tony reflected that he had been uneasy about the student assembly set-up prior to its occurrence:

> Yeah, today was a little bit too noisy for my liking, but that set-up for assembly isn’t good. It’s far too wide an audience and you know, I’ve got a good voice and stuff, but the Grade 7s and the Grade 11s are too far apart and when you’re trying to talk to all of them at once, um, so ah, so, you know . . . I was a little bit uneasy about that . . . I wanted it to be very well controlled and it wasn’t. The physical set-up made it less controlled than I wanted it to be.
I saw this as an opportunity for Tony to compose a draft assembly format to present at the first staff meeting for discussion purposes. Such an action would have displayed a desire for a marked or even moderate deviation from the assembly format of previous years and which, consequently, might have suggested a more proactive administrative leadership style. Tony took a passive stance to the noisy student behaviour during assembly activities by stating:

So, as far as incidents that were connected with that first day of classes, in the gym with the whole student body was something that was important. It affected me because it made me think, afterwards, that I wished that it would have gone better because of the student talking, and I realized that it wasn’t anything to do with me, or it was just the physical setting of the gym with all of those kids in it.

Tony readily displayed an acceptance of the status quo by not planning or advocating consideration of an alternative assembly format. It became another missed opportunity.

The research and Tony. In reflecting upon his own involvement in this dissertation, Tony admitted to being reactive rather than proactive as a co-researcher, in that he had relegated the research significance as unimportant to him while recognizing its importance to me. He also reflected upon his reactive stance in that he would not have actively thought about his administrative actions had it not been for his involvement in this study:

I would not have seen reflection as a priority. I would have thought of things as I was walking home or I would have chatted to my wife about things, but there would have been no formal thinking about events. I would not have done even what I am doing right now [the topical guided questions]. I would not have tried to put it all together and thought about it at all in a short period of time. Little bits of it would have come back to me as I was doing other things. So, it affected me in the sense that I did reflect, and I wouldn’t have reflected, probably, if it weren’t for you as researcher, being here.
Tony reminisced about his tendencies in dealing with specific staff and/or student problems:

For example, I will have a little note on my desk and it will sit there for two weeks until it is so stale that I think, "well, they must have figured it out" and into the garbage it goes.

In this circumstance, as there was no overt disruption in connection with the problem, Tony's solution was to discard the note after a lengthy period of time, rather than to actively pursue its contents. His action displayed a reactive rather than proactive administrative stance. However, by completely avoiding a negative situation by procrastination, Tony positively managed his image.

The local board meeting. In terms of my own sensemaking, I reflected on the fact that I considered the local board meeting and its contents to be of import to myself in anticipatory set to the principalship, whereas Tony did not reflect at all upon his attendance at, reports to, or thoughts about, the local meetings in his topical guided interview responses nor within his Chapter V personal reflections.

As a participant observer, I compared the limited powers of local members with the powers of division board members, and in both boards' ability to help the administrators and staff to shape the school to become a more viable and effective learning organization. On distinct occasions within this one local trustee meeting, members appeared to be either unaware of their role according to The Act, or they deliberately pushed the limits of their perceived power over the new administrator, and indeed, with the experienced elementary school principal who also attended that meeting.
The trustees requested that Tony invite the new teachers to attend the local trustee meeting in order to inform the trustees of the teachers' academic objectives and plans. Tony responded by suggesting that Ms. TeachTwo and/or other seasoned teachers might also attend the trustee meetings to discuss the school's academic program. Tony did not see the local board impinging on his management of the school, whereas I saw their requests as an impingement upon administrative authority.

I pondered the ramifications of such a meeting as perhaps being a positive move towards promoting a form of community-school dialogue, but as the request to attend a trustee meeting originated from local trustee members rather than from the neophyte administrator's initiative or even as an initiative from his seasoned administrative colleague, I adjuged the administrator(s) to be unaware of local trustee role limitations by their outward demeanour and verbal response, both of which appeared to be reactive rather than proactive in nature. It was obvious that the local board wanted to micro-manage the affairs of the school itself, and to me, this was an important observation but one of which Tony appeared to be oblivious or unaware. Ms. TeachTwo did accompany Tony to the next local meeting and explained the school's program to the trustees.

I also found it intriguing that the local trustees organized the school awards program in its entirety rather than to involve the staff members and students. This, in and of itself, appeared to be reactive rather than proactive in terms of the staff members abrogating responsibility and initiative to develop their own program. Indeed, the whole aspect of the extent of local trustee involvement in organizing the school awards program did not appear to be an outcropping or idea that fascinated or even led Tony to reflect
upon it, but it certainly fascinated me.

**Money management through the Student Representative Council.** In an effort to understand the Student Representative Council (SRC) finances, Tony invited the local bank accountant to speak to the two SRC treasurers and to Ms. TeachTwo and himself as SRC advisors. When the accountant questioned both SRC advisors about whether or not they had perused the last financial statement as there had been substantial losses in the books in previous years, Tony replied, "No, we haven't been through this at all." The accountant queried, "At all?", and Tony replied, "No". Thus it was that the SRC bank sign-off procedures, the audit from the preceding school year, and learning how to record receipts and disbursements took form under the direction of the local bank accountant, after school had been in session for two weeks.

My overall sensemaking of this incident was that matters of handling SRC school funds were done without a sense of urgency, which is diametrically opposite to the concerns of both the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and Saskatchewan School Trustees Association lawyers. These professionals indicate that financial accountability cannot be taken too lightly and must be one of the first issues to be addressed in taking over the principalship in a new school setting. In this respect, waiting until well after school had started to close off last year's books and to train students for the new term might be viewed as reactive rather than proactive in nature.

It seemed to me that if Tony had attended the Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course as an induction event, he would have been more cognizant of the significance of carefully accounting for all monies within the school setting as soon as possible. Again, I
saw this as a missed opportunity for Tony to exercise administrative authority in terms of being financially accountable. I was concerned for Tony in terms of the personal risk he took in non-accounting for school funds until mid-September. On the other hand, the dialogue between the bank accountant and students might be viewed as proactive in terms of involving community in the day-to-day workings of the school.

Throughout the study, I became increasingly aware of the multiple realities (Schutz, 1967, p. 229) through which Tony was viewed by various staff, student, and community members, as well as Central Office personnel. From my perspective as a Ph.D. educational administration graduate student, as one who had co-researched several "Effective Schools" studies, and as one who had been involved with the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course for three terms, I obviously applied different parameters to my observations than did Tony or those who interacted with him in his new environs.

My sensemaking of the incidents which were of interest to me was derived from my background experiences, which were significantly different from Tony’s experiences. For Tony, this whole money management incident appeared to be unimportant, as he did not identify it as an outcropping which fascinated him in any way. He did not identify financial accountability as an area in which he required administrative expertise. He was most concerned with getting through the day-to-day realities of his job, whereas I was concerned as a researcher, as a life-long learner, and as one in anticipatory set to the principalship.

In reflecting upon multiple realities from yet another perspective, I sensed that most division and in-school personnel compared Tony’s interaction with others and his
general demeanour to that of the former principal, and that as his personality was such a marked contrast to Mrs. AprioriPrinc, he was seen as a "wonderful person" by many. Thus, even though the bank accountant seemed momentarily surprised that the books had not been looked at in any manner until mid-September, she quickly recovered her composure and continued to teach the SRC students, the advisor, and Tony how to handle the financial accounting procedures. This, too, provided an example of how Tony is "other-directed" in that he relied upon others to direct him in his administrative tasks.

Teacher-principal professional development interview. In this interview, Mrs. TeachFour indicated that she wanted Tony to supervise her using the cognitive coaching technique. Tony reflected upon this request by noting that "my mentor at San Diego suggested that I get involved with [it], last summer." He explained to Mrs. TeachFour, "I don't know anything about cognitive coaching and I have people telling me this is something I should learn". Again, Tony provided an example of how he is other-directed rather than self-directed in administrative knowledge and tasks.

As a participant observer and academic researcher keen to learn more about cognitive coaching, I constantly scan my environment and look for signals which enable me to enhance my own understanding of the administrative process. Because of my scanning, I was aware of a colleague who had been actively involved in cognitive coaching within her own school division. I told Tony that I would be willing to contact my colleague on his behalf, if he so desired. I also lent Tony a newly published book from my own professional collection which I thought might be of interest to him in this respect. Tony said that he would be interested in pursuing such a contact; I subsequently
contacted my colleague, who indicated that she would be interested in assisting Tony.

Although proactive in pursuing four days of a six-day cognitive coaching seminar through the Professional Development Unit of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation, Tony affirmed with me that at the end of the year, even though he vaguely remembered making an initial telephone call to my colleague, he had not followed through with the contact, nor had he read the book I had lent him. In my sensemaking of this incident, it became apparent to me that Tony had relegated the book to yet another pile of paper in his "paper overload" pile; something to be looked at "later". The book was returned to me, unread, a year later.

From my perspective, I saw this as an important opportunity to learn more about cognitive coaching and to be proactive in terms of supervisory leadership. Tony missed this administrative opportunity, as he did not act upon it in his supervisory activities, nor did he mention it as having any import in his sensemaking of Chapter V. From my perspective, Tony could have been proactive in expanding his own instructional supervision repertoire by scanning or reading the book I had lent him and in applying his learnings from the cognitive coaching seminar to the supervision of Mrs. TeachFour. Through his own admission, however, Tony did not correlate his newly acquired knowledge of the cognitive coaching model in his subsequent supervision of Mrs. TeachFour. In this respect, then, of the many administrative role options available to Tony in his supervisory capacity, he displayed a nonactor or reactor response (Small, 1974 in Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 22) to the teacher’s cognitive coaching supervision request.
Professional development plans of the neophyte administrator. I found it of interest that Tony did not reflect upon or discuss his own professional development plans, other than in response to my own questions about his professional development opportunities. I asked Tony if he planned to attend the 1997 fall Saskatchewan Council of Educational Administrators’ yearly convention, as he had not attended the 1997 July Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course prior to entering the principalship. Tony’s response was, "No. I’ll do some PD when my butt catches up with my front!"

Nearly a year later, when I asked him if he planned to attend the 1998 Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course, Tony replied that he had no intention of attending any professional development course this summer. His "professional development", he told me, consisted of building a garage, in doing odd jobs around his home, and in spending time with his family. Again, my sense was that this neophyte administrator displayed reactive rather than proactive tendencies for his own professional development. What Tony was doing, in effect, was building a fence around his family time, as he indicated that family time was most important to him, over everything.

Overall, from the perspective of charisma and consideration, Tony might view his actions as being proactive rather than reactive in that he initiated the move away from holding many staff meetings per week to one per meeting month. He initiated the mid-September pot luck dinner as a means of meeting members of the school community. He refused to participate in administrative-level professional development conferences such as the annual Saskatchewan Council of Educational Administrators convention, and the 1997 and 1998 Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course opportunities as a way of drawing
limitations around his professional life and in succinctly defining his family time. He reasoned that the mental health and well-being of his own person and family life came first, over and above any learning which might accrue to participation in formal induction and professional development activities. To me, these actions also spoke of postmodernism in terms of the multiple realities used to define the organization.

Tony had been told by several individuals that he was a "fresh breath" to the school. He displayed an attitude and demeanour which was just what Central Office personnel, some staff members, and community believed they needed; that is, the opposite to Mrs. AprioriPrinc's administrative style. Tony's youthful appearance accompanied by an aura of cheerful perkiness radiated "a new beginning" for staff and students. Tony was able to use the administrative style of Mrs. AprioriPrinc to his own image management advantage.

Tony did not display attributes of Schon's (1983) *Reflective Practitioner* role in many instances; indeed, he was very forthright about not valuing reflection in his administrative capacity, other than through happenstance. I attribute this attitude to several possibilities: Tony is a young teacher with six years of educational experience. If I were to compare his administrative style to my own intended style, I sense that we are vastly different from each other. With a myriad of experiences behind me, I have more to draw upon in terms of reviewing what I have seen in other administrators and in the variety of different schools and situations, whereas Tony is limited to his own experience as a teacher in one rural school.
My location lens was significantly different from Tony's lens. As a researcher, I could afford to be critical of Tony's actions, as I did not carry the responsibility of having to directly act in the role of neophyte principal. Tony had the specific desire to move from outsider to insider status, whereas my newcomer lens was as an outsider who would leave Tony's community after the data collection had been completed.

As a researcher, my task was to reflect upon and to make sense of Tony's actions within the environment, whereas Tony's task was to act as a neophyte principal within that environment. As Weick (1995) stated, "sensemaking starts either with the action or the outcome" (p. 168). Although I might view Tony as "reactive" in terms of his action in some situations, I also viewed him as "proactive" or as an initiator in that his day-to-day actions prompted me to delve further into my own perceptions of the principalship.

Tony's actions also prompted me to make sense of, and to consider what it is that a mentor actually does to make the process a "mentoring" one. Although there are overt actions which can be attributed to the mentoring process, I considered that perhaps Tony's mentorship to me was simply to exist in his own world. As a mentee, I extracted cues from Tony's actions which subsequently dictated my reactions in enabling me to identify the emergent themes within this dissertation. Although Tony was the object of my research environment--the target point or focal person of my research--he also acted as an initiator in the development of my own sensemaking. Viewed in this vein, the mentoring process became both cognitive and reflective at the same time.

In short, it was my sense that Tony scanned his environment and noticed a plethora of issues that he had to deal with both as an administrator and family man.
Although issues were perhaps not selected consciously, Tony decided to limit his administrative involvements to a specific range of issues he considered most important: image and acceptance.

Summary

In reflection, it appears that Tony struck his psychological contract by learning through others. Tony used Mrs. CDOE and Mrs. SecondPrinc as his main indicators or judgements of success, in terms of educational personnel. He used his wife as his personal guide in matters of the home and for some school contexts.

Tony evaluated himself in comparison to Mortimer and Mrs. SecondPrinc. He relied heavily on specific female teachers to carry him through the initial months of the principalship and changed in-school mentors part-way through the year.

Tony avoided learning situations which might be confrontational, as seen in his wholesale avoidance of discussing school issues with the lady whom Tony met in his own front yard and with the mother who was distressed about the level of academic excellence within the school.

Tony was concerned about how others perceived him to act. He needed to impress certain individuals and was convinced that he could not change his mind on decisions that he had made because he would be seen as "wishy-washy".

In terms of induction, Tony's age may have been a factor to him in his attempts to move from outsider to insider within the various contexts. In effect, Tony had built "age" into his psychological contract by addressing it as a concern.
In determining the cut-off point of the field research, I left it up to Tony to decide the point in time when he felt he had been "socialized" so that I need not return to the research site. On August 29, he commented:

I feel like, now . . . I have a bit of the picture. I feel like it's not going to be very long at all where I'll be able to say, "OK, I have a general feel for the job and the community and, ah . . . and the things associated with the job . . . um, and so that general picture I [already] have" . . .

Um, but I certainly won't feel then like I've . . . like I'm fully socialized. Ah, you know, I'll have a general picture so it will be interesting to see how that definition of when I'm socialized comes out because I feel, in many ways, that I am now. After two days with the kids and five days with the staff. Um . . . but in many other ways I don't and I don't perceive that a year down the road I'm going to feel socialized as a . . . I mean, competent. I don't feel . . . I don't expect that I'll feel very ah . . . very confident. Yeah.

When Tony reflected upon the heavy paper flow as part of his induction to the principalship, he tied in his feelings of socialization at the end:

I can see that . . . you know, I was told . . . to stay within the bounds of four binders worth of paper that I haven't read yet and so you know . . . the school hasn't burned down and nobody's died . . . so obviously, something is happening, and a lot of it doesn't have anything to do with me, but it's working alright until . . . I get through those four binders of paper. And so that something that we're after [the point at which Tony felt there would be nothing new for me to learn; when Tony felt he had been "socialized"] . . . how I'm moving from a point of knowing nothing to a point of feeling like I know enough will come . . .

By the end of November, three and a half months after I had commenced the field research, Tony indicated that he thought there was "nothing new for you [Patricia] to learn". As a researcher, I felt it necessary to draw closure and agreed with him.

However, at the end of this time frame, I had developed a sense that Tony had voiced or constructed an overall Gestalt (Gestalt being "a stepchild of early phenomenology",
according to lhde, 1977, p. 57) of his own induction. In fact, Tony believed that he knew
the community, the teachers, the students, and the workings of the school on August 29:

I know the teachers, um, I would say. And, you know, I'll learn more
things as the time goes on, but in terms of ah, sort of their basic nature,
personality-wise, I feel like I know them all after this week. Um, now
teaching ability and stuff like that . . . I certainly don't know that and it's
going to be a long time down the road before I can really [. . .]

I feel like I do know an . . . an awful lot [about their politics] in that
regard. And I don't know if I'll ever, you know . . . maybe the roof will
have to cave in before I know all of that, but um, I think I have a pretty
good feel for the politics of the teachers and um . . . of whether there are
any sort of agendas and um . . . you know, that's after five days. Now,
maybe I'm naive and maybe I don't. Maybe a week from now I could
look back and say, "geez, I really . . . last Friday, I didn't know diddle
about that and I've learned an awful lot in the last week" but . . . but right
now, I feel pretty good about that. Ah, I don't feel like I know the kids,
specifically, very well, but I feel like I have sort of a good, general feel for
the kids already, after a day and a half. I have lots of . . . lots and lots of
interaction with them, both in my classroom and in general . . . and, you
know, I can say, on a scale of one to ten, in decency, where I think they fit
versus where the kids I taught in the last six years fit . . . um . . . so I know
them in a sense. Um, I don't know that you need any . . . I guess I haven't
had any personal interaction with the community, although I've had lots of
advice about the community, so I feel like I know, from second-hand,
quite a bit.

Tony's environment was rich with cues. In scanning his environment, which
intrinsically became my own environment, I noticed several cues. It was difficult for me
not to surface those cues in order for us to discuss their impact on Tony, but I recognized
that to do so would be to make the research my own sensemaking rather than Tony's.

I was conscious at all times of recording the raw verbatim data as a reflection of
Tony's environment rather than mine. I attempted to display the situated learning through
Tony's reflections in Chapter V and through mine within Chapters VI and VII.
At closure of the field research in November, Tony did not actually indicate to me that any of his experiences were at variance with the total induction picture he had developed in late August. He had not commented any further about how family members felt about his role as principal at the end of the field experience, about the composition of his learning community, or about what he believed to be his overall Gestalt in terms of his own induction experiences. Through my own sensemaking of the verbatim raw data and his Chapter V, I developed thirteen invariant meaning units which were then condensed to the four emergent themes within this chapter. The essence of the research experience is explored through the final chapter of this dissertation, Chapter VII.
CHAPTER VII: REFLECTIONS ON THE STUDY

The proof of research conducted by whatever means resides in the pudding of its outcomes.
(Peshkin, 1993, p. 23)

Introduction

Starubck and Milliken (1988) claimed that individuals tend to frame within the familiar, within the expected, and within what matters (p. 53). I thought that I could best understand the role of the principal by making sense, first-hand, of another neophyte principal's induction to the field of educational administration.

I envisioned the dissertation framework from perceptual, conceptual, and theoretical aspects. The perceptual framework described my process of identifying the research schemata itself; the theoretical component identified my perception of applicable research theory; and the conceptual component allowed me to weave my various interests together to form an understanding of what it was that I proposed to study. These aspects were combined to create a conceptual and theoretical framework.

Section One: The Perceptual, Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

The selection of a form of representation—or, as some people call it—a symbol system (Solomon, 1997) is a selection of not only what can be conveyed but of what is likely to be noticed. The selection of a form of representation, whether by mindless habit or by reflective choice, affects what we see.

(Eisner, 1997, p. 7)
The Perceptual Framework

A perceptual framework helps the perceiver to identify stimuli, to categorize data, to assign likelihoods to data, to hide data, and to fill in missing data (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51; Taylor & Crocker, 1981, p. 97, 103). In this section I will describe my perception of how the conceptual and theoretical framework of this research eventually came to be identified.

Knowing only that I wished to research socialization to the principalship, and not knowing in advance what observations would occur from the critical incident of induction, I placed closure on a rather unwieldy literature review. This traditional method of completing the literature review prior to field research had placed me in a conundrum of conflicting research epistemologies, considering that in the final analysis, the research methodology was phenomenological with postmodern elements. Reflections pertaining to my awareness of the traditional literature and its impact upon the research are presented in Section Three of this chapter.

My perception of the conceptual and theoretical framework [refer to Figure 4] evolved as a result of my field observations, concomitant with my sensemaking of the research process itself. I needed to experience the phenomenon before I could conceptualize the framework of the research and subsequently, the research design and correlating methodology. This conceptual and theoretical framework forms the basis for the literature review, the research methodology, and the very essence of this research.
The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

In reflection, the perceptual framework formed the basis of my subsequent depiction of the conceptual and theoretical framework. In keeping with the phenomenological characteristic of reflexivity (Moustakas, 1994), I placed induction as the stimuli I wanted to study into a framework that made sense of the stimuli (Goleman, 1985, as cited in Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51). Next, the conceptual and theoretical components of the overall framework will be described.

At least frameworks often imply that certain data ought to exist or ought not to exist.
(Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51)

Figure 4: The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework
The Conceptual Component

A conceptual framework serves to guide the search for meanings. In constructing the conceptual and theoretical framework, I identified the Induction phase of socialization as the primary area of interest and viewed the research through The Context, The Location, and The Sensemaking lenses, each of which were introduced in Chapter I. The theoretical component of the framework is encompassed within the sensemaking lens.

The Theoretical Component

The theoretical components of the research framework were identified as phenomenology, postmodernism, and sensemaking, each of which were described within the literature review of Chapter II. The postmodern perspective recognizes the continuous and reciprocal dialogue or discourse of individuals within the organization, and that all culture is text. Tony and I had a dialogical relationship (Valle, King, & Halling, 1989, p. 8). Rich language affords rich reflective thought: "the words I say affect the thoughts I form when I see what I've said (Weick, 1995, p. 90)". In sensemaking, a good story is necessary; (p. 61), so I needed to build my case as a qualitative researcher—to be a storyteller of the critical event (Wolcott, 1994, p. 17).

This research was viewed within the interpretivist paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 29). Despite the phenomenologist's inclination to bracket oneself out of the narrative (Creswell, 1998, p. 178), Moustakas (1994) introduced the reflexivity that phenomenologists can bring to a study in terms of casting the initial problem statement within an autobiographical context. All of these factors, then, comprised the basis of the conceptual and theoretical framework of the research.
The Participant Observer

As a component of the conceptual and theoretical framework, I identified Tony as the co-researcher and myself in the bifurcated role of primary researcher and participant observer in anticipatory set to the principalship within the location lens. A detailed description of the participant observer role was given in Chapter III of this dissertation.

Four attributes of social behaviour were identified by Wolcott (1995) which appear to be essential for the successful and satisfactory conduct of fieldwork: gaining entry and maintaining rapport, reciprocity, a tolerance for ambiguity, and personal determination coupled with faith in oneself (p. 91).

First, it was important for me to gain entry to the research site. Culture defines who is an outsider and who is an insider (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 171). As a researcher, I needed to penetrate Tony’s individual and group front by becoming an insider in order to gain deep and direct personal experience of his world (Adler & Adler, 1987, p. 21). The position of participant observer afforded me the opportunity to cross boundaries in my initial contact with the Director of Education at the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course, to acquire the “insider” or trusted person status (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 39). As I was accepted by the Director of Education, Tony more readily accepted my request for entry to the research site.

Rapport was relatively easy to attain and maintain, given the positive interest in my research topic displayed by the Director of Education and by Tony himself. A high level of rapport was established as I collected data and was invited to socialize with Tony’s family. Further evidence of our rapport may be seen in Tony’s willingness to
have his own reflections published within Chapter V of this dissertation.

Second, the attribute of reciprocity was an essential component of the research. "Fieldwork entails a subtle kind of exchange, one that often involves gifting across cultural boundaries where exchange rates may be ambiguous or one wonders what to offer in exchange for intangibles such as hospitality or a personal life history" (Wolcott, 1995, p. 91). Gaining access to the research site, receiving invitations to participate in a variety of interactions, having both Tony and the Director of Education accommodate me by setting aside valuable time to converse with me, having Tony provide his personal reflections in the form of verbal and written feedback, and receiving invitations into Tony's home and family life were all gifts bestowed upon me throughout the research. As discussed in Chapter III's Ethical Principles section, I was very aware of the reciprocity of gift-giving. I gratefully acknowledged the time and effort that Tony expended for my research; it impacted upon his personal and professional time. I tried to be sensitive to Tony's needs as much as possible throughout this research.

Third, participant observation requires a tolerance for ambiguity or the ability to remain as adaptable as possible in the research situation. It was impossible for me to anticipate or to prepare for all the vagaries of fieldwork. The complex meanings of Tony's social interactions were revealed only after I had set aside my personal prejudices and had reflected upon the observed incidents in a phenomenological manner.

Fourth, personal determination coupled with self-confidence was necessary for successful participant observation. The immersion into new social groups—the school staff, students, administrators' group, local trustees and division board members, as well
as Tony's family--created feelings of vague uneasiness at first, as I was an outsider, unsure of the local rules. I attempted to overcome this "culture shock" by being sensitive to the situation, and through self-confidence and acumen.

In summary, Tony's reflections and perceptions were really constructed realities, as were mine as participant observer. Our perceptions or constructions existed in forms of verbal, nonverbal, and tacit knowledge and comprised our individual sensemaking of the induction experience. "Fieldwork beckons, even dares, you to become part of what you study. That is the difference between observation and participant observation" (p. 240). I was indeed a participant observer by virtue of my ongoing discourse with Tony and through my own interest as one in anticipatory set to the principalship.

The Frameworks Summary

This Chapter VII provided a description of the perceptual framework, which identified the research schemata of the conceptual and theoretical framework. Along with the visual Research Map of Related Literature [Figure 1], the Conceptual and Theoretical Framework [Figure 4] provided my visual sensemaking of this research. To complement this visual, Section Two provides the summary of the study.

Section Two: Summary of the Study

My research objective was to observe, first-hand, the sensemaking that Tony, as a neophyte principal, developed which enabled him to function in the educational organization. Based on Tony's own reflective sensemaking and the 908 pages of verbatim raw data from this research, in Chapter V, Tony reflected upon the induction events which appeared significant for him. In Chapter VI, I used the phenomenological
research method to identify the underlying themes and contexts in my sensemaking of the induction experience. Thus, Tony and I independently amplified some stimuli and attenuated others. In this manner, the raw data were distorted (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 40) according to our own perceptual filters, and the postmodern aspect of multiple realities became manifest.

The following **topical-oriented questions** were posed: What experiences did Tony identify as significant as a neophyte principal and what did he *not* address? In short, Tony identified Ms. SecondPrinc, Mrs. AprioriPrinc, Mrs. CDOE, Mr. TeachOne, Ms. TeachTwo, Mrs. TeachThree, Mortimer, and Tony’s own family members as significant. He reflected on the need to create impressions with the students, the staff, and the community; he considered his age to be a factor in the administrative role; and he reflected upon the quantity of paper flow.

I identified some experiences which Tony did *not* address. Tony did not identify any induction strategies which might have helped him in his induction activities, such as attendance at the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course, the impact of the Law Module upon school leadership, or other professional development activities. I also identified specific staff members, the local board meeting, and the "Meet-the-Teachers Pot Luck Dinner" to be of significance in Tony’s movement from outsider to insider, although Tony did not attend to them in his Chapter V sensemaking.

With the phenomenological perspective of experiencing the social world through one’s own lens, the following culminating, over-riding, **issue-oriented questions** were posed: What sensemaking did I develop in the context of Tony’s experiences, and what
outcroppings and ideas fascinated me in terms of Tony’s experiences? Four main underlying themes and contexts that accounted for Tony’s sensemaking of those experiences emerged: (1) image management as a prime induction motivator, (2) the identification of and/or influence of significant others, (3) the identification of and/or influence of significant events, and (4) the neophyte principal as role proactive or reactive. It was my own perceptual filter which led me to discern these themes.

In concluding this research, I found Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) use of perceptual filters most readily applicable to this phenomenological research methodology. Three aspects of induction became manifest in my sensemaking of the research: First, Tony as co-researcher identified those with whom he came in contact as either positive or negative referents. Second, he assigned or reassigned valency to those referents as he moved through his induction experience. Third, knowledge of the task environment was a substantial factor in how Tony approached his role.

The Perceptual Filter

Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) research divided perception into noticing and sensemaking (p. 36). Perceptual filters place some stimuli in the foreground and other stimuli into the background. Starbuck and Milliken (1988) contended that people filter information rather instinctively (p. 41). Tony pushed certain stimuli to the foreground and deliberately ignored, or did not recognize, other stimuli. He made assumptions about the sources of stimuli he received and distinguished relevant from irrelevant sources in his movement from outsider to insider, as did I. Tony’s perceptual foreground was significantly different from mine.
It appeared to me that Tony came to the principalship with a basic image of himself as a "normal" or "nice guy"; he tended to accentuate that image in his new role. My sensemaking came into play in terms of the individual dynamics I observed when Tony interacted with others. Tony appeared to be proactive in his assessment of others, which then led to his deployment of certain strategies which assisted him in his movement from outsider to insider. One strategy appeared to be that of associating himself with conditions that previously existed and to build his own image based upon those events within the new environment.

For example, Tony made it very clear to students, staff, and parents that he had several connections to the community prior to moving into town, and that in essence he was returning to his "roots" by becoming principal of ABC High School. He talked about being born near the area, about how his wife’s family still farmed in the area, how one of his father’s job tasks was to supervise the local community pasture, and about how his sister knew certain community members. Tony’s acknowledgement of these pre-existing events might have hastened his movement from outsider to insider somewhat more than an outsider who had no local connections to the community. As well, Tony’s building of a garage in the summer and the substantial home renovations he undertook bespoke of permanence and intent to settle within the community, which probably furthered his movement from outsider to insider.

Tony constantly scanned his environment and filtered information in terms of people and events that he determined might in some way assist him in his movement from outsider to insider. He was intent upon his survival as a neophyte administrator and
acted upon that survival instinct by being dependent upon his charisma in interpersonal, social relationships. In effect, this proved to be another strategy which Tony used in his movement from outsider to insider. Tony’s definition of success appeared to be linked to approval of his actions by specific family members, Mrs. CDOE, staff, students, and parents rather than through recognition of a clear, professional identity in terms of a personal administrative philosophy statement.

In part, Tony used what he perceived to be the characteristics of Mrs. AprioriPrinc to help build a "nice guy" administrative image for himself. Through initial conversations with Mrs. CDOE and others, Tony became aware that Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s strength was her ability to develop organizational procedures within the school setting. The files she had left for Tony appeared to reinforce those initial impressions. Tony also knew that Mrs. CDOE would supplement Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s procedures with more current data at the first administrators’ meeting. As Tony recognized that Mrs. AprioriPrinc had already put into place the organizational structures necessary for immediate administrative survival, he tended to be reactive in task performance or task-orientation. He was cognizant of the worth of interpersonal relationships and knew that his own strength lay in his charisma, so he spent his efforts in being proactive in the building of those relationships.

As an example of environmental scanning, Tony noticed car drivers and deliberately waved to them. He admitted to me that while he did not necessarily know the drivers, he considered it important for his own socialization to "look friendly" by waving to them.
In contrast to Tony, I sensed that my own survival as a researcher and as administrator in anticipatory set to the principalship was by being proactive in task-orientation, and that the social relationships which might develop would be as a result of, and secondary to, that task performance. Tony made sense of the role through social relationships and charisma, whereas I made sense of the role through task-orientation via change theory and effective schools literature.

**Negative and Positive Referents**

Whenever Tony scanned and filtered his environment, he noticed and adjudged certain individuals as either negative or positive referents. He assigned valency to each of the individuals with whom he came in contact, determining their worth in assisting in his movement from outsider to insider.

Tony had a tendency to accept or reject the whole person, rather than to recognize that although he may not particularly like the individual, he might try to find ways to deal productively with that individual. In particular, it was evident that Tony had assigned Mortimer, the other administrator new to the division, as a negative referent. It was difficult for Tony to assign positive valency to Mortimer in any way throughout the course of this research. I surmised that the reason for this negativity might be because Tony appeared to be somewhat threatened by Mortimer’s administrative experience and skills as compared to his own skills, although he would not admit to such. Tony told me that he wanted Mrs. CDOE to see him in a positive vein. In my sensemaking of the situation, it appeared to me that although Tony was very professional at all times in his outward dealings with Mortimer, Tony perceived Mortimer as a rival for Mrs. CDOE’s
approval rather than as a more experienced colleague who could also assist Tony in his movement from outsider to insider. The negative valency was affirmed by Tony throughout this research, although its intensity appeared to lessen as Mrs. CDOE continued to publicly and positively reinforce Tony’s actions, as he gained more confidence in his own abilities, and as the year progressed.

The perceptual filtering that Tony applied in relation to Mortimer probably involved distortions in noticing, in terms of where to look and what to see. Tony let some stimuli draw too much attention to themselves, and other stimuli to evade attention (as I am sure I did throughout the course of this research). Distortions in sensemaking (what it means) allowed for the amplification of good events and attenuation of bad events and vice versa (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 43). If Tony had a more thorough knowledge of his task environment, perhaps his perceptual filters in relation to Mortimer might have caused him to react differently in his dealings with Mortimer. Tony reacted emotionally to Mortimer, rather than to appreciate the wealth of information that Mortimer could collegially share with Tony, if Tony had only acquiesced to tap that source. As it were, it became a matter of pride for Tony not to ask Mortimer for assistance.

In another example of a negative referent, when Tony first moved into town, he was initially drawn into a conversation with a community lady who informally visited with his sister-in-law on the front porch of his home. However, when the conversation continued with her criticism of ABC School, Tony chose to withdraw from the conversation and to ignore the woman by focussing on playing with his children, as he perceived the woman as a negative referent in his movement from outsider to insider.
To ignore the woman and to deliberately place her in his perceptual background might have been a useful discrimination for Tony at that point in time, although at some later point he might choose to resurrect and amplify the conversation by bringing it to his foreground as a means of furthering his movement along the socialization continuum. In this case, Tony noticed the woman but deliberately ignored her as his coping strategy within his own induction to the principalship. As a researcher, my perceptual framework was to comprehend Tony's selective ignoring as a missed opportunity to move more quickly from outsider to insider. For me, the conversation was a perceptual foreground induction opportunity, whereas for Tony, the conversation was perhaps a threat to his leadership, so it was relegated to his perceptual background.

Tony's interaction with the community lady also provided me with an example of how he gauged his fields of threat and sanctuary and developed each. Tony developed defensive practices which helped to define his zone of safety. When Tony ascertained that the community lady posed a conversational threat to him, he ignored the lady and entered his zone of safety; that is, he played exclusively with the children, letting his sister continue the conversation with the community lady. Tony's "sanctuary" was his home and family, with his wife Sandra pivotal to his concept of safety. It was my perception that Ms. SecondPrinc and Tony's family were sanctuary, whereas Mortimer and Mrs. AprioriPrinc were threats for Tony.

Mrs. AprioriPrinc proved to be a positive referent for Tony in that the administrative procedures she had developed during her tenure as principal at ABC School were maintained and utilized by Tony in his first months as the neophyte administrator.
Tony relied on Mrs. AprioriPrinc's administrative setup so that he could emphasize his own skills of developing interpersonal relationships with staff, students, and parents.

In a roundabout way, some negative aspects of Mrs. AprioriPrinc's tenure also provided a positive referent from which Tony could build image for himself. Tony knew that some staff members saw Mrs. AprioriPrinc's administrative strengths as being particularly taxing in terms of the number of staff meetings she required. Ms. TeachTwo pointed out to Tony on his first day in the school that the staff would prefer far fewer staff meetings than Mrs. AprioriPrinc had insisted upon during her tenure at ABC School. Acting upon Ms. TeachTwo's recommendation, at his first staff meeting Tony said he was not as experienced as Mrs. AprioriPrinc and would therefore would "have" to cut back on the number of meetings because of his fledgling administrative knowledge, compared to that of Mrs. AprioriPrinc. In this instance, Mrs. AprioriPrinc was again a positive referent for Tony in that he used her well-known efficiency as a means of garnering staff approval of himself through self-effacement. By portraying to the staff that he was a "normal guy" who disliked numerous staff meetings, he was unlike Mrs. AprioriPrinc.

Tony was able to use Mrs. AprioriPrinc as a positive referent for his own induction purposes in yet another situation. According to some teachers on staff (verbatim raw data, Staff Improvement Leadership Planning Meeting - Monday August 25, 1997), many years ago, ABC School had a "tough school" reputation. Mrs. AprioriPrinc inherited some difficulties when she became principal, but through strong administrative skills, she was able to "clean up" some of those difficulties. However, apparently some members of the community continued to harbour ill feelings towards teachers and administrators, based on
their experiences of many years ago, despite staff efforts to turn the reputation around.

Tony saw the negative feelings which had evolved and remained with some community members over the years and which were still evident during Mrs. AprioriPrinc’s tenure at ABC School, as an opportunity to establish his own identity within the new setting and of moving himself along the induction continuum from outsider to insider. For example, he proposed that a "Meet-the-Teachers Pot Luck Dinner" be initiated for community members as soon as possible in September. Many of the teachers were hesitant to plan for such an event, remembering how unmerciful some community members were towards the teachers at the difficult ratepayers’ meeting the previous spring. Tony knew his strength lay in his charisma in interpersonal relationships, and he believed that he could turn that staff and community negativity towards the positive through his charismatic efforts. If the dinner event proved to be successful, it would be one more way in which Tony could indicate that he was unlike Mrs. AprioriPrinc, and thus establish his own identity with staff members as well as with the community.

Tony also assigned positive or negative valency to individuals within his own school. He had initially assigned Mr. TeachOne a negative valency, as he had been somewhat intimidated by Mr. TeachOne, who appeared to be unamused by Tony’s attempts at a humorous response during the hiring interview. Tony affirmed his own sense of negative valency when he next met Mr. TeachOne at the track and field day, and surmised that Mr. TeachOne was not impressed with Tony’s parenting skills, as his young daughter was crying at his side.
Affirmation or Reassignment of Valency

Tony continued to scan his environment, and affirmed his original valency or reassigned valency whenever the occasion arose. In an example of affirming valency, Tony saw Ms. SecondPrinc as a strong, positive referent while he was a staff member at his former school. When he became principal of ABC School and felt the need to solicit advice from someone outside of the division, he invariably turned to Ms. SecondPrinc. Tony reported that Ms. SecondPrinc was always willing to help him solve administrative dilemmas and always had conversational time for him. As she continued to be a mentor to him even after he had moved away and had assumed a principalship, Tony affirmed to me, as researcher, his original valency of Ms. SecondPrinc.

In an example of reassignment of valency, Tony learned to appreciate Mr. TeachOne's sense of humour and gradually recognized that what he had initially sensed as Mr. TeachOne's disapproval of Tony was really just Mr. TeachOne's natural demeanour. Upon becoming more familiar with Mr. TeachOne's humour and style, Tony reassigned valency towards the positive for Mr. TeachOne.

In another example of reassignment of valency, Mrs. CDOE had specifically identified Ms. TeachTwo as "your strongest support" in a facsimile to Tony prior to his moving to Town ABC. With this initial indicator, Tony relied on Ms. TeachTwo's guidance from the very first day he entered the school. Ms. TeachTwo supplied Tony with small "sticky-note" comments and dialogued with him frequently about the specifics of his administrative tasks throughout his first weeks. Tony recognized this support by identifying Ms. TeachTwo as a positive referent and by alluding to her frequently in
informal conversations with staff, during staff meetings, and directly to me.

As the year progressed, though, Tony found himself relying less on Ms. TeachTwo and more on Mrs. TeachThree, as he assessed Mrs. TeachThree's steady, reliable and experienced influence in relation to Ms. TeachTwo's approach. Tony saw Mrs. TeachThree as one who had no qualms in telling him what to do in an effort to help solve specific school problems. As he told me, he relied upon her judgment more and more frequently, and felt he could talk to her about almost anything. Tony respected and valued Mrs. TeachThree's judgments, although whether it was because of her outgoing personality, because of her many years as a classroom teacher, because she was married to another senior administrator in the division whom he admired, because he eventually identified her as the informal staff leader, or because he respected and relied upon strong women to help guide him and he saw her as one from whom he needed approval, one does not know. At any rate, Tony had reassigned valency from Ms. TeachTwo to Mrs. TeachThree.

Tony's reliance structure appeared to include individuals internal to the school itself as well as individuals external to the school system. Within the school, Tony relied initially upon Ms. TeachTwo and then moved that allegiance over to Mrs. TeachThree as the school year progressed. He was also able to discuss administrative concerns with Ms. SecondPrinc, who was totally external to his system. It provided a means for Tony to carry out his administrative tasks with savoir-faire or aplomb and for him to appear seemingly independent of the need of internal advice from either Mrs. CDOE or other administrators within his own system. Again, Tony's actions appeared to be somewhat reliant upon his need for image management.
Knowledge of Task Environment

Starbuck and Milliken (1988) pointed out that in complex environments, effective perceptual filtering requires detailed knowledge of the task environment (p. 41). This filtering would have been either validated or invalidated when Tony acted on his environment. Weick (1979) pointed out that individuals "enact" their environments and that their beliefs and expectations define what they regard as relevant. Therefore, beliefs and expectations define the parts of task environments that draw the individual notice (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 50).

Tony told me that his graduate course work only involved one class in educational administration. Tony confined his sensemaking to the internal workings of his school and did not consider the Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course or the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation administrative subject councils to be venues to expedite his movement from outsider to insider. These decisions probably further limited his academic knowledge of the task at hand.

Tony chose to ignore the voluminous paper flow from Central Office as irrelevant until, as he said, a situation might occur wherein he would recognize the need for pertinent information to assist him in designing solutions. At that time, he hoped to delve into the pile of paper to retrieve whatever he found to be of relevance in his quest for solutions. Tony identified the plethora of papers as background stimuli in a sense, and chose to place specific paper stimuli in his foreground only when needed in particular situations. In my sensemaking, I saw Tony's placement of the paper stimuli in his background as perceptual filtering. If Tony had taken the time to read the contents of the
paper flow, perhaps the content of the stimuli would have provided another means to assist Tony in his induction movement from outsider to insider.

The efficacy of the principalship is characterized by orientation to task and by initiating structure within the organization. I perceived that it was more important for Tony to strive for acceptance as an internal member of the community through continued image management than through task performance. His career aspirations appeared to be contained within Town ABC itself, as he and his wife saw the town as a good environment in which to raise their three young daughters. Tony cast himself as an internal community member in many ways: he chose not to extend his professionalism by returning to summer school to further his administrative knowledge. Instead, he built a garage during his summer vacation, which outwardly bespoke of permanency and long-term commitment to the school and community. His charisma and overt images of building community, whether it was through a "Meet-the-Teachers Pot Luck Dinner" or the building of a garage in his back yard supported his drive to become an internal community member.

It appeared to me that Tony filtered perceptually by relying primarily on his emotions and feelings in terms of his interpersonal relationships, rather than to rely primarily on his cognitive or academic abilities within certain situations. In this respect, Tony emphasized his "people skills" and downplayed conceptual skills. His assessment of competence appeared to be through image rather than through cognitive abilities, through knowledge about and application of effective schools literature, or even through indicators of student achievement.
Tony's prime motivator and criterion of success was personal acceptance; he rationalized events to correspond with his image. The image Tony wanted to project was relations-oriented rather than task-oriented; he seldom initiated organizational structure. He attempted to exercise authority and management in subtle ways rather than to be overt in educational leadership. In order to build an image of charisma, Tony exuded consideration of others and maintained a friendly appearance. He wanted to be seen as "a normal guy" who was like everyone else; he wanted to be seen as an administrator who was young but mature. Tony was appreciative of the women in his life who were concerned about his well-being, whether it was his wife, Mrs. TeachThree, Ms. SecondPrinc. or Mrs. CDOE. He took pride in displaying his "feminine" side of administratorship, rather than to be identified with "the Old Boys' Club" network to which he perceived his director uncle belonged.

In summary, Tony and I used different lenses to view his movement from outsider to insider in terms of induction to the principalship. Tony was proactive in image-building through charisma and consideration of others rather than through professional autonomy and task-orientation. Task performance was rather passive and occurred primarily in reaction to his image-building. Image-building is dependent on the actions of others in reaction to one's actions. In typical hermeneutical fashion, then, the individual driven by persona probably is primarily an externally-driven being.

In my sensemaking, the difference between an individual who is persona-driven and one who is role-driven involves task-orientation being tied more specifically to an awareness of the professional literature and to a wide experiential base from which to
draw administrative actions rather than primarily from the actions of others within one’s environment [refer to Figure 5].
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**Figure 5: Pro-active and Reactive Induction Strategies of the Co-Researcher and Researcher**

I perceive myself to be proactive in role rather than in persona. To be role proactive for me is to initiate structure and to display expertise in order to ensure professional autonomy. Image-building occurs as a by-product of task performance. Adherence to task and initiating structure may be carried out with charisma, although consideration of others does not necessarily "drive" the motives of one who is role-oriented.

**Section Three: Reflections on the Research Process**

The purpose of this section is to reflect on my observations of the research methodology, the review of literature, and the research process in academia. First, I will comment on the use of sensemaking and phenomenological methodology in terms of triangulation on reflection; that is, on Tony as co-researcher and myself as researcher and participant observer. Second, I will comment upon the literature review and how it impacted upon this research. Third, I will reflect upon the rather traditional research
approach expected of a doctoral student within academia in conjunction with the
methodological approach of phenomenology.

The Methodology

The nature of the data within this research was viewed from two levels. On the
first level, the induction phenomena itself was experienced by Tony as a neophyte
principal, and by me as researcher and participant observer. Second, both Tony and I
attempted to report on the shared phenomena through our own sensemaking lenses.

First, the degree of centrality was a factor in Tony’s and my sensemaking of the
induction phenomena and of our independent reflections of the phenomena. If a
particular incident was an area of concern or an "outcropping that fascinate[d]"(Weick,
1995, p. 181) either of us, it received substantial attention; if it was not of concern, it
received relatively little or no sensemaking attention. The degree of centrality, then, is
key to sensemaking description.

A second factor in the research process was recognition of the necessity for
immediacy of reflection of the induction phenomena. Although initially enthusiastic
about the research, Tony found that after a long day at school, familial obligations and the
desire to be at home with his wife and young children over-rode my request for him to
reflect on events of the day. Although Tony insisted that he would "do better" by writing
his thoughts each night after the children went to bed rather than to reflect in an interview
setting, he kept "putting off" the reflection task. He eventually admitted that my research
priorities were not high on his priority scale, although he did feel a sense of obligation to
honour his commitment to the research.
As Tony’s immediate reflections were not available to me through personal interviews or through written notes, his reflections became somewhat artificial as time elapsed. Perhaps the later, forced reflection of the topical-guided questions through tape-recorded interviews also redefined Tony’s motivation to identify subsequent phenomena for sensemaking and the concomitant reflections, which in turn, affected the depth of sensemaking within the research.

In light of my experiences in attempting to procure Tony’s reflections of the phenomena, it became particularly obvious to me as a researcher that the quality of reflection drives the quality of analysis within sensemaking research. First, if the co-researcher has an understanding of the reflective process, it stands to reason that a substantial amount of time immediately following the event must be willingly set aside by the co-researcher (or, indeed, the researcher) in order to adequately reflect upon the experienced phenomena.

Second, the quality of this analysis was dependent upon the ability of the co-researcher to engage in complex sensemaking analysis. Tony’s ability to discern events was dependent on his personal sensitivity to particular situations, on his level of sophistication of academic knowledge of educational administration, and on his ability to profoundly reflect on the experienced phenomena. My own sensemaking was somewhat determined in light of Tony’s reflections. In effect, then, it also became obvious to me as researcher that the sagacity of the researcher’s sensemaking analysis is dependent upon the perspicacity of the co-researcher’s sensemaking descriptions.
Third, if a similar study involving sensemaking and phenomenology were to be undertaken, I recommend that the study be completed by one who has successfully attained the Ph.D. degree prior to undertaking this type of research. This was an extremely "risky" study for a graduate student to undertake, as successful completion of the study (and the subsequent recognition of a doctoral degree) was totally dependent upon the good will of my co-researcher, who could have decided to "pull out" of the study at any time, for any number of reasons. The research itself would have been placed in serious jeopardy as there would have been little recourse in an attempt to "redefine" a study such as this.

Fourth, as this was a study of sensemaking, it was extremely difficult for Tony (and for me) to make sense of the critical incident of induction within the parameters of the Code of Ethics of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation. Specifically, the Code of Ethics stipulates that if an educator is to make valid criticism of an associate, that criticism must be made only to appropriate officials, and even then, only after the associate has been informed of the nature of the criticism. If such a discussion does not occur and the associate objects to the criticism, that educator (or co-researcher or researcher) could be faced with ethical misconduct charges.

Thus, as a neophyte principal who was required to work with other professionals and to reflect upon his interactions with those individuals in a research capacity, Tony was hampered by the Code of Ethics to such an extent that he vetted significant amounts of material. Tony’s actions were an attempt to ensure that he responded in an ethical manner and, perhaps somewhat unknowingly, to maintain his own positive image management.
As a graduate student researcher, I also faced the possibility of ethical repercussions in my reflections of Tony and of his situation. In this particular instance, this study was based on the phenomenological research method with sensemaking at its core. In no way were the statements contained within this study meant to be defamatory towards any individual. Given this type of research, it might be prudent to suggest to other researchers that a pre-emptive statement should be made which indicates that the study was conducted to inform for purposes of academic research only.

Herein lies the conundrum: given these circumstances, is it truly possible, then, to undertake a research study with this type of methodology—to examine the sensemaking of a co-researcher in depth? I surmise that the answer is "no"; that one will always have difficulty in the research of sensemaking with high levels of honesty with a co-researcher simply because of possible ethical repercussions and because of the potential for image management. Perhaps a study such as this can only be undertaken in a reflective stance within oneself—and even then, one is subject to the possibility of placing oneself "in a good light", despite the best intentions to bracket such a prejudgment.

In summary, the degree of centrality is of importance in each individual’s sensemaking of the phenomena; immediacy of reflection is imperative for optimum reflective sagacity; and the quality of analysis is driven by depth of reflection. As well, this type of study is perhaps too risky to be undertaken as a graduate student in pursuit of degree designation, in terms of the possibility of co-researcher withdrawal from study and the possibility of ethical repercussions which might occur from the sensemaking.
The Review of Related Literature

This section will encompass my reflections regarding sensemaking literature and professional socialization literature in educational administration.

The Sensemaking Literature

The literature which spoke most clearly to me within the parameters of this study was that of Starbuck and Milliken (1988), as it identified perception and noticing within individual sensemaking rather than Weick's (1995) sensemaking in organizational structures. My research is strongly aligned with individual sensemaking in relation to socialization, but primarily in terms of the individual making sense of induction into the organization rather than that of the individual as a confirmed insider interacting with organizational others.

Tony appeared to operate from an internal locus of control with the prime induction motivator being image management. His was a rather symbiotic relationship with significant others in that the external locus of control was situated in his "reading" or perceptions of those others. Having read the situation, however, the internal locus of control dominated Tony's sensemaking through his respondent yet proactive use of image management through charisma. Tony was externally driven in that he constantly "read" what he believed significant others wanted or needed, but ultimately, he was internally driven in that he chose to promulgate a positive image in response to what he perceived the needs were in others, and in his attempt to control situations.

On yet another level, I sense that Tony's need to be charismatic stemmed from an apprehension of being identified or declared as unknowledgeable or ignorant in certain
situations, and from a desire to be accepted or liked by all. Tony's sensemaking was usually generated for the immediate face-to-face encounters rather than in consideration of the long-term search for possible end-results to specific situations.

Professional Socialization Literature in Educational Administration

The integrative socialization literature [refer to Appendix M] previewed prior to field research was bracketed in phenomenological fashion throughout this research. Essentially, this literature did not have any discernable impact on my sensemaking of the induction phenomena; that is, it did not influence the study, nor did it set the framework for the research.

It appeared to me that Tony's actions did not become manifest through role theory (Merton et al., 1957; Brim, 1966; Biddle & Thomas, 1986) in any overt way. He did not reflect upon his acquisition of appropriate norms, attitudes, self-images, values, or the role behaviours (Mortimer & Simmons, 1978, p. 429) which enabled him to be accepted into the Administrators' Group or to the occupation of "principal". Perhaps, in a way, Tony learned his tasks through reference group (Merton, 1957; Shibutani, 1955, 1961) observation, although the learning occurred through interaction with only a few select significant others.

Given the fact that Tony had relatively no administrative academic preparation or formal induction (Daresh & Playko, 1992, p. 18) experiences, and had but six years' teaching experience in one rural school, it is little wonder that he rather typically demonstrated a custodial response (Schein, 1971b) to the role. Although he exhibited difficulties with role clarification (Daresh, 1982; 1988, p. 85), Tony believed himself to
be somewhat "socialized" within the first few days of entering the position. On

September 14, 1998, at the beginning of his second year of the principalship, however,

Tony faxed me a transmission which stated,

I am busy, and most days I don’t feel like I am any more sure about how
to do things than I was this time last year! I do feel much more like a part
of the place than I did then, though. I guess experience comforts even if it
doesn’t teach!

Heck (1995) observed that there is a research need to understand the viewpoint of
the neophyte principal. This study addresses what I perceived to be a "gap" in the
literature; that is, the internal sensemaking of a neophyte principal in the induction phase
of socialization. With a view to understanding Tony’s own sensemaking, I am also
reminded of Leithwood and Musella’s (1991) observation that instructional leadership is
associated with greater formal education, knowledge gained on the job as vice-principal,
specific curriculum or policy-related knowledge, and open-mindedness (p. 323).

Specific induction activities external to the school system were available for Tony
to access throughout the school year and in the summer time, each of which might have
helped to ease his professional socialization movement from outsider to insider.
However, Tony felt overwhelmed with other commitments and chose not to participate in
any such induction activities. As well, he adjudged the plethora of paper provided by
Mrs. CDOE at the neophyte administrators’ induction meeting to be useful in reaction
rather than in proaction to events which arose throughout the school year.

Tony exemplified the novice principal difficulties as identified by Alvy and
Coladarci (1985, p. 46). In terms of Daresh and Playko’s (1992) Tridimensional
Conceptualization of Professional Development and the Three Major Phases of Career Development (p. 19), he acknowledged that he had only one educational administration class to his credit, although he did possess limited field-based learning in his previous experience as acting principal. Given his own sensemaking parameters, it was rather difficult, indeed, for Tony to be critically reflective of himself within the educational administration environment; that is, to experience personal and professional formation.

The literature calls for innovative induction experiences coupled with personal motivation (Crow & Glascock, 1995; Crow, Mecklowitz, & Weekes, 1992; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley, 1992; Ross, 1991; Weindling & Earley, 1990; Greenfield, 1985) for those in anticipatory set to the principalship as well as for neophyte administrators. For familial and other reasons, Tony drew time parameters around his commitment towards the principalship in such a manner that he was not able to exemplify the commitment to professional upgrading which would have perhaps eased his movement from administrative outsider to insider, and for him to experience personal and professional formation.

As I reflect on the literature, I am again reminded of both Tony’s and my personal situation. From a monetary perspective, there is very little incentive to entice newcomers to the profession of educational administration. Consideration must be given to undertaking a work load which will probably be divided among administration, classroom teaching, and extra-curricular (let alone leadership) activities for little financial gain in comparison to full-time classroom teacher duties. Add to this scenario the precariousness of an administrative position in comparison to the security of a teacher position within the union setting, the downturn in the farming economy and its
concomitant trend towards school closures and division amalgamations, and the difficulty of purchasing, selling, or renting a home in rural settings, the thought of moving to a rural administrative position is indeed a risky venture.

Even though the literature advocates participation in innovative induction activities (Leithwood et al., 1996; Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1992; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Calabrese, 1991) as a means of engendering instructional leadership within the school and division setting, in effect, there is very little financial support or release time allocated to personal professional development activities for aspiring or neophyte administrators by boards of education. While the literature exemplifies sound reasoning in its advocacy of induction practices, central office staff and boards of education are hamstrung in terms of being able to participate in, or to encourage formal induction activities, by the limited finances of provincial and federal politics. Even the call for attention to mentorship practises and models (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Buckner & Jones, 1990) is reliant upon the time constraints of very busy, often overworked, potential mentors.

Although there appears to be a general shift away from informal socialization practices and an increased commitment towards formal preparation programs and mandated preparation experiences (Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1992; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley, 1992), it also appears that those in academia continue to avoid Leithwood et al.’s (1996) challenge in terms of developing truly effective preparation programs which address the pragmatics of leadership. The University of Saskatchewan sponsors and delivers the Saskatchewan Principals’ Short Course, which is highly regarded throughout the province as an induction activity. Still, there is ample room for the
development of practical, field-based induction experiences in cooperation with school divisions across the province, as a strong credit component for both provincial universities.

Unless federal and provincial governments start to recognize education as a top priority within society, and they begin to redirect much needed monetary funds directly to school divisions so that neophyte administrators like Tony are given adequate release time to attend to pre-service and in-service professional development needs, and indeed, to recognize that professional development coupled with personal motivation is essential to instructional leadership, we will continue to experience the status quo.

In summary of this related literature section, I was able to immerse myself in a grounded sense of the induction context, although I deliberately bracketed the socialization literature for methodological research purposes. As I reflect on the tremendous amount of time required to compile a comprehensive overview of literature prior to onset of the research itself, I am reminded once again that the integrative socialization literature was indeed grounded theory and not particularly useful for the phenomenological and postmodern direction of this research.

The sensemaking literature which spoke most clearly to me was that of Starbuck and Milliken (1988), as it emphasized individual sensemaking rather than Weick’s (1995) emphasis on sensemaking within organizations.

The educational administration literature was useful in emphasizing the need for more innovative professional development activities, but one must consider personal motivation as integral to all professional development. As well, it is imperative for boards of education, universities, and indeed, for individual taxpayers, to be proactive in
demanding more than adequate funding for programs and in granting release time for educators so that true leadership activities might be learned and practised for the betterment of the education system and for society in general.

**Procedure in Academia**

As I reflect on this area of the research process, I am reminded once again of the difficulties encountered in undertaking this phenomenological study within the confines of the ethical requirements of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and of the more traditional research progression required by ethical protocol in academe.

First, as both Tony and I are members of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation, we are both bound by its Code of Ethics, even within the confines of this dissertation. This ethical consideration severely hampered the sensemaking that Tony felt comfortable in divulging within the phenomenological research context. As image management appears to be a prime motivator for Tony, it was difficult for him to approve anything in print which might even remotely be perceived as a negative connotation on his crafted outward image.

Thus, in Chapter V, Tony vetted a significant amount of material that he felt might negatively impact upon his image with significant others who might read the dissertation, or which might be misconstrued as unethical conduct by way of written sensemaking on his part. Although everyone in this dissertation with the exception of Tony and his own family members (by Tony's own choice) had been identified by pseudonym, Tony worried that significant others whom he had discussed in a negative light might later be able to identify themselves, might be upset with Tony's portrayal of
them, and might subsequently lay ethical misconduct charges against him. There is no
doubt that this ethical concern restricted the free-flow of information and sensemaking for
Tony as co-researcher, and secondarily for myself as researcher.

Second, research protocol within academe generally requires that written
permission to conduct the research be obtained *a priori* to immersing oneself as
researcher within the field context. *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*
(1998) is a tri-council policy statement on ethical conduct which evolved collaboratively
with the Medical Research Council of Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering
Council of Canada, and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
It is my belief, however, that this recently crafted policy statement fails to recognize
phenomenology as legitimate research which is outside *a priori* planning parameters.

Given the very nature of this phenomenological and postmodern study, it was next
to impossible for me to ascertain "where this study would go" prior to field entry even
though university protocol demanded that the obligatory Application for Approval of
Research Protocol [refer to Appendices I-1] be completed prior to onset of the field
experience. In typical hermeneutical fashion, the topic of this dissertation
metamorphosed in true phenomenological form rather significantly after I had immersed
myself in the research site.

I spent many months compiling an extensive socialization literature review prior
to field entry because of traditional proposal defense committee expectations. This
review was extensive because I had no foreknowledge of the specific research context
and so needed to include many aspects of socialization. The frustration was circular, as I
recognized that I needed to experience the research site prior to determination of the specific research topic—but in order to gain access to the research site, ethical requirements dictated that I have the research proposal pre-determined and pre-approved in its entirety prior to site entry.

In reflection of the difficulties I encountered in obtaining permission to complete this rather postmodern sensemaking study, I suggest that it is imperative for members of the professoriate and those within university protocol offices recognize that not all research must necessarily follow traditional lock-step research procedures prior to field entry.

Another concern for me in terms of procedure in academe is that the rigours of university ethics requires that the 908 pages of verbatim raw data be stored for five years following dissertation completion. In light of the highly sensitive nature of some of the comments recorded at various meetings, or indeed within Tony’s sensemaking (which was vetted within this dissertation but still remains open within the raw data), this stipulation places me in the uncomfortable dilemma of being in possession of sensitive audio tape and hard copy transcripts longer than immediate requirements necessitate. This study in sensemaking might open me to ethical repercussions if certain individuals were to identify themselves within the pseudonyms and subsequently take offense to my sensemaking of particular situations.

In summary, it is possible that the sensemaking which is recorded as written data for research purposes may be construed by others to be defamatory. In light of this concern, the sensemaking of research participants may be compromised in order to placate ethical considerations or the rather traditional processes of academe.
Section Four: Recommendations for Further Study

As I reflected upon the Literature Review of Chapter II and the Conduct of the Study of Chapter III, it became clear that the learning which took place as a result of Tony’s induction fell primarily within the perceptual filter of Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) research. This research emphasized individual sensemaking of one’s own circumstance rather than sensemaking with an emphasis on the organizational setting itself (Weick, 1995). It was my sense that Tony’s actions did not encompass a macro use of intersubjective, generic subjective, or extra-subjective meanings in his interactions with others.

In this respect, Weick’s (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations* was useful to me in its definition of the nature of sensemaking and of the seven properties of sensemaking, but was not particularly applicable to the research in its definition of sensemaking in organizations, of belief-driven or action-driven sensemaking processes. Starbuck and Milliken’s (1988) use of perceptual filters and what individuals notice and how they make sense was most useful in my own sensemaking attempts, as this study approached sensemaking from an individual learning perspective rather than an organizational learning perspective.

Although learning and socialization itself is continuous, one can see an end to the induction process (Hart, 1993, 1991). I perceive a literature gap at the point (if there is a literal point) whereby individual learning metamorphoses or transfers into organizational learning. The events of this research lead me to recommend further study on the question of whether or not anyone has an effect on the individual going through induction, or
whether induction is primarily controlled by the *individual* when he or she first enters the role. In this respect, it would be interesting to research whether or not induction involves ego-control rather than other-control of the environment. Perhaps the individual him/herself or herself actually organizes what events will be encompassed within the induction experience.

Induction involves individual acculturation to the task itself and to a whole group of individuals perhaps previously unknown to the newcomer. Perhaps there is a period of time individual learning must occur prior to the individual being able to address the interests of others. Perhaps when the neophyte senses induction completion and receives signals from others about his or her own successful individual induction, there is a possibility of more direct emphasis of the individual involved in sensemaking within an organizational (Weick, 1995) rather than individual setting.

In terms of a postmodern perspective wherein there are different realities and different frameworks, it would be intriguing to study sensemaking within individual learning and sensemaking within organizational learning and to determine the incongruencies between each type of learning situation. The whole concept of interaction with others while going through induction might be examined in terms of the newcomer being proactive in influencing others within the induction context as compared to being reactive and accepting of others might also be examined.

In this respect, it might also be of benefit for those interested in the movement from outsider to insider to undertake a study which considered the wisdom of establishing an internal reliance structure such as the school setting itself, and of establishing an
external reliance structure independent of the neophyte principal’s school system. This study might include the evolution of the reliance structure itself and the extent to which local context determines how that reliance structure is defined.

Senior administrators probably believe that the paperwork they distribute to neophyte administrators is in some way essential to the efficacy of the principalship. As a newcomer, however, Tony was overwhelmed by the deluge of paper he was required to absorb. A future study might examine the impact of such a paper flow on the beginning administrator, of how the administrator might more effectively deal with such a flow, and of making senior administrators more cognizant of immediate versus long-term needs of neophyte administrators when dealing with paper work.

I suggest that it would be interesting to delve into Weick’s (1995) Sensemaking in Organizations as a second phase of this research; that is, to do a follow up study of Tony in order to observe his movement from individual learning to sensemaking within the larger organizational structure. Concomitant with Tony’s sensemaking, the researcher could also continue to job shadow Tony, as was done in this research structure.

As another recommendation for further study, it would be intriguing to conduct similar phenomenologically informed studies within different contexts. For example, it might be possible to study a female neophyte principal, or a neophyte principal who does not have family commitments and obligations. Another research possibility might include studying a neophyte principal who moved into a school with a high percentage of Indian and Metis students, or a federally-operated Band School context, as the educational politics would perhaps be substantially different from a provincially-run
school or from a school with a rather homogeneous student population. Yet another research possibility would be to study a neophyte principal within private schools of specific religious affiliation, or within a Hutterian colony, or within a school of other racial mixes. Newcomers to each of these scenarios might display markedly different sensemaking because of different ethnic background or religious affiliation, rather than that which Tony and I experienced within the parameters of this study.

It would be interesting to study the extent to which the movement from outsider to insider is dependent upon the persona of the individual, or inherent to the context. If the context were different, Tony’s induction would have been markedly different from that which currently existed.

I also propose that might be intriguing to study a neophyte principal who had an educational administration academic background, as compared to one who had training in curriculum and instruction, as does Tony. The differences between my academic background and Tony’s probably played a significant part in how we each viewed induction within the educational administration context.

I also recommend that induction to the principalship might be different if one had vice-principalship experience prior to entering the principalship. As this study concludes, I have accepted the position of vice-principal of a rural high school. This position will afford me the opportunity to work with a principal in order to further my own anticipatory set to the principalship. I believe that the contacts I have made with others in similar circumstances has afforded me the opportunity to be more empathetic and sympathetic to Tony’s experience as well as to their experiences.
In addition to researching the sensemaking of those who aspire to or who attain principalship positions, parallel studies could be made in terms of the sensemaking which occurs in induction to the role of a Director of Education, or induction to the role of a school division board member. These positions are pivotal to the educational structure of this province; they also provide another level of career movement for principals or others who aspire to other administrative roles during their careers.

As well, this research provides others with an opportunity to review my phenomenological research strategies and methodology as I related the individual case study to sensemaking in a pragmatic manner.

**Section Five: Identification of Personal and Professional Outcomes**

In reflecting upon the Research Map of the Literature (p. 33), I was reminded that this research was intended to be a study of the "micro-organization"; that is, it was to be a self-study of the meaning system which was developed by each actor involved in his or her own induction to educational administration. What follows, then, is an identification of personal and professional outcomes which resulted from this research.

**Personal Outcomes**

As both the co-researcher and researcher were involved in sensemaking throughout this research, specific outcomes for both are addressed in this sub-section.

**The Co-Researcher**

In terms of personal outcomes, it is my hope that Tony found the study to be of personal benefit to him. Perhaps the interactive nature of this research provided Tony with the opportunity to become a more reflective practitioner (Schon, 1983) in his own
right. As Prawat (1991) observed:

[c]onversations with self about the validity of knowledge claims are
accompanied and perhaps set in motion by conversation with others.
Discourse or dialogue within the scholarly community is viewed as the
most important mechanism for treating knowledge claims. Knowledge
is a social product. (p. 742)

The topical-guided interview questions provided Tony with opportunities to reflect upon
his own actions as a neophyte principal. Perhaps the research also afforded Tony the
opportunity to hone his own socio-political insights through conversations with me as
researcher. I would hope, at the very least, that this research enhanced Tony’s inquiry
and reflection skills.

It is also my hope that Tony’s reflection on the data and the vetting of his own
words also afforded him the opportunity to consider new areas of research interest for his
own educational pursuits, if he were to eventually reactivate his graduate studies.

The Researcher

van Manen (1990) asserted that the aim of phenomenological research is to
attempt to explicate the meanings or experiences as we live them in our everyday
existence, our life world. Phenomenological research encourages us to explain and to
reflect on the experiences we have lived through (p. 11). As a researcher, I wanted to
enrich my own understanding of the principalship through observation of a neophyte
administrator in the process of induction.

This study was beneficial to me in many ways. The Board of Education and Mrs.
CDOE graciously allowed me to be present at any and all meetings, and Tony was very
open in his response to the topical-guided questions and in his reflections with me. I
would have had no understanding of local board meetings, division board meetings, the Saskatchewan School-Based Administrators’ Law Module, or of the politics of running a school and school division had it not been for the first-hand observations this research afforded me.

As well, this research afforded me the opportunity to enlarge my own circle of educational contacts and to dialogue with division administrators in situations not available to most classroom teachers who express a desire to become educational administrators.

This research was complex from the onset, as I had entered the field with a mindset to search for incidents which piqued my interest before anything else. Eventually, the research evolved to incorporate phenomenological methodology combined with sensemaking and elements of postmodernism. I read a plethora of articles and books and compiled what I considered to be relevant research literature. In gathering the data, I knew that I had to leave my biases behind and to venture into the unfamiliar, in terms of research methodology. I knew I needed to take on a more phenomenological perspective in terms of how I asked questions or stimulated discussions with Tony.

The lengthy bouts of rather tedious transcription of the verbatim raw data afforded me the opportunity to let my mind wander, as it were, away from technical research aspects and more towards the phenomenological approach. My sensemaking of the verbatim raw data and my direct observations of Tony heightened my understanding of the role of the principal considerably. My sensemaking of the transcribed data evolved through collegial discussion with Tony and with my advisor. As a result, I learned a great deal about the qualitative research process and about myself as a researcher. I also
believe this research afforded me the opportunity to develop a new appreciation for the value of the reflective process and its place in the professional development of educators.

I found that by dividing the sensemaking chapters of this dissertation into reflections from Tony and reflections from myself, it allowed me to more readily identify the researcher and participant observer lenses. At times, it was admittedly difficult to separate the lenses. Although Tony wrote his reflections in Chapter V, he had concerns about his original verbatim dialogue and decided to vet portions of it in order to maintain a certain image of himself with the reader. In this manner, it was easy to separate the bifurcated lenses, although it was not so easy at other times. In Chapter VI, I made sense of the research by moving back and forth as a participant observer and as a researcher.

I attempted to be critical of my own research procedure throughout the course of this study. I tried to ensure that Tony was given every latitude to tell his own story without bias from me as researcher. I wanted to gain as much detail as I could from Tony, so asked clarification questions while hoping that my prodding did not discourage Tony from discussing what he really believed to be most important, or that it disallowed an alternate perspective.

I struggled with my own sensemaking of Tony’s experiences in relationship to myself as participant observer. Occasionally my biases showed through, despite fastidious efforts to be unbiased in my sensemaking of Chapter VI. I wrote and rewrote each paragraph until I thought the essential meanings were extracted and accurately described. I knew that my phenomenological reduction was only one interpretation, and that others might have viewed the verbatim raw data from an entirely different perspective:
A phenomenological description is always one interpretation, and no single interpretation of human experience will ever exhaust the possibility of yet another complementary, or even potentially richer or deeper description. (van Manen, 1990, p. 31)

However, I reminded myself that this was most importantly a study in sensemaking for my own anticipatory set to the principalship, and that this was one of the most important facets of this research, over all.

**Professional Outcomes**

In observing Tony and in reflecting upon my own anticipatory set to the principalship, the primary professional outcome I noticed was that induction appears to be situationally defined; there is no one common reality (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 44). It is not a lock-step process as suggested in the literature (Schein, 1968, 1971; Feldman, 1976; and Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). "If we share anything, we share moments of conversation, activities, joint tasks, and actions, and then make sense of these by using even more idiosyncratic categories" (Weick, 1995, p. 188).

For me, the traditional literature did not yield or support the research explanations. My discourse came from the literature post-hoc rather than a priori. I found that understanding Tony in context gave me a better expletion than did rationalization of the traditional literature theory to the case. It was imperative for me to be immersed in and to learn the local context to best understand the induction experience through my own lenses. In this manner, the research truly became a self-study of my own meaning system.

As I stated at the commencement of this dissertation, at no point in time can I say that I know all there is to know about the organization, as other individuals continuously
impact upon my environment and I constantly change my perception of that environment as others impact upon me and I upon them. My observations of Tony and reflections on my own sensemaking reinforced that the environment itself is in a constant state of flux even as I adapt and evolve. The research context proved to be both hermeneutic and postmodern in its evolution, as anticipated. Tony’s gracious agreement to work as a co-researcher in this endeavour provided me the opportunity to study the sensemaking involved in his own induction at the same time it afforded me the opportunity to enrich my own understanding of my own anticipatory socialization to the principalship.

I started this research as a work experience of sorts, not knowing where it would lead me over the course of the year. At times, I was overwhelmed by the plethora of information I had gathered and by the multiple meanings I invoked from the data. Schon (1990) claimed that in order to make sense of complex situations and to arrive at a workable understanding of those situations, an individual must have "the time to look, the patience to ‘hear what the material has to say to you’, [and] the openness to ‘let it come to you’" (p. 62). The phenomenological method of research afforded me the opportunity to release my hold on certain beliefs and to embrace the uncertainty of the sensemaking. However, this research reaffirmed that induction is a highly individualistic process, dependent upon the personalities involved in the situation.

Section Six: Future Directions and Goals of the Researcher

The illustrative question for me as a researcher was, "what is the induction experience of one neophyte administrator?" so that I might effectively ease my own transition from classroom teacher to in-school administrator, should the occasion present
itself in my career aspirations. As such, I needed to discern the meaning and significance that the phenomenon of induction to the principalship had for me personally.

The significance of this lived research experience is that it has afforded me the opportunity to affirm my intention to become an educational administrator. I am already somewhat past the mid-point of my career in education; however, my career aspirations continue in terms of a desire to experience at least one senior educational administration position before retirement from the profession. In order for me to engender the respect of in-school administrators and to interact most effectively with them as a senior administrator, though, I believe it is imperative to gain experiential background as an in-school administrator myself.

Induction into one administrative position does not prevent anticipatory socialization into another position. My position as vice-principal obviously affords me yet another opportunity to experience anticipatory set to the principalship. I am reminded yet again of the words of my dissertation advisor: "You are a perfectionist! You have a fear of failure! You want to do your principalship before the principalship!" I am hopeful that this administrative experience will be successful for me in that it will enable me to continue to move from outsider to insider within the spectrum of educational administration career possibilities.

As a researcher, I hope my future directions continue to encompass the field of sensemaking. This includes my intent to publish segments of this dissertation within the academic community and to continue to learn from others in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of my own movement from outsider to insider within the
educational organization. Over time, I might perhaps become interested in attaining a position within the professoriate, but only after I have had experience as an in-school administrator.

Section Seven: The Essence of the Study and Its Inspiration

Husserl (1964, 1970) used the term *essence* to refer to structures of experience. In phenomenological research, one must to be able to distinguish aspects of an experience which are invariant or essential. Sensemaking is interpretive. Whether the perceiver was Tony narrating his own story, or whether it was me as researcher re-capturing Tony’s story within the framework of my own lived life, we made sense of the appearances of things as they presented themselves to our own individual consciousness. Phenomenologists believe that for individuals, multiple ways of interpreting experiences are available to each of us through interacting with others, and that it is meaning which constitutes reality (Greene, 1978). It is my hope that this dissertation provided a means for others to gain an enhanced understanding of what it must have been like to experience induction from our lenses.

This research was enriched by the inclusion of Tony’s sensemaking and his sometimes very private conversations along with my continual presence alongside one principal over an extended period of time. Certainly this research amplified my own understanding of what it means to be a neophyte administrator who experienced induction, and it allowed me to become more sensitive to others involved in induction experiences. I hope that Directors of Education and school division board members who hire neophyte administrators might also become more responsive to their newcomers as a result of
reading this study. This study provides information for others who also wish to pursue
careers in educational administration. Most importantly, the process of engaging in the
research was helpful in enhancing my own self-reflective skills as I compared Tony’s
responses to my own experiences and how I might have handled the same situations.

In my sensemaking, the essence of this research is that the individual plays the
pivotal role his or her own induction movement from outsider to insider. Successful or
unsuccessful induction might be dependent upon the individual’s ability to analyze the
situation. The neophyte administrator must personally assess his or her own strengths
and weaknesses of character and assess the local context in order to determine what
opportunities and threats exist within the induction forum. Upon assessing the situation,
the neophyte is then in a position to best determine what actions are necessary to make
the movement from outsider to insider actually occur. The fact that some individuals are
more successful in that movement than others might be an indicator of how well those
individuals are able to assess themselves in terms of interaction with the local context.

The phenomenological research method coupled with sensemaking provided
Tony and me the means to describe "the outcroppings and ideas that fascinate[d] (Weick,
1995, p. 191) each of us. It has been an exceptional research opportunity in providing the
forum to describe "the realm that comes into being at the intersection of consciousness
and the world – human experience" (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 58).
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APPENDIX A
Outline Summary of the Phenomenological Method

Processes

_Epocche_

Setting aside prejudgments
Opening the research interview with an unbiased, receptive presence

Phenomenological Reduction
Bracketing the Topic or Question

_Horizonalization_
Every statement has equal value

_Delimited Horizons or Meanings_
Horizons that stand out as invariant qualities of the experience

_Invariant Qualities and Themes_
Non-repetitive, non-overlapping constituents clustered into themes

_Individual Textural Descriptions_
An integration, descriptively, of the invariant textural constituents and themes of each research participant

_Composite Textural Description_
An integration of all of the individual textural descriptions into a group or universal textural description

Imaginative Variation

_Vary Possible Meanings_

_Vary Perspectives of the Phenomenon_
From different vantage points, such as opposite meanings and various roles

_Free Fantasy Variations_
Consider freely the possible structural qualities or dynamics that evoke the textural qualities

_Construct a list of structural qualities of the experience_

_Develop Structural Themes_
Cluster the structural qualities into themes

_Employ Universal Structures as Themes_
Time, space, relationship to self, to others; bodily concerns, causal or intentional structures

_Individual Structural Descriptions_
For each co-researcher, integrate the structural qualities and themes into an individual structural description

_Composite Structural Description_
An integration of all the individual structural descriptions into a group or universal structural description of the experience
Synthesis of Composite Textural and Composite Structural Description
Intuitively-reflectively integrate the composite textural and composite structural descriptions to develop a synthesis of the meanings and essences of the phenomenon or experience

Methodology
Preparing to Collect Data
1. Formulate the question: Define terms of question
2. Conduct literature review and determine original nature of study
3. Develop criteria for selecting participants
   Establish contract, obtain informed consent, insure confidentiality, agree to place and time commitments, and obtain permission to record and publish
4. Develop instructions and guiding questions or topics needed for the phenomenological research interview

Collecting Data
1. Engage in the *Epochen* process as a way of creating an atmosphere and rapport for conducting the interview
2. Bracket the question
3. Conduct the qualitative research interview to obtain descriptions of the experience. Consider:
   a. Informal interviewing
   b. Open-ended questions
   c. Topical-guided interview

Organizing, Analyzing, and Synthesizing Data
Follow modified van Kaam method or Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method
Develop individual textural and structural descriptions; composite textural and composite structural descriptions, and a synthesis of textural and structural meanings and essences of the experience

Summary, Implications, and Outcomes
Summarize entire study
Relate study findings to and differentiate from findings of literature review
Relate study to possible future research and develop an outline for a future study
Relate study to personal outcomes
Relate study to professional outcomes
Relate study to social meanings and relevance
Offer closing comments: Researcher's future direction and goals

(Moustakas, 1994, p. 182)
APPENDIX B

Topical-Guided Interview Questions

1. What dimensions, incidents, and people intimately connected with the experience stand out for you?

2. How did the experience affect you? What changes do you associate with the experience?

3. How did the experience affect significant others in your life?

4. What feelings were generated by the experience?

5. What thoughts stood out for you?

6. What bodily changes or states were you aware of at the time?

7. Have you shared all that is significant with reference to the experience?

(Moustakas, 1994, p. 116)
APPENDIX C

Modification of the Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen Method of Analysis of Phenomenological Data

1. Using a phenomenological approach, obtain a full description of your own experience of the phenomenon.

2. From the verbatim transcript of your experience complete the following steps:
   a. Consider each statement with respect to significance for description of the experience
   b. Record all relevant statements
   c. List each non-repetitive, non-overlapping statement. These are the invariant horizons or meaning units of the experience.
   d. Relate and cluster the invariant meaning units into themes.
   e. Synthesize the invariant meaning units and themes into a description of the textures of the experience. Include verbatim examples.
   f. Reflect on your own textural description. Through imaginative variation, construct a description of the structures of your experience.
   g. Construct a textural-structural description of the meanings and essences of your experience.

3. From the verbatim transcript of the experience of each of the other co-researchers, complete the above steps, a through g.

4. From the individual textural-structural descriptions of all co-researchers' experiences, construct a composite textural-structural description of the meanings and essences of the experience, integrating all individual textural-structural descriptions into a universal description of the experience representing the group as a whole.

(Moustakas, 1994, p. 122)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Researcher and Co-Researcher - Initial On-Site Meeting</td>
<td>August 19, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>New Principals' Induction Meeting</td>
<td>August 20, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Administrators’ Group Meeting</td>
<td>August 21, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Staff Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Improvement Leadership Planning Meeting</td>
<td>August 26, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Staff Improvement Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Division-Wide In-Service Day</td>
<td>August 27, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Advisor Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Education Informal Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Third Day of Classes</td>
<td>September 3, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 10 Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Regional Consultants Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Representative Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Child and Youth Counsellor Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-Librarian - Update of Library System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neophyte Teacher - Status Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents of One Student - Status Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Meetings of the Day</td>
<td>September 8, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Observations of After-School Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invitation to Family Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Trustees’ Board Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Administrator/Secretary Computer In-Service</td>
<td>September 12, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>SRC Treasurers’ Meeting with Professional Accountant</td>
<td>September 16, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Meetings of the Day</td>
<td>September 17, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Director of Education and Select Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet the Teachers Pot Luck Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>New Principals' Meeting - School Start-up and Supervision</td>
<td>September 18, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Administrators’ Group Meeting</td>
<td>September 26, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Principal-Parent Meeting</td>
<td>September 29, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Third Staff Meeting</td>
<td>October 6, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Administrators’ SSBA Professional Development Program</td>
<td>October 16, 17, 18, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teacher-Principal Professional Development Interview</td>
<td>October 21, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Administrators’ Group Meeting</td>
<td>October 23, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Meetings of the Day</td>
<td>November 12, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Board of Trustees’ Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial Government Discussion Paper - Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Division Amalgamation - Planning Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 13, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Informal Socialization Activity</td>
<td>December 21, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Topical-Guided Interview</td>
<td>April 13, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Topical-Guided Interview</td>
<td>May 17, 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
Personal Prejudgments of the Researcher

In accordance with the process of *Epocche*, the following list provides an awareness of my own prejudgments, prejudices, viewpoints, or assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation. I believe:

1. The human relations role is the most important role for an administrator to play in entering a new situation such as the principalship. The process of leading involves attempting to influence the behaviour of others to do things differently, whereas the process of administering involves a maintenance element. Initially, a new principal would do well to pursue the situation and to develop a solid working relationship with everyone (the maintenance element), so that later, instructional leadership goals can be carried out most effectively (the leadership element).

2. The neophyte principal is usually involved in first-order rather than second-order change. The newcomer tends to be involved with student discipline concerns and school routine issues and acts in a reactive rather than proactive manner.

3. The neophyte principal is more concerned about how others judge his or her role performance rather than being concerned about internal comparisons of performance.

4. The neophyte principal should have a set of administrative philosophical beliefs which should made known to staff and which can be translated into a working model so that those involved within the school setting can function most effectively within that system.

5. In Sergiovanni’s (1991) Paradigm of the Scruffies; that is, that the principalship is a science of the practical rather than a paradigm of the Neats or Mystics (p. 6). This paradigm stems from theories of practice which provide principals with practical as well as theoretical mindscapes from which to work.

6. The neophyte principal should display craft knowledge (Blumberg, 1989) gained from a combination of practical educational experience and of theoretical knowledge attained through the study of educational administration. Knowledge of relevant techniques and competent application of tried-and-true procedures, combined with the concept of a reflective practitioner (Schon, 1983) are critical for the neophyte principal.
7. It is more difficult for capable women to attain high-level administrative positions than it is for capable men. Men tend to have stronger, more highly-developed network systems to rely upon than do women; consequently, unless a woman has strong male mentors connected to "the old boys' club" who are willing to mentor her in the job-search, attainment of that first principalship position is difficult to acquire.

8. The neophyte principal operates under conditions of ambiguity relative to his or her relationships with other administrators and central office staff. Drawing from role theory (Biddle & Thomas, 1986), I believe there are four causes of stress for the neophyte principal: role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, and a sense of powerlessness (Kottkamp & Travlos, 1986) at various times in the first administrative year.

9. The position of the neophyte principal involves relative isolation. There is a feeling of separateness from the rest of the staff because of the authority (or lack of it) invested in the role. This feeling involves Weick's (1976) concept of loosely-coupled systems (p. 3) whereby other individuals or departments are loosely coupled to the principal's office but each maintain separate identity.

10. The neophyte principal's energies are initially turned inward towards the running of the school, rather than outward to the larger world surrounding the environment of the school. As the principal becomes more comfortable with the in-school environment, his or her energies expand to encompass the wider community on a regular basis.

11. The role of the principal should involve being a "people person" over being a "paper person". In other words, it is important to interact with people throughout the course of the working day, and to save the paper work for quiet hours after the people needs have been met.

12. It is important to be proactive and to structure the role of the principal to one's own beliefs, and then to the school situation, and to the expectations that others hold for that administrator. Above all else, it is important to be true to one's own beliefs.
APPENDIX F-1
Letter of Introduction
to the Director of Education
and Members of the Board of Education

July 28, 1997

Mrs. DOE, Director of Education
and Members of the Board of Education
ABC School Division No. ###
Box ###
ABC, Saskatchewan
LNL NLN

Dear Mrs. DOE and Members of the Board:

I am writing to request your consent to conduct research for a doctoral dissertation with one principal, Mr. Anthony A1, in your school division. My proposed dissertation topic is: Socialization Sketches of a Neophyte Rural Principal: A Narrative Case Study.

The research model I intend to use is a qualitative case study through which I seek comprehensive depictions or descriptions of the neophyte principal's experiences. Through Mr. A1's participation, I hope to understand the essence of socialization processes as they reveal themselves through his experience. He will be asked to recall and to reflect upon specific episodes, situations or events that he and his family have experienced during his principalship. I am seeking vivid, accurate, and comprehensive portrayals of what these experiences were like for him: his thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, and the meanings he would attach to situations, events, places, and people connected with his experiences. I anticipate that the study will also involve your reflections upon his socialization process into the school division context.

As researcher, I would appreciate your consent to spend substantial time on site within the school division community, personally in contact with all activities, meetings, and operations in which Mr. A1 would be involved.

I value the unique contribution that Mr. A1, along with you and others involved in his socialization process, can make to my study. Based on our initial conversation in this regard, I have taken the liberty of contacting Mr. A1 through letter, requesting his participation in my research project. His participation would be voluntary; the procedures for this study will be approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Saskatchewan. If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at 665-3038 or through e-mail at goriusp@duke.usask.ca. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Murray Scharf (966-7612), for further clarification or information.

I would appreciate your permission to conduct this research during the months of August to December 1997. Thank you for consideration of this request; I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gorius
Ph.D. Candidate
APPENDIX F-2
Letter of Introduction
to the Neophyte Principal

July 30, 1997

Mr. A. A1, Principal
ABC School Division No. ##
Box ###
ABC, Saskatchewan
LNL NLN

Dear Mr. A1:

Earlier this summer, I contacted your Director of Education, Mrs. CDOE, with regard to the possibility of conducting research for my doctoral dissertation on the socialization experiences of a principal new to the school division. Without hesitation, Mrs. CDOE enthusiastically recommended that I contact you directly, as she believes you to be the perfect candidate for my research study. It is with this initial contact that I now am writing to request your consent to conduct research with you, as you undertake your principalship within the ABC School Division.

Because of your qualifications, you are unique in possessing the requirements necessary for my research. I would be very grateful if you would agree to be the subject of my study. Your participation would be voluntary; the procedures for this study will be approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Saskatchewan. I also believe this research will have benefits for you as a beginning administrator. You would be able to converse with me as researcher, about administrative occurrences within your purview, and other avenues of support would be available to you in terms of effective school leadership through the Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit and the University of Saskatchewan.

The research model I intend to use is a qualitative case study through which I will solicit comprehensive depictions or descriptions of your experience as a neophyte, rural principal. Through your participation, I hope to understand the essence of socialization processes as they reveal themselves through your experience. I will ask you to recall and to reflect upon specific episodes, situations or events that you and your family experience during the principalship. I am looking for vivid, accurate, and comprehensive portrayals of what these experiences are like for you: your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours and the meanings you would attach to the socialization actions and activities. My role would be to accompany you through all meetings, situations, and events as a principal; that I would view your perceptions of situations, places, and people connected with your experiences. I also anticipate that Mrs. CDOE’s reflections upon your socialization process into the school division context would form part of the data.
As researcher, I would appreciate your consent to spend substantial time on site within the school division community with you, personally in contact with all activities, meetings, and operations in which you would be involved. Mrs. CDOE strongly believes you to be a bright, reflective practitioner who would be able to contribute substantially to research within the Saskatchewan context. It is with her recommendation that I ask your permission to conduct this research during the months of August to December, 1997.

If you have any questions regarding this research thesis, please contact me at 665-3038 or through e-mail at goriusp@duke.usask.ca. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Murray Scharf (966-7612), for further clarification or information. I hope you will favourably consider my request, and I look forward to your immediate response.

Sincerely,

P. Gorius
Patricia Gorius
Ph.D. Candidate
20 August 1997

Dear Mrs. Gorius:

I am writing to respond to your letter about conducting research with me as I begin my duties as principal at ABC High School.

I would be delighted to participate in any way that you feel would benefit your study. I am comfortable with the idea of you being in the school as I work, and will be happy to discuss my experiences with you at times that are mutually convenient. If it is helpful for your research, I would also be comfortable if you felt that you wanted to record my experiences on audio cassettes or videotape. The only concern that I have is that our discussions fall within the parameters of my ethical obligations as a teacher. My wife, Sandra, would also be willing to participate in any way that might be helpful for your research.

I believe that the Board of Education will have to approve your plans prior to the beginning of your study. In anticipation of their approval, I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Anthony D. (Tony) Al
Neophyte Principal, ABC High School
Appendix F-4
Permission Letter
from the Director of Education

August 25, 1997

Patricia Gorius
1101 - 405 - 5th Avenue North
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7K 6Z3

Dear Patricia,

The Board of Education of the ABC School Division No. ## at their regular meeting held Tuesday, August 19, 1997 passed a motion approving your research project in the ABC School Division.

We wish you all the very best in your work in our school division.

Sincerely,

[signed]

Mrs. CDOE
Director of Education

cc: Tony A1
File

Note: This is a re-keyed copy of the received Permission Letter.
APPENDIX G
Confirmation Letter to the Co-Researcher

September, 1997

Mr. A. A1, Principal
ABC School Division No. ##
Box ###
ABC, Saskatchewan
LNL NLN

Dear Tony:

Thank you for your interest in my dissertation research on socialization to the principalship. I value the unique contribution that you can make to my study and am excited about the possibility of your participation in it. The purpose of this letter is to reiterate some of the items we have already discussed and to secure your signature on the participation-release form you will find attached.

The research model I intend to use is a qualitative one through which I am seeking comprehensive depictions or descriptions of your experience. In this way, I hope to illuminate my question of how you developed a meaning system which enables you to function within the educational organization.

Through your participation as co-researcher, I hope to understand the essence of the induction phase of socialization as it reveals itself in your experience. I will collect raw data of meetings or other situations in which you find yourself, through use of a cassette tape recorder and written field notes. You will be asked to recall these specific episodes, situations, or events. I am seeking vivid, accurate, and comprehensive portrayals of what these experiences were like for you: your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, as well as situations, events, places, and people connected with your experience.

I value your participation and thank you for the commitment of time, energy, and effort. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (306) 665-3038.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gorius
APPENDIX H
Information and Consent Form
for the Co-Researcher

Proposed Dissertation Title
- Socialization Sketches of a Neophyte Rural Principal: A Narrative Case Study

Initial Purposes of the Study
- to understand the essence of socialization as revealed through your beginning principalship experiences
- to recall and to reflect upon specific episodes, situations or events that you and your family have experienced through your socialization to the principalship
- to obtain vivid, accurate, and comprehensive portrayals of what these experiences were like for you: your thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, and the meanings you attach to situations, events, places, and people connected with your experiences.

On-Site Research Process
- I would appreciate meeting with you prior to, and after, each day's activities so that I may record your immediate impressions of the events of the day. Unstructured interviews will be used to dialogue about your reflections; they will revolve around regularly scheduled or impromptu release time from your regular administrative responsibilities, at your convenience.
- After I have transcribed the tape recorded raw data, the verbatim transcripts will be presented to you for verification prior to your formal analysis of the transcripts. Upon data verification, you will be requested to reflect upon the verbatim transcripts in order to make sense of your experiences within those contexts. In addition to the unstructured interview format, a set of written interview questions will be used to assist you in reflecting upon the verbatim transcripts of each event. It is at this point that you may wish to reflect through face-to-face dialogue with me or through your own written, narrative; depending upon your own time commitments and preferences. Your reflections will be recorded within one specific chapter of this dissertation.
- After incorporating your responses within that one chapter, I will return the chapter to you and would ask that you review it in its entirety as a means of validating your own responses. After reviewing your own analysis, you may recognize that an important experience(s) was neglected. You would be free to add comments which would further elaborate your experience(s), or if you prefer, we could arrange to meet again and to tape record your additions, deletions, or corrections. You would not be asked to edit for grammatical corrections, as the manner in which you make sense of your own reflections is critical to this research.
On-Site Data Collection

- Interviews and meetings will be tape recorded and transcribed verbatim; field notes will be taken as back-up to the mechanical tape recordings. Transcriptions will be made available to you for verification prior to proceeding with further analysis.
- The amount of time spent on initial data collection at the research site will be made in context of the research itself. As a researcher, I hope to be sensitive to the data saturation point. There are two ways this point could be acknowledged:
  - First, you could signal to me whenever you believe there is little else for me to learn, from your viewpoint. This might occur when you see yourself in a position of becoming familiar with a particular meeting process, or when you find the meeting content becoming repetitious, with little new learning taking place.
  - Second, through my sensemaking of the critical incident of the induction phase of socialization, I may also adduce what I believe to be the point of diminishing data collection returns.
- This research is also limited by my own time-bound restrictions. These internal restrictions will serve to structure the informal interviews and to impose written interview questions for use in your subsequent sensemaking of the verbatim transcripts.
- There may be special circumstances in the course of your job whereby you would prefer to talk privately to an individual, or where confidentiality would be breached by my presence and it would be inappropriate for me to record or to observe that event. The expectation is that you would inform me of such a circumstance; your request would be immediately respected and I would withdraw from the situation.

On-Site Researcher Involvement

- to "job shadow" you in any school-oriented activities you might be involved in, as a neophyte principal. Examples of such involvements include all in-school and professional development activities as well as trustee, administrative, and community meetings
- to informally dialogue with you about your reflections on events of the day
- to interview you about your sensemaking of the events which transpired as per the verbatim transcripts
Co-Researcher Anticipated Involvement

- Participation
  - You may terminate your participation in this research at any time
  - The research will not be used in any evaluative capacity for you
  - Confidentiality and anonymity are assured unless you choose to be recognized for your contribution to this research

- Time commitments
  - in structured and unstructured interviews on-site immediately following the day’s activities
  - in verification of verbatim transcripts of the raw data
  - to reflect upon, and to make sense of, your experiences
  - to record your reflections in a concrete format, possibly through face-to-face interviews using a tape recorder, or in written narrative form
  - to verify your own responses as recorded in the draft chapter

- Benefits
  - provides the opportunity to consciously improve upon your current reflective practitioner skills
  - provides the opportunity to dialogue with a non-evaluative outsider regarding events of the day
  - provides the opportunity to use portions of this research to further your own research interests at some later point in time
  - provides insight into your own growth as a neophyte educational administrator

Your participation in this research is critical. I would like to ensure that you are entirely comfortable with the research process. To ensure this comfort, I ask that you read and sign the attached Co-Researcher Consent Form as an indicator of your comfort with the research process. Please feel free to ask questions and to contact me at any time about your concerns.

Patricia Gorius, Researcher
Co-Researcher Consent Form

I agree to participate in a research study of socialization to the principalship, having received prior approval from the Board of Education and the Director of Education to participate in such a study. I understand the purpose and nature of this study and am participating voluntarily.

I grant permission for the data to be used in the process of completing a Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration, including a dissertation and any future journal publications, books, and/or conference presentations.

I understand that a synopsis of myself will be used and will include the following information: first name, marital status, number of children, factors which led to my involvement in the study, and any other pertinent information which will help the reader to come to know me. I know that in retaining my own name and those of my immediate family, I willingly assume the risk of being identified in the dissertation and in any future publications.

I grant permission for the above personal information to be used in the dissertation itself as well as in any future journal publications, books, and/or conference presentations. I know that in all other respects, confidentiality and anonymity are assured unless I choose to be recognized for my contribution to this research.

I agree to be interviewed, and grant permission to have field notes taken and tape recordings made of my experiences at meetings and in other situations related to my role as principal. I know that the researcher’s advisor, Dr. Murray Scharf, will safeguard and securely store all data at the University of Saskatchewan for a minimum of five years as per University requirements.

I know that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time and that if I do so choose, my withdrawal will not adversely affect my position within the school division or access to any services within the University of Saskatchewan. Furthermore, if I decide to withdraw from the study, any data I have provided will be deleted from the study and will be destroyed.

I know that I may contact Patricia Gorius as researcher (1-306-695-2785), the researcher’s advisor Dr. Murray Scharf (1-306-966-7612) and/or the Office of Research Services (1-306-966-4053) if I wish to further clarify my rights as a research subject.

As Co-Researcher of this dissertation, I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this Co-Researcher Consent Form for my own records. I know that I will receive a copy of the dissertation upon its completion.

[Signature]
Co-Researcher

[Signature] Patricia Gorius, Researcher / Date
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University of Saskatchewan
Advisory Committee on Ethics in Behavioral Sciences Research

Application for Approval of Research Protocol

ORS USE ONLY
File Number ________________
Date Received ________________

Research Title
A Phenomenological, Postmodern Study of a Neophyte Principal During the Induction Phase of Socialization: A Researcher’s Reflections

Submitted By
Dr. Murray Scharf

Department
Educational Administration, College of Education

Student
Patricia Gorius, #849963

Program
Ph.D. in Educational Administration

Abstract

The purpose of this naturalistic case study with postmodern elements is designed to develop and extend knowledge of administrative behaviour through phenomenological descriptions of the sensemaking that a neophyte principal within a rural context will experience during his induction to the organization. Simultaneously, through anticipatory set to the principalship, the principal’s experience will become part of the researcher’s own induction experience. The research will be guided by the following questions:

1. What dimensions, incidents, and people intimately connected with the experience stand out for you?
2. How did the experience affect you? What changes do you associate with the experience?
3. How did the experience affect significant others in your life?
4. What feelings were generated by the experience?
5. What thoughts stood out for you?
6. What bodily changes or states were you aware of at the time?
7. Have you shared all that is significant with reference to the experience?
**Academic Validity**

The following were primary considerations which gave significance to this study:

1. This study has the potential to contribute to the socialization literature through the phenomenological research lens. This study uses phenomenological research methodology to observe, collect, organize, analyze, and synthesize data of the sensemaking undertaken by one principal directly involved in the early encounter phase of induction. As such, the study may fill the gap between "other"-directed and participant-centered or phenomenological socialization views.

2. At the professional level, this study has the potential to advance the literature through specificity to the study of educational administration.

3. At the micro or personal level as an educational practitioner in the classroom, as a researcher, I would be provided with the opportunity to learn first-hand about hitherto unaccessible facets of the principalship; it would provide valuable insight into the role to which I aspire.

4. At the theoretical level, this study has the potential to advance the relatively new sensemaking literature through individual case study as well as through a specific profession.

**Funding**

No additional funding is being provided for this research.

**Subject**

One principal in a rural context will be involved in this study. Selection criteria suggests that the subject be:

1. A neophyte administrator
2. Situated in a rural context
3. Employed in a K-12 or 7-12 school
4. Have at least 50 percent administration time
5. Be articulate and displaying a reflective practitioner stance
6. Whose immediate family would be directly impacted by his/her socialization to the principalship

Permission to contact and to work with the subject will be obtained from:

1. The Director of Education of the school division
2. The Board of Education of that school division
Permission to work with the subject will be obtained from the principal himself/herself, after obtaining permission from the Director of Education and the Board of Education. The selected principal will be contacted by the researcher and informed of the nature of the study. The researcher will request voluntary participation in the study by the principal.

**Procedures**

The researcher will utilize a qualitative method of inquiry for this study, specifically phenomenological in nature and involving the researcher as participant-observer at various meetings with the principal and those with whom the principal associates in the course of his regular administrative duties. Interviews and meetings will be audio-taped with accompanying field notes, both of which will be transcribed for analysis purposes. In the event of meetings involving the principal and his interaction with other individuals, the researcher will ask permission to tape record the meeting(s) from all participants. The interviews will follow a set of pre-determined topical-guided interview questions as indicated above. The data collected will provide an in-depth understanding of the induction of a neophyte principal in a rural context.

**Consent Forms**

Refer to attached forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Letter of Introduction to the Director of Education and Members of the Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>Letter of Introduction to the Neophyte Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Information and Consent Form for the Co-Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Co-Researcher Sign-Off Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Comments**

**Risk or Deception**

The co-researcher wishes to retain his actual name and those of his immediate family members rather than to use aliases. As the co-researcher wants his name included, he knows his assumption of risk in that he may be identified. The co-researcher chose to vet the verbatim raw data included in text in collaboration with his employer, his spouse, and the researcher. There are no other known risks resulting from participation in this study.
Confidentiality

See Appendix H - Information and Consent Form for the Co-Researcher and Appendix K - Co-Researcher Sign-Off Form. Confidentiality and anonymity will be ensured through the use of pseudonyms in reference to those with whom the neophyte principal socializes with, to the school division, and geographic site in this study.

Feedback and Debriefing

The subject will have the opportunity to review transcripts of the audiotapes and of his own phenomenological reflections as obtained from the interviews and from the unobtrusive participant-observation measures. Member checks and subject debriefing are built into the methodology of the study, all of which will establish credibility and ensure that the obtained data is available for use in the final document. Upon completion of the dissertation, a copy will be made available to the principal.

Signatures

Dr. Murray Scharf, Advisor

Dr. Patrick Renihan, Department Head

Patricia Gorius, Student Researcher and Participant
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UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON ETHICS IN BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

NAME: M. Scharf (P. Gorius)  BSC #: 1999-47
Department of Educational Administration

DATE: April 13, 1999

The University Advisory Committee on Ethics in Behavioural Science Research has reviewed
the Application for Ethics Approval for your study "A Phenomenological and Postmodern Study
of a Neophyte Principal During the Induction Phase of Socialization: A Researcher's
Reflections" (99-47).

1. Your study has been APPROVED.

2. Any significant changes to your proposed study should be reported to the Chair for
Committee consideration in advance of its implementation.

3. The term of this approval is for 3 years.

4. I wish you a successful and informative study.

[Signature]
Daryl Lindsay, Chair
University Advisory Committee
on Ethics in Behavioural Science Research
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APPENDIX I-3
Co-Researcher Letter Regarding Vetting Concerns

ABC High School
Box ###
ABC, SK
### ###
Phone: (306) ####### Fax: (306)########

School Motto

October 29, 1998

Mrs. Patricia Gorius
Indian Head High School
Indian Head, Saskatchewan
SOG 2KO

Dear Mrs. Gorius:

I am writing to this letter as an accompaniment to the final revisions I have made to Chapter IV of your dissertation. I know you will be in a hurry tonight when you pick it up, so here is what I have done:

1. I have used a green marker to indicate areas that I do not wish to have included in the published version of the dissertation.
2. I have checked the top right corner of pages that I am comfortable with at this time.
3. On page 185, I have made a suggestion for a different pseudonym for Mrs. EfficientPrinc. If you decide that the one you have chosen is better, that is fine with me.

As I explained on the telephone, I am uncomfortable with the tone and content of the statements that I have highlighted. While the statements are accurately recorded, I believe that they lose much of their real intent without their non-verbal component. Because of this, I am concerned that they could be misconstrued if read without further explanation of the context in which they were said.

I hope that this additional editing does not take away from your dissertation in any way. As I have said before, I would be happy to assist with the presentation of my experiences in any other way you deem to be appropriate. Thank you for your patience; please let me know if I can help in any way.

Respectfully,

Tony
Principal, ABC High School

cc: Mrs. CDOE, Director of Education
APPENDIX J-1
Thank You Letter to the Co-Researcher

Fall, 1998

Mr. A. [Surname], Principal
ABC School Division Number ##
Box ###
[Town], Saskatchewan
[postal code]

Dear Tony:

Thank you for meeting with me this past year and for sharing your experiences as a neophyte principal during the induction phase of socialization to the principalship. Your willingness to share your unique and personal thoughts, feelings, events, and situations, and a part of your working life with me has been tremendously appreciated.

Throughout the study, you received transcribed copies of the verbatim transcripts (the raw data) of all meetings and interviews and reviewed each document in detail prior to responding through your sensemaking of those experiences. Subsequently, you submitted your analysis of the sensemaking you made from the verbatim transcripts. I have enclosed a copy of the transcript of your own sensemaking of the verbatim transcripts and have entitled it Chapter IV: Data Analysis of the Co-Researcher of my dissertation. I would appreciate it if you would review this entire document. After reviewing your own analysis, you may realize that an important experience(s) was neglected. Please feel free to add comments which would further elaborate your experience(s), or if you prefer, we can arrange to meet again and to tape record your additions or corrections. Please do not edit for grammatical corrections, as the manner in which you tell your story is critical to this research.

After you have reviewed this Chapter IV and have had an opportunity to make changes or additions to your reflections or analysis of the verbatim transcripts, please return the transcript of Chapter IV in the stamped, addressed envelope.

I have greatly valued your participation in this research study; indeed, it could not have happened at all without your enthusiastic participation. I appreciate your willingness to share your experience with me. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to telephone me. I wish you well, with continued success in your administrative career.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gorius
Enclosure: Transcript of Analysis
APPENDIX J-2
Thank You Letter to the Director of Education
and the Board of Education

Summer, 1999

Mrs. CDOE, Director of Education
and Members of the Board of Education
ABC School Division ##
Box ###
ABC, Saskatchewan
LNL NLN

Dear Mrs. CDOE and Members of the Board:

Thank you for granting me permission to work with Tony as a co-researcher in my
dissertation research over the past years. Your approval that I initially be allowed to
approach Tony in order to request his participation in this research was appreciated. His
subsequent decision to become involved in this research was based on your initial support
of this project.

I also thank you for allowing me to tape record meetings and other sessions in which you
were involved with Tony, throughout the course of this research. The verbatim
transcripts have been used by Tony and myself in order to assist each of us in recalling
specific episodes, situations, or events that Tony experienced during the induction phase
of his socialization to the principalship within your school division. Following final
dissertation defence, all cassette tapes and verbatim transcripts will be sealed, stored, and
placed in the care of Dr. Murray Scharf for a period of five years, according to University
protocol requirements. At the end of that time, all hard copies of verbatim transcripts will
be destroyed; all tapes and disks erased or destroyed.

Upon final approval of the dissertation, Tony will receive a copy of the dissertation for
his personal professional literature collection. As an outsider to your school division, I
have been very appreciative of the warm and welcoming atmosphere displayed by all
staff, students, central office staff, and yourselves towards me. Again, thank you for
allowing me to work with Tony; it has been a pleasure and a tremendous learning
experience for me, and I hope, for Tony.

Sincerely,

P. Gorius
Patricia Gorius
APPENDIX K
Co-Researcher Sign-Off Form

I have read the chapters of this dissertation which make use of the information contained in the verbatim transcriptions of meetings which I attended in my role as neophyte principal in the induction phase of socialization to the principalship. I confirm the accuracy and interpretation of this research. As co-researcher of this study, I hereby permit Patricia Gorius to present this information in the format outlined within these dissertation chapters.

[Signature]

Co-Researcher Signature

14 September 1998

Date
APPENDIX L

Examples of Verbatim Transcripts

The following verbatim transcript excerpts provide examples of forms of dialogue and meetings which took place during the course of the research. The first example is of the one-to-one dialogue which initially transpired between co-researcher and researcher.

INTRODUCTORY MEETING

ABC High School
Tony A, Principal
Patricia Gorius, Researcher

Tuesday, August 19, 1997 - 8:30 a.m.

[Researcher Notes] Walked into ABC High School and found Tony working in his office; no one else in school. I introduced myself. Tony welcomed me and said he didn't know what else to do, so he was attempting to sort the mail on the floor of his office, placing mail in the form of small stacks for each teacher.

We walked over to the Board Office, a block away from the school, and met Mrs. DOE, Director of Education, at 8:50 a.m. The Board of Education division meeting was scheduled to commence at 9:00 a.m.; TB seemed unaware of this meeting time. Mrs. CDOE welcomed Tony, and appeared to be pleasantly surprised to see me walk in with Tony. She immediately told me that my letter to her, requesting permission to work with Tony, was on the Board Meeting agenda. She stated that she anticipated no problems in the Board granting approval for the research; that approval would be dependent upon Tony’s willingness to be involved in the research. Tony indicated to Mrs. CDOE that he thought the research would be of benefit to him in many ways; that he was delighted to be involved in such a project.

Mrs. CDOE introduced me to secretaries Mrs. B and Mrs. G, to secretary-treasurer Mr. J, and to curriculum consultant Ms. S. Mrs. CDOE then invited us into her office and said that she only had a few moments to spend with us, as the board meeting was expected to start on time, at 9 a.m. She turned her attention to Tony, and asked him what his concerns were. Tony quickly outlined three questions:

1. How much time would he be given for secretarial services for the school secretary, Mrs. C?
   - 5.5 hours each day, for 200 days in total
2. Could he get a bulletin board put up in his office?
   - fill out a request form and send it in to the board office
3. Was Mrs. CDOE aware of my request to study him as a neophyte principal?
   - cross purposes; now all are aware; pending board approval; no problems anticipated

Mrs. CDOE asked him how the physical move was coming along, and if he had settled into his house alright. He said it was disconcerting mostly for their four-year old daughter Nicole--moving out of Town DEF and down to San Diego and back up to Town DEF and over to the grandparents and back to Town DEF and now to Town ABC. He confided to Mrs. CDOE that she was the second to know (having told me during our initial telephone conversation yesterday) that they were expecting their third child in January. Smiles and congratulations all around; then it was time for Mrs. CDOE to go into the Board Meeting.
On our way out of the office, Mrs. CDOE introduced me to a female division board member. Tony talked briefly with the secretaries and thanked secretary G for lending her hedge trimmers to Tony for the day. Tony found out where his mailbox was; we collected the mail.

Tony introduced me to the division computer consultant, Mr. T. Mr. T teaches half-time and consults within the division for the other half-time. He is scheduled to be in a different school in the division, every afternoon. He is currently setting up a network system with Pentium 133s across all schools.

At the board office parking lot, Tony introduced me to his school board member, a young woman with family the same age as Tony's children. Tony confided to me that he hoped they would get to know each other, and that their children could become friends. Another female board member got out of her car and Tony introduced us. They were both curious as to why I was with Tony; the first member asked if I would be making a presentation to the Board. I indicated that Mrs. CDOE would present my letter to them during the day's meeting.

As we walked back to the school Tony waved at all passing cars. I asked him if he knew any of the people he was waving at, and he said, "No. I just think it's important to have a friendly appearance!"

When we got back to Tony's office, he indicated that he was more than willing to take as much time as I needed to discuss the study. We needed to get to know a little bit about each other, so Tony told me about his move into town, and then he asked me a few questions about the research. He indicated that he was quite happy to have me contact a professor at the U of S, whom he has worked with on the STF English Subject Council for a number of years, for character reference. I indicated that it wouldn't be necessary; I was most interested in Tony's impressions. Tony photocopied his letter of introduction to Mrs. CDOE and his resume for my files, without my asking for same. He appears quite eager to participate. I asked his permission to tape record any and all meetings with him; he hesitantly and graciously gave such permission.

[first segment of tape fuzzy, muffled]

Tony  OK. Um, I was going to ask if you would have any use um, or if it would be helpful if I, ah, gave you some names of people who could give you some background on me from their perspective . . . or it's more me and my perspective, eh?
PG  Maybe later. It's you. We're interested in you.
Tony  OK.
PG  But we may move it later into that, if we feel the need. Right now, we are looking at you.
Tony  All right.
PG  Can we just look at few things, before we get too far along. and we forget or I forget?
Tony  Sure.
PG  Let's look at . . .
Tony  OK. Do you want to start there, or do you want to start with the whole application, and the job thing? Does that fit? Or . . .
PG  We're going to do all of that, but maybe . . .
Tony  OK. Two days of the staff, first.

PG  No, whatever you want is fine with me. We are going to have to go back over all of that. The only thing, at this point, is that it has not passed the Ethics Committee at this stage. I don't see this being a problem.

Tony  No. You wouldn't think there would be, because I should be the only one affected.
PG  I just want you to be aware that I don't have formal clearance from the Ethics Committee right now.
Tony  Right.
I'm just thinking in terms of how to collect all the data, and especially your thoughts on the first few days. Your arrival here.

The things that have happened.

Yes. And whatever reasoning you may have on these happenings.

Um, I came... the day of my interview I came to the school and Mrs. AprioriPrice, who was the old principal, showed me around. Um, and I don't know if the other people who were interviewed did that as well, but uh, Mrs. CDOE suggested that I could and I was kind of interested in seeing the school. So... and there were two teachers that I met that day in the library--Mrs. TeachFour and Mr. TeachEleven--and um, I just looked around the school and saw the library, looked at the computer lab, talked with Mrs. AprioriPrice a little bit about um, about the school. [Note: Tony commented that the former principal did not talk about the actual interview]... Um, I don't think there were very many specifics that day. I remember, um, ah, I remember thinking that I... I remember thinking that I had seen people at my old school coming in because they were having interviews, and I remember thinking, "gee, I want to ask good questions here because ah, here I am, in the school, and you know, I might even get this job, and so I need..." One of the things I said that Mrs. AprioriPrice disagreed with... I said something about computers in the lab, and something to do with, really, they were used mostly in the school ah, for word processing, and she disagreed quite vehemently with me, so [Tony laughed]... so I went, "oh, brother, now she's going to go and tell everybody that ah, --I had this one clod in who said that ah..." Um, Mr. TeachEleven and ah,... I think he was a first-year teacher last year... very young guy, and very, very young looking... um, and Mrs. TeachFour is the um, is the um, at least I think she's the oldest teacher on staff, and I think she's forty-two... and they were together and um, I can't even remember what they were doing, but Mrs. TeachFour said since, and one of the other times I was here that, um, that it must have been a terrible first impression, because they were horseing around, or whatever, and really, it was--you know--it was very nice. [telephone rings. Tony struggles to answer in office, runs to outer office to answer].

Good morning. ABC High School... Hello?... [hangs up]... Have to figure out the phones! [While we were talking, the phone rang twice. Tony jumped up, trying to answer it from the outer office. He said he couldn't answer it from his own office; couldn't figure out the phone system at the secretary's desk. It obviously is an intricate switchboard system. I followed him: tape recorder was left running in Tony's office. Tony was frustrated because he couldn't pick up and connect the call at all. He lost two callers while we spoke: there appear to be no manuals around. Tony also said that he had to find the janitor in the hall the other day and looked at the intercom system in dismay, not knowing how to track the individual down via the PA system. Tony frustrated.]

Yeah.

I'm sure that I've cut off thirty people. [phone rings again; Tony runs to outer office to answer]... Good morning. ABC High School... Yes... That is at Division Office... Yeah. Something about those numbers, anyway!... Ah, I'm not sure... Patricia?

Yes?

Do you remember what the computer consultant's last name was? Since you met him at Division Office?

No.

Something long and difficult...

Yes. Sorry.

[Speaking to caller]... Oh, he's the only "[name]" there. If you could just ask for "[name]" I think they could get him... OK... Goodbye... [speaking to PG]... ah, S** or something like that.
The following verbatim transcript excerpt is a second example of the dialogue which occurred at one division office meeting between Tony, Mrs. CDOE, and Mortimer, the other administrator new to the school division.

**NEW PRINCIPALS' MEETING**

**Wednesday, August 20, 1997 - 10:00 a.m.**

Board Office
ABC School Division No. ##
Mrs. DOE, Director

Present Director Mrs. CDOE, Central Office Person CO1, New Principal as Administrator A2, New Principal Tony as Administrator A1, and Researcher Patricia Gorius as PG...
Mrs. CDOE introduced or described the following individuals to the group present:
- CO1 - Curriculum Coordinator; Shared Services with SD#3 and SD#4.
  Shared Services works out of SD#5:
  - SS1 - Educational Psychologist
  - SS2 - Speech Language Pathologist - Tony's contact
  - SS3 - Child and Youth Consultant
  - SS4 - Tony's contact for Child and Youth Consultant
  - SS5 - Transition-To-Work Facilitator
  - SE1 - Special Education Coordinator; replacing SE2
  - CO2 - Secretary-Treasurer of school division
  - CO3 - Computer Consultant
  - A2 - New Principal in school division. Previous experience.

Mrs. CDOE asked PG to give a brief overview of the dissertation topic. *[The discussion did not come through properly on tape, so in summary, the following points were made]* . . . I'm in the process of learning about social context . . . the socialization of the new principal in terms of the new job, the new community. A limitation to the study may be the forced reflection that it affords Tony. It is a study of the “firsts” Tony will experience as he becomes socialized into his administrative position . . . the meanings Tony will assign to his own situations and circumstances . . . the phenomenological approach. In many ways, Tony’s lived socialization/induction experience will also be an anticipatory socialization process in educational administration for the researcher.

CDOE . . . and I’ll give you one, too, Patricia. *[Mrs. CDOE distributes meeting agenda]*
PG Thank you.
CDOE Now, I wanted to do that . . . I tend to be a really an early riser and come really early in the morning and you can reach me here, usually before school, unless I’m going to a school. Because I live in *city*, I sometimes will go to DEF first and see A2. The Board doesn’t pay mileage for me from SD#4. They pay from here. There are just certain times . . . where JKL is closer to SD#4, actually, than to ABC. So sometimes I will just stay in JKL for the day. Now, [secretary] always knows where I am, even if I, for example, there may be a day when I choose to work at home if I’m writing grants or something, and don’t even bother to come to the office. It’s very seldom. I don’t think it ever happened last year; but it may happen—she always knows where I am, and the principals are always free to phone me—the teachers, too—but just call me at home . . . you know, if you have to call from the school or call from home . . . just call me collect and there’ll be no problem. And everybody does it. Everybody knows that it’s all right, so just call me there. Again, they always know where I am, so if you ever need to get hold of me there, if you ever want to discuss anything. Um, something also to really . . . is the trust . . . Like, if I’m not here, like holidays or something, then CO2 is designated to look after those and he usually refers to the Regional Director. Now, I tell you that just because we don’t have an assistant director, so . . .

Tony Right.
CDOE If, for some reason . . . and the board has been designated, and CO2 will look after it after that. . . . Now, the other phone number you can use is the trustee, because they can, you know . . . just discussing it with the trustee is always a good idea because they are the guys that are questioned on the street about it—just let me know that you’ve discussed it with them and this is what we decided . . . *[voice muffled]* . . .

Tony Are there two trustees for ABC? Three . . . and so . . . *[female trustee #1]* . . .
CDOE  male trustee #1 . . .
Tony  male trustee #1 and female trustee #2.
CDOE  female trustee #2 is in town . . . because of the communities. You have [town], [town].
Tony  Right.
CDOE  And female trustee #1 is [town]. Female trustee #2 is ABC.
Tony  OK. But they are all sort of the ABC sub-division.

CDOE  Yes. Now they are reviewing the number of trustees for the election, so it may be that they decide to go lower, which may . . . I would say, probably . . . my guess is, they won't . . . until, you know, they look at amalgamation down the road and that sort of thing . . . well, they couldn't do it, actually, before the election at this time, so that's why . . . probably not . . . they are "on the books" . . . [Mrs. CDOE chuckles]. . . . Now, I need to order cards for both of you, and so I just used mine . . . our mission is on the back, if you want your school mission stated on the back, feel free to put that on the back . . . but if you would, just make the correction. You may also want to put your e-mail address . . . and I'm ordering one for the others . . . the special ed consultant, so . . . I'll just pass it around . . . make the corrections . . . if you have an e-mail address that you want on there . . . you may not have your e-mail address yet, because CO3 is just . . .
Tony  Yeah.

CDOE  Sure! Just take it. That would be great. Yeah . . . Now, in your binder . . . and Patricia, I'm very sorry I took care of these before . . . now, in your binder, you will notice that there is an agenda dealing with the orientation. What the purpose of the first meeting is, is to give the information that I think may help you to better understand the division from the point of view of an administrator. Now, it's my personal belief that an administrator is the key person in the school who really affects the tone . . . and I want you to know this because this is my own . . . where I'm coming from, and where I think the Board would echo this. Um, the principal is the key player in the school and sets the tone for the school in curriculum, in what happens in special ed . . . that doesn't mean you do everything, but it certainly means that you are a leader. And I know that our teachers feel that way. That they want people to play a leadership role, and certainly to be in setting the tone of the school, consulting with the staff and you know, working with the staff to develop the best possible program. We really have an excellent staff. And most of you, I think, will be very happy with the people in your school and, you know, we really . . . I think the other big thing is that it has to be a team effort all the way around, so . . . this is my own personal feeling . . . so, today . . . what I'll present to you . . . and I think we'll probably be finished by noon and hopefully have the opportunity to go out for lunch . . . [Mrs. CDOE laughs] . . .
Yesterday, all the board wanted to go out to [new restaurant] . . . [Mrs. CDOE laughs] . . . but yeah, A2 is very gracious . . . well, I mean, if somebody is buying their lunch, they don't complain! [Mrs. CDOE laughs] . . . Go wherever! [Mrs. CDOE laughs] . . . OK . . . So. We'll try to give you a little bit of information that I don't have to give to the other principals at this time that may be helpful, that you may have questions about.

[at this point, Mrs. CDOE gestures towards a tall stack of loose papers for Tony and A2. Mrs. CDOE apologized for not duplicating a similar stack of papers for PG.] The papers included the following, among others:

. . . Overview to Region, Principal's Evaluation, Shared Services, Division and School programs and rules, Budget, Administrative Calendar, Program Planning in the School, [Staff Professional Development] Initiative, New Teacher Orientation, Principal Supervision, Critical Plan, Division Office documents, Urgent Items for today and tomorrow, School Division Protocol, Fall Priority Review, Regular Meetings, Mailbox information, Agenda for today's meeting, ABC School Division beliefs and mission statement, Region Three information, Duties of Principal, Staff Lists.

CDOE So what I am going to do is just a little bit of an overview of the region, which A2 will be familiar with, but Tony, you may not.

Tony OK.

CDOE Principal evaluation . . . that process. How that occurs in the division. Shared services because of where it's at. Something the new teacher will want to know about. You have a new resource teacher, so again, that person will not be familiar . . .

Tony Right.
APPENDIX M
Integrative Socialization Literature Review

As this research is postmodern in its perspective, the literature which was reviewed prior to writing the dissertation did not directly influence my study, nor did it set out the framework for the dissertation. The literature which was reviewed prior to research onset, however, elevated my own knowledge level and subsequently intrinsically enriched my own sensemaking for the research. This Appendix provides the background to my sensemaking, but in true phenomenological methodological fashion, this review was bracketed for research purposes.

The first section of this integrative literature review will chronologically review the concept of socialization as it has metamorphosed from early writers’ definitions of socialization within sociological, psychological, and anthropological fields of study; to an understanding of socialization as it relates to the individual; to consideration of the socialization of the individual within an organizational context; and to transitional and transformational socialization literature, including various modes of socialization.

The first perspective of socialization as a field of study and as a concept will include various descriptions of the terms socialization, acculturation and enculturation, induction, and organizational and professional socialization. Socialization will then be placed within sociological, psychological, and anthropological parameters before viewing the socialization process as either predictable or fluid and emergent through an overview of various socialization theoretical perspectives.
The second perspective, that of *individual socialization*, will examine early socialization literature in terms of van Gennep's (1925/1960) anthropological socialization and Brim’s (1966) developmental socialization. Expectancy theories (Vroom, 1964; Lawler, 1973) link anthropological and developmental socialization to adult socialization and organizational socialization. Organizational socialization will be linked to professional socialization through detailed attention to Schein’s (1968) work.

The third perspective will introduce *organizational socialization*. Linkages between the individual and the organizational setting will be viewed from organizational boundaries and passages, and through organizational structure itself. Individual initiation into organizational role through specific commitment activities will be examined. Particular attention will be devoted to the theories of Schein (1968, 1971), Van Maanen and Schein (1979) and Feldman (1976) because of their strong contribution to organizational research literature.

The fourth perspective will examine *socialization transitions and transformations*; that is, the phases and contingencies an individual may move through in the course of a career. Various types of socialization practices will be addressed, as will developmental theory, organizational typology, disjunctive processes, the influence of groups, and various factors such as the task involved, the individual, technology, remuneration, turnover, and so on. Earlier transformation researchers include Brim (1966), Berlew and Hall (1966), Schein (1964, 1968), and Van Maanen (1976), among others. More recent transition researchers include Louis (1980b, 1982), Brett (1980, 1982, 1984), Jones (1983), and Nicholson (1984).
Socialization as a Field of Study and as a Concept

Socialization most often designates a general area of interest rather than a definitive, definable process. Socialization literature encompasses child and adulthood, life stages and life-span development, mid-life crisis, and aging as well as traditional research on the family, occupations, and education (Mortimer & Simmons, 1978, p. 421). In its broadest form, socialization "refers to the sum total of past experiences an individual has had which, in turn, may be expected to play some role in shaping [his] future social behaviour" (Inkeles, 1969, p. 615).

Socialization also has been defined with a focus on behaviour (Child, 1954, p. 655), with emphasis on the individual learning component (Elkin, 1960, p. 4), and identifies the range of what is acceptable (Aberle, 1961, p. 387). It "entails a continuing interaction between the individual and those who seek to influence him" (Clausen, 1968, p. 3).

Socialization denotes a break in the smooth flow of daily events and represents interruptive transitions or breakpoints (Van Maanen, 1977) or changes which thrust an individual from knowing to not knowing, from certainty to uncertainty, or from the familiar to the unfamiliar (Katz, 1980, p. 107). Katz (1980, p. 107) theorized that transitions into the socialization period represent Lewin's (1951) notion of unfreezing, where the individual is primed for change.

*Induction* is the "systematic organizational effort to assist personnel to adjust readily and effectively to new assignments so that they can contribute maximally to work of the system while realizing personnel and position satisfaction" (Castetter, 1996, p. 182). It is the process of offering possible positions or orientations towards the
organization and work, preferring some over others, for the new member to adopt or
discard (Linestad, 1985, p. 3).

Organizational socialization occurs when a novice member learns the norms,
value system, social skills, and required behaviour patterns of the society, organization, or
group which the individual enters in order to become role incumbents—to assume an
organizational role (Schein, 1968b, p. 2; Cistone, 1977, p. 19; Van Maanen & Schein,
1979, p. 211). Values, attitudes, and behaviours which do not fit the organization must
be relinquished and replaced by those which encourage communication, cooperation, and

Occupational socialization is "the inculcation of occupational values and skills
which may generalize across organizational settings in which the occupation may be
practised" (Fisher, 1986, p. 102). Professional socialization is characterized by decisions
made through general principles, theories, or propositions (Schein, 1968b); such
decisions imply specific knowledge by the individual as expert in certain areas rather than
as generalist (p. 11).

Socialization has been defined as a life-long process, as individuals initiate and
reciprocate social action upon each other in a hermeneutical fashion and so are
continuously exposed to new socialization situations. While one can attribute a particular
meaning to socialization in one context, it assumes different meaning within other
contexts. Socialization is iterative in that we are never fully "socialized": there is always
someone or something "new" to experience, a new boundary to be crossed. Induction,
however, is an early segment of socialization which has a finite time frame and which
optimally could be completed by the newcomer as early as four months into an

Early definitions of socialization have been placed within sociological,
psychological, and anthropological parameters. From a sociological aspect, Clausen’s
(1968) research was concerned with social interaction in terms of self-other patterns, as
well as in the significance of social roles, role recruitment, and role training for the
understanding of behaviour (p. 48). Brim and Wheeler’s (1966) research contributed
mainly to the realm of adolescent and adult socialization.

Psychological socialization studies were closely linked to specific theoretical
premises and focussed on specific segments of socialization influence such as parent-
child relationships, language learning, and socialization techniques within the school
setting (Clausen, 1968, p. 51).

Anthropological socialization research tended to include the study of the effect of
particular cultural emphases and institutional constellations on the process of
socialization and personality development, the documentation of the wide range of
alternate emphases in modes of socialization, and the study of the interrelationships
between cultural change and significant personality features (Clausen, 1968, p. 22).

In summary, socialization is a two-fold process to be viewed from the vantage of
the individual as well as the group. Individual socialization is seen as a process of
learning to participate in social life; whereas within the group structure, socialization is
the mechanism through which new members learn the values, knowledge, beliefs, norms.
and interpersonal skills which facilitate role performance and further group goals.
Distinctions are made on the basis of content to be learned, the context in which learning occurs, and responses of the newcomers (Mortimer & Simmons, 1978, p. 422).

**The Individual**

The first perspective of this Appendix of integrative literature viewed socialization as a *field of study and concept*. The second integrative literature perspective involves socialization of *the individual* and examines *anthropological* and *developmental* socialization, with *expectancy theory* (Vroom, 1964; Lawler, 1973) providing the link to *adult* and *intra-organizational* socialization.

**Anthropological Socialization**

Modern-day induction theory has its roots in van Gennep’s (1925/1960) anthropological studies and classification of rites, which premised that an individual’s life involves a series of passages from one age to another and from one occupation to another (p. 3). and that there is a period of time when one must stop, wait, go through a transitional period, enter, and then be incorporated (p. 28). His studies facilitated Brim’s (1966) conceptualization of personality, which postulated that most of what is learned from childhood socialization and through later life is a series of complex interpersonal relationships.

**Developmental Socialization**

While anthropological socialization focussed on the individual progressing through a series of passages or rites in life, developmental socialization focussed on the individual in relationship with others and how the individual’s values and motivation affect socialization. Socialization processes involve the individual learning behaviour
appropriate to the group position, through interaction with others who hold normative beliefs about what the individual’s role should be, and who reward or punish the individual for correct or incorrect actions (Brim, 1966, p. 9). Socialization content changes as individuals progress through different life-cycle stages and social institutions. The most important change is the shift from a concern with values and motives to a concern with overt behaviour (p. 25).

Goffman (1959) recognized that little attention is generally paid to the newcomer’s underlying motivation or general value structure when entering the organization and that an individual’s efforts to ascend rather than descend the organizational ladder involves maintenance of a "front" (p. 36). A critical period for the newcomer is during the first year, when the individual is most ready to develop or change in terms of organizational expectations. Never so readily will the newcomer experience Lewin’s (1951) model of attitude change in terms of unfreezing (Berlew & Hall, 1966, p. 223).

In summary, Brim’s (1966) concepts of personal change address underlying socialization processes but do not identify explicit characteristics of socialization, nor are his "self-other" systems empirically verifiable. Expectancy theory provides the link between socialization setting characteristics and consequences for the individuals involved. **Expectancy Theory**

Expectancy theory adds the mechanism by which individuals become motivated to perform specific role tasks (Van Maanen, 1976); it emphasizes people’s beliefs about what will occur while taking into account what has already occurred; it is an explanation of role-specific behaviour. The theory provides the link between anthropological and
developmental socialization to that of adult and organizational socialization (p. 74).

Expectancy theories espoused by Vroom (1964) and Lawler (1973) postulated that "an individual is motivated to perform a particular role to the point where the individual visualizes himself or herself capable of performing the role, and to the extent that the individual perceives the role performance leading to favourable outcomes" (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 73). Adult socialization consists of the individual recognizing what behaviours are necessary in a given situation and then turning oneself into that type of individual in order to be successful (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 74).

**Adult Socialization**

In adult socialization, most individuals embark upon a job or career in order to function within society. Merton, Reader and Kendall (1957) viewed the concept of career from the perspective of organizational entrance in terms of the interrelatedness of the different perspectives of the individual, the occupational group, and the society (p. 58).

Initially, career movement through the organization was thought of in terms of newcomers entering the organization into positions of least prestige and as they gained in age, skill, and experience, they moved up through the organizational ranks, although few actually reached top administrative positions. However, Becker and Strauss (1956) noted that any position may be filled from the outside, that individuals may be "frozen" at a specific level, or that career flow may not only be upward, but also downward or sideways (p. 254).

Becker (1960, 1964) and his associates (1956a, 1956b) viewed adult socialization from the structuralist position in that the settings in which socialization occurs actually
define the nature of the outcomes. *Situational adjustment* is the process whereby individuals take on the characteristics required by the situations in which they participate (1964, p. 41). *Side bets* were Becker’s (1960. p. 35) way of defining socialization settings which require the recruit to invest in *counters* such as time, money, or public commitment which initially are external to decisions to participate, but eventually become tied to the newcomer’s continued organizational participation (1964, p. 50). Socialization process success depends upon the importance and size of side bets made by the individual (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 75).

Schein (1971a, p. 409) contended that individuals construct social selves which allow them to fulfill various role expectations. Changes which occur in an individual as a result of adult socialization are changes in the nature of the individual’s social self, although extensive change in one’s basic character is unlikely (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 74).

**Intra-Organizational Socialization**

This subsection looks at ways the individual experiences socialization within the *organization*. Positive adult socialization is dependent in part upon successful organizational and professional socialization. *Socialization* processes include new learning acquisition through organizational literature, managerial/peer example and instructions, orientation sessions, and a system of organizational rewards and punishments. The most potent sources of socialization are through senior member instructions and guidelines (Schein, 1968b, p. 7). *Organizational* socialization processes include "learning the ropes", being indoctrinated and trained, being taught what is organizationally important. "The process is so ubiquitous and we go through it so often
during our total career, that it is all too easy to overlook it. Yet it is a process which can make or break a career, and which can make or break organizational systems of manpower planning" (Schein, 1968b, p. 2).

In summary, although anthropological and developmental socialization provide the base lines for expectancy theory’s theoretical link to adult socialization practices and have applicability to this research, it is the individual’s experience of the work world in organizational socialization which is of the most direct impact. The individual may use organizational socialization to fulfill his or her needs, whereas senior administration may optimally use newcomers and others to fulfill organizational needs. These divergent issues involve the developmental perspective, because both the needs of the organization and those of its members change over time and with experience; socialization is a life-long process and interactions between the individual and the organization are in constant dynamic flux.

The Organization

The first perspective of socialization literature was identified as a field of study and concept. Socialization was viewed as a two-fold process from the vantage of the individual and the group through early sociological, psychological, and anthropological writings. Second, the individual socialization perspective was viewed through anthropological socialization, developmental socialization, expectancy theory, adult socialization, and organizational socialization. The shift from the perspective of the individual to the third perspective of the organization is provided through Glaser’s (1964) view of the organization, through internal and external lenses.
Glaser (1964) used the concept of internal and external lenses in relation to the individual locating himself or herself within concentric organizational communities. An external organizational view showed that when an individual joins an organization, he or she locates himself or herself within that specific community and particular knowledge area. Conversely, an internal organizational view showed that the individual is placed in a location group situated within the organization, and more narrowly within that particular location group, further situational location may occur in terms of a department or section (p. 85).

In summary, an organization’s status, purpose, and inter-organizational relationships may have an effect upon the content, form, and outcomes of various socialization processes. Glaser’s (1964) paradigm displayed the complexity of an occupational environment (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 77), and was able to establish a link between the individual and the organizational setting using internal and external lenses.

Schein’s View of the Individual, the Organization, and the Career

The third perspective of this Appendix will outline the organizational theories of Schein (1971a), Feldman (1976, 1981), and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) in terms of the individual’s entrance to, and career within, the organization.

Schein (1971a) conceptualized an organizational model and a corresponding set of variables to describe an individual’s career movement through the organization [refer to Figure M1]. The concept of career was considered from the viewpoint of the individual who joins, moves through, and leaves an organization; and from the viewpoint of individuals already inside the organization, who determine which individual to move.
Figure M1: A Three-Dimensional Organizational Model

(Schein, 1971a, p. 404)

how, when, and at what speed (p. 402).

Schein considered the structure of the organization, the structure of the individual, and the structure of the career in his model by imagining the organization as a three-dimensional conical or cylindrical shape, with organizational movement conceptualized vertically, radially, and circumferentially. Vertical movement increases or decreases the individual's rank in the organization; radial movement increases the individual's centrality or being on the "inside track" of the organization; circumferential movement involves changing the individual's function or division of the organization (p. 403).

Schein (1971a) believed that individuals construct different selves for different situations; his focus was upon the "constructed" social self which is presented to others
(p. 410). Thus, an individual’s basic personality structure and pattern of psychological defences remains fairly stable, but the social self may change tremendously in the development of new values and attitudes, new self-images, new competencies, and new ways of entering and conducting oneself in social situations (p. 413).

A career is made up of a series of boundary passages in which the individual may move up, inward, or around the organizational center. One may move upward without moving inward or around; moving in toward the organizational center implies an increase in power and access to information, which allows the individual to influence his or her own destiny. The "parallel ladder" provides rank but not the power or influence associated with centrality. Movement around without movement in or up occurs when an organization cannot promote outright or get rid of the individual and so transfers the individual from one job to another (p. 418). If organizations desire high levels of organizational innovation, they must ensure highly permeable external boundaries (p. 425).

In summary, Schein’s (1971a) conceptual scheme clearly tied the individual and the organization together. His frame of reference allowed consideration of the term career in relation to organizational boundaries, the social self, career stages, and transitional processes.

**Feldman’s Contingency Theory of Socialization**

Generally descriptive in design, research tended to be comprised of the phrases and activities of the socialization process (Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1976), the recruitment process and socialization methods (Caplow, 1964; Wanous, 1973), and the impact of job duties, the job environment, and supervisors on newcomers (Schein, 1964;

Feldman’s studies (1976b, 1981) identified outcomes of the socialization process and specified which variables determine whether or not individuals attain those outcomes. As individuals adjust to new organizational positions, they go through three stages: getting in or anticipatory socialization, breaking in or accommodation or encounter socialization, and settling in metamorphosis or role management (1976a, p. 65). This research formed the basis for Feldman’s (1976b) contingency theory and its redefined socialization stages. Within each of these three stages, the newcomer experiences specific "process variables" or distinct sets of activities which indicate progression through the socialization process.

In order to test this contingency theory of socialization, Feldman (1976b) researched a New England community hospital, the results of which clearly identified the stages of socialization, the activities engaged in at each stage of the process, and the possible outcomes of the socialization experience.

Feldman’s Multiple Socialization of Organization Members Model

The results of Feldman’s (1976b) contingency theory research prompted him to extend his three-stage contingency model into a five-stage multiple socialization model (1981). Within each of the stages, specific process variables were again used to reflect the extent to which an individual may successfully conclude a particular activity in the socialization process [refer to Figure M2]. The contingency theory’s (1976b) anticipatory socialization stage was expanded to the four process variables of realism about the
organization and the job, congruence of skills and abilities, and of needs and values (p. 310) rather than the previous (1976b) two of realism and congruence.

Feldman’s (1981) model described the second stage as encounter socialization rather than as accommodation (1976b). It recognized that the newcomer eventually discerns what the organization is actually like, and sees some shifting of skills, attitudes,
and values. The four contingency model (1976b) process variables were expanded in the new (1981) model to reflect five variables: management of outside-life conflicts and of intergroup role conflicts, role definition, initiation to the task and to the group (p. 310).

The new model (1981) defined the third stage as change and acquisition rather than as role management (1976b). In this stage, long-lasting changes take place, new recruits master the job skills required, perform their new roles, and make adjustment to the work group's values and norms. The newer (1981) model described three process variables which reflects mastery of three organizational socialization tasks: resolution of role demands, task mastery, and adjustment to group norms and values (p. 310).

The contingency (1976b) model outcome variables were replaced with more extensive outcome variables in the multiple socialization model (1981). In order for the organization to function effectively, individuals must engage in the following three behavioural outcomes: carry out role assignments dependably, remain with the organization, and innovate and cooperate spontaneously. The three affective outcomes to be employed included general satisfaction, internal work motivation, and job involvement (p. 311).

In summary, the shift from the perspective of the individual to the organization was provided through Glaser (1964), who used internal and external lenses to view the individual's affiliation with the organization. Schein (1971a) linked the nature of the organization, the individual, and the career together through an organizational model and its variables, which described an individual's career movement through the organization. Feldman's (1976b) contingency model of individual socialization into an organization
identified three stages of socialization process and variables of socialization outcomes. Feldman's (1981) multiple socialization model clarified his earlier (1976a, 1976b) empirical and theoretical research, and was pictured as a set of multiple simultaneous socialization processes with a range of outcomes.

**Van Maanen and Schein's Theory of Organizational Socialization**

In contrast to Feldman (1976b), who believed that the socialization process could be successfully concluded at the role-management stage (p. 436), Van Maanen and Schein (1979) posited that if one believes learning to be a life-long process, the entire organizational career of an individual could be considered a socialization process. From this theory, they developed a model of the general setting in which organizational socialization takes place. They advocated an organizational model whereby individuals can be distinguished from one another and from outsiders on the basis of as few organizational variables as possible. Schein's (1971) model of the organization provided the descriptions necessary to further their joint (1979) socialization theory. *Role* was defined in terms of three empirically discernible dimensions: the *functional* domain of the organization, the *hierarchical* distribution rank within the organization, and the individual's *inclusion* within the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 219) ([refer to Figure M3]).

The *functional* dimension refers to the various tasks performed by organizational members; the *hierarchical* distribution rank within the organization refers to who is responsible for the actions of whom. The interpersonal domain of organizational life is
Figure M3: Inclusionary Domains of an Organization

(Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 221)

an interactional dimension which refers to the individual’s *inclusion* within the organization. The individual moves toward the center and away from the periphery of organizational action, so the individual’s relationship with others in a particular segment of the organization is bound to change. This dimension involves the social rules, norms, and values by which one is judged by members of the total group. To move along this dimension is to become accepted by others as a central figure of the organizational segment. In order to move to the center and to become a leader, as a member-in-transition, the individual must share the same assumptions as others in the setting as to what is organizationally important and what is not (Van Maanen & Schein,
Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined individual responses to organizational socialization role components. The individual may respond to the socialization process by displaying either a custodial stance toward the knowledge, strategies, and missions associated with the role; a content innovation approach whereby substantive improvements or changes occur in the knowledge base or strategic practices of the role; or a role innovator stance in changing the mission associated with that role by rejecting most of the norms of conduct and performance in a role (p. 229).

In summary of the third perspective of this integrative literature review, definition centered around organizational socialization research. The stages of socialization process and concomitant variables were identified in Feldman’s (1976) contingency model of individual socialization into an organization, and in his later (1981), more elaborate model of multiple socialization. Other research in organizational socialization revealed the possibility that organizational change via role innovator behaviours on the part of newcomers was an important outcome of socialization practices (Schein, 1971, 1978), and that these socialization practices could operate within the work place (Van Maanen (1976, 1978). Predictions about the relationship between socialization strategies and outcomes were outlined in Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) theory of organizational socialization.

**Transitions and Transformations**

Socialization theory consisted of three strands of thought up to the 1980s: life-span development, organizational change, and occupational socialization (Nicholson, 1984, p. 173). Organizational socialization literature tended to concentrate on three types
of outcomes: identity changes (Strauss, 1959; Brim, 1966; Hall, 1971), behavioural outcomes (Van Maanen, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), and affective stages (Brett, 1980; Frese, 1982). From the perspective of socialization within an organization, this literature review now addresses the transitions and transformations perspective.

This fourth perspective has been identified as the theoretical link between organizational socialization and the vicissitudes of the individual within the socialization process. Addressing what she saw as a void in socialization research, Louis (1980b, 1982) researched the cognitive task of sensemaking in new work settings. Subsequent transitional and transformational socialization research was carried out by Jones (1982), Nicholson (1984), and Brett (1980, 1982). This transitional and transformational research appears to correlate with the concept of induction, as both areas involve sensemaking and the development of internal meaning systems.

**Louis's Theory of Surprise and Sensemaking**

Louis (1980) noted that studies of organizational socialization and recruit turnover lacked a theoretical framework for understanding what newcomers experience and how they cope with their experiences in entering unfamiliar organizational settings, so she proposed conceptual categories to distinguish among features of the entry experience: change, contrast, and surprise [refer to Figure M4]. How newcomers coped with their entry experiences became the sensemaking model which focused on the cognitive processes that individuals employ in organizational settings to cope with novelty and surprise (p. 244).
Figure M4: Sensemaking in Organizational Entry

(Louis, 1980b, p. 242)

*Change* is a major entry feature between new and old settings; it represents the external, objective differences in moving from one organization to another (p. 235). Newcomers usually voluntarily undergo the role change, and as experiences from prior roles are recalled, *contrasts* are generated and many different subprocesses may be triggered (p. 236). *Surprise* represents a difference between the individual’s anticipations of, and subsequent actual experiences in, the new setting; it may be positive and/or negative. Surprise encompasses the individual’s affective reactions to any differences, including changes and contrasts.

Louis (1980b) identified five varieties of surprise [refer to Figure M5]: when conscious job expectations are not fulfilled in the newcomer’s early job experiences,
Figure M5: Varieties of Surprise

(Louis, 1980b, p. 237)

when conscious and unconscious expectations about oneself are unmet, when
unconscious job expectations are unmet or when features of the job are unanticipated,
when there are difficulties in accurately forecasting internal reactions to a specific new
experience, and when cultural assumptions are made by newcomers. Weick (1977, 1979)
examined cognitive processes in organizational settings and suggested that an analysis of
cognition in organizations should address the question of what provokes cognition in
organizations (1979, p. 71).

Louis (1980b) suggested that the event of surprise provokes cognition; that
surprise is an inevitable part of entering an unfamiliar organizational setting (p. 241). In
order to understand how individuals in organizational settings cope with entry level
experiences, Louis (1980b) posited that we must first ask how individuals cope with
everyday, normal situations which do not invoke surprise. She suggested that conscious
thought is not a very large part of our everyday mode of operating; that as long as the predicted outcomes occur, thinking is not necessary. When scripts fail, the individual must develop explanations for why the actual outcomes occurred and why the predicted outcomes did not. The retrospective explanations are produced through the thinking process labelled *sensemaking* (p. 240).

After development of the surprise and sensemaking model (1980b), Louis (1982) identified seven career transition tasks: mastering the basics of the job’s formal procedures, technology, tasks and activities; building a role identity or image; building relationships with others; constructing a frame of reference which indicates what is considered to be essential or taboo; mapping relevant players in terms of names, faces, roles, and power; locating oneself in social and task networks; and learning the local language.

Louis, Posner and Powell (1983) found that newcomers appreciated the daily interaction with peers above all other factors in becoming organizationally effective. Their finding appears consistent with conceptual models of socialization which postulate *accommodation* and *sensemaking* are important processes through which the newcomer learns about organizational entry (Louis, 1980b; Feldman, 1976). Berlew and Hall (1966, p. 208) and Kotter (1973, p. 98) emphasized the significance of the first supervisor on the newcomer. Louis, Posner and Powell (1983) also found that mentors were not particularly available or helpful and that the mentor relationship was significantly correlated with job satisfaction but not with commitment nor tenure intention (p. 864). Formal onsite orientation sessions were viewed as only modestly helpful; the greatest
value of these programs was in commitment, in developing loyalty to and identifying with the organization. Offsite residential training programs, on the other hand, strongly correlated with positive newcomer job attitudes (p. 865).

In summary, this fourth perspective of *transitions and transformations* has provided a theoretical link between organizational socialization and the experiences of the individual within the socialization process through the cognitive task of sensemaking in new work settings (Louis, 1980b), by identification of career transition tasks (1982), and by an examination of the socialization practices most available to newcomers and the extent to which the practices were seen as being helpful in becoming effective organizational members (Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983). These studies were only the first of many transitional and transformational studies.

**Jones’s Model of Initial Orientation and Socialization Process**

Building upon earlier socialization works (Schein, 1968; Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and the sensemaking transitional socialization model of Louis (1980b), Jones (1983) developed a model which incorporated two transitional factors using concepts drawn from symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934; Silverman, 1970), social learning theory (Bandura, 1977, 1978), and attribution theory (Bem, 1967). This model shows the effects of individual differences and attributional processes involved in newcomer transition and adjustment [refer to Figure M6].

Jones (1983) contended that the newcomer’s organizational orientation towards the organization must be analyzed from an interactionist perspective in which newcomers
are given an active role in mediating personal and role outcomes. He hypothesized that the way newcomers react to new contexts and the way they define established organizational members' expectations is influenced by the nature of previous biographical experiences (p. 466). This interactionist model accounted for three factors:
the manner in which formal and informal socialization practices influence newcomer response; the manner in which individual differences affect initial newcomer psychological orientation towards the organization and which subsequently condition newcomer response; and the manner in which attributional and learning processes affect how the newcomer and insiders negotiate a joint situational definition (p. 468).

Three organizational entry positions were identified within the model: the naive, competent, and dominant newcomer orientations. The naive position identifies the newcomer as being overwhelmed by the experience because of poor past experiences or low self-efficacy expectations. Opposite to the naive position is the newcomer who displays a competent organizational entry position. This position represents the experienced newcomer who has passed hierarchical and inclusionary boundaries either external to the organization or from another internal organizational position. The newcomer seeks to resocialize established members by disrupting taken-for-granted cultural assumptions, either on the interpersonal level or by altering the rules for promotion and inclusion (p. 471). Whether or not the third position of dominance results in conformist, role innovative, or content innovative behaviours depends on the way in which initial orientation influences the newcomer’s subsequent stance towards the organization, the way in which organizational insiders use socialization tactics to impose situational definition on newcomers, and the organization’s ability to control self-other perceptual relationships (p. 472).

To summarize, Jones’s (1983) model suggests a socialization view based on an interactionist perspective which gives weight to newcomer interpretation of the context, as
well as to socialization agent intentions. The process of internalization is contingent on constructs which newcomers bring to the situation, and consequently, that organizations need to develop socialization programs which suit the nature of newcomers rather than to decide only upon the socialization outcomes it wishes to encourage (p. 473).

**Nicholson’s Theory of Work Role Transitions**

Nicholson (1984) furthered the transitional literature through his theory of work role transitions. Initially, he had identified organizational socialization and transitional literature as focussing attention on three types of outcomes: *affective states* and their consequent coping responses in those treatments which show transitions as a source of stress (Brett 1980, 1982), *identity changes* in which new values, skills, and dispositions emerge as outcomes of the search for new personal meanings to match new situational demands (Strauss, 1959; Brim, 1966), and *behavioural outcomes* in which adaptations to new setting either reinforce or transform elements of the organizational culture (Van Maanen, 1976; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

However, Nicholson (1984) observed that the possible interdependence of these three outcomes had not been sufficiently recognized in the literature, and so developed his theory. The theory provided the link between personal and organizational adjustment outcomes with characteristics of the individual, the role, and the organization (p. 174). It also provided another perspective on issues in life-span development, careers and work socialization, and organizational change. In developing his theory, Nicholson (1984) defined the field, identified modes of adjustment to transition, predicted outcomes of work role transition, and discussed dynamic changes in the outcomes of transition.
The field defined. Work role transitions were defined as any change in employment status or job content, including status passages (Glaser & Strauss, 1971), forms of intra- and inter-organizational mobility (Louis, 1980a), and other employment status changes (Nicholson, 1984, p. 174).

Modes of adjustment to transition. The adjustment process poses the fundamental alternatives of the individual choosing to adapt to meet environmental requirements or to manipulate the environment to meet individual requirements. An individual’s role transition adjustment is a type of personal development whereby change is absorbed through the individual altering his or her frame of reference, values, or other identity-related attributes. Role development varies according to the opportunities or constraints of the role and the expectations and needs of the individual. Both personal and role development are divided into classes of high or low development, which allows for characterization of extreme cases and generates outcomes spanning four adjustment modes. Transitional modes are identified as replication, absorption, determination, and exploration (p. 175) [refer to Figure M7].

Cell I’s replication represents transitions which generate minimal adjustment to personal or role systems; individual performance is similar to that of previous positions and as previous positional occupants. Cell II’s absorption represents transitions in which the individual does little to modify or adjust the parameters of the new role; it is characterized predominately by role learning. Cell III’s determination represents the newcomer’s adjustment to the demands of role transition that leaves the individual relatively unaffected but alters the new role. The individual actively determines elements
in the structure or content of the role. Cell IV's exploration represents simultaneous change in personal qualities and role parameters such as may occur in response to managerial inter-organizational transfer. These situations may involve positions where social contracting and interpersonal role negotiations are central features. Cells III and IV are similar to Schein's (1971b) role innovation (Nicholson, 1984, p. 176).

**Predicted outcomes of work role transition.** The main purpose of Nicholson's (1984) theory was to explain and predict the range of adjustment modes defined by role and personal development. Two characteristics of roles which impact on adjustment to a role change are discretion and the novelty of role demands. Discretion is the individual's opportunity to alter the network of goals and means-ends relationships involving both people and materials. The novelty of job demands is the degree to which the role permits the exercise of prior knowledge, practised skills, and established habits; it is a function of
how similar the new role is to previously occupied roles (p. 178).

Nicholson (1984) was concerned with the opportunities and constraints which surround the individual’s transition process. An individual has the most capacity to exercise will or choice over adjustment incomes in roles of medium discretion and moderate novelty. Two constructs which distinguish orientations to experience and environment are the desire to control and the desire for feedback (p. 183).

Dynamic changes in the outcomes of transition. The theory identifies stabilized commitment in which future personal or role development is avoided, and progressive commitment in which shifts to greater role or personal development are sought (p. 185). How the four sets of determinants (replication, absorption, determination, and exploration) can change permits the possible shifts in modes of adjustment to be anticipated. Shifts in adjustment modes may provide different perspectives on life-span development and occupational careers in that work histories may be viewed as sequences.

In summary, Nicholson’s (1984) theory of work role transitions proposed a conceptual framework which linked personal and situational causes with individual and organizational outcomes. It showed how transitions can sustain continuity or engender revolutionary or evolutionary change in social and personal systems. It was developed to explain status passages in careers and work and to explain how role transitions can be pivotal events for the evolution of the organization and the individual (p. 188).

The transitional and transformation literature reviewed thus far has encompassed surprise and sensemaking theory (Louis, 1980) along with career transition tasks (Louis, 1982), the availability and helpfulness of socialization practices (Louis, Posner, &
Powell, 1983), newcomer initial orientation and socialization process (Jones, 1983), and a theory of work role transitions (Nicholson, 1984). Research up to this point in time was concentrated on how newcomers adapted to the organization after initial entry; however, very little research existed which addressed the change newcomers bring to organizations.

**Brett's Model of Personal and Role Development**

This subsection of the transition and transformation literature review addresses the concept of how newcomers affect the culture of an organization. Brett and Werbel (1978) completed an empirical job relocation study which was later followed up by Feldman and Brett (1983) on new hire job changers, and later refined by Brett (1984) in her model of personal and role development.

Brett (1984) postulated that the results from her study of job transfer and well-being (1980) and the study of new hires and job changers and their coping strategies (Feldman & Brett, 1983) could be synthesized to form two structural models: a personal development model and a role development model, each of which involve different types of change. *Personal development* involves change in behaviour from a previous position to a new position, which is eventually reflected in changed abilities, values, and attitudes. *Role development* implies rejection of the traditionally practised role by previous role occupants. Brett (1984) juxtaposed these two models to suggest a relationship between them, and what resulted was an imposed model of personal and role development (p. 160).

Brett's (1984) work on job transitions and personal and role development viewed *job transition* as any type of change, including organizational entry, geographic relocation, promotion, or demotion and which involved change from task content and/or context.
(individuals, places, equipment) from the previous job (p. 155). Her model predicted that the more the job context changes, the greater the behaviour-outcome uncertainty and the more role development. Behaviour-outcome uncertainty is generally context specific, and contingencies which form the basis of behavioural routines are usually tied to context-specific locations and individuals. The tendency is to repeat old routines until elements of the new environment begin to negatively reinforce old routines (p. 178).

In all of these perspectives, socialization is experienced by individuals in various ways or *modes*. The manner in which the newcomer fits into the status order, the social networks, and the activities of the organization is crucial in order for that individual to acquire appropriate attitudes, behaviours, and values (Van Maanen, 1976). Caplow (1964) believed there were only a few modes of socialization which appear in every type of organization, and contended that there is less variation in forms of process than in content (p. 172). Specific socialization modes include anticipatory socialization; recruitment, screening, and sponsorship; destructive socialization; training and education; apprenticeship, co-optation, ineffectacious socialization, mentorship, networks, mortification, trial and error, assimilation, and nepotism, among others.

In summary, most researchers viewed organizational socialization as occurring in phases (Caplow, 1964; Schein, 1971; Van Maanen, 1976; Feldman, 1976), with organizational focus on the development of newcomer skills and abilities. This fourth perspective of *transitions and transformations* addressed the transition from outsider to insider, and the transformation that occurs when the newcomer enters the organization. This movement was addressed through the surprise and sensemaking theory of Louis
(1980) along with her career transition tasks (1982), through study of the availability and helpfulness of socialization practices (Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983), through a view of newcomer initial orientation and socialization process (Jones, 1983), through a theory of work role transitions (Nicholson, 1984), and through personal and role development of the newcomer within the organization (Brett, 1984). It appears appropriate, then, to imply that sensemaking and the development of internal meaning systems might be somewhat correlated to concepts of transitional and transformational socialization.

**Summary**

This Appendix attempted to set parameters around an understanding of general socialization theory. The first perspective addressed socialization as a *field of study and concept*, giving definition to sociological, psychological, and anthropological socialization within the larger context of socialization.

The second perspective studied socialization from the viewpoint of the *individual* in terms of early anthropological and developmental writings. Expectancy theory was postulated as the theoretical link from early research to the more modern concepts of adult socialization and intra-organizational socialization.

Linkages were established between the individual and the work setting in order that the third perspective of the *organization* be placed in context. Within organizational settings, the individual experiences movement through various boundary passages, with previous experiences, specific motivations, values and expectancies helping to determine the ease or difficulty of passage (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 115). Socialization is an ongoing process, both from the viewpoint of the individual and the organization. In the final
analysis, Lewin's (1951) concept of *unfreezing* occurs in the socialization process so that new learning can occur. The result is the transition or "metamorphosis" (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 98) of the individual from newcomer to fully-fledged organizational member.

The difficulty or ease with which individuals experience boundary passages provided impetus for later researchers to develop transitional theories to explain the transformative experience, the fourth perspective of this review. The *transitions and transformations* literature presented here resembles the induction phase, as both rely upon sensemaking (Weick, 1995; Louis, 1980b) as a fundamental element of socialization. Lastly, various socialization modes which the individual may encounter through boundary passage were identified.

**Appendix M Summary**

The literature outlined within this Appendix was reviewed *a priori* to consideration of a postmodern approach to the research and was subsequently phenomenologically bracketed. The literature did not directly influence my study, nor did it set out the framework for the dissertation. The knowledge gained through initial reading intrinsically became a part of my stream of consciousness even within the elements of a postmodern approach, though, and thus, contributed to sensemaking.
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UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
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TO: Patricia Gorius
FROM: Patrick Renihan
DATE: December 3, 1996
SUBJECT: Comprehensive Examination

Following a meeting of your Ph.D. Advisory Committee on December 2, 1996 I am writing to advise you as to the questions and format for your Comprehensive Examination. The Examination will involve three questions, the first of which is addressed orally and in writing. Questions 2 and 3 will be addressed orally.

The questions selected by your Committee were as follows:

1. Answer in writing and orally
   Given that Patricia is proposing to a "descriptive study" of the socialization process experienced by neophyte principals, I would like to ask her what role philosophical and epistemological issues raised by Schutz and Foucault would play in the development of the theoretical basis and research design of her study. The fundamental question is "What role will the study of 'dialogue' and "text play in her theory and her research?" The response to the question should include both theoretical and practical considerations.

Alfred Schutz was a social phenomenologist playing a major role in advancing the constructivist views. Schutz's thinking has been summarized by Maxine Greene in the following manner:

... he wrote often of intersubjective existence in a shared world where people come together through "making music together" or by means of face-to-face dialogues. Social scientific inquiries, he said, have to come to terms with what he called "verstehen," a term for a particular kind of social reality, he believed, means taking into account "the subjective meaning of the actions of human beings from which social reality originates." This means, of course, that educational researchers who study classrooms or the realities of supervision must take into account the meanings of what happens as articulated by the students, teachers, administrators, all who are involved. All this connects not only with what we now view as qualitative research but with what we now recognize as constructed reality. For Schutz, individuals move into a commonsense world from varied biographical locations that have to be recognized. They do so by shaping and reshaping their experience with the aid of schemata made available by "predecessors and contemporaries." ... Schutz went on to describe the "provinces of meaning" that allow people to apprehend "multiple realities" (Maxine Greene, "Epistemology and Educational Research," Review of Research in Education, vol. 20, 1994, p. 435).

Foucault held power as a central theme and expressed the belief that it must be studied through the analysis of "text." Again, as stated by Maxine Greene:

Power is diffuse. Foucault says; it exists in networks of relations, sometimes repressing and normalizing, sometimes producing new modes of seeing, modes of making change in a polymorphic world. ... The power for which those other people stand is being disseminated through what they say and through the way they carry themselves, and it is his resistance that allows him to recognize the dispersed power that deprives him of recognition (p. 445).
Both authors call for the study of discourse and define socialization far beyond that normally found in role theory.

2. Answer orally:

Postmodernism has been used to describe a social mood, an historical period filled with major social and organizational changes, and a set of philosophical approaches to organizational and other studies. Using a postmodern perspective, discuss the socialization of the neophyte principal into the school.

3. Answer orally:

Using one of more of the ideological warrants presented in Kymlicka (1990), Brown (1986), Tong (1986) and other course materials (EDADM 884), what arguments could be made for the social worth of research on the socialization processes experienced by beginning principals in a rural context?

It is expected that your answer will also consider the views of those who argue that such a research exercise is not socially worthwhile (i.e., “Who cares? If these are hired educational professionals, why should we babysit them into their jobs? — if, indeed they are professionals should they not come to their work as beginning principals prepared, mature, and able? — it infuriates me when we panders to the weak, reinforce “toughly-fuzzy” attentions, and spend our resources on politically-correct projects. Such research efforts would have us over-focus on professional welfare issues and the agenda of professionals taking care of themselves, rather than research that helps them to get their jobs done. We pay these people good money to deliver education and work with the children — what are we doing spending time on their needs and experiences?” OR “Every school culture and every beginning principal requires different socialization processes. There is virtually no utility and minimum good that will result from understanding particular socialization experiences of beginning principals for policy and practice — its a waste of research energy.”

In the latter part of your Comprehensive, your Committee may ask questions on any course work taken during your academic program. The time allotments typically allowed for the exam are as follows:

- 40 Minutes: Presentation and discussion of Question #1.
- 30 Minutes: Presentation and discussion of Question #2.
- 30 Minutes: Presentation and discussion of Question #3.
- 30 Minutes: Open questioning and general discussion regarding course work and tentative research plans.

You should note, however, that you should limit your actual presentation time for each question to 15 minutes maximum.

A copy of the Department’s guidelines for Comprehensive Examination is enclosed for your information.

Given the timelines required, we will need to hold the Comprehensive some time on January 17, 20, 21 or 22. I will be in touch about these arrangements when I have checked with all members of your Committee.

[Signature]
Patrick J. Renahan
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