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CHAPTER I

EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM

How shall I talk of the sea to the frog,
if he has never left his pond?
How shall I talk of the frost to the bird of
the summer land,
if he has never left the land of his birth?
How shall I talk of life with the sage,
if he is a prisoner of his doctrine?

— Chung Tsu
4th Century B.C.

This study is an interdisciplinary attempt to associate the fields of anthropology and educational administration. It uses an emic and etic approach from anthropology to investigate a particular informal organization of school administrators.

Emics and etics have the potential to provide an interdisciplinary focus as well as a framework for collecting, crosschecking and analyzing data. Both researcher and informant can articulate data from various and diverse points of view. It provides a natural cross-check of perspectives and may reduce the possibility that either the researcher or the informant risks, as Chung Tsu posited in the 4th century B.C., being a prisoner of one's own doctrine.

Attention will be focused on the informal interaction patterns of principals in an urban school system. The investigation will describe
grouping patterns and avenues of communication between and among principals and other organizational members. The sample will include principals representing both primary and secondary levels. A description of the informal system of school administrators within an urban school district and the consequences of such structure for the school administrator position, the school organization, and the district will be the conceptual goals of this study.

This paper will draw heavily on an interview methodology developed by Licata and Hack, previously used to describe the informal system of school principals in a suburban school district in Ohio. The Licata and Hack study hereafter will be referred to as the "grapevine study." To some extent, this proposed inquiry might be viewed as a quasi replication which will be conducted in a different contextual framework, urban schools. This research project will combine the methodological tenets of the grapevine study and Harris' emic and etic analysis. The emic and etic framework from anthropology may provide a more complete theoretical framework for cross-checking the data and analyses derived from the informal system inquiry.

The Grapevine Study

In the same vein, the grapevine study described an entire informal communications system or network in a school administrators' subculture. This research used the school principals' subculture and other groups in a suburban midwestern school district as its primary unit of analysis. In the grapevine study, principals at all levels of the school district were interviewed using twenty-two substantive questions. These questions were related to informal interaction with peers and other district
personnel. "Clan-like" grouping patterns among elementary principals surfaced. These relationships were reflective of the processes by which certain principals develop close social and work relationships which hinge on mentoring or professional kinship. "Guild-like" patterns among secondary school principals emerged as well, characterized by principals who belong to the same informal group and show common professional competence. These two clusters reflected both grouping patterns and informal systems of communication in that particular subculture of school administrators.

The researchers described the principals' grapevine and noted its consequences for the role of principal, the principals' subculture and school district organization as a social system. They suggested that occupational socialization of school principals was a basic consequence of the principals' informal system; e.g., elementary principals tended to associate with other principals that they worked with previously. A second systemic consequence posited by the researchers was informal boundary spanning, a process by which the organizational structure buffers the organization's core so that predictability is realized with respect to the external environment. For example, using the high school as the unit of analysis, the principal may regularly attend meetings of the local Rotary Club and other business groups. In this pattern of interaction with groups external to the school, the principal is able to predict certain community demands and concerns as a means of making appropriate adjustments in school organization to avoid external inputs which may be disruptive in nature.
Field research regarding informal systems has been one of the cornerstones for scholarly investigation in the areas of anthropology and education. Franz Boaz, the father of American anthropology, conducted field investigations in 1945 across the American educational system to substantiate his thesis that an inordinate number of teachers were presenting classroom views which resulted in closed-minded prejudicial views. Rosenfeld conducted anthropological field studies in Harlem to determine "Why Have Minority Groups Been Disadvantaged by Schools?". Utilizing a line of informal inquiry, he determined that teachers had preconceived notions regarding poverty and culturally disadvantaged students' ability to perform. These attitudes developed into kinds of self-fulfilling prophecies. Herskovits investigated the phenomenon of enculturation. He determined the process to be a kind of cultural conditioning that was both conscious and unconscious, formal and informal. For Herskovits, enculturation is the key to several anthropological and educational enigmas: it unlocks the mystery of the relation of the individual to his culture.

The teacher subculture has been studied to determine the attitudes of neophyte and veteran teachers regarding their ideas on pupil control. Research conducted by Willower reveals that neophyte teachers are relatively humanistic in their pupil control ideology. However, veteran teachers condition or enculturate neophyte teachers to become more custodial in their pupil control views and practices. Hoy's findings regarding organizational socialization patterns in the teacher subculture substantiated portions of Willower's research. Wolcott expanded the
use of anthropological methods in education with respect to a study of
the principalship and school district innovation. A recent study in
educational field research, by Cusick, observed that students see school
as a place to meet their friends. During the class period, students
quietly socialize with their classmates as their teachers consume an
estimated sum of 200 minutes a day on procedural or maintenance
details.

SIGNIFICANCE

Contrasting Urban and Suburban Schools

Earlier it was mentioned that the grapevine study would be con­
ducted in an urban school district setting. Such a setting
provides an opportunity to cross-check findings from the original
grapevine study with those of an urban school system. Increasingly,
over the last decade a mounting tide of charges and countercharges has
been leveled against the urban school systems of the United States.
While many of the charges are the result of bandwagonism and sensation­
alism, some are, to an extent, rooted in substantial fact and call for
a reshaping of the educational system to make it more responsive and
more compatible with societal changes that have accelerated in the
post World War II chronicles.

Southern agricultural decline, change, and eventual mechanization
led to large-scale movements from farm to city, and usually from South
to North. During the seventy-year period from 1900 to 1970, the number
of urban whites in this country increased from 28,700,000 to 129,000,000,
and the number of blacks residing in urban areas from fewer than
1,500,000 to 18,400,000. Despite the fact that both races have engaged
in rapid urbanization in this century, closer scrutiny within the urban sector demonstrates that blacks and whites are inordinately distributed within the nation's city network.  

The distribution of economic resources has been crucially inequit­able, historically speaking. This inequitable distribution, in recent years, has permitted certain kinds of housing patterns whereby whites have moved to suburban areas outside the cities, and minorities and people from lower economic strata remain in the inner city. The change to suburban living was a result of a variety of factors, one of which was an educational issue. This is perhaps the most volatile and emo­tional issue to surface in American education. The issue was and is "desegregation." Desegregation resulted in white flight to the suburbs for many city dwelling American families, to such an extent that today most major urban school districts have minorities as the majority of the clientele they serve.

There are some marked differences between urban and suburban school districts. Originally noted by Candoli in 1976, these will be addressed as generalizations in the following section:

a) Urban school systems find it difficult to respond quickly to a diverse student population. Students have different needs which may be in opposition to each other in the same class, coupled with the fact that students come from a broad range of socio-economic levels. Suburban schools, on the other hand, are less often subject to a large diverse student population and families tend to be in a mid- to upper-range socioeconomic stratum.
b) Urban school systems may need to reeducate their staff to consider the heterogeneity present in student groups. Flexibility and diversity associated with tolerance for individual differences are essential elements. Suburban schools may less need to consider as much reeducation of staff because their student bodies are much more homogeneous.

c) Most urban school systems may need to be restructured so that educational services can be effectively and quickly delivered to students. Individual needs and local resources vary significantly throughout most urban school systems; therefore, it may be critical that program decisions be made at the level closest to the child. Decentralization is a concern relative to most urban school systems because it is felt that bigness leads to remoteness, and remoteness leads to impersonalization, which is inappropriate in an institution (education) that is based on human services. The real issue is not decentralization; it is what functions are best highly centralized and what decisions are best made closest to the student. Suburban school districts are much smaller and make the distribution of educational services more readily available. Also, due to size, educational services are much more personable.

d) Urban school systems are hard pressed to develop viable coordinated and comprehensive planning activities, due in part to the vastness of the system and the large number of intervening variables. Because planning is important at
every level of a school system, it must be coordinated into an effort to direct resources to particular needs—be they individual, classroom, building, area, or systemwide. Suburban school systems have a much better opportunity to develop their educational plans due to the reduced size of the district and the reduced number of intervening variables.

e) Urban school systems cannot easily identify and gather resources with which to accomplish the expected massive educational task. In urban school systems the cost allotted per student is lower, the buildings are older and less flexible, the ratio of teacher per student is higher, and, as a result of white flight, the tax base is reduced. For most suburban schools, these situations are reversed.

f) One element common to both urban and suburban school systems is the emergence of power groups. These groups are often flexing their muscles and asking impossible demands on the school system. The reasons are not generally for the well being of the students but for the most part are a vehicle for establishing a power base.

g) One resounding criticism of urban schools is the problem of discipline. The problems result many times because the family unit is not intact and adequate resources are not in the home to take care of students' basic needs. Discipline is best maintained when there is communication and interaction between the teacher, student, and parent.
Suburban schools generally have more intact family units and as a result have fewer discipline problems.

Conducting the grapevine study in an urban school district as opposed to a suburban district, may or may not produce any variation in the interaction of principals in the informal subculture. However, given the nature of the two school systems, there is ample latitude for variation.

**Toward a Replication Methodology**

There is substantial research significance attached to replication. Bauerfiend has stated that the principle of replication is "... the cornerstone of scientific inquiry."\(^{18}\) Bauerfiend also observed that although replication is a vital aspect of research design and interpretation, "the principle of replication was largely ignored in educational research until around 1950.\(^{19}\) The principle of replication holds that if one's research findings represent a true phenomenon, these findings should be obtained in each repetition of the study.\(^{20}\)

If possible, a researcher should attempt to replicate one's own research project, particularly if the first data collection and analysis yield findings that show promise of making a contribution to educational research. If the researcher is able to replicate his findings, they have much more "significance to other educational researchers than a statistically significant but weak finding." A replicated finding is strong evidence against the possibility that a Type I error (rejection of the null hypothesis when it is true) occurred in the original study.\(^{21}\)

While replication in and of itself is vital, replication in another context may introduce critical variables which affect the results of the
original investigation. When research is conducted in another context, it suggests the notion of scope.

Hans Zetterberg spoke about scope as it related to replication. He defined scope as the proportion of all possible sources of data which are represented in a search. Zetterberg demonstrated the importance of scope in the example, "All swans are white." This generalization held true until black swans were found in Australia. Anthropologists have noted similar occurrences. Margaret Mead initially thought that children in any culture making the transition from childhood to adulthood went through a series of dramatic neurotic stages. Observing cultures and conducting field research in the South Seas disproved that hypothesis. Mead concluded that while human nature is malleable, malleability is limited. Often it appears that when the scope is expanded the theory is disproved, revised, or strengthened.

Generally, most theorizing claims universality. The universality of a sociological proposition is an assumption which has to be confirmed by wide replication of the study. When applicable, one has to confirm propositions on different subject matters (political, religious, etc.), in different categories in the same society (professions, income brackets, educational levels, etc.), and in different societies (civilized and primitive, ancient and contemporary). This is an expensive process of demanding labor to be undertaken before one can claim a hypothesis or generalization to be truly verified.

Certinaly the study proposed here is not a true replication; with slight methodological modification, it is anticipated that the
study will provide further evidence to support or refute the Licata and Hack findings.

The emic and etic research design is only a partial replication of the original grapevine study mentioned in Chapter One. The grapevine study contained only etic/emic type questions which covered a broader range of research considerations. This investigator's study has seven etic/emic questions exactly like those found in the grapevine study. Each question of the original seven questions has a complement of three other questions. Each set of four is called an "interview set" which requires a more narrowly focused line of inductive inquiry when compared to the grapevine study. At least in part, the use of emics and etics also allows for cross-cultural replication, because the grapevine study was done in a suburban setting. By cross checking the data derived from the two studies, investigators may identify certain similarities and differences in the nature of informal principal interaction.

THEORETICAL BASES

Functional Analysis

The theoretical framework for this research will be grounded in two concepts: functional analysis and the emic and etic perspectives. Merton defines functions as those observed consequences that make for adaptation or adjustment of a given system; dysfunctions are observed consequences that lessen the adaptation of adjustment of the system. For example, the administration of a principal who is sensitive to the needs of the school and community might produce functions such as high faculty and staff morale; an insensitive administration might produce
such dysfunctions as student unrest or poor community support.

Manifest functions are those which are intended and recognized by system participants. Goals and objectives for student academic achievement might be considered manifest functions in most school organizations. Latent functions are neither intended nor recognized by the system participants. In the grapevine study, the consequences of informal communication channels appeared to be unknown to the school administrators involved. The object of functional analysis, as discussed by Merton, must be a standardized item; that is, it must be patterned and repetitive. This is apparent when one examines social structures, roles, and social norms.

Functional analysis will be operationalized as a result of the interview process. The original grapevine study was done in the context of a suburban midwestern school district in the United States. This investigation will be conducted in an urban school community in a large southwest city. The process could produce organizational comparisons of structures which are functional, dysfunctional, manifest, and latent in nature.

Generalizations and Propositions

The purpose of this study is to examine the informal system of school administrators in an urban school system. Keeping in mind the generalizations about occupational socialization and informal boundary spanning produced by the Licata and Hack investigation of a suburban school system, the intent of this inquiry is to use these generalizations, resulting from interview responses, as conceptual starting points for analysis or as "sensitizing concepts," i.e., abstract ideas that,
when supported by particular empirical data, might produce a scheme for interpreting a given social phenomenon. With the understanding that these tentative generalizations or propositions may undergo revision, they are stated below:

Proposition 1: The informal system in a school administrator subculture can be understood in terms of its latent function of "occupational socialization" of the participants.

This proposition indicates that the informal organization of principals reflects relationships based on a congruence of career patterns among specific group members, i.e., guild-like relationships in part reflect occupational specialization and clan-like relationships distinguish between and among upward mobile and nonmobile elementary principals. These patterns seem to be part of a "sorting" of the system's professional staff into various occupational and administrative roles. This sorting process often produces a corps of principals who are relatively stable and predictable candidates for promotion in the system. This process is often unrecognized by system participants.

Proposition 2: The informal system in a school administrator subculture can be understood in terms of its latent function of "informal boundary spanning."

Thompson's description of boundary spanning, organizational structure which links or buffers the organization's core, was a useful construct in the grapevine study. Using the principalship itself as the unit of analysis, principals reported using informal communication with their teaching staff to reduce the uncertainty of particular
decisions. Using the school as the unit of analysis, other principals reported cross-checking with principals in other buildings about normative dimensions of decision making within the district to avoid "getting caught out on the limb."  

**Emic and Etic**

This section focuses on the second concept which is the emic and etic perspective. This is an anthropological concept used to distinguish observations and interpretations of persons considered as informant, native or indigenous to a culture as opposed to persons viewed as outside observers. **Emic** operations are characterized by the elevation of the native informant as the ultimate judge of the researcher's descriptions and analyses. This increases the level of objectivity because it forces the observer to explain observed phenomena from a native perspective. **Etic** operations are characterized by the primary use of the researcher as the ultimate judge of constructs and concepts employed in descriptions and analyses. This permits the researchers to use the scientific theories and language germane to one's own discipline in the description of events.

The idea of emics and etics, as has been noted earlier, is most closely associated with anthropology. Emics and etics have been used to explain societal rules. Kay claims that etic behavior will correspond and is somewhat predictive to rules, if those rules are stated in terms of contingencies and alternatives. He uses as an example post-marital residence patterns among the Samal of the Philippines. Johnson has demonstrated knowledge of how Brazilian peasants classify their soils and crops combined with the observer's (etic) knowledge of soils and
crops can be used to predict how much land will be devoted to a particular crop.\(^{36}\) Anthropologists also examine the ambiguity associated with emic rules, and how these rules are associated with the notion of open and closed social systems. Very few social structures operate in a closed system. Rather, most societal structures are influenced by outside forces. Harris and Kottak tried to develop a codification that would distinguish moreno and mulato individuals in Brazil. Their research revealed that there was no standard codification among the people's emic which clearly separated moreno and mulato people.\(^{37}\) Additional research by Pelto and Pelto supports the view that people's emic perception can have diverse and ambiguous beliefs and values.\(^{38}\)

P. Pelto views the emic approach as a unit of conceptualization in anthropological theory that should be "researched" by analyzing the cognitive processes of the people studied, rather than "imposed" from cross cultural (hence ethnocentric) classifications of behavior. This perspective is sometimes referred to as "the New Ethnography", or "ethnosemantics".\(^{39}\) Boaz posits a similar view. He cites the researcher's demand for specificity in classifying phenomena and the need for the phenomena to be described in concise and unambiguous terminology. This rigidity of definition, according to Boaz, may lead to misunderstanding of the essential problems involved. If it is our serious purpose to understand the thoughts of a society the whole analysis of experience must be based on their concepts, not ours.\(^{40}\) Sapir's thoughts are along the same line; he adopts the assumption that the native's categorization of behavior is the only correct one.\(^{41}\)
Marvin Harris represents the "eticist" point of view. In his new ethnography he states, "The ultimate source of the emicist's difficulties lies in the attempt to impose upon non-verbal behavior the type of approach which has proven successful for verbal behavior, on the mistaken assumption that, since both verbal and non-verbal behavior are behavior, a single standpoint should be equally appropriate for both." Harris goes further to suggest that human communities invest a great amount of effort and training (mostly informally programmed) in insuring that members of society distinguish clearly among the units of verbal communication. The community consensus about verbal communication is essential and is possible because of the limited number of basic units (phonemes) of which the communication is constructed.

Emics and etics have been placed in an interdisciplinary context by Price-Williams who combines anthropology and psychology. He states the emic approach has been used mainly by anthropologists interested in the field of cognition. The technique of componential analysis has encouraged investigation of "ethnosciences," which portrays any one society's ideas about a particular domain; thus it is possible to develop fields such as ethnozoology and ethnobotany.

Etic approaches may be composed of several different types. The J. Whiting school provides one method. With this approach, the intention is to discover whether there is a significant correlation between sets of data from different societies. It is critical to note that this kind of research relies on second-hand observation.

The B. Whiting technique uses first-hand observations over which one has complete control. This is a second etic approach in which
research workers are trained in advance to confine their observations to an agreed codification. As a subject, psychology tends to be biased in the etic direction.

While the emic and etic framework seems to make some intuitive sense in terms of understanding certain aspects of experience in various social and organizational contexts, the framework may have the potential to contribute to inquiry (particularly inductive inquiry) and theory building in educational administration. The classic observer/informant relationship characterized by emic-etic methodology is very similar to inductive methodologies employed to study a junior high school organization (Willower, 1968), student subcultures (Cusick, 1973; and Burnett, 1969), the principalship (Wolcott, 1973; Greenfield and Blumberg, 1980) or teaching as a profession (Lortie, 1975). In each case, the inductive procedures used observations, interviews, document analysis and other data-gathering techniques to produce fields of specific observations from which generalizations were derived to explain social phenomena. With certain variation, the observers viewed the social context from the etic perspective and information from informants or system participants as being reflective of emic perceptions.

The emic and etic perspective will be adopted from anthropology to this project in educational administration. This will be done by utilizing a portion of the 22 questions used in the grapevine study locking in emic and etic response frameworks. This, in some degree, narrows the number of various questions to be asked, but the emic and etic interpretation may provide a much more intense and in-depth interview methodology. The emic and etic process has an analytical dimension
by which emic can be used as a cross check of etic and vice versa. This provides a vehicle to examine and reaffirm the sociocultural events in the school organizations being studied. The instrumentation used to generate interview data will be discussed in detail in the methodology section.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Communication should be as clean and concise as possible when conveying meaning. Shared meaning creates shared understanding. A glossary of terms is provided to enhance the readers' perception of the study, thereby serving as a vehicle to co-orient the cognitive maps of the researcher and the reader. 48

Grapevine Terminology

1) **Clan-like and Guild-like** are terms which are grounded partially in the informal group structure on natural clustering of principals from verified two-way interaction links and partially on particular characteristics which appeared common to certain informal groups. Guild-like groups are bound by shared professional orientations and competence; e.g., high school principals interacting predominantly with other high school principals. Clan-like groups, exclusively elementary principals, are bound by trusting relationships developed through sponsorship and close working relationships; e.g., elementary principals might interact with other elementary principals that they worked for previously as a teacher. 49

2) **Functional Analysis** is the theoretical basis of this study. Necessarily, Merton's paradigm on functional analysis helps focus attention
on objects which are standardized, patterned and repetitive, and the observed consequences of such objects. The informal organization of school administrators is the object of functional analysis in this study. The researcher will attempt to describe such structure and its consequences or functions for the role of school principal, the school and school district organization. Recall that Merton classifies functions as follows:

a. Functions are observed consequences that make for adaptation or adjustment of a given system.

b. Dysfunctions are observed consequences that lessen the adaptation or adjustment of the system.

c. Manifest functions are those which are intended and recognized by system participants.

d. Latent functions are neither intended nor recognized by the system participants.\(^{50}\)

3) **Grapevine Structure** - an informal communication network existing in an organization or subculture involving interacting peers. For example, grapevine interaction by principals in the suburban school district was with other principals. Grapevine structure here is viewed as peer relationships in the principal's informal system.\(^{51}\) However, this researcher recognizes and plans to study other informal communications that principals have with superiors, subordinates and other groups.

4) **Informal Boundary Spanning** was originally described by Thompson as boundary spanning, an organizational structure which links or buffers the organization's technical core, particularly with respect to the
external environment and thereby increasing the predictability of external inputs. Licata and Hack use informal boundary spanning as a construct to describe certain functions of the principal's grapevine. Principals tended to interact informally to gain information that would reduce the uncertainty of decision making and to increase the predictability of external inputs like new school board policy constraints or pressures on the schools' operations.

5) **Occupational Socialization** is concerned with the means by which persons, in this case principals, are enculturated or socialized to the values or ways of the school district. As individuals advance through the various stages of employment in the school system (teacher, vice principal, principal), they are carefully prepared and molded for the principal's role. For example, Wiggins notes that characteristics of various principals in the same district rendered them relatively "interchangeable."52

**Anthropology Terminology**

1) **Emic** has as its hallmark the elevation of the native informant to the status of ultimate judge of the adequacy of the observer's ability to generate statements the native accepts as real, meaningful or appropriate. In carrying out research in the emic mode, the observer attempts to acquire a knowledge of the categories and rules one must know in order to think and act as a native. The native informants in the replication of the grapevine study will be the urban principals.

2) **Etic** has as its hallmark the elevation of observers to the status of ultimate judge of the categories and concepts in descriptions and
analyses. The test of the adequacy of etic accounts is simply their ability to generate scientifically productive theories about the causes of sociocultural differences and similarities. Rather than employ concepts that are necessarily real, meaningful, and appropriate from the native point of view, the observer is free to use alien categories and rules derived from the data language of science. In the grapevine study, the investigator will perform the role of observer that provides the etic perspective. After cross checking the interview information for accuracy with principals in the urban district, the investigator/observer is free to classify the information into categories and theories one feels are appropriate according to the training and language particular to one's discipline.

OBJECTIVES

The first objective of this study was to complete a modified replication of the methodology used in the Licata and Hack grapevine study, this time with school principals from an urban school district. Selected questions from the 22 originally proposed in the grapevine study would be employed to achieve this objective. The interviews were conducted using questioning procedures grounded in emic and etic theory.

The second objective was to provide insight into the informal interaction and communication patterns in a principal subculture in an urban setting. The basis for extracting and categorizing information was logical and straightforward. Because of its descriptive nature, this study was grounded in an inductive line of reasoning which engages in interviews and results in generalizations. Inductive analysis was considered a critical analytic tool, particularly because of its ability
to compare and contrast the respective school organizations. At stake was the scope of the generalizations from the initial grapevine study.

LIMITATIONS

Any line of inquiry in which data are collected was subject to anticipated and unanticipated intervening variables. Unfortunately, there is no crystal ball for research. However, given the nature of this investigation, some factors must necessarily be changed while other factors are carefully monitored, all of which may or may not have a limiting effect.

The twenty-two questions used in the grapevine study were reduced to seven. This is due to the nature of the emic and etic interview questionnaire. For each interview question there was a set of four "emic/etic" related responses. Therefore, seven questions produced twenty-eight responses. Although the number of questions was reduced, the emic/etic related responses provided a more intense and in-depth interview methodology. However, it was recognized that the exclusion of questions may limit the relative variety of information gained.

Finding a corresponding sample in an urban school district was a limiting factor. An ideal district would be one in which there were geographical subunits or areas with area superintendents. This arrangement would provide a unit of comparison comparable to the suburban district in the grapevine study. Attempting to interview all of the principals in an urban school district would be a monumental task for one investigator.

People tend to interact with persons they are familiar with or persons that have credibility. A major factor enhancing the grapevine
study was the fact that the principals in the suburban school district were familiar with one of the major investigators. This increased the investigator's credibility and the quality of the response. The investigator conducting research in the urban setting fortunately knew someone in the urban school district hierarchy who had credibility with the principals or the external validity of the responses would have been poor. The credibility gap was a deciding factor concerning the depth and intensity of the principals' response to the questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

Chapter I

Chapter I will be addressing the research problem. This chapter will set the general framework within which the investigation will take place. The framework will be based on a review of the grapevine study by Licata and Hack and the anthropological concept of emics and etics as proposed by Marvin Harris. The value of replication will be addressed as well as the implications of field research and informal systems research. The theoretical basis for the study will be set in terms of functional analysis and the emic and etic perspective. From the theoretical premise, propositions will be proposed from certain generalizations related to the grapevine study and the purpose of this study.

Chapter II

Chapter II will be a review of the literature. This review will focus on functional analysis and researchers who have used this analytical tool as a means of interpreting research findings. The review of literature will also focus on informal systems. General attention will
be directed as to how informal systems fit into organizational structure, but more specifically, how the grapevine interacts in creating the informal system subunits.

Chapter III

Chapter III describes the methodology that will be used to generate the research data. The methodology is an interview process used to determine patterns of interaction in principals of urban schools. The questions are a group of approximately seven that were taken from twenty-two questions and will be treated from an emic and etic perspective. Thus, there will be four forms for each of the seven question sets. This will provide a means by which information can be cross-checked or verified. The interview instrument is a questionnaire consisting of twenty-eight questions divided into seven question sets.

Chapter IV

Chapter IV is concerned with reporting the results of data collection. The site for the collection of the data will be an urban school district. The data will be compiled and analyzed to determine patterns of interaction between and among principals. The data will also be compared to the findings in the grapevine study to determine similarities and differences.

Chapter V

Chapter V will address two areas: conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions would permit personal discussion which could reflect one's own values, preferences and experiences in the data gathering process. Recommendations are ideas presented for future research
possibilities. These ideas for future research may be pursued by other researchers or the primary researcher, depending on the need or availability of new research ideas.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will review selected literature about informal organizational structures and functional analysis, particularly as they relate to the social context of the school district setting and the principals' subculture. Both subjects are crucial to the current investigation. Informal organization literature demands attention because this is a study of the informal organization of a school administrator subculture. Functional analysis is noteworthy because it is an analytical tool that this researcher uses to focus on the possible consequences of informal organizational structure of the urban school principalship.

Informal Organization

The interplay between formal and informal organizations has been addressed in numerous volumes of books, periodicals and articles concerned with organizational theory. Max Weber, a pioneer of organizational theory, developed "rational theory," a concept which focused on bureaucratic structure as exemplified by the Prussian postal service. Pugh notes the bureaucratic structure of organizations as described by Weber. The Weberian model is likened to computer jargon. Pugh describes a bureaucracy as an organization which is completely programmed. He further states that Weber's model is incomplete and inadequate in terms of human action. Credence for this position is cited in the classic
studies of bureaucratic dysfunction by Merton (1940),2 Dubin (1949),3 and Gouldner (1955).4 Finally, Pugh states that "crucial significance must be given to the attitudes, values, and goals of specialists sub-units and individuals and the way in which these continuously modify the organization's formal structure.5

Elton Mayo and Chester Barnard developed an area of organizational consideration loosely called the "human relations movement" in industry. This movement was different from the scientific management school of thought in that consideration of the human element of the organization was important. Perrow acknowledged the writings of Mayo, Barnard, Simon and Waldo in the 1940s as "scathing attacks" on the theory of scientific management. Perrow felt these attacks were based on vague generalities, implicit principles, and normative bias. Although the scientific management theorists had a mechanistic perspective, they did acknowledge the importance of informal social relations and noneconomic motives. Their largest problem was based on the premise that organizations cannot be designed on the basis of the kinds of informal relations that grow up in them. Rather, the scientific management proponents believed that the design must minimize the opportunity for unfortunate and uncontrollable informal relations, leaving room only for the necessary ones.6

A classic example of informal organizational influence became apparent in a study of the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company described first by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939)7 and later by Elton Mayo (1945).8 The study involved varying the amount of illumination and correlating its effect on productivity. Researchers were
perplexed as to why productivity increased in both the control and experimental groups when the researchers increased or decreased lighting. Much to the researchers' surprise, they realized the workers were motivated because of their being selected to work on this special project.

The bank wiring room at Western Electric was another classic example of the effect of informal structure on the formal structure. In the bank wiring observation room, researchers observed workers who conformed to daily work quotas—group norms restricting production—at the expense of their own higher earnings. There are also informal status hierarchies and leadership patterns established that confronted the formal systems designed by managers. The research was further noted by Roethlisberger and Dickson and Homans.

Concerning the "natural system" (informal system), there seems to be little disagreement relative to the importance of the informal structure. However, there is a good deal of concern as to how informal structure is defined. The human relations school suggested by Roethlisberger and Dickson proposed that: "The patterns of human interrelations, as defined by the system's rules, policies and regulations of the company, constitute the formal organizations. . . . It includes the systems, policies, rules, and regulations of the plant which express what the relations of one person to another are supposed to be in order to achieve effectively the task of technical production."

By contrast, the informal organization is described as follows:

Many of the existing patterns of human interaction have no representation in the formal organization at all, and others are inadequately represented by the formal organization. . . . Too often it is assumed that the organization of a company corresponds
Thompson considers the informal organization only one example of research in complex organizations from a natural system perspective. With the natural system, one phase of the informal organization's attention can be focused on variables which are not included in any of the rational models—sentiments, cliques, social controls via informal norms, status and status striving, and so on.  

Another natural system approach is more comprehensive. The institution views the organization as a unit interaction with its environment. This approach received support from empirical studies conducted by Barnard (1938), Selznick (1949), and Clark (1956). This line of inquiry leads to the conclusion that organizations are not autonomous entities; managers experienced unintended consequences and are conditioned or upset by other social units—other complex organizations or publics—on whom the organization is dependent.  

Simon expresses his consideration about formal and informal relationships to administrative authority. He states that procedural coordination—the specification of lines of authority, and the spheres of activity and authority of each organization member—creates a formal organization, a set of abstract, more or less permanent relations that govern the behavior of each participant.  

The formal scheme of the organization will always differ from the organization as it really operates in several respects. Initially, there are elements which are omitted. The actual organization presents many interpersonal relationships that are not specified in the formal scheme. Next, the interpersonal relations in the organization as it
functions may be in fact a contradiction to the specifications.  

The term "informal organization" refers to interpersonal relations in organizational units that affect decisions within, but either are not included in the formal scheme or are not consistent with that scheme. Simon expresses the notion that no formal organization will operate effectively without an accompanying informal organization. He further states the appropriate distribution of duties and the maintenance of adequate channels of communication may both relieve the necessity for the growth of informal channels and encourage cross fertilization and attitudes of cooperation within the informal structure.  

Scott differentiates the dynamics of bureaucracy as they relate to formal and informal structures. He indicates that most research analysts view formal and informal structures as encompassing both normative and behavioral dimensions, so that it is possible to speak of formal norms and formal patterns of behavior and informal norms and informal patterns of behavior. Yet there is discord about the basis for differentiating between the two types of structures. Some analysts relate to this dichotomy with earlier distinctions as primary/secondary and gemeinschaft/gesellschaft relations. They argue that relations within organizations are "clearly distinct" from either of the polar types.  

The kind of group behavior that manifests itself from the organizational chemistry was a line of inquiry pursued by Joseph Litterer. He considers formal organizations as those which have been, or possibly might be, consciously planned. He views the informal organization as being the aspects of organization that are not formally planned but that more or less spontaneously evolve from the needs of people.
Early studies regarded informal systems as dysfunctional consequences of formal organization structure. Analysts used negative descriptors such as private and irrational concerns that impeded the implementation of the elaborate formal design. Roethlisberger and Dickson thwarted the notion and came to the conclusion that the formal structure expresses the "logic of cost and efficiency," whereas the informal structure embraces the "logic of sentiments." On the other hand, Gross focuses on the positive functions accomplished by informal structures—increasing ease of communication facilitating trust, and correcting for the inadequacies of the formal system.

Management, administration and planning are tightly woven into the organizational fabric. For many years top management and administration felt detached from the lower strata of organizational structure affected by the informal or natural system. However, Dalton conducted research which dispelled the myth that only lower levels of organizations were characterized by informal structures. Organizational planners have been placed in a precarious role relative to their ability to look into the future. Natural systems analysts weigh heavily the idea that formalization places heavy and often intolerable burdens on those responsible for the design and management of an organization. Planners cannot be so farsighted or omniscient as to be able to predict all the possible alternatives that might confront each position in the organization. Such programming can easily become maladaptive and lead to behaviors both ineffective and inefficient, giving rise to the "trained incapacity" that Veblen called attention to long ago and for which some organizations have become notorious.
Leadership can have a profound impact on social behavior. It can be viewed initially as a vehicle for influencing the behavior of individual participants. This view is from a human relations perspective. Studies in the formative stages considered leadership traits or characteristics that would stimulate individual performance in the service or organizational goals. Lippitt and White pioneered research on the influence of autocratic vs. democratic teacher leadership styles. Lippitt and White's work was significant, because heretofore psychologists were concerned with the individual kinds of traits leaders possess. These early psychologists most often found unclear trends with contradictory results. Lippitt and White's studies indicated that leadership was apparent more in the nature of the group atmosphere or roles performed by leaders that in the personalities of leaders. These studies are also significant because of the use of observational techniques as a research tool.

Solidarity as it relates to the informal structure is an area of concern investigated by Stinchcombe. He defines an organization as a set of stable social relations created with explicit intention of continuously accomplishing some specific goals or purposes. A concern as expressed for the effect of organizations on social structure, more particularly the effect of the mere presence or absence of organizations on the solidarity and feeling of identity of "communal" groups. Ethnic groups or geographical communities or other large groups with multiple functions could have various levels of solidarity, varying potential to shape their members' loyalties, to control their behavior and act as units.
Stinchcombe advanced the hypothesis that the greater the number and variety of formal organizations in a communal group, the more solidarity there is likely to be. This directly opposes the notion that solidarity and the instrumental and impersonal relations characteristic of formal organizations are at opposite poles of a continuum of social relations, and that the more of one there is the less of the other there is likely to be. 32

Writings by Castetter on the informal organization as it relates to the personnel function of educational administration express the notion that informal structures develop through the interaction of members of a collective whose associations are determined by such factors as employment location, degree of security and mutual interest of values. It should be noted that common interests are critical to informal groups. Ideally, the formal and informal organizations should complement each other. To this end, administration should encourage informal organization, recognizing that it is a means through which fulfillment of individual needs and organizational functions might be sought. 33

It should be noted that scientific management made contributions to the corpus of knowledge in educational administration. Lawrence Cremin wrote a distinguished chapter in the history of educational administration with his work on The Transformation of the School. 34 Smith speaks laudably of Cremin's work, but alludes to the oversimplified view of human nature held by scientific management. Human relations, Smith feels, would address a variety of human needs, especially those involving the more emotional, nonrational, and unplanned aspects of emotional life. Human relations is different from scientific
management in that it is focused on the informal rather than the formal elements of organizations, and instead of trying to persuade workers to mesh their efforts and goals with the latter, it urged the formation of workers' social groups which stressed participation, communication and leadership.  

Social psychologists and sociologists have also established lines of inquiry to gain insight into informal group processes. Maier's work, Principles of Human Relations, and Katz's Productivity, Supervision, and McRae among Railroad Workers are very influential in analyzing group processes in organizational settings.

Gouldner conducted a study at a gypsum plant which has become a classic in terms of examining formal and informal interaction patterns in response to bureaucratic leadership. The study, titled Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, depicts a gypsum plant in transition between a plant superintendent who was lenient (mock bureaucrat) and one who was autocratic (punishment-centered) in their administrative styles. Gouldner comes to the conclusion that there are three bureaucratic typologies that can appear: the "mock bureaucratic" pattern, characterized by the failure to enforce or obey rules; the "representative" pattern, where rules are both enforced by management and obeyed by workers; or the "punishment-centered bureaucracy," where management attempts regular enforcement, but is resisted by the workers. A similar study was conducted by Page, observing formal and informal social interaction patterns present in the Navy's bureaucracy.

Wolcott's book, Teachers and Technocrats, is a good example of government funded research imposing its will on the teachers of a school.
district. The research project SPECS was to be on the cutting edge of a government trend to help make schools more accountable. This was to be done through a planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS). Wolcott was the program ethnographer and as such made some distressing observations. Most distressing of all was the SPECS research team's exclusion of faculty input in planning or operationalizing the program. A core of teachers resisted the program because it did not address their concerns and the researchers would not listen to their concerns. Walcott described the researchers and resisting teachers as "two moieties engaged in a rivalry that went almost unnoticed by the larger community they purportedly were serving. He tried to remain objective, but his biases are recorded in the book. PPBS was seen as just a fad throughout the Johnson Administration and was obsolete by 1971. The SPECS project should be critically examined to determine the anomalies that result from heavy-handed government interaction and poor research planning on social systems.

The principal's behavior, as manifested by his personality and acquired skills, is an area addressed by Wiggins in his work, The Influence of Role and Organizational Climate upon Principal Behavior: A Systems Analysis. He felt internally that the school keys on the principal's behavior upon school expectations and the demands of one's assigned role, whereas externally the principal serves the school district and the clientele, which in turn tends to provide added focus for his behavior. The sanctions and rewards acting within the educational milieu (schools, school system, and school clientele) impact the intensity and scope of influence which necessitates compliance. With compliance,
accordingly, comes a curious process of socialization. Wiggins is also of the opinion that it is the district (the system), as a result of time, which affects the behavioral characteristics of its principals in an enduring and pervasive manner a good deal more than does the school where one is assigned.  

Griffiths examined similar social phenomena in his research concerning teacher mobility in New York and its effect on the recruitment, selection, appointment and promotion of New York City school teachers. Other significant studies were carried out in school organizations by Boyan and Iannaccone. Boyan researched the formal and informal organizational structure of a junior high school faculty and Iannaccone studied the social system of a school staff from an anthropological perspective. These three studies engender valuable insight into the sociological formal and informal structure of school organizations.

More recently a line of investigation by Licata and Hack at Ohio State University explored the informal organization of school district organization, particularly the principals' grapevine network. They examined informal interaction patterns among principals in a suburban school district. They identified "clan-like" informal grouping patterns among elementary principals and "guild-like" informal grouping patterns among other principals, as well as informal patterns of communication. The principal's role in the informal system was viewed from a "functional analysis" perspective. The grapevine framework in the principals' subculture seemed to indicate patterns of occupational socialization of school principals and informal boundary spanning processes—processes viewed as latent yet relatively adaptive in terms of educational
Licata and Hack extended the grapevine research by developing a description of norms and beliefs common to the principals' informal organization. The framework also included ideas concerning nurturance of face and the blindside mentality. Nurturance of face with regard to the principalship is concerned with a principal being perceived by his peers as being skillful in administration, controlling and adapting to his school environment, a trusting interaction partner and a helpful sounding board. When a principal loses face, he is perceived as incompetent, a gossip, pessimistic, disloyal to his peers, and someone who "cries wolf" too often. Blindside mentality can best be explained by examining a situation found by most automobile drivers. Most persons who drive automobiles realize that even though they have a left-side rear-view mirror, there exists a natural blindspot to their rear in which another automobile might be hidden. And so it is with the principalship. A principal may be confronted with a critical situation that presents no warning—thus, a principal is blindsided. These two concepts represent situations around which the principal might constantly be involved. While this is not a definitive work, it does offer plausible interpretations of activities present in the informal organization of the principals' subculture.

Functional Analysis

Functionalism or functional analysis, as was mentioned earlier, is an analytical tool that can focus on possible cause and effect relationships in organizational or social structures. Functionalism dates back to the 19th century. Auguste Comte was considered the father of
sociology and a student of Saint-Simon. Against the backdrop of the French Revolution, Comte developed the concept of "positive philosophy" and wrote a six-volume work, *The Course of Positive Philosophy* (1830-1842). In the work, sociology was formally named and the basis of functional theorizing was established.

Comte's arguments affected the development of functional analysis in two ways. First, most functional writings hold some view of the "good" society or what the "normal" state of society is. Second, functional analysis begins with the notion of social equilibrium—whether this be conceptualized as "social integration," "social cohesion," or some other state of stasis.

Another 19th century philosopher, Herbert Spencer, was a structural-functionalist. His philosophy closely paralleled that of Comte's, although Spencer only gave Comte partial credit. Spencer promoted utilitarianism and organicism which produced a basic contradiction he could never resolve. Spencer wrote extensively about the similarities between social and individual "organisms."

In his relative comparisons between the individual and social organisms, Spencer delineated between "structure" and "function." It is from this distinction that the essence of functionalism resides: structures contain functions for maintaining the social whole.

One of the later authors during the 19th century was Emile Durkheim. He was aware of the need for social order and followed the same tenets as did Saint-Simon and Comte. Durkheim developed for sociology some of the first sound examples of methodological and statistical analysis.
Durkheim utilized Spencer's distinction between structure and function. His carefully developed distinction between cause and function, when coupled with Spencer's separation of structure and function, presented sociology and anthropology with the fundamental elements of the functional orientation.  

For many years Durkheim's works were not seen or translated from the French. Durkheim wrote The Elementary Forms of Religious Life in 1912. He felt that if the function of a trait could be discovered, then its place in the greater society could now be "understood." And if traits in different societies could also be seen to provide similar functions, then even greater understanding of the patterns of human organizations could be achieved. In The Division of Labor in Society (1893) and The Rules of the Social Method (1895) Durkheim made his functional approach explicit before the time of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowsky. Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowsky and Durkheim all studied Australian aborigines about the same period. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown analyzed kinship among the aborigines. Durkheim converted Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski to his analytical framework and therefore ensured the dominance of the functional approach in the 20th century through anthropology and sociology. They were the first of several anthropologists to demonstrate detailed and systematic field work on traditional societies; Malinowski in The Trobrian Islanders (1915-1918) and Radcliffe-Brown in the Andaman Islands (1906-1908).  

In the 1930s the writings of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski influenced not only anthropological theory but sociological theory as well. Kingsley Davis and W. E. Moore produced one of the early functional
schemes in sociology. The "Davis-Moore Hypothesis" was advanced in 1945. The theory addressed the issue of how and why social positions within a society receive unequal shares of scarce and valuable resources, such as money, prestige, honor and power. Thus, scholars called the theory "Some Principles of Stratification." It took the following position: "The more functionally important positions in a system, and the less available qualified personnel to fill these positions, the greater the inducements necessary to attract qualified personnel, and hence the greater the rewards attached to these positions."

Davis and Moore were both graduate students at Harvard. Another graduate student at Harvard who later contributed to functionalism was Robert Merton. In 1949 he presented a major work in sociology titled Social Theory and Structure. It was later in the 1950s that the Parsonian scheme came to the front. Merton based his paradigm on a "triple alliance between theory, method, and data." That is to say, functionalism, on the one hand, is a useful method for collecting and arranging data, while on the other hand it promises to be a useful way to interpret and explain regularities that emerge from empirical investigations.

Merton accused both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown of only implicitly employing the tenets of functional unity, universal functionalism and indispensibility in their works. Merton's functional analysis is an effort to correct the deficiencies in anthropological functionalism.

The first step in Merton's functional analysis is for the investigator to describe the phenomenon of interest, for only by description can the nature of the context in which certain structures operate be
exposed. The second most important procedure is to describe the "meaning" of a situation for the actors implicated in the process and structures of interest to an investigator. Understanding the significance of events to actors can offer clues as to the reasons behind "manifest functions" or "latent functions." These concepts address functional consequences that can be intended and unintended, as well as recognized and not recognized. 66

The second step in the functional analysis of an empirical system deals with the assessment of requisites that exist for various system referents: individuals, subparts, and the systematic whole. Identifying system referents involves determining if an item of concern has positive (functional), negative (dysfunctional), or no discernible consequences for various system referents. Functional analysis thus becomes a kind of "balance sheet" of functions and dysfunctions for different aspects of a system. 67

Merton's position is supported by Turner and Maryanski who refer to functional analysis as a social phenomenon in terms of its consequences for the broader society. What does the heart do for the body? What is the relationship between the lymph system and the body? Functionalism in the social sciences asks the same questions biological scientists ask. It seems as if functionalism closely parallels the science of the "body social," for it was felt that if insight into the parts of the human body could be achieved by determining how they affected bodily states, the same would be possible for society. 68

Another analyst in the Harvard tradition was Talcott Parsons. He published his first work in 1937, approximately during the time
Malinowski's scheme had reached maturity. Parsons' original work had little of the complexity present in his writings on the *Social System* and his collaborative effort, *Toward a General Theory of Action*.

Two factors moved Parsons toward functionalism. The first was Max Weber's use of the "ideal type" method to develop systems of categories that reflect the actual social world; Parsons used the term "analytical realism." The second factor was his realization that actors do not exist in isolation from each other. They interact in social systems.

Parsons' functionalism moves through two distinct stages: a) Stage One is the mechanism-equilibrium stage, and b) Stage Two grows out of Stage One by employing the mechanism-equilibrium analysis. Parsons' analysis of functional schemes merged such disciplines as economics, psychology and sociology. Parsons, more than any other social scientist in this century, has sought to bridge disciplines in order to unravel the mysteries of human action and organization.

It can be debated that Parsons has taken theoretical strategy to its logical conclusion as a theoretical strategy. And if there is a deficiency found in this conclusion, then functionalism as a theory-building strategy is also deficient. However, in anthropology it was found that functionalism can be used as a method for collecting and organizing the data base from which theory could be inducted and tested.

In more contemporary times, the notion of "comparative functionalism" was associated with Walter Goldschmidt's approach in the mid-1960s.
He sought to recapture the comparative thrust of the functional method. Goldschmidt contends that as custodians of a particular corpus of data on traditional peoples, anthropologists have an obligation to present this data, and to provide reasonable interpretation of its meaning, to the social sciences. Goldschmidt takes issue with Malinowski and states that social institutions are highly variable. While some of the problems that humans face are universal, they should provide the foundation for the comparative analysis of social systems.

As a case in point, Malinowski presented an extensive description of the Trobriand Islanders as a cultural institution. Goldschmidt views the description of the Trobriand institution as an inappropriate yardstick for comparative analysis. Albeit the description of institutionalized social patterns is essential in generalizing an ethnographic report on an individual culture, it will not serve as the foundation for the comparative analysis of diverse social systems. To resolve this dilemma it is necessary to use functions as the yardstick for comparison.

Functionalism for many sociologists and anthropologists has been subjected to a myriad of interpretations and debates. Parsons wanted to know what system parts do for meeting the needs of an entire action system or for specific subsystems. This is paralleling the biological notion that is concerned with how parts maintain the total "body social." Merton has argued for assessments of structures in terms of how well they satisfy empirically established needs of individuals and social systems. Goldschmidt perceives utilizing the idea of functional requisites as a way for ordering and comparing data on diverse social systems.
Anthropologists such as Malinowski\textsuperscript{78} and Goldschmidt\textsuperscript{79} have keyed on the notion that the assessment of how structures resolve basic human and organizational problems can be utilized as a basis for ordering data and thereby facilitate the process of understanding regularities in the data. As a result of these regularities, explanatory theories can be induced, or conversely, existing theories can be tested with respect to the facts ordered by a functional method.

Sociologists such as Merton,\textsuperscript{80} Parsons,\textsuperscript{81} Davis,\textsuperscript{82} Moore,\textsuperscript{83} and Levy,\textsuperscript{84} have depicted functionalism at various points in their work as a way of generating "understanding" as a result of theoretical explanation. The idea of requisites is not only as methodological tools; they are also key concepts that will be incorporated into theoretical propositions, and ultimately into the laws of human organization.\textsuperscript{85}

Considering functionalism in the future, a decision will have to be made as to what constitutes "understanding" and is intellectually viable. Many researchers assess the future of functionalism as theoretical explanation is more than likely less viable than its future as a methodological tool that can produce research inquiry and theoretical induction. We should be ever mindful of the fact that the aspect of functionalism that scholars and laypersons find most appealing is its attention to the question of what social structures and processes "do for" individuals and society.\textsuperscript{86}

Willower considers Merton's views on "functional analysis" and how it impacts educational change. Merton defines functional analysis as those observed consequences that provide for the adaptation or adjustment of a given system; dysfunctions are observed consequences that
reduce the adaptation or adjustment of the system. Manifest functions are those which are intended and recognized by persons within the system, while latent functions are neither intended nor recognized. Merton stresses the notion that functional analysis must fit an exacting pattern of being patterned and repetitive. Examples of this can be observed by examining social structures, roles and social norms.

Willower believes the analysis of structural features of school organizations in functional terms has relevance to the problem of educational change. It should be recognized initially that functional analysis has some weak points which can cause problems. These problems center around functional requirements of a system and appropriate methodologies for functional analysis. This was addressed in the Merton/Parsons debates discussed earlier in this chapter. Additional commentary was given by Homans in 1964. Willower is aware of the problems of functional analysis, but prefers to direct his efforts to areas where his paradigm seems to hold promise for understanding and planning educational change.

By carefully observing schools, the consequences of various structures can be viewed from the standpoint of the adjustment of selected positions and roles in their subcultural and organizational settings and from the position of the adjustment of the organization in the larger environment. Willower contends that the school displays a variety of structures that are functional for the organization and for its adult personnel but dysfunctional or neutral for its student clientele.

It should be noted that Functionalism is the general framework from which the paradigm of functional analysis evolves. Homans, in an attempt
to differentiate between functionalism and functional analysis, claims analysis is the "fancy word" sociologists give to activities they do not wish to get more specific about. Recognizing the fact that functional analysis claims to examine the consequences of social behavior, Homans has suggested that it is at times difficult to distinguish functional analysis from ordinary sociological analysis in that a sociologist would be foolish to investigate the consequences of social behavior.

**SUMMARY**

A rejoinder to this chapter must consider the literature of informal organizations and functional analysis as they relate to the informal nature of the principal subculture. It does not appear to be happenstance that sociologists like Merton and Goffman are mentioned in both reviews of the literature. There seems to be a natural parallel between formal and informal structures and functional analysis. Merton indicated the need to examine social structures of a patterned and repetitive nature. Educational institutions have, over time, established formal and informal social structures which meet this criteria. Although the framework of functionalism predates the study of formal and informal social systems, the paradigm of functional analysis by Merton and the theories advanced by Weber, Roethlisberger and Dickson are contemporary in nature. Focusing particularly on the informal role of the principal, functionalism provides a methodological framework that can produce research inquiry and theoretical induction. Functional analysis provides a lower level of abstraction for examining the informal interplay in school organizations and its consequences for the principal subculture.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

This chapter will consider the selection of the sample, the interview form used in the study, the way in which the interview form was administered and the analysis of the data. The strategies and circumstances which influenced the development of the aforementioned areas will be addressed in detail.

Selection

The selection of the sample came after considering the feasibility of multiple alternatives. Initially, the investigator explored using a cross-cultural sample of school principals from another country, particularly Kingston, Jamaica. The pace at which matters are addressed by the Jamaican bureaucracy indicated long response times between the Ministry of Education and the investigator. The investigator had contacts in Kingston who tried to facilitate the communications process. However, even with the assistance of these contacts the investigator was not able to significantly improve the communications flow. As a result, the researcher abandoned the consideration of this sample possibility.

The second alternative involved pursuing one school district subdivision of a very large urban metropolitan school district. The investigator personally carried letters to the committee of the school
district that reviews outside research proposals. The committee responded by saying that the research proposal did not offer enough advantages for the school district to permit conducting the research.

Finally, the investigator approached a smaller urban school district in the same city as the district which had rejected the investigator's earlier request. Board permission was not necessary to conduct the study. However, the investigator's initial success to the school district was through the efforts of a board member. Although the superintendent and the two deputy superintendents granted tentative permission to conduct the study, final approval from the principals themselves was necessary. The principals' permission to conduct the interviews was critical, because the principals were the units being interviewed. Fortunately, the investigator gained permission from the total population of principals in the school district to conduct the study. The investigator was given permission to address the principals in the district at their regularly scheduled Tuesday meeting. The principals unanimously endorsed the study. One contributing factor was the fact that one of the principals in the school district had mutual educational experiences with the investigator which he shared with the other principals. The investigator used the week following the Tuesday meeting developing a schedule of interview appointments for the respective principals. The investigator telephoned each principal in the school district to determine a time to conduct the interview.

Sample

The school district used in the study is located in a large metropolitan city in the Southwestern United States. The school
district selected is not the largest school district in the city. It serves 17,483 students with sixteen schools—ten elementary and six secondary. The school district is in the northeast quadrant of the city, just outside the interstate loop system (see Appendix A). In addition to its Board of Education and superintendent, there are two deputy superintendents, four levels of assistant superintendents, eleven directors and sixteen supervisors (see Appendix B, Organizational Chart).

The community served by the school district is in a bedroom section of the city. Initially, the school district served a predominantly white clientele; however, over the past years that ratio has been shifting to one which is predominantly black. This is emphasized by the fact that the school board is predominantly black.

The sample was composed of 16 principals representing the total number of schools in the district. The principals involved were a very heterogeneous combination—six white, ten black, five female, and eleven male. There were ten elementary principals, four middle school principals, and two high school principals. The investigator conducted interviews over a two-week period and averaged 45 minutes per interview. Permission of the principals was crucial, due to the potentially sensitive nature of some of the interview questions. After the investigator received permission from the administration and principals, appointments for interviews were set up by the investigator with respective principals.

**Emics and Etics**

According to Harris, Kenneth Pike introduced emic and etic constructs to provide access into the dynamics of a social system and initial points of analysis.1 Pike's framework derives the words "etic"
Common across cultures, phonetics are the sounds of a language that are based upon a taxonomy of the body parts active in the production of speech utterances and their characteristic environmental effects in the form of acoustic waves. Unlike phonemics, they do not include the cultural parts of speech such as accent or dialect. Phonemics take into consideration the sounds based on the implicit or unconscious system of sound contrasts that native speakers have inside their heads, that they employ when assigning meaning to utterances, and that they use in producing a native language. Applied in a broader sense, etic becomes an outside, external or generalized understanding that spans various cultures, emic is a native understanding particular to a specific culture.

Emics and Etics Interview Form

Harris presents a case of emics and etics based on his study of farmers in the state of Kerala in Southern India. Harris interviewed farmers concerning the death of their domestic cattle. Each farmer stated firmly that he would never consciously shorten the life of his cattle by killing or starving them to death. Each farmer was firm in his belief in the standard Hindu prohibition against the slaughter of domestic bovines (cattle). Yet, when animal reproductive histories were examined, the mortality rate of male calves was twice as high as the mortality rate of female calves. It was also noted that male calves got sick more often. When farmers were asked to explain these inordinate differences, it was suggested that the males simply ate less than the females. Further questioning revealed that the male calves were
restricted to much shorter feeding periods at the mothers' teats than were female calves. No farmer alluded to the fact that there was virtually no need for traction animals, resulting in males being culled and females being reared.\textsuperscript{3}

The emics of the situation suggest that there was no premeditated attempt to shorten the life of any male calf. The etics of the situation suggest that cattle ratios are systematically adjusted to the need of the local ecology and economy through preferential male "bovicide." From the emic perspective, the systemic relationship between Kerala's cattle sex ratios and local ecological and economic conditions simply does not exist. The reverse of this situation was found in other cultures where "traction animals" held a higher priority.\textsuperscript{4}

In an anthropological sense, the emic and etic perspective utilizes an informant/field observer relationship. Other synonyms such as internal/external, native/observer, indigenous/outside observer may be used to describe this relationship. As a result, consideration is given to the fact that underlying every observer etic is a possible emic foundation. For example, if anthropologists are born and trained in the United States, then go to South America to study the Yanomamo culture, they carry the emic perspective of those raised in the United States with them. For these observers, etic objectivity becomes a matter of reducing the influence of their own emic in favor of the logic of science. The "ugly American" is probably an example of someone who employs little sensitivity for the emics of another culture and depends solely on a personal emic focus—a focus which is often unacceptable to the natives that he visits and the scientific community.
On the other hand, one might note that associated with every emic is the possibility of an etic point of view. For instance, a school administrator from Jamaica (informant) involved in a description of his educational system for an American school administrator (observer) might employ a predominantly emic perspective. However, if the Jamaican is questioned about his practices, his shared understanding with his visitor of the tenets of science might allow him at least in part to see himself in a shared or cross-etic light. Among anthropologists, a lack of this conceptual ability might be considered an objectivity deficiency which they sometimes call "being (informant) or going (observer) native."

Appendix C shows that the emic-etic can present a relatively comprehensive combination of observer-informant data collection relationships. For instance, the observer can pose questions or collect data from an etic or an emic perspective. The observer could initiate inquiry from the classic etic (external or scientific observer) stance or share his personal emic with the natives or informants, possibly as a part of certain cross-cultural exchanges or comparisons. The informant can respond from an emic perspective, and in those cases where the informant is familiar with the tenets of science, the informant can respond from an etic perspective. Keeping these various perspectives in mind, four types of analysis are possible: etic/emic (the classic mode used by social researchers), etic/etic, emic/emic, and emic/etic. It should be noted that these names of analysis types represent the informant perspective first, the observer perspective second.
Although several inquiry modes such as historical or contemporary document analysis, survey methods, or participant observation may employ specific analysis types noted in Appendix C, the most obvious adaptation of emic and etic inquiry would probably be interviews between investigators in the field and native informants. In this study, interview method targeted as a research tool in exploring a principal (school administrator) subculture in a particular school district is an example of how the emic and etic framework can guide the interviews of principals (natives). The investigator employs an unstructured, scheduled interview, i.e., specific interview questions, but the interviewer is not restricted to only questions on the interview form in determining the actual meaning of the respondents' answers. Discussion of this example will focus on the four analysis types, their meanings noted in Appendix C, and their relationship to specific interview questions. The specification of the four informant/observer relations to the study of the principals' informal system follows:

a. Etic/Emic - the investigator (Etic) is asking the principal (Emic) how a phenomenon is perceived from the perspective of the principal as a native. The question might be phrased by saying, "Tell me how, by what means, do you interact informally with other principals or peers?"

b. Etic/Etic (cross etic) - the investigator (Etic) is asking the principal (Etic) to step out of his role and speak from an objective external observer's perspective. The question might be phrased, "As an objective external observer, tell me how you would view the means by which
Informal interaction takes place between and among principals in your system?

c. Emic/Emic (cross emic) - the investigator (Emic) describes the phenomenon in his system as it is perceived from his own perspective as a native. The principal (Emic) might be asked to respond to the same phenomenon from his position as a native. The question might be posited, "As a member of this research team, the means by which I informally interact with other team members are by telephone, chance meetings, and eating together. How does that compare with the way you interact with your fellow principals?"

d. Emic/Etic - the investigator (Emic) describes the phenomenon in his system as it is perceived from his own perspective as a native. The principal (Etic) steps out of his native role and speaks from an objective external perspective. The question might be posited, "The means by which I informally interact with other members of this research team are by telephone, chance meetings, and eating together. As an external observer, how would you describe these means by which informal interaction takes place between and among the research team members that I described?"

The most common question/answer mode is the etic-emic combination. In this study, there are seven sets of these four types of questions. Each set includes an etic/emic question first (all capital letters)
and the other three questions (upper and lower case letters): the etic/etic, emic/emic, and the emic/etic. Appendix D presents a sample interview form.

Administration

The instrument was administered in an urban school district. Prior to the administering of the instrument, the investigator sought permission from the superintendent to conduct the interviews. The principals in the district met with this researcher prior to the interviews. The interviewer explained the project to the principals and received their voluntary cooperation. It was crucial to get backing from the central administration office and all the principals. This provided essential "rites of passage" for the interviewer. An advantage of having the principals meet prior to the interview was that schedules were set for school interviews. Each interview consisted of seven interview sets with four questions each and lasted approximately 45 minutes. The investigator completed two or three interviews per day.

All of the interview data obtained have remained confidential. The results will be shared with the school district. The interview was given with a minimum of inconvenience to the principal's busy work schedule. The investigator did not use a tape recorder. Rather, the principals' responses were written in longhand form. The investigator set up a notebook such that each principal's response to a question appeared on the same sheet of paper. This process enhanced the investigator's ability to analyze the data using the intraform and interform of question analysis. The investigator assured the principal's anonymity in the study.
Data Analysis

The investigator used three types of analyses to identify emerging generalizations which resulted from the interview data. A brief description of the terminology used in the analysis of data is given to enhance the reader's comprehension. The terms are as follows (see Appendix E):

1. Interview set - is composed of a group of four questions (e.g., 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4). There are seven such sets in the interview form.

2. Question - is an interview question within a set of four.

3. Subgeneralization - primary generalization from clustering of data through inductive analysis and classification of responses.

4. Generalizations - final generalizations from clustering of subgeneralizations. The most abstract summary of the data, common trends or themes.

The first type of analysis is called "intraquestion form of analysis" (see Appendix E). This form of analysis examines each question in each of the interview sets. The principal's responses to a particular question are grouped to produce a data field for inductive analysis. For example, question 2.1 from principal #1 is listed with question 2.1 from principal #2, etc. From this procedure subgeneralizations and generalizations are formed based on the responses to each question.

The only exception to this pattern is interview set questions 1.1 - 1.4. Question 1.1 is used to gather sociometric data about the principals in the urban school district. Questions 1.2 - 1.4 are used as cross-check items in the interview questionnaire and also maintain continuity to the standard question format established throughout the questionnaire.
The second type of subsequent analysis the investigator refers to is "interquestion form of analysis" (see Appendix F). In this form of analysis, the investigator compared subgeneralizations and/or generalizations from each question within a set to the subgeneralizations or generalizations from the other questions within the set. Within each interview set, subgeneralizations are compared and contrasted to produce similar or improved generalizations. This form of analysis necessarily operates at a higher level of abstraction than intraquestion analysis, but provides a manageable framework for interquestion analysis.

The alternative form of "interquestion analysis" operates initially at a lower level of abstraction. All responses to all questions within a particular interview set are listed so that all principals' responses to each question are represented in a large data field. If there were 30 principals responding to 1.1 - 1.4, 120 responses would compare the data field for induction and possible generalizations. Generalizations will be derived from each set, based on a new clustering of this large data field. The process is repeated for each set. This process appears relatively cumbersome and is used only when the initial form of interquestion analysis is inappropriate.

These three forms of analysis are presented as conceptual guides to analysis, not as mechanical or lock-step procedures. When appropriate, they are conceptual frameworks that guide the natural interplay between specific observations and emerging generalizations. The selection of an analysis form as well as actual data analysis was continually cross-checked with individuals on the thesis committee.
SUMMARY

Originally the sample selection site was Kingston, Jamaica. However, communication problems between the investigator and the Ministry of Education caused the investigator and his adviser to consider other alternatives. The second choice was a large school district in a large metropolitan area. A proposal submitted to the district's research committee did not receive approval. Therefore, a third district was sought. The proposal was submitted and approved. This was a smaller school district in the same large metropolitan area in the Southwestern United States.

The school district had 16 schools—10 elementary schools, 4 middle schools and 2 high schools—in a bedroom community of the city. The community was one which had gone through transition from a predominantly white to predominantly black clientele. The school board was predominantly black, but the superintendent was white. The principals involved in the study were a very heterogeneous combination—six white, ten black, five female, and eleven male. The investigator conducted interviews over a two-week period and averaged 45 minutes per interview. All 16 principals consented to the interview procedure, creating total population for that district.

The theoretical framework, grounded in emics and etics, received considerable attention. The basic rationale for the theoretical framework was to utilize the informant/field observer relationship used in anthropology. It was noted that underlying every observer etic is an emic foundation. In basic terms, it should be noted that an emic perspective deals with observations made by persons (informants) within a
culture or organization, as opposed to etic observations which are observations made by persons outside a culture or organization or by persons who are not indigenous to a culture or organization. A crucial criterion in the interview methodology was the fact that the interview respondents, in this case the principals, had to have a basic understanding of the tenets of science. Otherwise a role reversal, which would allow a respondent to answer from the etic perspective, could not take place.

Cognizant of this factor, four interview perspectives evolved, centered around a common theme. The four types are as follows: the etic/emic (the classic/single issue mode used by social researchers), etic/etic, emic/emic and emic/etic. It should be noted that these names of analysis types represent the informant perspective first (e.g., etic/emic, etic/etic) and the observer perspective second (e.g., emic/emic, emic/etic). (See Appendix C.)

As indicated earlier, all 16 principals consented to the interview. All of the interview data obtained has remained confidential. The results will be shared with the school district. The investigator did not use a tape recorder; rather, the principals' responses were written in longhand form. A notebook was set up by the investigator such that each principal's response to a question appeared on the same sheet of paper. This process enhanced the investigator's ability to analyze the data using the intraform and interform question analysis. The investigator assumed the principal's anonymity in the study.

To analyze the data, three types of analyses were used to analyze the generalizations resulting from the interview data. However, a brief
description of the terminology was necessary to enhance the reader's comprehension of the data. Words such as interview set, question, subgeneralization, and generalization were put into context. The three forms of analyses were intraquestion analysis, interquestion analysis, and an alternate form of interquestion analysis. The first type, intraquestion form of analysis, examines each question in each of the interview sets. The principal's responses to a particular question are grouped to produce a data field for inductive analysis (see Appendix E).

The second type of analysis referred to is interquestion form of analysis. In this form of analysis the investigator compared subgeneralizations and/or generalizations from each question within a set to the subgeneralizations or generalizations from the other questions within the set. Within each interview set, subgeneralizations are compared and contrasted to produce similar or improved generalizations (see Appendix F).

The third form, alternate interquestion analysis, examines all responses to all questions within a particular set which are listed so that all principals' responses to each question are represented in a large data field. Generalizations will be derived from each set, based on a new clustering of this large data field. The process is repeated for each set. This process appears cumbersome and was not utilized in this study. It should be noted that these three forms of analysis are presented as conceptual guides to analysis and not as mechanical or lock-step procedures. The elements in this chapter, while for the most part descriptive in nature, also provide analytical insight as well as conceptual guides to understand the framework of the study.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Two-Way Communication

The first question in the interview set produced a sociogram. The sociogram indicated two-way communication links (Figure 1) as well as all one-way and two-way communication links (Figure 2).

Figure 1 shows two-way verified communication between principals in the urban school district; e.g., principals 6 and 14 independently identified each other as informal communication partners. The sociogram (Fig. 1) emerged as a result of interview question 1.1: "Tell me, among other principals in the district, which ones would you most likely contact for information or advice?" Each circle has a number and a letter. The number represents a principal in the urban school district. The letter is one of three which represents the school's level; e.g., E = elementary, M = middle school, and H = high school. The arrows at each end of a bar indicate independent verification by two principals that they informally communicate with each other. However, this sociogram does not indicate the frequency with which this interaction takes place. There are three strata of educational institutions represented, as was mentioned earlier. The district has 10 elementary, 4 middle, and 2 high schools.

As noted in Figure 1, two-way verified communication between principals in this urban district suggest informal structure which...
FIGURE 1  VERIFIED TWO WAY COMMUNICATION
FIGURE 2 ALL ONE AND TWO WAY COMMUNICATION!
closely parallels formal school district structure. Elementary principals tend to associate with elementary principals, middle school principals with middle school, and high school with high school principals. The only exception noted in this figure is the relationship between a high school principal (number 11) and an elementary principal (number 1). These two were previously assistant principals in the same high school and maintained their relationship after becoming principals.

Due to the relatively small size of the district (16 schools) and a high degree of inbreeding, this could be expected. When the researcher presented all reported communication links (see Figure 2), one- and two-way links, the general clustering of elementary principals with elementary principals, and secondary principals with secondary principals (high school and middle school) is apparent. Again, the only exceptions seem to be with the relationship between 1 and 11, and a somewhat weaker one-way relationship between 9 and 4.

Licata and Hack reported clan-like and guild-like grouping patterns among suburban school principals. Clan-like groupings among elementary school principals in their study exhibited relationships in which principals tended to interact informally with elementary school principals who (1) had worked for them as teacher or assistant principal (or they had worked for in such a capacity), (2) shared a common ancestor or mentor, or (3) were close socially as friends, neighbors or relatives—each sharing common professional aspirations and socialization experiences. Guild-like relationships seemed to rest on group members' feelings that they held their positions because they were seen by superiors, members of community, other professionals and one another.
as having relevant and specialized abilities which made them logical persons for their roles. They share common professional interests and the need for mutual aid and protection.²

The grouping patterns in Figure 1 appear less definitive with respect to the clan and guild notions. Certainly the middle school principals suggest a clan-like grouping when one realizes 9 worked for 10 before becoming a principal himself. In the larger group, 6, 8, 14, 3, 1, 7, 11 and possibly 13, clan-like characteristics are present. Principals 8 and 3 are sisters, 3 was once an assistant principal of 14, 11 was an assistant principal with 1 in the same school, 6 and 14 were both older principals with more than 20 years in the district as teachers and principals who reported that they interacted together as a result of similar philosophies, 3 and 1 as well as 7 and 1 also reported that their interaction ties were related to shared philosophical and practical orientations. These relationships seem similar to those Licata and Hack identified as clan-like.

An interesting diad was found between principals 4 and 5. Factors which focused the investigator's attention to this diad were their age, racial composition of their schools, years of educational and administrative experience and their backgrounds. Principals 4 and 5 administer schools having ratios that are approximately 60% black and 40% white, with enrollments of 578 and 877 respectively. The two have 67 years of teaching and administrative experience between them. Both principals come from very different backgrounds. One principal was an army intelligence officer and speaks five languages, while the other principal is actively pursuing a doctorate degree in education. Principals 4 and 5
have a clan-like (and guild-like) relationship based on many years in
the business together and the location of their schools makes them
professional neighbors. These principals were not perceived as tired
individuals waiting for retirement. They were constantly concerned
about the future of their students, coupled with a thorough understand­
ing of the dynamics necessary to maintain a stable community. One
principal was commonly referred to by his peers as "The Old Gray Fox."
In terms of other principals' perceptions, principals 4 and 5, and to
a degree, 6 and 14 appear to be "honored anachronisms," for they were
seemingly from another place in time but bringing the sum total of their
skills and experiences to bear in their present position.

Principals 11 and 13 are the only two high school principals in
the district. They have developed a more guild-like relationship based
on mutual respect for each other's competence and administrative abili­
ties. Were it not for the unusual relationship between 1 and 11, the
three levels of schools (elementary, middle, and secondary) would exhibit
much the same grouping patterns as was present in the suburban grapevine
study.

All One- and Two-Way Communication

Figure 2 represents all one-way and two-way informal communication
patterns between and among principals. By carefully examining the maze
of circles and arrows, one can perceive certain patterns. For example,
principals 2, 8, 6, 3, 14, 7, 1, 16, 5 and 4 are elementary principals
grouped together. With the exception of the aforementioned relationship
between 1 and 11 and a weak one-way link between 4 and 9, elementary and
secondary groupings are clearly distinguishable. The secondary group
is composed of the middle school and high school principals 11, 13, 10, 9, 12 and 15. Upon closer examination of the two groups (elementary and secondary), "immediate" and "extended member" relationships can be observed. In the elementary cluster, principals 6, 8, 3, 14, 7, 1, 5 and 4 are considered immediate members because they are engaged in a two-way communication network. While elementary principals 2 and 16 are considered extended members, because there are no two-way interaction patterns with only limited (no more than 2) one-way communication patterns. More attention will be given to immediate and extended member relations when sponsorship patterns are examined.

Another interesting pattern that emerged in the elementary group was the fact that certain elementary principals were focal points of interaction patterns. Principals 1 and 3 seem to be the principals most contacted by other principals. Principals 1 and 3 assume a shaman-like role in that they are regarded as specialists whose primary function is to protect the principal subculture from harm. These skills or perceptions, perhaps literally the "tricks of the trade," give principals 1 and 3 high legitimacy among their peers. A principal remarked, "I call 1 to get the flow of things." Another commented, "He (1) and I think along the same lines; he's a good sounding board." One would think these two to be stately deans of the principals' subculture. However, this is not the case. Both are in their middle to late 30s with an average of 9\frac{1}{2} years of administrative experience.

The secondary school cluster of principals are 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. In terms of immediate member relationships, principals 9 and 10, 11 and 13 would belong to the previous definition, where there is at
least one two-way interaction with several (more than 2) one-way patterns. Principals 12 and 15 would be considered extended members, due to the absence of any two communication links.

As was mentioned earlier, Figure 2 provides an opportunity to analyze possible sponsorship patterns in both the elementary and secondary clusters. These patterns may be useful in explaining lines of communication as well as clan-like relationships. For example, at the elementary level 2 worked for 6, 3 worked for 14, and 7 worked for 4. A variation from this pattern is considered in the fact that 8 worked for a now central office administrator. The researcher is not sure if the possible sponsorship was during the person's tenure as a principal or central office administrator. It is interesting to note that not all possible sponsorship patterns result in two-way interaction patterns. For example, principals 2 and 6, and 4 and 7, are one-way links whereas in the same cluster principals 14 and 3 do two-way interactions with each other. If the sponsors feel the sponsorees have no valuable input, it was not conveyed during the interviews.

Analysis of the secondary cluster reveals that 9 sponsored 15 and 10, while 11 also sponsored 10. However, in terms of two-way links principals 9 and 10 are the only principals with two-way sponsorship links. Sponsor 9 does not call sponsoree 15 and sponsor 11 never calls sponsoree 10. It is interesting that the two patterns exist in both group clusters (elementary and secondary). Also, it should be noticed that when the two clusters (elementary and secondary) are compared based on sponsorship patterns, they both appear clan-like. This is in contrast to the finding of the suburban grapevine study where elementary clusters
were clan-like and secondary clusters were guild-like. Secondary principals 11 and 13 are exceptions because they appear guild-like based on their respect for each other's administrative skills and there is no sponsorship pattern between them.

A social structure that was patterned and repetitive, in both the suburban and the current urban informal interaction studies, was the appearance of principals linking in diads and triads with respect to one- and two-way interaction patterns. In the suburban study, for example, the high school principals form a two-way triad relationship. Triads in the urban study are formed by the combination of one-way and two-way links, as demonstrated by principals 3, 6 and 14 in Figure 2. Diads of one-way and two variety are common in both the suburban and urban studies.

Principals were examined sociometrically as to whether they would consider upward mobility into central office administration. At the elementary school level, only 37% of the principals wanted or considered moving into a central office position, while at the secondary level 83.3% of the principals had central office aspirations. In the suburban grapevine study two groups distinguished themselves. One group had characteristics similar to the "GAS-ers" portrayed in Griffiths' et al. study of teacher mobility: in New York City. GAS-ers were described as young, mobile teachers who ascended to the principalship after spending little time teaching in the classroom. The second group consisted of principals who had been teachers for an extended period of time before becoming principals. Lipham would describe this group as "nonpromotable," that is, having no aspirations beyond the principalship. No such
delineations emerged in the present study. However, it should be kept in mind that some principals were hesitant about verbally expressing central office aspirations, while others were quite positive about their position. Therefore, it would be difficult to be definitive about the percentages based on the ambiguity of the input.

**Interview Set Analysis**

Each Table 1-6 summarizes the 16 principals' responses to their informal interactions in the form of generalizations. Each table is divided into two sections. The first two questions (i.e., 2.1 and 2.2) describe the etic/emic and etic/etic responses. The second two questions (2.3 and 2.4) describe the emic/emic and emic/etic responses. All of the tables consider the characteristics, social meaning and sample responses for the generalizations generated by the principal respondents. It should be made clear that these responses are not totally inclusive of all the possible responses. However, the responses given in the tables are representative of those responses suggested by the data field. It is interesting to note that the etic/emic and etic/etic question do evoke a descriptive response, as opposed to emic/emic and emic/etic responses which generally produce judgmental or evaluative responses. This is the rationale underlying table organization.

Table 1 interview set 2.1 and 2.2 addresses the question of factors that would inhibit the informal exchange of information between principals. The etic/emic and etic/etic responses agreed that lack of trust and/or confidence and the nature of the information are factors which can significantly inhibit the exchange of information. One principal stated: "I am least likely to contact a peer if I have no confidence
**TABLE 1**

**Data Analysis - Interview Set 2.1-2.2, 2.3-2.4**

**Question 2.1 (Etic/Etic) -** Tell me, what factors would inhibit informal exchange of information between principals over administrative situations?

**Question 2.2 (Etic/Etic) -** Tell me, as an external observer, what factors would inhibit the informal exchange of information between principals over administrative situations?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.1 & 2.2.
**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.1 only.
***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.2 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1) Lack of trust or confidence inhibits principals.</td>
<td>1) Principals would not exchange information with a peer who was thought to be not trustworthy or in whom other principals had no confidence.</td>
<td>1) I am least likely to contact a principal if I have no confidence in his/her output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The nature of the information can act as an inhibitor.</td>
<td>2) A principal may not interact with certain peers because it is felt the information is not relative to a peer or the information could be used against him.</td>
<td>2) A feeling person would not have the needed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) This principal feels free to contact anyone in the district.</td>
<td>3) This principal feels s/he can access any peer in the district for information or informal exchange.</td>
<td>3) Feels free to contact any principal in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Differences in philosophy and perspectives can prevent interaction.</td>
<td>4) Peers who do not share the same educational and administrative philosophy would not be likely to exchange information informally.</td>
<td>4) I would not consult a person who has a different philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Ego feeding or a sign of weakness could affect principal interaction.</td>
<td>5) A principal would not interact with a peer if it was perceived that the peer's self-esteem were being fed, or the peer viewed the principal as weak or incompetent.</td>
<td>5) If peers were the kind to find fault, or if I thought they would engage in destructive criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6) Nonfamiliarity and dissimilar student bodies can negatively affect interaction.</strong></td>
<td>6) Principals generally will not interact with peers where there has been no prior basis for interaction. Principals may not interact with peers whose schools differ in terms of size, student composition, etc.</td>
<td>6) Nonfamiliarity with a particular principal and a situation where student body is not comparable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***6) Indirect involvement prevents direct access and acts as an inhibitor.</td>
<td>6) The formal and informal nature of the organization is not conducive to a large amount of direct peer involvement. Therefore, few inhibiting factors result.</td>
<td>6) Loosely connected groups produce minimal amounts of interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 1 (continued)**

Question 2.3 (Emic/Emic) - In my position as a graduate student, I tend **not** to seek counsel from persons whose credibility is in question. How would you describe this position as a principal?

Question 2.4 (Emic/Etic) - In my position as a graduate student, I tend **not** to seek counsel from persons whose credibility is in question. How would you describe this position as an objective external observer?

*Produced by intraquestion form analysis of 2.3 & 2.4.

**Produced by intraquestion form analysis of 2.3 only.

***Produced by intraquestion form analysis of 2.4 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Contact persons in question anyway but use the information wisely.</td>
<td>1) The graduate student should interact with persons of questionable credibility but critically evaluate the input received.</td>
<td>1) Seek counsel, then determine whether it is useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Do not seek counsel of person in question.</td>
<td>2) The graduate student would gain nothing by interacting with the person in question.</td>
<td>2) If credibility is in question, you're wasting time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Get other opinions first, then make a decision to seek the person's counsel or not.</td>
<td>3) The graduate student would be wise to gather a number of other relevant opinions, then decide as to whether counsel of the person in question is needed or not.</td>
<td>3) Seek information from others and make decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Do not seek counsel of person in question because of possible implication-by-association notions.</strong></td>
<td>4) If the person's credibility is in question, then the graduate student, by virtue of association with this person, might also have his credibility questioned.</td>
<td>3) Person seeking counsel might be hurt, through the guilt-by-association notion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in his input. Lack of confidence and honesty inhibit me. No confidence if former contacts have not been beneficial." Other factors which inhibit the informal exchange of information between 2.1 and 2.2 are differences in philosophy, ego feeding, unfamiliar and dissimilar student bodies and indirect involvement with other principal. The term "ego feeding", contextually speaking, refers to increasing a peer's self esteem by consulting the peer for advice. All of the factors in the previous statement were 12% or less, looking at the respondents from 2.1. However, in question 2.2, responses dealing with indirect involvement were up 25% from 6.3% in question 2.1. Typical responses were: "Physical separation and lack of time would be an inhibiting factor. Loosely connected groups (diads and triads) produce minimal amounts of interaction. Not being directly involved one could not determine inhibiting factors."

Table 1 interview set 2.3 and 2.4 examines a graduate student's position not to seek counsel from persons who have questionable credibility via the emic/emic and emic/etic perspective; 62% of the emic/emic respondents and 50% of the emic/etic respondents said: "The person having questionable credibility should be contacted but use information wisely. Try it one time to see if any future interaction is warranted. You should ask anyway and evaluate." Two other responses, both accounting for 19% in the emic/emic domain, stated: "A person with questionable credibility should not be sought and another opinion should be sought first before making a decision. This response was similar with the emic/etic perspective. A different concern was posited by one principal who stated, "A person seeking counsel may be hurt through the
guilt-by-association notion."

In Table 2 interview set 3.1 and 3.2 the investigator is trying to determine the means or structure used in informal communication. Actually, several questions are addressed. The etic/emic perspective identifies the mechanism and places used for informal communication. The responses show 100% of the principals use the telephone and make personal contact informally with peers. Principals generally said the telephone and personal conversation, the telephone and personal interaction, or the telephone and school visitations were the mechanisms principals thought appropriate to communicate informally with peers. With respect to the place, 75% interact informally at regularly scheduled meetings. When questioned about regularly scheduled meetings, respondents replied: "I generally meet informally at principals' meetings, staff meetings and lunch. Informal meetings seem to parallel the formal meeting, but there are also luncheons. I generally interact informally at principals' meetings, board meetings and travel to conventions." Another 25% stated that their informal meetings were in social settings, at lunch or workshops or meetings in other principals' offices. These would not follow the normal formal structure.

As an objective observer in the etic/etic perspective, 38% believe informal communication is externally visible. With respect to the conditions under which communication is externally visible, the principals commented: "Communication is externally visible to some extent. Communication is observable in terms of personal contact, but almost unobservable in terms of the telephone. The socialization aspect is externally observable." Assuming the opposite position, 31% consider
TABLE 2
Data Analysis - Interview Set 3.1-3.2, 3.3-3.4

Question 3.1 (Etic/Enic) - Tell me, what means or structure do you use in communicating informally with peers?

Question 3.2 (Etic/Enic) - Tell me, as an objective external observer how do you describe the means by which this informal communication takes place?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 3.1 & 3.2.
**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 3.1 only.
***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 3.2 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1) Regularly scheduled meetings are a means of informal communication.</td>
<td>1) Regularly scheduled meetings (i.e., principals, school board, etc.) provide a forum for principals to communicate informally.</td>
<td>1) Visitations before, during, and after principals' meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lunch, workshops and conventions provide informal settings for communication.</td>
<td>2) Impromptu or non-regularly scheduled activities such as lunch and workshops provide additional opportunities for informal communication among principals.</td>
<td>2) Workshops and conventions are a good way to informally communicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**3) Telephone and personal contact are mechanisms for informal communication.</td>
<td>3) Principals many times use the telephone and personal contact to communicate informally.</td>
<td>3) I use the telephone or personal conversation, never in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***3) The informal nature of the system provides an opportunity for peers to interact.</td>
<td>3) The organizational structure provides an informal setting exchange of information.</td>
<td>3) There exists a tightly jointed, almost family atmosphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**4) Social setting at the home of the principal is a place for interaction.</td>
<td>4) Social occasions at the homes of various principals provide an opportunity for interaction of an informal nature.</td>
<td>4) Sometimes communication takes place at home with a cup of coffee, can of beer, or any social occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***4) Informal communication is not externally visible.</td>
<td>4) Principals communicate informally in their office or other closed areas, making external observations virtually impossible.</td>
<td>4) Informal communication is not externally visible because contacts are made in confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**5) Meeting in principal's office is an informal setting.</td>
<td>5) Informal communication takes place via principal visitation (i.e., one principal will visit another's office).</td>
<td>5) I generally meet in my or the other principal's office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***5) Informal communication is externally visible.</td>
<td>5) It would not be difficult to observe principals in informal communication settings.</td>
<td>5) Informal communication is visible in terms of personal contact but not by phone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) A positive approach in informal interaction.</td>
<td>1) Principals believe meetings after class and planned informal social gatherings are acceptable means of informal interaction.</td>
<td>1) A positive, wholesome exchange of ideas is helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 3.3 & 3.4.*
informal communication to be externally not visible. Principals replied: "Informal communication is not externally visible because contacts are made in confidence. Informal communication is readily discernible unless you can be trusted. Informal communication is not discernible unless you are looking for it." Other etic/etic responses stated informal communication parallels the formal system, depends on the informal nature of the system and events not normally scheduled in the system.

Table 2 interview set 3.3 and 3.4 views a graduate student's informal communication with peers in a planned informal setting from the emic/emic and emic/etic perspectives. In this case both perspectives totally agree that planned informal gatherings are a positive approach for informal communication. Responses like "best way to generate ideas; a positive, wholesome exchange of ideas is helpful and people are prone to speak freely" are indicative of the replies received.

The question for discussion, in Table 3 interview set 4.1 and 4.2, considers the situation that motivated a principal's last informal interaction. From the etic/emic point of view 44% of the situations were motivated by teacher related matters concerning the AFT organizers in the district. Responses such as "I interacted regarding the AFT representative on my campus; I interacted after an encounter with an AFT representative; I used a peer as a sounding board regarding a teacher problem" were common. Another 44% of the principals stated that central office and policy concerns prompted them to informal interaction. Some of their specific responses stated: "I called a peer to coordinate expenditures for a principals' trip; I called a peer to coordinate a
TABLE 3

Data Analysis - Interview Set 4.1-4.2, 4.3-4.4

| Question 4.1 (Etic/Etic) | Tell me, what was the situation that motivated your last informal interaction with a peer? |
| Question 4.2 (Etic/Etic) | Tell me, as an objective external observer, how would you describe the situation that motivated your last informal interaction with a peer? |

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.1 & 2.2.  
**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.1 only.  
***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 2.2 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1) Central office and policy matters are motivators.</td>
<td>1) The principal called a peer to determine whether their actions were in keeping with school district policy.</td>
<td>1) I called the office in reference to a budgetary matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2) Teacher-related matters can act as motivators.</td>
<td>2) The principal interacted with peers concerning uniform actions they could take against union organizers and other teacher-related matters.</td>
<td>2) I interacted regarding AFT representatives on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***2) Congruency and consistency in decision making will act as motivators.</td>
<td>2) No principal wants to get caught out on a limb, so they interact with one another to make congruent decisions on similar problems.</td>
<td>2) I wanted to make sure reports were similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**3) A relaxed setting stimulates interaction.</td>
<td>3) Settings which are not stressful or threatening can enhance informal interaction.</td>
<td>3) Lighthearted interaction took place at a computer workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***3) Possibility of disruptive forces will precipitate interaction.</td>
<td>3) Impending dangers from external environmental forces will cause informal interaction.</td>
<td>3) The disruptive nature of the AFT representative precipitated the call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**4) Could not remember.</td>
<td>4) The principal would not provide any contextual information.</td>
<td>4) An external observer might consider it questionable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***4) A peculiar setting can cause one to interact.</td>
<td>4) The principal would not provide any contextual information.</td>
<td>4) An external observer might consider it questionable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**5) The need to monitor a teacher will bring about interaction.</td>
<td>5) The principal needed to alert peers to the possibility that a teacher was leaving his school to actively organize in their building.</td>
<td>5) I called neighboring principals to be cognizant of teachers from my school organizing in their building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3 (continued)**

Question 4.3 (Emc/Emc) - In my position as a graduate student, uncertainty and lack of information are factors that cause me to interact with my peers. How would you describe this as a principal?

Question 4.4 (Emc/Etic) - In my position as a graduate student, uncertainty and lack of information are factors that cause me to interact with my peers. How would you describe this position as an objective external observer?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 4.3 and 4.4.*

**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 4.3 only.**

***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 4.4 only.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>1) This is a good procedure for seeking information.</em></td>
<td>1) Principals feel this is an acceptable method to interact with peers and gather information.</td>
<td>1) Exchanging ideas is good for decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Peer interaction is not encouraged to gather data.</td>
<td>2) Principals feel this is an unacceptable method to interact with peers and gather information.</td>
<td>2) Information should be sought without peer interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
report; I called a peer concerning the initiation of a new discipline format." The remaining respondents stated a relaxed setting (a principals' workshop) stimulated the last interaction. Finally, one principal just couldn't remember the last informal interaction with a peer. From the etic/etic perspective, 62% of the principals gave the rationale for interacting as wanting to be congruent and consistent in their decisions. When addressing the question, they responded: "I need to make decisions consistent with my peers; I wanted to submit a uniform price range for my expenditures; I was not familiar with the procedure, so I called someone with more experience." Smaller responses cited possible disruptive forces such as the AFT representative, peculiar settings and the monitoring of a teacher as factors which made them consider informal interaction. A somewhat different case was cited where the principal had to inform a neighboring principal that one of his teachers was organizing for the AFT in the neighboring principal's school.

A graduate student's uncertainty and lack of information are factors that cause one to interact with peers. Table 3. interview set 4.3 and 4.4 considers the principals' responses. Nearly 81% of the emic/emic and emic/etic responses agreed that interaction with peers is a good procedure for seeking information. As principals responded to the question, these types of answers were generated: "Exchanging ideas is good for decision making; this is beneficial to one's success and helps serendipitous findings. I feel good about it, it's a mechanism for clarification." The remaining 19%, from both the emic/emic and the emic/etic point of view, agreed that seeking information from peers is not encouraged. One respondent stated: "Go to the source first, then
go to your peers." Another, somewhat different response was: "Information should be sought without peer interaction."

Table 4 interview set 5.1 and 5.2 addresses a two-part question. The presence of a grapevine among principals is examined, as well as how the grapevine is operationalized. In consideration of the etic/emic portion of the question, 94% of the principals believe grapevine structure does exist among the principal subculture. However, one principal (6.3%) did not acknowledge the principal grapevine structure as a viable one. He stated rather strongly that this (grapevine structure) is not a primary structure. Focusing on the operational aspect of the grapevine among principals, 56% of the grapevine forum was conducted in confidence by principals in small numbers (diads or triads). Principals reported these kinds of statements: "Information goes to those principals who often interact with each other. Information is shared with clickish groups that have validity. Concerning the positive exchange of information, no one principal calls everyone." Some 19% of the principals thought the nature of the information determines the recipients. Still, another 19% decided telephones best operationalized the grapevine for them. A remaining 6% expressed the view that most information comes from teachers and not other principals.

Viewing the grapevine operation as an external objective observer, principals felt 50% of the grapevine structure was not externally visible and took place in a confidential setting. Typical responses like "I doubt if a grapevine could be observed due to its exclusive setting; it's not immediately visible, due to its confidential setting; it's not externally discernible, you must gain credibility before
**TABLE 4**

Data Analysis - Interview Set 5.1-5.2, 5.3-5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1) Principals' grapevine is not a primary one.</td>
<td>1) There are grapevines with much more information and more accessible than the principals' grapevine.</td>
<td>1) The principals' grapevine is not the primary grapevine; most input comes from teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Principals' grapevine does exist.</strong></td>
<td>2) There is in existence among principals a grapevine.</td>
<td>2) Yes, there is a grapevine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<strong>2) Principals' grapevine is observable.</strong></td>
<td>2) This grapevine is observable by objective external observers given sufficient time.</td>
<td>2) Grapevine could be observed externally due to grouping patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) The nature of information determines the recipients.</strong></td>
<td>3) The kind of information determines who receives the information because all principals are not in the same group.</td>
<td>3) Information is situation specific; information also determines how extensively the grapevine is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<strong>3) The grapevine is observable as a function of time.</strong></td>
<td>3) If the principals are observed over a significant period of time, the grapevine is observable.</td>
<td>3) Not discernible immediately, but eventually it would be discernible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Telephones are operationalizing factors.</strong></td>
<td>4) Telephones are used by principals in operationalizing the grapevine structure.</td>
<td>4) By phones, cross checks are made to verify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<strong>4) Confidential settings inhibit external observation.</strong></td>
<td>4) Because principals sometimes interact in secluded settings, they are less likely to be observed.</td>
<td>4) Doubt if it could be observed due to exclusive setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) Information is passed in confidence in small numbers.</strong></td>
<td>5) Principals organize in diads and triads when exchanging grapevine information?</td>
<td>5) Information goes to those with whom they most frequently interact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizations</td>
<td>Social Meaning</td>
<td>Sample Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Some support the use of grapevines to gather information.</td>
<td>1) Principals believe the grapevine is a viable support system for administrators.</td>
<td>1) Good; it gives insight into the formal structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Some support alternatives other than grapevines to gather information.</td>
<td>2) Principals should look at information sources other than grapevines as a means of acquiring information.</td>
<td>2) It has its place but is not always desirable, depending on the nature of the information and the grapevine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 5.3 & 5.4.*
inclusion. Twenty-five per cent of the principals thought that grapevine structure was externally observable based on aggregating patterns. They would state: "Grapevines could be observed, due to grouping patterns; grapevines are externally observable by division or school levels." A smaller portion of the respondents (19%) thought that the grapevine was observable as a function of time. The following kinds of statements were generated: "It depends on how long one spends in the district. It's not discernible immediately, but eventually it would be." One principal felt that the grapevine structure was not external, because it does not exist.

The second part of Table 4 is interview set 5.3 and 5.4. These two questions connote the principal's response to a graduate student's grapevine structure. The same observations were apparent for both the emic/emic and the emic/etic perspectives. The largest response (81%) supported the use of grapevines as an acceptable means for information gathering or interaction. These were mostly evaluative in nature and stated: "It's a good idea; grapevines exist in most organizations. It's helpful to students and serves as a guidance system. It's O.K., I used it in school." The remaining 19% of the principals preferred other alternatives to the grapevine as a means of information gathering or interaction. Their responses were voiced along these lines: "It has advantages and disadvantages, due to the nature of the information and objectives. It has its place, but it is not always desirable depending on the nature of the information and the grapevine source."

The question of the grapevine existing and its accessibility to the principals is addressed in Table 5 interview set 6.1 and 6.2. All
**TABLE 5**

Data Analysis - Interview Set 6.1-6.2, 6.3-6.4

Question 6.1 (Etic/Etic) - Tell me, do other grapevines exist in the school district? Do you have access to them? How?

Question 6.2 (Etic/Etic) - Tell me, as an objective external observer, would you say other grapevines exist in the school district? Do you perceive a principal having access to them? How?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 6.1 and 6.2.
**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 6.1 only.
***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 6.2 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**1) Grapevines exist in district.</td>
<td>1) Principals believe that grapevine networks are in operation at various district levels.</td>
<td>1) Yes, other grapevines do exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2) Grapevines are explicitly acknowledged.</td>
<td>1) There is evidence to support the notion that informal lines of communication exist at various strata in the school district.</td>
<td>1) Other grapevines exist because it gets into the community and other parts of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2) Teachers, top administrators, secretaries and students are the grapevines principals access the most.</td>
<td>2) By conducting an item count, these four categories were most frequently mentioned as being grapevine in nature.</td>
<td>2) I feel grapevines exist at every level in the district. I have contact through teachers, top administrators, and by personal contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2) Grapevines are implicitly acknowledged.</td>
<td>2) Principals have reason to believe that the grapevine exists but are not a part of it.</td>
<td>2) Board members and principals have a grapevine but I don't have access to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**3) Answer was not applicable.</td>
<td>4) Grapevines may or may not be visible depending on the level at which they exist in the organizational structure.</td>
<td>4) Grapevines are externally visible at the student and teacher level, not at top admin. level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**4) Grapevines are only observable at certain levels.</td>
<td>5) Grapevines would not be accessible to an external observer because they would not be a part of the informal network.</td>
<td>5) Grapevine would not be externally visible; you would have to know someone first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**5) Grapevines are not observable due to inaccessibility.</td>
<td>6) Grapevines are observable if you remain in the district sufficient time to build credibility with the principals' informal system.</td>
<td>6) Depends on the length of time and how close you are to a principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**6) Grapevines are observable relative to time.</td>
<td>7) Grapevines, depending on their nature, can work to the advantage or disadvantage of a principal's administration.</td>
<td>7) Pro and con; a grapevine can build or tear down teacher morale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6.3 (Emic/Emic) - In my position as a graduate student, I tap into other grapevines. I ask secretaries, administrative assistants, and other clerical personnel about information that cannot be obtained from my peers. How would you describe this action as a principal?

Question 6.4 (Emic/Etic) - In my position as a graduate student, I ask secretaries, administrative assistants, and other clerical personnel about information that cannot be obtained from my peers. How would you describe this position as an objective external observer?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 6.3 and 6.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Tapping into a grapevine is OK for gathering information.</td>
<td>1) Principals felt that asking personnel, at various levels in the organization, for information the principal thought relevant was acceptable.</td>
<td>1) Good idea; a way to gain valid information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Tapping into grapevines brings about reservations.</td>
<td>2) Tapping into other grapevines may bring about undesirable consequences; therefore, careful thought should be exercised before accessing some grapevines.</td>
<td>2) Use discretion when tapping other grapevines; if it will hurt someone, leave it alone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principals acknowledged the presence of other grapevines in the district in response to the first part of question 6.1. There were eleven grapevine categories listed by the principals. The top four, in terms of frequency, are as follows:

(1) teacher grapevine - 15
(2) top administration - 9
(3) secretary grapevine - 7
(4) student grapevine - 4

Responding as an external observer, 56% of the principals acknowledged the existence of other grapevines. They responded with comments like: "There are other grapevines specifically at the elementary level. Other grapevines do exist, especially at the paraprofessional level. There are some grapevines, especially with respect to students, teachers and secretaries." A significant 38% suggested or implied an affirmative answer to the existence of other grapevines. There was one principal's response which was not applicable. The second part of the etic/etic question revealed that 50% of the grapevines were thought to exist and were observable at certain levels within the district. Responses which were given stated: "Grapevines are externally visible, especially in the absence of good public relations. Grapevines are externally visible, due to community and school district involvement. Grapevines are accessed, especially through students, teachers and secretaries." A second group (19%) thought that grapevines were not externally visible and therefore were not sure how to determine access. Comments were generally in the vein: "Grapevine would not be externally visible, because one would have to know someone first." A somewhat larger 25% of
the principals thought external observability would be relative to time spent in the school district. When interviewed, they produced comments like: "It depends on the length of time in the district and how close you are to the principal. Grapevines might eventually, but not immediately, be observable. Grapevines would not be immediately visible, but as time progressed, one could see and be a part of the various grapevines." One principal was concerned about the effects (positive or negative) grapevine structure would have on teacher morale.

Phase two of Table 5 interview set 6.3 and 6.4 has congruent responses to the position of a graduate student tapping into other grapevines. Thirteen of the sixteen principals (81%) considered tapping into other grapevines as a standard operation procedure for gathering information. Consistent with this notion were statements such as: "Tapping is necessary for adequate information; a means of getting valid information at the closest level. A good idea to plug into as many sources as possible." The remaining three respondents (19%) had some reservations about tapping into grapevines to gather data. Apprehensive comments such as: "I would use discretion before tapping into other grapevines. If it will hurt someone, leave it alone."

Table 6 interview section 7.1 and 7.2 speaks to the question of principals' consulting persons outside their peer group. From the etic/emic approach, several perspectives were considered. In terms of considering groups as directly related to school or indirectly related, 75% of the groups designated outside the peer group were directly related to the school environment. Groupings like custodians, teachers, students and secretaries were represented. The remaining 25% mentioned indirect
### TABLE 6
**Data Analysis - Interview Set 7.1-7.2, 7.3-7.4**

**Question 7.1 (Etic/Etic)** - Tell me, outside your peer group, who else do you consult about situations at work?

**Question 7.2 (Etic/Etic)** - Tell me, as an objective external observer, are there occasions where principals consult persons outside your peer group?

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 7.1 & 7.2.
**Produced by intraquestion analysis of 7.1 only.
***Produced by intraquestion analysis of 7.2 only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalizations</th>
<th>Social Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>i) Top 6 categories of people principals consult in the district:</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) directors  d) parents&lt;br&gt;b) teachers  e) custodians&lt;br&gt;c) secretaries f) superintendents</td>
<td>1) Principals consult with a large and varied group of school district personnel while gathering information; this group is consulted most frequently.</td>
<td>1) I consult with directors, board members, asst. principals, secretaries, teachers, parents, students, custodians, and cafeteria personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***i) Conditions and places outside of peer group where principals consult, but within the district.</td>
<td>1) Principals cannot always rely on their peers for information or advice. There are times when it is necessary to seek help or consult outside one's peer group, yet within the confines of the district.</td>
<td>1) Good idea, because peers are not always knowledgeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii) Persons principals are most likely to consult outside the district:</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) husbands  b) wives</td>
<td>2) Some principals are not always able to gain the information they need within the school structure. Therefore persons outside the educational area are consulted or used as sounding boards.</td>
<td>2) The persons I consult most outside the district are my husband and my lawyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***ii) Consulting outside peer groups is a church related practice.</td>
<td>2) Consulting, outside the immediate organizational structure, occurs in both religious and educational organizations.</td>
<td>2) This is a common practice in church organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***iii) Outside consulting is a matter of time, space, and associates.</td>
<td>3) A principal will consult outside the peer group provided one has time to do so, spatial constraints can be easily overcome, and there are associates who have the answers.</td>
<td>3) Consulting outside one's peer group is a function of time, space, and associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***iv) Not aware of principals consulting outside peer group.</td>
<td>4) Some principals are not aware outside consulting takes place; furthermore, it would be difficult to observe.</td>
<td>4) This would not be externally observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizations</td>
<td>Social Meaning</td>
<td>Sample Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Outside consulting is a good procedure.</td>
<td>1) Principals believe consulting persons outside one's peer group is an acceptable procedure to broaden one's information base and explore alternatives.</td>
<td>1) Good idea; get information where you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Outside consulting should be restricted to certain conditions.</td>
<td>2) Principals should not routinely contact or consult outside their peer group; rather, this should be done if alternatives are not immediately available from the usual sources or information cannot be obtained from peers, i.e., legal advice on a school matter.</td>
<td>2) Contacting persons outside the school district should be situation specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Produced by intraquestion analysis of 7.3 & 7.4.*
school categories, noting husbands, wives, lawyers and insurance representatives. The second approach was the frequency with which certain categories appeared in the responses. Examining the 25 categories listed, directly and indirectly related to the district, in descending frequency, the top six categories were:

1. Directors
2. Teachers
3. Secretaries
4. Parents
5. Custodians
6. Superintendents

The objective external approach (7.2) considered occasions where principals consult outside their peer group. The majority of the principals (69%) agreed that there were places and conditions under which consulting outside one's peer group takes place. They responded, stating opinions as: "This is an ongoing process in the district. To my knowledge they all do. This is a good idea, because peers are not always knowledgeable." A smaller group (19%) were not aware of consultation outside the peer group. They stated: "If consulting takes place outside, I'm not aware of it or this does not generally occur." One principal (6.3%) perceived consulting outside one's peer group as similar to practices in church-related organizations, while another principal thought that consulting outside one's peer group was a function of time, space and associates.
The notion of a graduate student consulting persons outside his/her peer group is highlighted in Table 6 interview set 7.3 and 7.4. The generations from 7.3 and 7.4 sort in the same grouping patterns. In the cluster, 94% of the principals felt consulting outside one's peer group was perfectly acceptable. Comments included evaluative statements such as: "Good idea, get information where you can. Helpful; the situation can provide more options. Great; helps crosscheck information where given." The remaining 6% thought that the procedure should be situation specific.

Earlier it was mentioned that most etic/emic and etic/etic responses tended to be descriptive, while most emic/emic and emic/etic responses appeared to be evaluative or attitudinal. If one examines etic/emic and etic/etic questions 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2 and 7.1, 7.2, it will become evident that all of these are indeed descriptive accounts or responses. Emic/emic and emic/etic responses 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4 and 7.3, 7.4 substantiate the evaluative or judgmental nature of those responses. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, mentioned earlier, support emic/emic and emic/etic responses when used in a crosscheck framework. However, 2.3 and 2.4 have an atypical nature in that they are descriptive.

Comparing Suburban and Urban Grapevines

The idea of replicating lines of inquiry, if only in a quasi manner, provides an opportunity to question and speculate as to the causes of commonalities and differences regarding research. The grapevine study conducted by Licata and Hack was operationalized in a suburban setting, as opposed to the administrator's informal subculture in an urban
district using emic and etic analyses. Hereafter it will be the "urban grapevine" study.

Licata and Hack's grapevine delineated two groups of principals called guild-like and clan-like. Guild-like abilities among principals were based on administrative skills and specialized abilities. Clan-like characteristics were based on social or quasi consanguineous relationships with persons having similar aspirations. In the grapevine study, guild-like characteristics existed at the secondary level and clan-like conditions were represented at the elementary level. This was not the case with the urban grapevine study. Clan-like conditions were prevalent at both the secondary and elementary levels based on possible sponsorship. In the grapevine study, all schools sorted with respect to elementary, middle school and high school levels. The urban grapevine study was somewhat the same, with the exception of a two-way relationship between principals 1 and 11 (see Figure 1) which linked the elementary and high schools together. That unusual relationship was explained earlier in the chapter.

The words "GAS-ers" and "nonpromotables", mentioned in the suburban grapevine study, were terms coined by Griffiths and Lipham respectively. They were given reference because the suburban grapevine study had principals that matched some of these characteristics. GAS-ers are depicted as young, mobile teachers who assume principalship with a few years of teaching experience. Nonpromotables are presented as teachers of long standing prior to becoming principals, who are only interested in the principalship. The urban grapevine study noticed the majority of the secondary principals (7 out of 8) had their sights on
upward mobility and elementary principals, for the most part, are place-bound (3 out of 10).

Loners are principals who do not interact extensively within their peer group. In terms of the study, the suburban grapevine investigator defined loners, or isolates, as principals with no more than two one-way communication interactions from among their peers. The grapevine study produced two principals (1 and 11, Figure 2) who fit that description. However, the urban grapevine study used the terms immediate and extended members. Immediate members were those principals who had at least one two-way link, whereas extended members were principals who had no two-way links but only one-way links. Principals 2 and 16 fit that criteria.

There were several interaction type questions used in both grapevine studies. The question examines "What means or structures do you use in communicating informally with peers?" The answer was the same in both studies. Principals tend to use the telephone and personal interaction at regularly scheduled meetings as the primary means of communicating informally. Wolcott's findings support both results by acknowledging the principalship as a verbal culture. In the urban grapevine study, many principals stated that they interacted informally before, during, and after the regular Tuesday morning principals' meetings. This was a similar situation with the district-wide meeting in the suburban grapevine study. Supported by these two examples is the idea that the informal organizational structure closely parallels the formal organizational structure.
A second interaction question focuses on the factors that motivated principals' interaction with a peer. Responses, as one might expect, fell into two categories—one concerned with teacher matters and the other with central office policies and procedures. During the time the investigator was conducting interviews for the urban grapevine study, the American Federation of Teachers was trying to organize teachers in the district. As a result, of the 44% responding to teacher matters, 31% were related to the AFT's impact on teachers in the district. Another 44% were motivated by central office and policy concerns. Several principals were concerned about a new discipline policy. Although the suburban grapevine study did not quantify results relative to motivation of informal interaction, the two aforementioned categories for the urban grapevine hold true for the suburban grapevine. From an objective external perspective, the rationale for the motivation, from most of the principals, was to be in synchrony with similar decisions regarding the same matters.

The third question, in the interaction sequence of both studies, dealt with other grapevines existing in the district and principals' access to them. The original study suggested the existence of individual grapevine structures among central office personnel, teachers, non-certified employees, parents and students. The urban grapevine study listed eleven grapevine structures which could be sorted in the same categories as the original study. The point should be made that when the term grapevine was mentioned, almost 80% of the principals asked that the investigator give a contextual clarification of the term. It seemed as though the principals wanted a clear distinction between
grapevine (peer) and pipeline (super-subordinate) structures. However, in the urban grapevine study, all principals did acknowledge the presence of other grapevines and access to several grapevine structures.

A final finding similar to both studies was the fact that both districts, primarily because of their size, were heavily inbred. That is, almost all principals moved into their positions from teacher positions within the district. In the urban grapevine study, only one principal interviewed had not previously been a teacher in the district.

Principals, as was mentioned earlier, were familiar with the term grapevine. Most wanted some kind of contextual clarification before responding to interview questions. The nature of the principal grapevine (diads and triads) does not lend itself to a comprehensive picture of communication as it relates to the principal culture. Therefore, principals were not cognizant of the communication pathways beyond the diad or triad relationship. According to Merton's definition, this might be classified as a latent function. Similar results were reported by the suburban grapevine study.

Communication pathways implemented by staff and administration in a school district can directly affect socialization patterns. Due to the condensed nature of the school system and the reduced number of interaction partners, there is a significant possibility that the principals, vice principals, teachers, and noncertified personnel have all been socialized to the norms of the district to the extent that their actions are somewhat programmable. There was only one principal in the urban grapevine study who came to the position from outside the district. This indicates a high degree of inbreeding, recalling the
fact that, based on sponsorship patterns, both elementary and secondary principals were clan-like. This observation indicates a higher index of socialization among principals. It might be suggested, as was the case in the Wiggins study, that principals operating in a highly socialized school system might be readily interchangeable. Another alternative might be that the school can sort and identify potential administrators with values which coincide with that of the school district. The major difference between the socialization patterns in the two studies is that the clan- and guild-like relationships differ. In the suburban grapevine study, clan-like characteristics were associated with the elementary level and guild-like characteristics were associated with the secondary level. In the urban grapevine study, clan-like characteristics exist at both the elementary and secondary levels of the school organization. Speculation might suggest that the more condensed and inbred a school district, the greater the degree of clan-like relationships.

The idea of "boundary spanning," as described by Thompson as an organizational structure which combines or buffers the organization's technical core, particularly with respect to the outside environment and thereby increasing the predictability of external inputs, may be a useful construct in further analyzing the functions of the principals' grapevine. Units of an organization (principals) that address boundary spanning factors must be vigilant in recognizing and adjusting to environmental elements that can impact the teachers (technical core) in the organization, for which the organization has no control. Boundary spanning must be considered with respect to the unit of analysis.
example, using the school as the unit of analysis, a principal who seeks advice from the superintendent or monitors political conditions external to the school is boundary spanning. Boundary spanning, using the school district as the unit of analysis, is exhibited if the school board is meeting with state legislators discussing increased funding for district students. When informal boundary spanning is considered at the school level it is contextualized within the informal structure. This was evidenced in both grapevine studies by the fact that principals interacted with peers in informal settings which paralleled the formal structure. Unscheduled informal meetings after the regularly scheduled meeting speaks to the idea that the formal structure is paralleled by the informal structure and the informal structure leads to informal boundary spanning.

Further investigation by researchers Willower, Cistone and Pankard has addressed the boundary spanning function of the supervisor of instruction role within educational organizations, suggesting that such a role can be specified as linking managerial and technical subsystems or as linking organizational subunits at the same hierarchical levels. In keeping with the suburban grapevine finding and other researchers, grapevine interplay in the urban school district often appears to supplement formal structure for integration and articulation between and among various organization subunits. This is evidenced by the fact that principals call their peers to coordinate reports that are required by the formal organization.
SUMMARY

This chapter has reported the findings of the urban grapevine study. Sociometric data concerning two-way and one-way communication patterns among principals revealed that the principals, for the most part, sorted or socialized informally according to their organizational levels (elementary with elementary and secondary with secondary). There was one exception between an elementary and a high school principal. A most significant finding was that clan-like socialization patterns, based on sponsorship, existed at both the elementary and secondary levels. This differed from the suburban grapevine findings in that elementary principals appeared clan-like, while secondary principals were guild-like in their tendencies.

Six sets of interview question responses were examined for generalizations. In sorting the responses according to naturally evolving criteria, generalizations emerged. Generalizations fell into two categories, which were descriptive and evaluative. Most etic/emic and etic/etic responses were descriptive, while most emic/emic and emic/etic responses were evaluative in nature. These six sets of interview questions also provided opportunities to crosscheck information—a positive feature of the emic/etic interview technique. Although it has not been mentioned previously, the emic/emic and emic/etic part of the interview sequence is a reversal of roles for the principal and may give some insight into the evaluative nature of the emic/emic and emic/etic responses.

The suburban and urban grapevine findings were compared and contrasted. The clan- and guild-like traits have just been addressed.
In the suburban study, principals interested in upward mobility had the designation of "GAS-ers." Principals who were satisfied in their present position had the designation of locals. In the suburban grapevine study most of the GAS-ers were young and most of the locals were older. In the urban grapevine most of the GAS-ers were at the secondary level, while most of the locals were at the secondary level. The suburban grapevine spoke of "loners"—those principals who had no two-way links and no more than two one-way links. The urban grapevine study addressed principals in this category as "extended members" as opposed to "immediate family" members. Attention was given to three of the same interaction type questions in both studies, with similar results in all three. The research findings confirmed both systems promoted primarily from within, creating a high index of inbreeding. Finally, functional analysis, socialization and boundary spanning patterns between the two studies were given careful examination and found to closely parallel.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER IV


2. Ibid., pp. 5-8.


8. Ibid., p. 12.


16. Ibid.


   (b) A. W. Gouldner, *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an interdisciplinary attempt to associate the fields: anthropology and educational administration. Associated with the overall purpose of the study was the use of an anthropological methodology called emics and etics. This methodology was used to investigate a particular part of the informal school organization, especially that which applies to the principalship. It was thought that emics and etics would provide both the researcher and the informant an opportunity to generate data from different perspectives, as well as develop a format for collecting, crosschecking, and analyzing data.

This chapter will be divided into two sections based on inter-question analyses: conclusions and recommendations. The first section will have two subsections entitled "Emic and Etic Methodology" and "Informal Systems." The second section is entitled "Recommendations" and has the same two subheadings.

Emic and Etic Methodology

With respect to emic and etic methodology, this author presents two basic conclusions. First, the investigator notes the nature of the data derived in this study. Second, this writer mentions observed difficulties of informant role transition inherent in this methodology.

1. Analysis of the interview sets indicated that responses generally fell into two categories: descriptive and evaluative. Descriptive responses were most prevalent when principals were asked to respond
from an etic/emic or etic/etic perspective; that is, the principal responding as a native and as an external observer to external observer questions about the principals' informal system. This was an expected outcome, since persons can generally describe with relative ease situations with which they are familiar. However, it should be noted that when principals were first asked to assume the outside observer's role (etic/etic), they were not comfortable with that task. It was only after criteria were given as to what psychological experiences should be taken when assuming this role that the principals became less apprehensive about the task. Principals were told to take their academic and administrative experiences with them in the external observer's role but not that information peculiar to their current school district. This is also an example of the lack of purity in any emic or etic perspective. In this case, a predominantly etic view is still influenced by academic and administrative experience.

Evaluative responses seemed to predominate when principals reversed their positions and responded from an emic/emic or emic/etic perspective. That is, they responded to a situation which would parallel the principals' environment, but was indigenous to the observer's culture or environment. The principal would then respond as a native and then as an external observer. The principal's evaluative response was an unanticipated and unintended consequence of this interview mode. Originally this study was designed as a cross-cultural study. The investigator suspected that principals from their emic or etic perspective would be more apt to describe than to evaluate the researcher's emic setting. Instead, these interview questions produced
a situation in which 85% of the responses were evaluative and 14% of the responses were descriptive. During this role reversal part of the interview, it seemed as if the respondents took on a collegial posture which might, in part, account for the judgmental kinds of responses. Still, the mechanics of this shift to evaluation as a result of role reversal remain somewhat unclear and open to examination through future research.

2. Given this researcher's attempt to systematically order emic and etic, observer and informant perspectives, it is apparent that there is no way to exclusively differentiate such perspectives. This should be kept in mind when examining any social system. As stated earlier, for every etic there is an emic base. This means that one cannot be completely objective about observing a situation because of the ever present tendency to observe in terms of our own experiential experiences. In modern society, this problem becomes more complex because many respondents have both emic and etic viewpoint potential. Rather than hiding this problem, emic and etic analysis may offer a means of making researchers aware of such perceptual complexity and a means to deal with it systematically. The emic/etic process may have some advantages over the standard sociological line of inquiry (etic/emic only), in that four questions are centered around a common theme instead of one question and there is an opportunity to cross-check responses for consistency and reduce bias. This methodology seems to have the potential for more comprehensive use as a data gathering tool. The investigator suggests that this methodology was worth employing in this investigation, if only to realize the variety of responses one can expect from different points
Informal Systems

In this section, the writer employs eight general conclusions to summarize findings about this informal system of urban school administrators. While there are multiple findings, comparisons and contrasts from this study and between urban and suburban systems, these conclusions are necessarily stated at a higher level of abstraction than the presentation mode of the previous chapter.

1. With some minor but noteworthy exceptions or idiosyncrasies, this author concludes that this urban principal grapevine structure parallels or resembles the suburban principal grapevine described by Licata and Hack. For example, elementary principals associated with elementary principals and secondary school principals (middle and high school) associated with secondary principals. However, clan-like relationships were found among principals at both the elementary and secondary levels with guild-like relationships less apparent. This finding was different from the Licata and Hack study, where clan-like relationships existed only at the elementary level and guild-like relationships appeared at the secondary level. The difference in these relationships was based on sponsorship patterns observed on one- and two-way communication sociograms. Contrasting relationships in the two studies may be explained by taking into consideration the condensed nature of this district which restricted the number of interaction partners, promoted a high degree of inbreeding and created a family type atmosphere regardless of principalship level.
Elementary and secondary clusters were reviewed and sorted into immediate and extended member groupings based primarily on the presence or absence of two-way interaction links. Principals 1 and 3 seemed to be the principals most contacted by the other elementary principals. They were characterized as shaman-like in that they were regarded as specialists whose primary function is to buffer the principal subculture from uncertainty with their relevant information and expertise. These shaman-like figures also appear in the Licata and Hack study (4 and 18). It could be speculated that these principals have gained informal leader status among their peers based on their previously demonstrated knowledge and administrative skills. One should note that these are guild-like qualities.

Guild-like tendencies were more apparent between the two high school principals. This was expected, because there are only two high schools in this district and high school principals are generally perceived as skilled administrators, administrators who saw themselves as a special breed. The Licata and Hack findings seem to support this notion.

The sociogram in Figure 2 revealed, as in the suburban grapevine study, that communication patterns are in diads and triads in both the elementary and secondary principal subcultures. The same sociogram also indicated that principals at the elementary level are seemingly less interested in central office administration than principals at the secondary level. These findings may not be totally accurate because some of the elementary principals were somewhat apprehensive about discussing plans for upward mobility in the district. The investigator
intuitively sensed a propensity toward central office administration from some of these principals. However, the respondents may have perceived an open admission of their intentions as an inhibiting factor to such mobility. On the other hand, this difference may be more indicative of the ethos of elementary as compared to secondary principals rather than actual differences in upward mobility tendencies.

The investigator originally intended to contrast aspects of urban and suburban school districts. This was done under the assumption that marked differences might appear in the data and findings. However, this was not the case; most of the urban grapevine findings were relatively consistent with the suburban findings. One might speculate that the distinction between urban and suburban might be due more to differences in the content rather than the structure of interaction. This is based on the premise that issues addressed by principals in the urban district might differ for those addressed by suburban principals, even though the structure or means remain as similar as formal organization of the two types of districts.

An unexpected finding was the fact that principals who have worked for other principals before assuming their roles seldom received communication from the principals who possibly sponsored them. Rather, communication was mostly one-way, going from the newer principal to the one who possibly sponsored him/her. Of the total number of possible sponsorships, 67% of those relationships were situations where the possible sponsor apparently never called the sponsoree. This situation might be the result of latent status or prestige relationships, perhaps suggesting that disciples can seek guidance from their masters but
rarely the other way around without risk to the master's prestige.
The above 67% never appeared in the same diad or triad as the principal
for whom they worked. The remaining 33% of the principals were regu­
larly contacted by their former employer and were a part of the former
employer's diad or triad.

2. Certain Principals, called here "honored anachronisms," may
represent subcultural membership that hold knowledge of the past values
and traditions of the system. The study's labeling of principals 4 and
5 as honored anachronisms was due to their tenure in the district, their
relationship to each other, and the somewhat unusual and dated skills
and perceptions they brought to bear on their positions. It would seem
that each of these principals brings an added dimension to the district
by virtue of her/his knowledge of the history and traditions of the
principalship in that district. However, they are not the principals
peers seek for advice. One might anticipate principals 4 and 5 also
being the shaman-like characters of the district instead of two somewhat
younger principals 1 and 3. The sociometric patterns do not support
this view. Their ways, while honored by peers, are from another time
and not necessarily relevant to modern practice. Instead the distinction
between shaman and honored anachronism roles may be suggestive of a
"generation gap" in the principalship of that district.

3. Consistent with findings in the suburban district, informal
interaction took place through verbal, often spontaneous and unobtrusive
means in this urban district. Upon inspection of interaction type ques­
tions, it became apparent that they paralleled the findings in the
suburban grapevine study. For example, the question was asked: "What
means or structure do you use in communicating informally with your peers?" The answer was the same in both studies. Principals tend to use the telephone and personal interaction at regularly scheduled meetings as the primary means of communicating informally. Different levels of technology may require different levels of organizational structure in culturally and educationally different societies, e.g., in cultures where there are no telephones, other structural alternatives may emerge.

A second question focused on factors that motivated a principal's interaction with a peer. The underlying factor was essentially the same for both: that principals wanted to be in accord with other principals' decision making. Interaction similarities might expectedly be consistent in both studies, given the general context of schools in this country. Most public schools in the U.S. have similar organizational structures and operate on similar administrative philosophies, one of which is that principals, while having much autonomy to operate the school, like to avoid being "caught out on a limb" on most administrative and policy decisions.

4. Again consistent with suburban findings, interaction appeared dependent on the perception that a potential interaction partner held about expertise, could be trusted to maintain confidentiality, as well as the opportunity to interact with peers. Other findings in the interview set relate to the question of inhibiting factors concerning the informal exchange of information. The majority of the responses centered around the lack of trust or expertise and no opportunity for direct involvement. One respondent indicated that, because groups and
individuals were loosely connected, limited amounts of interaction took place. This often reduced the opportunities to build trusting relationships. Most principals agreed that grapevines did exist in their ranks. However, one principal denied this notion and alluded to the teachers' grapevine as the major grapevine in the school. The sociogram indicated this principal had one two-way link and two one-way links to other principals. One might suspect that this particular principal's perception of a grapevine differs from the investigator's, that is, this principal may consider the term grapevine as a lower or pejorative organizational form. This principal may consider informal association with his peers as a process of a higher order than the "grapevine." As indicated above, sociometric evidence indicates that this principal interacts with a limited number of peers. While it is somewhat apparent that grapevine structure exists in loosely connected units of diads and triads, the principal grapevine does in fact exist and not all principals are aware of its entire structure and functions.

5. Principals consulting outside their peer group most frequently speak to directors, teachers, secretaries, parents, custodians, and superintendents. The major portion of the principals felt the need to consult outside their peer group. Although there were some respondents who stated that they were unaware of the practice, this seems to be a natural course of action to maximize one's available resources and make one's administration more predictable and stable while buffering the external environment's effect on the teachers. It should be kept in mind that principals may depend more on networks or pipelines than on the grapevine/peer group structure. However, this study was not designed to
measure this possibility.

6. An interesting point relating to both studies was the observation that each school district was heavily inbred. This may have been a result of size. However, almost all principals moved into their positions from teacher or administrator positions within the district. In the urban grapevine study, only one principal interviewed had not previously been a teacher in the district. The type of inbreeding within the district probably enculturates the principals, on a broad basis, to the philosophy and ways of the district. In addition, this study seems to suggest that inbreeding correlates closely with clan-like characteristics as opposed to guild-like characteristics.

Figure 2 (not Figure 1) of the sociogram, two-way and one-way relationships, appeared to be much more helpful in explaining patterned relationships than did Figure 1 (two-way only). This was probably due to many one-way sponsorship ties and was the reverse of the Licata and Hack study. Rather than rejecting descriptions in the suburban setting, these new sociogram patterns probably reflect a degree of the variance possible in informal systems structure among school administrators.

7. There are little data from this urban context to reject Proposition 1 about the occupational socialization functions of grapevine structure. Proposition 1 stated: "The informal system in a school administrators' subculture can be understood in terms of its latent function of occupational socialization of the participants." There was support for this proposition because of the clan-like patterns that emerged at the elementary and secondary levels based on possible sponsorship patterns. With a minor exception (principals 11 and 1), elementary
principals associated with elementary principals and secondary principals associated with secondary principals. Other findings indicate that guild-like relationships (principals 11 and 13) in part reflect occupational specialization. These patterns, again, appear to be part of a "sorting" of the system's professional staff into various occupational and administrative roles. This occupational socialization process apparently produces a corps of principals who are relatively stable and predictable candidates for promotion in the system. This process is described as latent, for it is most often unrecognized by system participants.

One might conclude that sorting patterns are a vital component of any organizational structure. Lawrence and Lorsch consider sorting patterns in terms of differentiation. It is "a state of segmentation of the organizational system into subsystems, each of which tends to develop particular attributes in relation to the requirements posed by its relevant external environment. Differentiation, as used here, includes the behavioral attributes of members of organizational sub-systems." Thompson refers to sorting relative to domains of organized action. In the aforementioned cases both authors and the investigator call attention to the notion that people operating at the same level in an organization and with similar unit responsibilities tend to interact and socialize one another. They even appear to take similar behavioral characteristics. This informal behavior parallels the formal organizational differentiation of structure.

8. There are little data from this urban context to reject Proposition 2 about the informal boundary spanning functions of grapevine
structure. Proposition 2 stated: "The informal system in a school administrator's subculture can be understood in terms of its latent function of 'informal boundary spanning'." There has been some support for this proposition in this study of an urban district. Using the school as the unit of analysis, principals employ informal boundary spanning when they informally seek advice or counsel from their peers. For example, one principal would call another to keep from being "caught out on a limb." This kind of informal boundary spanning activity was also identified in the Licata and Hack study.

In this urban district, using the school as the unit of analysis, formal boundary spanning takes place if a principal consults his superintendent or deputy superintendent in charge of administration regarding a school related concern. Informal boundary spanning seemingly parallels formal boundary spanning and the formal organizational system. A cogent point should be made that the principals are utilizing a mechanism that makes the external environment more predictable. This in turn helps principals adjust to environmental inputs which lead to a greater understanding of intervening variables and certainty. Informal boundary spanning can be used by the principal at every level of the school organization to predict changes in board policy, AFT activities, the pulse of the community or budgetary considerations. Due to the small units in which principals interact, generally they are not always aware of their actions with respect to the larger organization. This suggests latent consequences, as was the case in the Licata and Hack study.
In order to speculate about the meaning of the above findings, the whole idea of informal boundary spanning might gain a new dimension if examined in the context of Weick's loosely coupled systems.\(^3\) Human relationships when viewed within an organizational unit often form loose couplings. They are responsive, maintain their own identity, individuals can choose to associate or not to associate.\(^4\) The strength of coupling is probably relative to the number of variables each principal has in common.\(^5\) This could explain the sorting of principals into elementary and secondary interaction and socialization patterns.

Loose coupling can be considered in the larger context of school organizations as "loosely coupled systems"\(^6\) and boundary spanning of principals as the social interaction consequences of loosely coupled systems. Attention here is focused on the informal as well as the formal nature of loosely coupled systems in educational organizations. Keeping this in mind, schools might be viewed as loosely coupled formal organizations accompanied by informal systems which can be understood in terms of their latent functions.

As a result of school units being loosely coupled systems, principals engage in informal interaction with their peers. The reason for the informal interaction may be the principal's semi-autonomous position. He has some discretionary powers, but they must be administered within the norms established by the central office and the principal (and teacher) subcultures. March and Simon in part describe this as a "felt need for joint decision-making."\(^7\) One might envision this process in a cyclical fashion whereby schools are observed as loosely coupled systems. Consequently, principals develop informal
relationships, loyalties, and communication links as a means of adapting to the uncertainty of loose coupling. In turn, the reduction of uncertainty perpetuates the perseverance of these sets of elements across time.

It has been stated that for every degree of loose coupling there is probably a degree of tight coupling. A tight coupling policy can possibly precipitate informal boundary spanning between and among school units. For example, filling out state reports might be considered a tightly coupled organizational operation. Because the principal may be reprimanded or lose face before his superordinates and his peers if his state report is incorrect, he will engage in informal boundary spanning to ensure uniformity concerning the form and substance of principals' state report.

There is also the possible description of grapevines using the coupling metaphors. For instance, this study introduced the notion of extended and immediate family members. In terms of degrees of loose coupling, immediate family members would have tighter ties, a higher degree of trust, and more variables in common based on two-way interaction patterns. Extended family members might have elements of the immediate families' characteristics, but to a lesser degree, indicating the possibility of impermanence and tacitness. One-way links would characterize the more loosely coupled or extended family.

Further, coupling of units exists in diads and triads in both studies, thereby indicating a relatively tight association of principals within clan-like relationships (while still maintaining more loosely coupled relationships with the remainder of the subculture). Principal
grapevines also link other grapevines with tightness (or looseness) of coupling dependent on the number of shared concerns the two grapevine members have in common. It is not difficult to conceive of a principals' and secretaries' grapevine interacting to the benefit of both groups. Given the degrees of loose or tight coupling within the grapevine itself, in most instances grapevine relationships are probably more loosely coupled than formal organization relationships. As a consequence, it might be posited that this looseness in informal structure allows for more flexible adaptation to problems than possible through formal structure.

**Recommendations**

**Emic and Etic Methodology**

The emic/etic interview methodology, while moderately useful in a domestic educational setting, would probably realize its greatest contribution in international inquiries that are cross-cultural in nature. This study produced mostly evaluative responses in the role reversal situation. Operationalizing the role reversal portion in a culturally different environment would be recommended for further testing this role reversal tendency.

The four interview perspectives inherent in the interview questionnaire can be useful in a case study approach to situations in educational administration as well as other disciplines. By applying four perspectives to a problem, a person is forced to examine his options and feelings from a number of positions.
The four interview perspectives can be used in a participant observation study. Reviewing observations from four vantage points guards against emic bias as well as offers alternate ways of interpreting observed phenomena. Further, inter- and intra-question analysis patterns need to be applied to other data fields to test their viability.

Use of the four interview questions might be used as a possible group planning or problem solving technique. Often groups cannot perceive the various dimensions of a problem. One technique which could be employed to fully involve each member in the solution would be to divide a group of about 20 people into four groups of five. Use four different meeting areas. Initially, have each group address one of the four perspectives of a problem using the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) process. Next, sequence each group through each of the four perspectives and compare their collective responses to each of the four perspectives.

Considering the idea that fewer and fewer primitive societies are left to be discovered, anthropologists are having to concentrate more on knowledgeable and sophisticated informants. This indicates the possibility that more literate informants will be involved in research. The use of the emic/etic methodology on modern informants should be considered as a viable alternative to the standard sociological line of inquiry. The potential for greater intensity and perception of the desired research area may be present.

Informal Systems

The frequency of informal interaction between and among principals was not addressed in the Licata and Hack or the urban grapevine studies.
Frequency analysis could present a valuable dimension to the current line of research.

The study of grapevine structures might be replicated in a larger school system, since previous investigations have had relatively modest numbers of twenty-two (Licata and Hack) and sixteen in the present study. Most large school systems are divided into area districts. These area districts should present ideal subunits for investigation.

It might also be useful to replicate this study in a large school district among its central office administrators. A comparison of informal interaction patterns between central office administrators and principals might produce some new and useful insight for educational administrators.

The search of the literature did not produce much information on informal interaction patterns of administrators in other organizations. A study targeted at military, business, and social welfare organizations could produce a line of research, probably revealing new findings, especially as they might relate to bureaucratic organizations.

Few studies concerning informal interaction patterns have been done which take into consideration race and sex as they relate to the principalship. While not suggested by the data in these two grapevine investigations, there may be correlations between socialization patterns and race or socialization patterns and sex which could be determined by examining a number of school districts with different administrative structures.
Interdisciplinary research, where one researcher employs theoretical frameworks from two different disciplines, is still a fertile area for research consideration. One would do well to look at various disciplines and determine mutual and compatible lines of inquiry.


4. Ibid., p. 3.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.


APPENDIX B

Organizational Chart of School District
## Appendix C. Emic and Etic Analysis Observer/Informant Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer Perspective</th>
<th>Informant Perspective</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation (meaning)</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emic</td>
<td>Etic/Emic</td>
<td>Etic/Etic</td>
<td>The Investigator (Etic) is asking the Informant (Emic) how a phenomenon is perceived from the perspective of the native.</td>
<td>Tell me how you interpret the phenomenon as a native? (Classic type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etic</td>
<td>Etic/Etic (cross Etic)</td>
<td>Etic/Etic</td>
<td>The Investigator (Etic) is asking the Informant (Etic) to step out of his role and speak from an objective external observer’s perspective.</td>
<td>Tell me how you view this phenomenon as a fellow scientist (native provides objective external observer discourse)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emic</td>
<td>Emic/Emic (cross Emic)</td>
<td>Etic/Etic</td>
<td>The Investigator (Emic) describes the phenomenon as it is perceived from his own perspective as a native. Next, the informant is asked to respond to the same phenomenon from his/her position as a native.</td>
<td>In my culture or experiential base we view it this way; how would you compare/contrast this from your cultural or experiential base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etic</td>
<td>Emic/Etic</td>
<td>Etic/Etic</td>
<td>The Investigator (Emic) describes the phenomenon as it is perceived from one’s own perspective as a native. Next, the informant (Etic) steps out of that role and speaks from an objective observer perspective.</td>
<td>In my culture or experiential base we view it this way; how do you view this as a fellow scientist (Informant) provides objective external observer discourse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the interview is to identify means of informal principal interaction. Questions will be posed from an external observer's position. Participation is voluntary. Each principal has the privilege of not answering any question. The name of the district, the school, or the principal's name will never be used in the study. Before using any quote or particular information in the study which would identify a particular principal, the permission of that principal would be sought. Because of the critical time line of the principals, the interviewer will try to remain on task by seeking the necessary information to the question and moving as rapidly as possible to the next question. However, sufficient time will be utilized to clarify points.

SCHOOL___________________________________________________________________

PRINCIPAL_________________________________________________________________

ENROLLMENT_____________________________________________________________

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE__________________________________________

YEARS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE_____________________________________

MALE____ FEMALE____ BLACK____ WHITE____ HISPANIC____ OTHER____

PROFESSIONAL ASPIRATIONS______________________________________________

Interview Set Questions for the Principals' Subculture

Set I  PEER CONTACTS FOR ADVICE OR INFORMATION

1.1 TELL ME, AMONG OTHER PRINCIPALS IN THE DISTRICT, WHICH ONES WOULD YOU MOST LIKELY CONTACT FOR INFORMATION OR ADVICE?

1.2 Tell me, as an external objective observer, how would you describe the practice of contacting other principals in the district for information or advice?

1.3 In my position as a graduate student, I seek out other graduate students for information and opinions regarding courses and instructors in order to gain as much input as I can before making a decision. How would you describe this action as a principal?
1.4 In my position as a graduate student, I seek out other graduate students for information and opinions regarding courses and instructors in order to gain as much input as I can before making a decision. How would you describe this as an objective external observer?

Set II INHIBITORS TO PEER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

2.1 TELL ME, WHAT FACTORS WOULD INHIBIT INFORMAL EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN PRINCIPALS OVER ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATIONS?

2.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, what factors would inhibit informal exchange of information between principals over administrative situations?

2.3 In my position as a graduate student, I tend not to seek counsel from persons whose credibility is in question. How would you describe this position as a principal?

2.4 In my position as a graduate student, I tend not to seek counsel from persons whose credibility is in question. How would you describe this as an objective external observer?

Set III MEANS AND MECHANISMS FOR INFORMAL COMMUNICATION

3.1 TELL ME, WHAT MEANS OR STRUCTURE DO YOU USE IN COMMUNICATING INFORMALLY WITH PEERS?

3.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, how do you describe the means by which this informal communication takes place?

3.3 In my position as a graduate student, I communicate informally with my peer group after class or at planned informal social gatherings, e.g., the pizza parlor. How would you describe this position as a principal?
3.4 In my position as a graduate student, I communicate informally with my peer group after class or at planned informal social gatherings, e.g., the pizza parlor. How would you describe this position as an objective external observer?

Set IV MOTIVATORS OF INFORMAL PEER INTERACTION

4.1 TELL ME, WHAT WAS THE SITUATION THAT MOTIVATED YOUR LAST INFORMAL INTERACTION WITH A PEER?

4.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, how would you describe the situation that motivated your last informal interaction with a peer?

4.3 In my position as a graduate student, uncertainty and lack of information are factors that cause me to interact with my peers. How would you describe this position as a principal?

4.4 In my position as a graduate student, uncertainty and lack of information are factors that cause me to interact with my peers. How would you describe this position as an objective external observer?

Set V GRAPEVINES AMONG PRINCIPALS

5.1 TELL ME, IS THERE A GRAPEVINE AMONG PRINCIPALS IN THIS DISTRICT? IF SO, HOW DOES IT OPERATE?

5.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, would you say there is a grapevine among principals in this district? If so, how would you say it operates?

5.3 In my position as a graduate student, there is in existence a grapevine among the graduate students. It operates informally, but parallels the formal classroom structure. Its purpose is
to help graduate students make sound choices while negotiating the system. How would you describe this position as a principal?

5.4 In my position as a graduate student, I feel a need to interact with my peers (fellow graduate students) about courses, instructors, and issues. How would you describe this position as an external observer?

Set VI  DISTRICT GRAPEVINES, OTHER THAN PRINCIPALSHIP

6.1 TELL ME, DO OTHER GRAPEVINES EXIST IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT? DO YOU HAVE ACCESS TO THEM? HOW?

6.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, would you say other grapevines exist in the school district? Do you perceive a principal having access to them? How?

6.3 In my position as a graduate student, I tap into other grapevines. I ask secretaries, administrative assistants, and other clerical personnel about information that cannot be obtained from my peers. How would you describe this action as a principal?

6.4 In my position as a graduate student, I ask secretaries, administrative assistants, and other clerical personnel about information that cannot be obtained from my peers. How would you describe this position as an external observer?

Set VII  CONSULTANTS OTHER THAN PEERS

7.1 TELL ME, OUTSIDE YOUR PEER GROUP, WHO ELSE DO YOU CONSULT ABOUT SITUATIONS AT WORK? (note situation)

7.2 Tell me, as an objective external observer, are there occasions where principals consult persons outside your peer group?

7.3 In my position as a graduate student, I consult persons outside
my peer group to increase my data base for decision making. How would you describe this action as a principal?

7.4 In my position as a graduate student, I consult persons outside my peer group to increase my data base for decision making. How would you describe this action as an objective external observer?
### Appendix E. Intraquestion Analysis for Question 1.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interview Set 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question 1.1 response of Principal 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interview Set 1</td>
<td>Subgeneralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question 1.1 response of Principal 2</td>
<td>Subgeneralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interview Set 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Question 1.1 response of Principal 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interview Set 1</td>
<td>Subgeneralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Question 1.1 response of Principal 4</td>
<td>Generalization(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Interview Set 1</td>
<td>Subgeneralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.1 response of Principal 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The same sequence is followed for each question in the various interview sets.
Appendix F. Interquestion Analysis for Set 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Interview Set 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 30</td>
<td>Question 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgeneralization(s) from 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgeneralizations(s) from 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgeneralization(s) from 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subgeneralization(s) from 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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