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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study centers on how one woman administrator in a public university experienced her work environment. It was conducted at a time in American higher education when equity in the workplace focused attention upon the issue of women's participation as administrators and as faculty in academe (Simeone, 1987; Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). It was also done at a time when the human side of organizations was becoming increasingly important as an object of governmental and managerial attention (Kanter and Stein, 1979).

The research focus on women administrators' situations in academe is not new, although it has intensified particularly since the early to mid-1970s as women began to gain access to positions which were formerly inaccessible (Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). The largest growth was and continues to be within the ranks of middle management (VanAlstyne et al., 1977; Moore et al., 1982). During those years the body of research on women in administration centered primarily on their status (VanAlstyne et al., 1977; Frances and Mensel, 1981; Harter et al., 1982; Moore et al., 1982) and their personal histories (Arter, 1972; Pfiffner, 1976 & 1979; Palley, 1978 & 1979; Ironside, 1981 & 1983; Curby, 1980; Alexander, 1980). From the status and some of the profile studies a picture of women administrators can be extracted:
Women are more likely to be assistants to, assistants, or associates than they are to be directors, deans, vice presidents, provosts, or presidents. Women are more likely to be staff than line. Women do a great deal of "women's work;" for example they run programs that deal with women as a special constituency or they serve as deans of professional programs in which students are primarily women (Tinsley, 1984).

While this picture lends some insight into women's lives as administrators in the workplace because people's experiences are shaped in large measure by where they happen to be in the system (Kanter and Stein, 1979), it is incomplete because it does not consider women's perceptions of their role as administrators.

In more recent years, the emphasis has shifted to attitude studies (Andruskiw and Howes, 1980); perceptions of organizational barriers studies (Stokes, 1984); perceptions of academic environment studies (Sandler, 1986); and organizational structures that influence opportunities, achievements, and satisfactions (Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). The perceptions of organizational barrier studies, perceptions of academic environment studies, and organizational structure studies lend further insight into women's lives as administrators in the workplace, particularly their perceptions of collegial relationships, work, roles, and recognition which is useful in delineating potential dimensions of their experiences. Furthermore, these studies use theories extant in the social sciences and linguistics to undergird their conceptual frameworks and/or supply tentative hypotheses. What is missing from the body of research on women administrators, however, is a detailed accounting of women administrators' lives in the work setting: what
they do, how, when, where, with whom, under what conditions, for what purposes, with what outcomes (Hymes, 1974; Weade and Green, in press). Such detailed accountings lead to the identification of recurrent patterns of life and make visible the interdependent pieces that go toward making up women administrators' experiences in the work setting.

Since the late 1970s there has been a call from among those interested in understanding women's experiences in academe to "deal with the female world in and of itself, as an entity in its own right not as a by-product of the male world" (Bernard, 1981). Shakeshaft (1981), in a review of the dissertation literature on women in administration, revealed that the dissertation research emerges from a framework primarily male defined. That is, the research presents men and the male model as the norm and women and the female model as a deviation from the norm. "Such research," she claims, "reconstructs reality by trying to fit the female experience into the male mold" (p.24). For example, in the research on organizational barriers the questions that are asked pertain to what keeps women out of a man's world, rather than what changes can be made in the male world to facilitate women (Shakeshaft, 1981).

In concert with this recognition, that is, that women's lives are looked at against the fabric of men's lives, researchers have asked about the research paradigm (Anton, 1979; Shakeshaft, 1981; Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et al., 1986; Elshtain, 1981). Elshtain (1981) states that researchers must look at the "individual female subject in her particular social location and probe her inner and outer realities" (p. 303). Shakeshaft (1981) puts forth several tenets for research about women: 1) use of qualitative methodologies; 2) must grow out of
the personal experiences, feelings, and needs of the researcher; and
3) authority for truth needs to be reinvested in the subject (Anton,
1979). "Slice of life" research, as some have called it (Kanter and
Stein, 1979; Shakeshaft, 1981), is a means of developing theory about
the experiences of women that is grounded in the phenomena of women's
experience, rather than attempting to understand women's experience
within an established theoretical framework based on the experience of
men.

As patterns are made visible through a detailed study of a woman
administrator's life in the work setting and looked at against
existing theories about women, one can begin to identify aspects of
her experiences that are unique to her, that are specific to women in
her position, and that are generic to women across positions and
settings. The scope of this study was not intended to offer
generalizations about the experiences of women administrators in
higher education, but rather to identify patterns of experience that
were part of one woman's life as an administrator. Attention is now
directed toward an explanation of the dimensions of the study.

DIMENSIONS OF THE STUDY AND IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary goal of this study was the identification of factors
that contributed to a woman administrator's experiences in the work
environment. The rationale for focusing on women, and in particular
women administrators, was explained in the previous section. This
section describes the major dimensions of this study:
administrator, experience, and work environment.

Administrator

The woman administrator who was selected for this study was a
white middle manager in a college within a public university. There
were several reasons for selecting an administrator in this position. First, as an administrator with academic duties she was more likely to interact with a wide variety of students, faculty, and administrators than an administrator with duties in student affairs, external affairs, or administrative affairs (e.g., administrators in external affairs have little contact with faculty). Second, the greatest growth in administration has come at the middle manager level, particularly for women (Scott, 1978). Selection of a middle manager for this study allowed for the possibility of further research across similar positions. Scott (1978) referred to middle managers as "linking pins" between the vertical level of the college and the horizontal structures of the university. In her position as a "linking pin" she was more likely to interact with a wide variety of administrators and faculty.

Experiences

Experience was conceived of as multi-layered (Solomon, 1985). Her experiences consisted of work, social, and personal layers. As will be further explained in Chapter IV, the emphasis in this study was placed on the work and social layers rather than the personal layer. Experience was also conceived of as the meaning she made out of situations through her actions (Blumer, 1969). There were five aspects of experience.

Work

The nature of work was examined for several reasons. First, the activities that are performed as part of work frequently affect how one feels about what one does (Bryant, 1972). Second, the nature of work informed the other aspects of experience: roles, relationships, and authority. Work and role are linked, for example, because work
often takes place within the context of a larger social configuration with each person performing his or her specialized roles in order to accomplish an overall task. Work and relationships are linked, for example, because frequently one performs work as part of a larger group effort. Usually those co-workers or colleagues are not selected by choice; rather by necessity as dictated by the nature of the task. Often those frequent interactions provide the foundation for the development of primary informal work groups within the larger formal structure (Bryant, 1972). Furthermore, as one carries out tasks, the work styles of the incumbent are made visible; for example, preferred communication patterns are revealed. Halstead (1980) found that administrators in his study spent over 70% of their time in contact with others, suggesting that administrators live in a predominantly oral world as opposed to a written world.

Meetings

Meetings, as part of the woman administrator's work, were examined for several reasons. First, Halstead's (1980) study of student affairs vice presidents revealed that meetings are a significant part of the life of an administrator. Over 57% of their time was spent in meetings. Second, meetings are an integral part of the governance of colleges and universities (Baldridge et al, 1978; Keller, 1983). Third, meetings provided a context (Erickson and Schulz, 1981) in which to examine other aspects of experience (i.e., relationships, roles, authority). Kanter (1977) and Wheatley (1981) suggest that participation in meetings and task forces is a job activity that brings with it power, since it increases visibility, particularly in large organizations.
Roles

Roles, as an aspect of experience, were examined because they are intertwined with relationships (Blumer, 1969; Banton, 1965). The establishment and persistence of interaction tends to depend upon the role (Gordon, 1972). In some cases the more salient the role (e.g., gender), the more it plays a part in those interactions. For example, in the organizational setting a woman may experience encounters in which her role as woman rather than as competent worker is noted (Colwill, 1982).

Studying just the woman administrator's roles, however, would not capture her diversity and complexity as a person (Coulson, 1972). Although role, as a concept, can handle highly structured social systems where goals are well-elaborated, it cannot handle adequately expressive social systems, that is, matters of primary group relations (Coulson, 1972). For that reason the woman administrator's relationships with subordinates, peers, and superiors were examined.

Relationships

Relationships are a critical thread running through a person's experience in the work environment (Kanter and Stein, 1979). Relationships with peers, subordinates, and superiors are important to one's experience in the workplace because they can be a source of support, influence, and information.

Research literature suggests, however, that the nature of relationships may be different for women, particularly in male-dominated professions. Hughes (1944) posits that the appearance of new kinds of people (in this case women) in established positions creates a status dilemma for the person concerned and for the people who have to deal with the person. The dilemma for the people is
having to choose whether to treat the woman administrator, for example, as a woman or as an administrator. One way for people to reduce the conflict is to keep the relationship formal and specific (Hughes, 1944; Epstein, 1970) and another is to shun the person (Hughes, 1944; Wolman and Frank, 1975). The effect of either of these approaches is to exclude women from the informal organizational structures which limits access to key decision makers, sources of positive reinforcement and sponsorship, role models, peer support groups, and recruitment and informal socialization cultures (Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). When women are alone in a group of men or very small in number, Kanter (1977) maintains that this situation affects relationships between men and women. Their position as "token" (representatives of their category rather than independent individuals) accounts for their difficulties in fitting in, gaining peer acceptance, and behaving "naturally."

Authority

Formal authority is frequently the most important determinant of governance (Pfeffer, 1981). Individuals have formal authority because within organizational hierarchies they hold positions other members acknowledge as legitimate sources of communication (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985). Communications are accepted as legitimate because the individuals initiating them are seen as "duly constituted" sources of influence (Haas and Drabec, 1973). Since formal authority is vested in organizational positions, it should be available to all participants. Haas and Drabec (1973) maintain, however, that the treatment of personal attributes as requisite occupational characteristics can negate the essentially automatic imputing of
formal authority. More explicitly, the lack of an "appropriate" personal characteristic in a particular person can undermine the legitimacy inherently attached to an organizational position (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985).

**Work Environment**

As will be further explained in Chapter IV, the work environment was conceived of as four settings: the unit she managed, the college in which the unit was embedded, the university in which the college was embedded, and outside the university. These settings were identified through observing the combinations of persons with whom the woman administrator interacted and the different physical settings in which those interactions occurred.

Rooted in the knowledge base and through interaction with the data five major research questions guided the process of observation and analysis of the data. These questions were:

1.0 What is the nature of the work in which the woman administrator engages?

This major question was divided into four subquestions:

1.1 What are the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?

1.1.1 What are the major components of the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?

1.2 How are these kinds of work distributed over time?

1.3 What is routine and what is extraordinary in the kinds of work the woman administrator does?

2.0 What is the nature of the roles the woman administrator plays while in the work environment?
This major research question was divided into three subquestions:

2.1 What are the kinds of roles the woman administrator plays?

2.2 How are the kinds of roles the woman administrator plays similar and different across four settings?

2.3 What kinds of role conflicts does the woman administrator experience?

3.0 What is the nature of the personal relationships the woman administrator has with people while in the work environment?

This question was divided into four subquestions:

3.1 What are the kinds of personal relationships the woman administrator has with people?

3.1.1 What are the interactional characteristics of those relationships?

3.1.2 What are the structural characteristics of those relationships?

3.2 With whom does the woman administrator have personal relationships?

3.3 With what frequency does the woman administrator contact those with whom she has personal relationships?

4.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's authority in the work environment?

This question included one subquestion:

4.1 What kinds of authority does the woman administrator have?
5.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings?

This question was divided into four subquestions:

5.1 What are the roles the woman administrator plays in planned meetings?

5.2 What is the organizational structure of planned meetings?

5.3 What are the ranges of talk by the woman administrator and by selected members in six planned meetings?

5.4 What are the patterns of participation within six planned meetings?

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS

The goal of the research was to identify the factors that contributed to the woman administrator's experiences within and across the four settings that comprised her work environment: the office, the college, the university, and outside the university. The goal was arrived at by looking at the everyday life of a woman administrator in her work setting. This ethnographic perspective takes into account the common day-to-day interactions in the work setting: the tasks performed, the place where the tasks are performed, the individuals involved. In order to look at the everyday life, participant observation was used as a method. The type of data collected was primarily observational, although perceptual data were also gathered as a check upon the researcher's interpretation of meaning.

The research process did not conclude with the collection of the data. Although the researcher had identified some initial questions to guide the research, interaction with the data, particularly after data collection, led to a refinement of initial questions posed for
the study and to identification of several additional questions regarding the woman administrator's experiences. One of those questions, "What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings," is focused upon here because of its implications for the study. As the patterns of the woman administrator's everyday life unfolded during the analysis stage, it was apparent that the planned meeting was a significant factor in her experiences as an administrator. It was at this point, with the approval of the researcher's committee, that the researcher re-entered the data, and using a sociolinguistic perspective (see Chapter III), looked in depth at six planned meetings.

The six planned meetings were examined in two ways. First, one meeting was studied in great detail, and then compared with the other five meetings. The process involved the identification of recurring patterns of action and interaction in the meetings. Variables grounded in the observed patterns were constructed and tested across cases. This led to the identification of new questions, and subsequently the finding of additional patterns and the process repeated itself. The findings with regard to planned meetings were a product of the reactive-interactive nature of the research process. The patterns that were identified were those that were broadly universal to the six planned meetings and were linked to three of the aspects of experience (roles, relationships, authority). Second, to look at participation in planned meetings, the concept of a tracer unit was borrowed from the work of Cole, Griffin, and Newman (1982). A tracer unit is a type of behavior, construct, or information that is traced or followed across various settings and/or contexts. In this case, the woman administrator's participation, through her initiation
of themes and extended responses to themes, became the unit for examining pre-selected members' participation in meetings. The study, therefore, through the examination of planned meetings, expanded beyond a purely case study approach to one including a comparison of patterns of participation among pre-selected meeting members, including the woman administrator.

Assumptions about the Research Process

The following assumptions regarding the research process were made:

1. the researcher would influence the setting since she was not formally a member of the setting;
2. the reactions of the participants being observed might distort the process of phenomena being observed.

These assumptions, which are sources of error (Green, 1986; Lincoln and Guba, 1985), are discussed in greater depth in Chapter III.

3. While observations were not made in the absence of the bias of theoretical reference, neither, were observations made through the constrained vision of a single theoretical perspective. Familiarity with an array of theoretical framework may contribute to researcher bias, while that same broad familiarity contra-indicated myopic distortion.

Limitations to the Study

Four limitations to the study are acknowledged.

Limitation #1

The study is a case study of one woman administrator at a public university in the midwest. The description obtained, therefore, cannot be generalized beyond the scope of the 96 days in which the
study was conducted. While the lack of generalizability might be considered a limitation, the intent of the study was not to generate descriptions of a woman administrator's experiences that would be immediately generalizable.

Given the newness of the case study approach for exploring women administrators' experiences in the work setting, the intent was 1) to determine what kinds of understandings could be gained about a woman administrator's work and relationships from the application of the theoretical and methodological frameworks embedded in ethnography; 2) to obtain in depth descriptions of a woman administrator's work and relationships; 3) to determine what factors contributed to her experiences in the work environment; and 4) to look at those factors through the multiple theoretical frameworks that have guided research on women (see Chapter III). Ultimately, it is hoped that the descriptions and factors in this study will become part of a larger body of findings conducted using an ethnographic approach. As the findings accumulate, it should be possible to look across studies of women administrators' lives in the work setting and identify those aspects of their experiences that are generic, those that are specific to certain types of positions or settings, and those that apply to this particular woman administrator.

Until these descriptions are generated and the case literature developed, no attempt is made by the researcher to generalize the findings. However, the findings do provide a series of questions and issues for consideration for further research on women in higher educational administration.
Limitation #2

The research was conducted by a single investigator who was both a participant and an observer. This is acknowledged as both a strength and limitation to the study. It is a source of potential strength because the researcher has access to an "insider" perspective; for example, experiencing what it is like to be a subordinate or a co-worker. The researcher as participant is recognized as a potential limitation because of the possible influence on the researcher's objectivity in the analysis and interpretation of the data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) maintain that awareness of the potential is a "step toward prevention." Recognition of the potential led to the adoption of a variety of measures both in the field and in analyzing the data to minimize influence and establish trustworthiness of the data such as prolonged engagement, member checks, and interobserver agreement.

Limitation #3

The researcher was not able to observe the woman administrator at all times. As will be discussed in Chapter III, sometimes the researcher was not permitted access to meetings. In addition, sometimes the researcher had to rely on hearing rather than observing interactions between the woman administrator and others in the work setting. Since continual observation was not always possible, the researcher had to rely on the woman administrator's reconstruction of events in her journals and interviews. The researcher was thus able to see how the woman administrator made connections to what had occurred.
Limitation #4

The researcher was not able to observe the woman administrator during an entire academic year. Although the observation period was two full academic quarters (Summer and Autumn), any seasonality associated with the subject's experience would not be fully addressed in the absence of observations for the Winter and Spring Quarters.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This was a case study of how one woman administrator in a public university experienced her work environment, and although the description cannot be generalized beyond the scope of the 96 days in which the study was conducted, the study has theoretical significance. The descriptions of her work, roles, relationships, and authority can become part of a larger body of findings using an ethnographic approach that over time should make it possible to look across women administrators' lives in the work setting and identify those aspects of their experiences that are generic, those that are specific to certain types of positions or settings, and those that apply to a particular woman administrator. Such an approach enables theories to be developed (Shakeshaft, 1981). The descriptions of work can become part of a larger body of findings on the work of the middle manager, particularly as it relates to their authority and relationships with senior administrators and faculty. The descriptions of formal and informal networks of relationships in the worksetting can become part of a larger body of findings using an ethnographic approach to understand the role of women administrators' networks. Women's networks are enjoying a resurgence in academic settings, particularly among faculty (Bernard, 1981; Simeone, 1987); however, little is known about the nature and function of women administrators' networks.
(Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). With women's entrance into administrative positions in greater numbers, the role of networks will become increasingly important.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter II is composed of three sections. The first provides information about the theoretical frameworks that have guided research on women. The second section focuses on the research relevant to the dimensions of experience that were identified in this chapter. The third section describes studies that focus on the daily lives of administrators in higher education. Also included in this section is a description of the sociolinguistic perspective and its underlying conceptual framework which was used to guide the analysis of planned meetings.

Chapter III discusses the design of the study, the methodologies used, and the steps for establishing trustworthiness of the data. Chapter IV reports the findings. Chapter V is a discussion of the findings that draws on the theories and research presented in Chapter II so that the women administrator's experiences can be seen from multiple perspectives.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is presented in three sections. The first section provides information on the theoretical frameworks that have guided the research on women. The second section focuses on the research relevant to the dimensions of experience that were presented in Chapter I: work, meetings, roles, relationships, and authority. The third section describes studies that focused on the daily life of administrators in higher education. Also included in this section is a description of the sociolinguistic perspective and its underlying conceptual framework which was used to guide the analysis of planned meetings.

Theoretical Frameworks that Guide the Research on Women

In the last decade there has been a growing research interest in the areas of women and women in administration. Accompanying the growing body of research have come efforts to categorize the literature (Hochschild, 1973; Adkison, 1981; Bernard, 1981). Such categorizations are important because "the one that is used makes a difference in our thinking" (Bernard, 1981). As Table 1 illustrates, there are multiple frameworks that have been used to guide the research on women. Although each of the researchers had different reasons for presenting these frameworks, there are some similarities in their categorizations. For example, Hochschild's (1973) minority and caste perspectives resemble Bernard's (1981) "place" perspective and Adkison's (1981) social power and status perspective. Each of
## Table 1

### Theoretical Frameworks Guiding Research on Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Roles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female World</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership and Women's Experiences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sex differences</strong></td>
<td>&quot;place&quot; female world as encapsulated</td>
<td><strong>sterotyped and socialization</strong> focuses on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focuses on differences in the way men and women think, perceive, aspire, experience, play games; analyzes sources of emotive and cognitive traits; nature vs socio-cultural culture</td>
<td>occupation analogous to other world's; reflected in magazines, women's pages</td>
<td><strong>rising aspirations</strong> aspirations role, prevented women from learning administrative skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>role perspective</strong></td>
<td>female culture viewed as product of female role</td>
<td><strong>structural characteristics</strong> structural and situational variables determine organizational behavior of men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focuses on women in the family and role in the economy; conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>minority perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group singled out because of physical sphere or cultural characteristics for unique treatment; prejudice, assimilation, marginality</td>
<td>female world is autonomous but functionally integrated with male world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>politics of caste</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power differences, distribution and use of power; linked to minority perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


these frameworks are described briefly. The intent is not to review the entire body of literature for each framework, but rather to provide an overview of the different perspectives.

The purpose for including a description of each of these perspectives is twofold. First, to clarify the theoretical frameworks from which research found in subsequent sections of the literature review were guided. Second, to use these multiple theoretical frameworks as a means of explaining some of the findings in Chapter V.

These descriptions are followed by an in-depth look at two of the theoretical frameworks: structural characteristics of organizations (Adkison, 1981) and female system (Bernard, 1981). The former framework is described in depth because of its capacity to explain the experiences of women in administrative positions (Adkison, 1981). Bernard's (1981) female system perspective is based on evidence from a research literature which documents that "women and men do experience the world differently and that the world women experience is demonstrably different from the world men experience" (p. 3). Bernard includes in her conceptualization of the female system the research literature on women's development. It is that body of research that is focused on here, particularly the research of Miller (1976), Chodorow (1978), Gilligan (1982). Their research has centered on understanding women's psychological development. From their research they have discovered that "women's lives and beliefs about women, are embedded in social interaction and personal relationships" (Chodorow, 1978, p. 178).
Hochschild Scheme

**Sex Differences Perspective**

This body of literature focuses on women's character and personality predominantly through analysis of emotive and cognitive "traits" (Kanter, 1976; Hochschild, 1973). Findings in this area center on the way in which men and women differ in the way they think, perceive, aspire, experience anxiety, daydream, and play competitive games, and how they differ in character, temperament, attitudes, self-esteem, language, gestures, and interpersonal orientations whether by nature, early socialization, or accumulated learning.

**Role Perspective**

This body of literature focuses on the division of labor between men and women, beginning with the family, as the key to women's position and the foundation of occupational segregation. Research in this area centers on role dichotomies and role dilemmas, and it considers change in conceptions of family roles the major issue to be addressed. Often the larger social world tends to be seen as a reflection or projection of basic male-female roles derived from the family, that is, that both the segregation of occupations within the world of work and the segregation of housework from labor market work find their origin in the family and continue to be reinforced by family patterns and attitudes toward family roles (Hochschild, 1973; Kanter, 1976).

**Minority Perspective**

This body of literature focuses on women as a group who have been singled out because of physical and cultural characteristics for differential or unequal treatment. The conceptual vocabulary includes such terms as prejudice, assimilation, and marginality. The research
centers on those who have been discriminated against and those who do the discriminating. The "marginal woman" is probably more common in all male preserves than in predominantly female or integrated occupations. She faces more contradictions than do women who are more integrated into the male work world (Hochschild, 1973).

"Politics of Caste" Perspective

This body of literature focuses on power, the different kinds of power, its distribution, use, and expression. As in the minority perspective, this view assumes that sex differences are due to socialization, and that differences in socialization are linked to differences in status and power. It sees role strain in power terms, and it takes as assumptions many of those found in the minority perspective: that women are an inferior caste and experience discrimination and prejudice. It also assumes that what women as a stratum gain in resources, men lose.

It sees the balance of power in society linked in complex ways, not yet understood, to various characteristics of face-to-face interaction; for example, the superordinate initiates more interactions, while the subordinate is typically more passive (Henley, 1977; Hochschild, 1973).

Bernard Scheme

Whereas Hochschild's scheme came out of the research on sex roles, Bernard's scheme arose as a means of explaining the different conceptualizations of the female world. Her underlying premise being that most human beings live in single-sexed worlds, women in a female world and men in a male world, and that the two are different from one another in a myriad of ways, both subjectively and objectively. Furthermore, she maintains that the world women experience is
demonstrably different from the world men experience, and that this in part is explained by the fact that women are governed by different norms, rules of behavior, and expectations; they are subject to different eligibility rules for rewards and punishments (Bernard, 1981).

"Place"

Similar to Hochschild's (1973) minority and politics of caste perspectives, "place," in Bernard's (1981) scheme, refers to place in the male world, where the male world is conceived of as the "real" world, coterminous with society as a whole. The "place" conceptualization, according to Bernard, tells more about the male world than it does about the female.

Occupation

Related to, but not identical with the "place" conceptualization is that of "occupation." In this conceptualization the female world is analogous to the organization man's world, the lawyer's world, or the blue-collar worker's world. The analogous occupational world of women is the world reflected in women's pages, women's magazines with their strong emphasis on nutrition, food processing, and homemaking skills (Bernard, 1981).

Culture

The culture conceptualization proposes that instead of viewing sex roles as an aspect of culture, female culture is viewed as a product of the female role and male culture of the male role. Components of each culture are revealed in the rituals, roles, dress customs, gestures, communication patterns, reference groups, and artifacts of the role. As part of this culture, women have rules or
norms, whether legislated or socially conventional in nature, that are different from those governing men (Bernard, 1981).

Ethnic

Related to the previously mentioned conceptualizations is one that sees the female world as analogous to ethnic groups. The female world and ethnic groups are both seen as having structures and characteristic cultures, that is, customs, traditions, mores: a "consciousness of kind" (Bernard, 1981).

Separate Sphere

This conceptualization of the female world had its roots in the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century. As Bernard states, "it was one of the few conceptualizations with a self-conscious ideological basis, one that saw the female world as autonomous though functionally integrated with the male world" (Bernard, 1981, p. 23).

Female System

This conceptualization views the female world as a system of beings with some common characteristics that constitutes a unity. The female world in this view is a sociological entity with a characteristic demographic structure (age, marital status, education, income, occupation), a status and class structure, and a group structure, a sociological entity with a characteristic culture. Furthermore, this conceptualization of female culture is seen as having its own boundary maintenance system, but with faultlines (Bernard, 1981). The characterization of the female world in this context is one of a kin- and locale- based world performing an integrating function which is supported in some of the recent findings of developmental psychologists (Gilligan 1982; Miller, 1976).
Adkison Scheme

Adkison's scheme came out of the research on women's experiences in educational organizations, primarily public school administration. It focuses on women's entrance into leadership positions.

Stereotyping and Socialization

This body of research on school administrators focuses on women's character and personality and the ways in which women differ from men by early socialization and accumulated learning. Except for its specific orientation (i.e., school administrators), it is linked to Hochschild's sex difference and sex role perspectives.

Administrative Behavior and Performance

This conceptualization is closely related to the previous one in that the research focuses on women's administrative behavior and the ways in which it differs from men's. It links adult sex role stereotypes (e.g., women are appropriate in people-oriented jobs; women are nurturers) with administrative behavior and performance.

Rising Aspirations and Organizational Responses

This body of research looks at women's exclusion from administrative positions as a function of their aspirations and attitudes (e.g., low aspirations prevented women from acquiring skills needed for administrative careers).

Career Socialization and Mobility

This body of research looks at the formal and informal filtering processes that exist in educational organizations that deter women from moving into administrative positions such as stereotypes about women, negative sanctions, role models, role conflicts, sponsors, and informal networks.
Structural Characteristics

This body of literature focuses on organizational structures and the organization of work. Organizational structures -- who works with whom, who dominates whom, how members come into contact with one another -- are the topics of analysis and explanation. Such structural and situational variables as opportunity structures, internal labor markets, dominance structures, and sex ratios within and across hierarchal levels are linked with the organizational behavior of women and men (as opposed to sex differences and social roles) (Adkison, 1981; Kanter, 1976).

Social Status and Power

This body of literature looks at women as analogous to inferior castes or minority groups subject to prejudice and discrimination.

Summary

This section focused presenting an overview of on the theoretical frameworks that have guided the research on women. Attention is now directed toward an in-depth discussion of two of those frameworks: structural characteristics of organizations and female system, specifically women's psychological development.

Theoretical Frameworks

This section begins with a discussion of the structural characteristics framework; its theoretical underpinnings and orientation. Research about women administrators in higher education is included so that their position and behavior can be understood from this perspective.

Structural Characteristics of Organizations

This perspective views the organization as a large, complex social unit in which many groups interact (Kanter, 1975). These
groups are defined both by their formal (task-related, functional) and informal connections and differentiations. The relative number and power of such organizational groupings, their tasks, and the ways in which they come into contact shape the nature of the organization. Groups may comprise different strata, like different social classes, with interests and values potentially in conflict, and integration between them limited by the potential for conflicts of interest. Those with power wield it in the interests of their own group as well as perhaps in the interests of the system as a whole (though in a model it is often difficult to define such collective interests). Self-interest, including material self-interest, is considered as potentially important as social needs, so that the formation of relationships should be seen in the more political sense of advantage to the person as well as in the human-relations sense of social satisfaction. Further, people are viewed as members of groups outside as well as inside of the organization, which both help to place them within the organization, give them status, define their involvement with it, and may or may not articulate with the organization's interests. Finally, the tasks of the organization and the tasks of those within it (the division of labor) are important because they define the number, interests, and relative arrangements of organizational classes as well as how informal relations may develop (Kanter, 1975).

Using the above model, which encompasses the work of Etzioni, Argyris, Katz and Kahn, neo Marxists, and others, Kanter (1977), in her ethnography of a large, multinational corporation identified structural characteristics of hierarchical organizations that
perpetuate women's underrepresentation in management and limit the effectiveness of the minority who attain managerial positions.

The structural characteristics, opportunity, power, and social composition of peer groups, shape the behavior of men and women in hierarchical organizations. Kanter found that in positions where men and women perceive there is little opportunity for mobility and growth, they display behaviors that are stereotyped as female such as limiting their aspirations and seeking satisfaction from interpersonal relationships or doing well socially rather than task accomplishment. Where the structure of power limits a person's ability to mobilize resources and support subordinates, they exhibit behaviors stereotypically linked to women such as behaving in more directive and authoritarian ways and trying to retain control.

When the social composition of peer groups is such that there is a skewed numerical dominance by members of one sex, for example, and a "lone" or nearly alone member of the other sex, Kanter labeled such persons tokens. Tokens tend to be more visible, be "on display." They feel more pressure to conform, to make fewer mistakes, and try to become "socially invisable," not stand out too much. They find it harder to gain "credibility," particularly in high uncertainty positions such as certain management jobs. They tend to be more isolated and peripheral, and more likely to be excluded from informal peer networks. Hence, they are limited in this source of power-through-alliances, have fewer opportunities to be "sponsored" because of the rarity of people like them upward, and face misperceptions of their identity and role in the organization. They develop a preference for already-established relationships, tend to be
stereotyped, and placed in role traps that limit effectiveness. They also face more personal stress.

Kanter also discovered that organizational uncertainty makes homogeneity of the management group important to its members. Social certainty compensated for some of the other sources of uncertainty in the tasks of management. "It was easier to talk to those of one's kind who had shared experiences - more certain, more accurate, more predictable....less time could be spent concentrating on the subtle meanings, and more time on the task" (Kanter, 1977, p. 58).

Kanter found that people whose social characteristics differ from those of the homogeneous management group tend to be clustered in positions having the least uncertainty. They were responsible for routine activities with clear evaluative criteria, serving as experts as opposed to decision makers. They tended to be found in those areas where least social contact and organizational communication were required: in staff roles that were administrative rather than line management and in functions such as public relations, where they are removed from the interdependent social networks of the organization's principal operations.

Kanter's work provides a conceptual lens for looking at women's position and behavior in higher education. As will be shown in the following discussion, administration of institutions of higher education is similar to that of business organizations in terms of the representation of women in policy-making positions and the clustering of women in low- and middle-level positions.

The administration of institutions of higher education has been and continues to be dominated by males at all levels and in all kinds of institutions (Marks, 1986). Although the number of women senior
administrators increased 90% during the period 1975-1983, the actual number is still quite small - an average of 1.1 per campus in 1983 compared to .06 in 1975 (Administrator, 1985, p. 3). Women constitute a minority of presidents (6%), chief academic officers (12%), chief business officers (5%), chief development officers (8%), deans (18%), and full-time faculty (25%) (Mark, 1986).

Women in higher education are clustered in entry and middle-level administrative positions, often dealing with women's issues and programs. In her Leader in Transition study, Moore (1983) found that the positions most frequently held by women and minorities were registrar, librarian, and director of financial aid. The three positions held by the greatest number of men were president, chief business officer, and registrar. Women comprised 13.8% of the deans, over half of whom were in the fields of nursing, home economics, arts and sciences, and continuing education. Men were more likely to hold new positions, to have tenure, to have achieved the rank of full professor, and to hold the doctorate.

This brief summary suggests that quantitative differences do exist, with women occupying fewer positions than men at every level of higher education administration, although women are more likely than men to be clustered at middle-level and entry-level positions than at upper-level ones. This quantitative difference also suggests that some of Kanter's findings may be applicable to higher educational administration.

Stokes (1984), who surveyed 168 women administrators in Florida state universities, found that they did share some of the same experiences. The experiences the women often encountered were "women have to work twice as hard and expend more energy than the average man
to succeed" (64%) and "women have less access to power" (61%). The experiences they occasionally encountered were "women are often ignored or find it difficult to participate during discussions" (57%); "a woman is cast as a sex object which results in her other categories being negated" (51%); "women serve as a mother figure to whom others bring private troubles and expect comfort" (50%); and "women find it difficult to receive recognition for their accomplishments" (52%).

Stokes' study is the only one that has examined some of Kanter's findings using women administrators in higher education. Others have looked at women students and women in counseling settings, all with mixed results. This suggests that "accurate conclusions about work attitudes and behavior cannot be reached by studying people in the token position, since there may always be an element of distortion or compensation involved (Kanter, 1977, p.236).

The structuralist perspective, as described in the preceding pages, provides a conceptual framework with which to look at the processes relating work, individual, and gender. Another conceptual framework for looking at women's behavior is offered in the developmental theories of women, to which attention is now directed.

Women's Development

The absence of women as research subjects at the formative stages of psychological theories of human development has spurred the recent research on women (Miller, 1976; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et. al, 1986). As Belenky et al. (1986) conclude:

from earlier theories we learned a great deal about the development of autonomy and independence, abstract critical thought, and the unfolding of morality of rights and justice in both men and women. We have learned less about the
development of interdependence, intimacy, nurturance, and contextual thought. Developmental theory has established men's experience and competence as a baseline against which both men's and women's development is then judged, often to the detriment or misreading of women (p. 6-7).

Chodorow (1978), attempting to account for the reproduction within each generation of certain general and nearly universal differences that characterize masculine and feminine relational capacities and senses of self, attributed it to the fact that young children grow up in a family in which women mother. Because the early years are experienced differently by male and female children, basic sex differences recur in personality development. As a result, in any given society feminine personality comes to define itself in relation to others and connection to other people more than the masculine personality does. Chodorow further explains that identity formation occurs during the first three years and that during those first three years the female identity formation takes place in a context of ongoing relationship since mothers tend to experience their daughters as more like and continuous with themselves. At the same time, girls, in identifying themselves as female, experience themselves as like their mothers, thus fusing the experience of attachment with the process of identity formation. Chodorow shows that externally, as internally, women grow up more connected to others. She maintains that:

Not only are the roles they learn interpersonal, particularistic, and affective but the processes of identification and role learning are also particularistic
and affective - embedded in interpersonal relationships with mothers (p. 177).

Writing against the masculine orientation of psychoanalytic theory, Chodorow argues that girls emerge from this period (early mother-child relationship) with a basis for empathy built into their primary definition of self. Girls emerge with basis for experiencing another's needs or feelings as one's own (or of thinking that one is so experiencing another's needs and feelings) (p. 167).

From very early, then, because they are parented by a person of the same gender "...girls come to experience themselves as less differentiated (than boys), as more continuous with and related to the external-object world, and as differently oriented to their inner object-world as well" (Chodorow, 1978, p. 167).

Gilligan (1982) sees this as affecting relationships and particularly issues of independence. For girls and women, issues of femininity or feminine identity do not depend on separation from the mother or on the progress of individuation. Since femininity is defined through attachment, feminine gender identity is threatened by separation. Thus, Gilligan posits, females tend to have difficulty with individuation. The quality of embeddness in social interaction and personal relationships that characterize women's lives becomes more than a descriptive difference when women's development through childhood and adolescence is compared to men's development. Since the development of their masculine identity is tied to separation from the mother, theories of development that have used male subjects have
identified separation as a major aspect of development, hence women's failure to separate became by definition a failure to develop.

As children enter the middle years, studies have shown that girls' play tends to occur in smaller, more intimate groups, often the best-friend dyad, and in private places. This play replicates the social pattern of primary human relationships in that its organization is more cooperative (Gilligan, 1982). As Gilligan states, "it fosters development of empathy and sensitivity necessary for taking the role of the "particular other" and points more toward knowing the other as different from the self" (p. 11).

Miller (1976) and Gilligan (1982) have explored women's development in the early and middle adult years. Miller, focusing on the dimension of inequality in human life, identifies the psychology of women as arising from the combination of their positions in relationships of temporary and permanent inequality. She describes temporary inequality as representing the context for human development, such as relationships between parent and child or between teacher and student. Permanent inequality she describes as the condition of oppression. In relationships of temporary inequality, power ideally is used to foster development that removes the initial disparity. In relationships of permanent inequality, power cements dominance and subordination and "there is no assumption that the goal of the unequal relationship is to end the inequality" (Miller, 1976, p. 7).

While women are dominant in temporary relationships of nurturance that dissolve with the dissolution of inequality, women are subservient in relationships of permanently unequal social status and power. In addition, although subordinate in social position to men
"women are at the same time centrally entwined with them in the intimate and intense relationships, creating the milieu - the family" (Miller, 1976, p. 2). Thus, Miller maintains, women's psychology reflects both sides of the relationships of interdependence and the range of moral possibilities to which relationships give rise: women are ideally situated to observe both the potential in human connection through care and for oppression.

Miller looked at women's lives through their experiences. As she discusses their experiences she points out that the characteristics are two-sided:

In a situation of inequality and powerlessness, these characteristics can lead to subservience and to complex psychological problems. On the other hand...these same characteristics represent potentials that can provide a new framework, one that would have to be inevitably different from that of the dominant male society (p. 27).

Miller also sees these characteristics as presently more highly developed in women as a group. Bernard (1981), in her conceptualization of the female world, further qualifies Miller's contention:

when we say that the female world "is characterized by" or "does" something or other, we mean that the norms - legal, conventional, moral, whatever - prescribe, permit, or at least tolerate this behavior...nor is the female world immune to nonconformity. Not all members of any specific world live up to every item that composes it (p. 30).

One of the characteristics that Miller identifies is the "ties to others." She maintains that male society, by depriving women of the
right to its major bounty - that is development according to the male model - overlooked the fact that women's development is proceeding, but on another basis. One central feature of that development is that:

women stay with, build on, and develop in a context of connections with others... women's sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make and then maintain affiliations and relationships (p. 83)

Another characteristic of women as viewed in the developmental literature is that of serving others. Serving others, Miller maintains, is "a basic principle around which women's lives are organized" (p. 61). Women have developed the sense that "their lives should be guided by the constant need to attune themselves to the wishes, desires, needs of others. The others are the important ones and the guides to action" (p. 61-62).

Gilligan (1982), also by listening to girls and women, traced the development of morality organized around notions of care and responsibility. She found that those who operated within a morality of responsibility and care, primarily women, rejected the strategy of blindness and impartiality that characterized the morality of rights described by Kohlberg (1981, 1984). Gilligan's subjects operated on an understanding of the context for moral choice, i.e. that the needs of others cannot always be deduced from general rules and principles and that moral choice must also be determined inductively from particular experiences each person brings to the situation. In all of the women's descriptions, identity is defined in a context of relationship and judged by a standard of responsibility and care. In her study, Gilligan found in listening to the "voices of maturity," 
that all of the women described a relationship depicting their identity in the connection of future mother, present wife, adopted child, or past lover. In connection with that, Gilligan found:

similarly, the standard of moral judgement that informs their assessment of self is a standard of relationship an ethic of nurturance, responsibility, and care. Measuring their strength in the activity of attachment ("giving to," "helping out," "being kind," "not hurting"), these highly successful and achieving women do not mention their academic and professional distinction in the context of describing themselves (p. 159).

The work of Gilligan (1982), Miller (1976), and Chodorow (1978) point to the significance of interpersonal relationships in women's lives. The developmental perspective provides a framework for understanding the nature of relationships in the work setting. When looked at through a different conceptual lens, that is, the structuralist conceptual lens, women's attendance to interpersonal relationships is seen as a function of their structural position in the organization.

Dimensions of Experience

Work

A review of the research on the work of administrators revealed information about its content and factors that shape its content. The content of administrators' work is formulated largely by the demands of the subsystem of which the specific job that they hold is a part. Katz and Kahn (1975) identified a managerial subsystem made up of the presidents, deans, and department chairpersons, a production subsystem made up of faculty, a maintenance subsystem made up of clerical and
maintenance staff, an adaptive subsystem made up of institutional research staff, and a supportive subsystem made up of admissions and other student support staff.

The content of administrators' work is also shaped by the primary task functions and the constituencies with which they interact. The College and University Personnel Association identified five task functions. Administrators in the academic affairs task function are concerned primarily with teaching and academic matters. Those in administrative affairs are concerned with financial, business, and personnel matters. Administrators in external affairs are concerned with external audiences through public relations, alumni services and development. Those in student affairs are concerned with non-academic support services for students. The fifth task function is that of executive and is found in the offices of president, chancellor, or executive vice president (VanAlstyne et al., 1977).

The content of administrators' work is also shaped, to some extent, by the external environment (Mintzberg, 1973). As scholars in the field have pointed out, fewer resources from state and federal governments have put units in direct competition with one another for resources and this condition has led to a centralization of power (Austin and Gamson, 1983). Another external pressure is the tightening grip of outside controls, such as the federal and state government which bring pressures for accountability (Keller, 1983; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978), and accrediting agencies which often dictate detailed teaching loads, length of academic programs, and grade point averages for entrance into the profession (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). Scholars see a shift in the base of power (Austin and Gamson, 1983) which challenges
the traditional base (Corson, 1979). Authority flows to the administrative staff who are empowered by state agencies, for example, to enforce dictates of those agencies (Corson, 1979).

The content of an administrator's job activities contribute to power (Kanter, 1977; Wheatley, 1981). Formal job activities contribute to power when they are visible to others, relevant to current organizational problems, and extraordinary. Job activities are visible when they are linked to people both inside and outside the work unit, when they are in contact with other activities and functions, when they are central in information flow networks, and when their contributions are clearly identifiable and measurable. Job activities are relevant to current organizational problems when they involve handling environmental contingencies and when they are at the center of crises, problematic activities, and current organizational goals. Job activities are extraordinary when they are nonroutine, discretionary, and pioneering (Wheatley, 1981). Using Kanter's definition of power, Sagaria (1980) found that among 243 senior administrators in Pennsylvania four year colleges and universities, being editor of a journal was an activity that contributed significantly to the prediction of perceived power.

The content of an administrator's work may also be initiated or proactive. Halstead (1980) found that there was a high propensity for vice presidents for student affairs in public universities to initiate their own work. Cohen and March (1974), on the other hand, found that the work of presidents was reactive, that is, in response to others' requests.

An administrator's work is predominantly oral. Halstead (1980) studied the instrumental activities of student affairs vice presidents
and discovered that three quarters of their time was spent either talking to or listening to people. His finding was consistent with research on executives who were found to spend 80% of their time in oral work (Kanter, 1977).

The content of an administrators' work, as revealed through specific job characteristics, can be a source of general satisfaction (Austin, 1985). In her study of 417 middle managers at a large public university, Austin (1985) looked at specific job characteristics and their relationship to general job satisfaction. Specific job characteristics included: skill variety, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job itself, and opportunities to deal with others and their relationship to general satisfaction. She discovered that autonomy, followed by feedback from the job itself, followed by skill variety were significantly related to general job satisfaction by male middle managers while skill variety was the only significant job characteristic identified by female middle managers. Related to the job characteristic, feedback from the job itself, Stokes (1984) found in her study of 168 women administrators in low- and middle- level positions at Florida state colleges and universities that over 80% of the women felt that it was difficult to receive recognition.

Sagaria (1985) looked at the kinds of skills middle managers needed to perform their jobs. The skills that she identified, using a modification of Sell's substance and functions of higher education administrators' work, included: program planning and implementation, personnel utilization, program needs assessment, financial planning and decision making, financial management, enrollment management, curriculum development, and resource development. Using 53 pairs of men and women having identical job titles in similar types of
colleges, she found that both men and women had high requirements for program planning and implementation, utilizing personnel effectively, assessing needs to provide programs based on demand, and financial planning and decision making. She found no differences between men and women in their rankings, indicating that men and women holding similar positions within the same institution do not differ in their perceptions of the knowledge requirement for the eight required managerial skills.

Middle managers occupy a special place in the mixed organizational structure of college and universities. Broadly defined as administrative or professional staff appointments below the vice-presidential and dean levels (Sagaria and Johnsrud, 1987), middle managers serve as linking pins between vertical levels and between horizontal structures, that is, between colleges and central offices (Scott, 1978). Although their specific job activities vary depending upon the task function (e.g., academic affairs, administrative affairs), the skills required for such positions are often specific, and furthermore can be translated into definable terms by applying a somewhat objective criterion, such as changes in revenues generated by the administrative unit or an increase in enrollment (Sagaria, 1985).

Overall, middle managers carry substantial responsibility for developing and implementing policy, coordinating resources and activities, supporting academic functions, and serving as liaisons to a variety of constituents such as faculty, students, business and industry, and government (Sagaria and Johnsrud, 1987). Often these positions are ones that are designed specifically to provide help to others (Dalton, 1959; Shapiro, 1984).
Among those who manage there are personality and style characteristics (Mintzberg, 1973). Getzells (1958) referred to these style differences as the personal dimension which consists of the office holder's personality and needs disposition system. The sociology of work literature suggests that females in work situations are more concerned with interpersonal relations than their male colleagues (Crowley, Levitan, and Quinn, 1973; Davis, 1967; Johnston, 1975; Bartol, 1975). Kanter (1977) contends that such "style" differences such as concern for interpersonal relations and other behaviors frequently attributed to female managers such as rule keeping, pettiness, and defensiveness are characteristics of either gender finding themselves in certain kinds of managerial jobs. In other words, gender is an artifact; it appears be explain behavior, but is really the result of other variables such as blocked opportunity for mobility. With mobility rare and the chance for social contact so great, strong peer networks are easily developed (Kanter, 1977).

Austin (1984) found, however, that despite their perception of low mobility, emotional attachments to people in the system (affective) was not among the factors contributing to their commitment to jobs, organizations, and careers. Austin attributed this finding to the fact that many middle managers seldom see faculty or students. As Austin (1985) compared men and women middle managers on the extent to which they perceived the university as a caring environment, that is, that the environment is characterized by a sense of personal concern and support among and between those working in it, she discovered that women found the environment less caring than men. This suggests that women middle managers have different expectations
about the nature of a caring environment than their male colleagues. What is not clear, however, is to what extent those expectations are related to interpersonal relationships or to other factors.

Meetings

In this section, meetings are discussed as both an activity of administrators and as a specific context for interactional activity (Erickson and Shultz, 1981). As an activity, Halstead (1980) found that meetings are a significant part of the daily life of vice presidents for student affairs. He discovered that meetings comprised over 50% of the instrumental activities in which they engaged.

Participation in meetings and task forces is also a means of gaining visibility and subsequently enhancing power (Kanter, 1977). Meetings that necessitate the straddling of boundaries between organizational units or between the organization and its environment contribute to one's visibility (Kanter, 1977). Meetings also afford access to observing and analyzing administrative behavior and provide opportunities for making contacts and gaining information beyond one's administrative unit (Sagaria, 1985). Research has shown that for women middle managers, meetings are a highly valued experience for acquiring managerial skills (Sagaria, 1985). Sagaria speculates that women middle managers place a higher value on these kinds of structured experiences than their male counterparts because men have an informal network for learning the workings of their institution and developing contacts beyond their work group. For women, meetings are a way in which they compensate for their exclusion from informal administrative learning opportunities.

For a discussion of meetings as a specific context for interactional activity, both the sociolinguistic and small group
literature were examined. Belenky et. al (1986) conclude that the "world is commonly divided into two domains: speaking and listening" (p. 43). Research suggests that it is women who do the listening in meetings. Eakins and Eakins (1976) analyzed turns at talk at a faculty meeting and found that men averaged more turns than women, and furthermore, that these turns at talk followed a hierarchy of power or status according to rank, importance, or length of time in the department.

Turns at talk, however, may be situation dependent. Edelsky (1981) found that in a mixed-sexed university committee, turns at talk depended on the type of "floor." In one-at-a-time type floors (F1), men took longer speaking turns, did more joking, arguing, directing, and soliciting than the women. In the more informal and collaborative floor (F2), women talked, argued, directed, and solicited responses more and men talked less than they did in the one-at-a-time type floor. Edelsky concludes that when floors are more jointly constructed, men and women interact more as equals whereas men dominate when floors are under single party control. Women's role as predominantly listener may be linked to the composition of the group. In mixed-sexed groups it has been shown that the ratio of male to female affects verbal interaction (Aries, 1976; Finigan, 1979).

As listeners, women use minimal responses such as "mmm" or "yeah" more than men (Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956; Zimmerman and West, 1980). The use of minimal responses indicate the listener's positive attention to the speaker. Smiling, nodding, and grimacing, which are paralinguistic signals, indicate also that the listener is playing an active role rather than a passive role in the conversation (Coates, 1986). Women use both these verbal and nonverbal signals more than
men, and at appropriate points in the conversation, that is, at points in the conversation which indicate the listener's support for the current speaker (Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956; Zimmerman and West, 1980).

As talkers, women are interrupted more than men. Eakins and Eakins (1976) found that men averaged a greater number of active interruptions than women. Since men had more turns at talk than their female counterparts, this outcome was anticipated. As they looked at the proportion of interruptions to turns at talk, they found a higher quotient by males except for one female. Upon closer analysis of her interruptions, they discovered that the majority of her interruptions were toward other females and that very few were perpetrated upon males. Proportion of interruptions to turn talking were also linked to rank, importance, or length of time in department.

As talkers, women also ask more questions. As a speech act questions are stronger than statements since they give the speaker power to elicit responses. Research suggests that women have a different style of questioning (Lakoff, 1975; Swacker, 1976) and that they use questions for a different purpose (Coates, 1986). Swacker (1976) found that women at a professional meeting asked shorter questions than their male counterparts, and furthermore, that they employed less pre-question predication (e.g., scholarly background information). They posed single questions. Coates (1986) suggests that women use questions as a strategy for conversational maintenance, while men use questions as a strategy for information requests.

Lakoff (1975) found that women use more tag questions which are perceived as more tentative and decrease the strength of assertions. Johnson (1980) found that use of tag questions depended on role, not gender or powerlessness. Use of tag questions was linked to the
purpose and intent of the speaker. In four mixed-sexed meetings, Johnson found that the leader asked disproportionately more questions (including half of all the tags) primarily to sustain interaction. This suggests that there are techniques or machinery that a leader might use to ensure that speakers and listeners have their rights and appropriate slots to talk in relation to their responsibilities (Atkinson, Cuff, and Lee, 1978). Furthermore, these techniques are varied and involve the leader in using her pre-allocated rights and slots to talk in order to secure satisfactory completion of episodes and activities (Atkinson, Cuff and Lee, 1978).

Control of topic is normally shared equally between participants in a conversation. In conversations of the same sex, this seems to be the pattern; however, when one speaker is female and one male, male speakers tend to dominate. Leet-Pellegrini (1980) found that speakers who were both male and well-informed tended to dominate conversation. They talked more and infringed the other speaker's turn more. On the other hand, speakers who were both female and uninformed talked less and used more minimal responses. Male speakers who were well-informed dominated conversations because they used a style of conversation based on power (asserting an unequal right to talk and control of topic) while well-informed female speakers used a style of conversation based on solidarity and support. The solidarity and support style is one in which the speaker builds on others' utterances, links contributions of previous speaker so that they can then talk on topics directly connected (Coates, 1986).

In their management of conversations, the research shows that women are careful to support each other's turns, tend to apologize for talking too much, support everyone's participation, and dislike any
one person dominating the conversation (Coates, 1986). That women engage in socio-supportive roles in groups is well-documented. They try to be interpersonally close and to express and reveal more of themselves than do males (Aries, 1976; Patterson and Schaffer, 1977; Annis and Perry, 1977; Finnigan, 1979). Kanter (1977) suggests, however, that task and task organization shape this behavior. She found that all-female professional groups were very abstract and intellectual with a tendency to stay away from personal comments or revelations.

As leaders of groups, Eskelson and Wiley (1976) found that when females were made to believe that they had achieved, with their own abilities, the legitimate right to a leadership role, their leadership rate improved. The researchers also found that the composition of the group affected male and female leadership acts. Females gave the similar high rate of leadership when they were in groups composed exclusively of their own gender. Leadership rate declined, however, when the female was alone in the group, even though she was legitimately supposed to be the group leader. Kanter (1977) suggests that task and task organization affect the leadership role. She found in all-female meetings in a bureaucratic setting that some women dominated other women using dominance-signaling behaviors and other women behaved in more nurturant, supportive ways while maintaining clear task focus.

In their ethnography of a business meeting, Atkinson, Cuff, and Lee (1978) found that by analyzing the talk of the leader and others present at the meeting that participants perceived meetings as episodic. They oriented to the course of events and activities as episodic and to the talk within them. For example, although
participants were at the meeting, they "temporarily scheduled themselves out of the meeting" to engage in the coffee break and to the conversation within that episode.

The researchers also identified another structure to which some participants oriented: the side engagement while "official talk" was going on. Side engagements might bring forth sanctions depending upon local conventions. Goffman (1983) labeled these by-play, cross-play, and side-play. By-play is a subordinated communication of a subset of ratified participants and bystanders, cross-play, a communication between ratified participants and bystanders across the boundaries of the dominant encounter, and side-play, respectfully hushed words exchanged entirely among bystanders. Each of these is managed by gestural markers that are distinctive and well standardized.

Atkinson, Lee, and Cuff (1978) also concluded that participants present have to be and have to be seen to be occupying their appropriate roles (this includes listening and talking properly) in order for those participants present to see that business was done in a proper and legitimate manner and thereby establishing the meeting as having been properly and seriously constituted. In support of Atkinson, Cuff, and Lee's finding, Johnson (1980) found that participation in professional meetings (specifically asking questions) is role-linked, not gender-linked; that is, variation in speech situations results from the way in which speakers perceive and execute their roles.

Roles

One way in which to conceptualize the notion of role is on a continuum (Banton, 1965; Colwill, 1982). Banton (1965) classified roles according to the extent to which particular roles can be played
independently of other roles. Colwill (1982) classified roles according to their centrality to self-concept. Each system is discussed in order to provide a framework for the presentation of the data in Chapter IV and as a vehicle for discussing the research that exists on organizational roles and on the effects of sex role on organizational role vis a vis effectiveness in that role.

Colwill (1982), classifying roles according to their centrality to self-concept, places sex role on the far right of the continuum as illustrated in Figure 1. Sex role is very central, very important, and very salient. As Colwill states: "these roles are highly complex and we begin teaching them to children in their cribs" (p. 37). As with most roles, it is difficult to describe one sex role without talking about its reciprocal, because "it is in interaction with others that we play the multitude of roles necessary to fulfill our various social functions - parent, student, librarian, receptionist, sales manager" (Colwill, 1982, p.36). With sex role, males are considered independent, competent, and adventuresome only relative to women, for women are perceived to be the opposite of men in these and in many other respects (Broverman et al., 1972). Thus a strong, interlocking, and mutually reinforcing system is established and maintained (Colwill, 1982). It clearly outlines sex-role appropriate and sex-role inappropriate behaviors and according to Colwill "daily administers rewards and punishments for adherence and deviance, thereby strengthening the centrality of the concept" (p. 37).

As Colwill's continuum illustrates, organizational roles occupy a space in the middle since they are not as central to the self-concept, that is, they can be laid aside for a few hours a day. Many of the behaviors necessary for the successful portrayal of organizational
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The Continuum Of Role Centrality
roles are explicitly taught to the role player, many are not. As will be discussed in a later section of this review, research suggests that men and women middle managers in higher education may learn through different kinds of organizational experiences (Sagaria, 1985).

As Colwill's continuum also shows, transient roles occupy a space to the far left since they are very noncentral to the self-concept. Transient roles are those in which the person has to put little thought into its correct portrayal and seldom considers it a role (Colwill, 1982). As Colwill states, "only when people deviate grossly from expected behavior are they reminded by others that they have relatively restricted roles to play" (p. 36). For example, in a library, patrons are expected to be quiet; only when patrons talk loudly are they reminded that their role as patron is to be quiet.

Banton (1965), classifying roles according to the extent to which particular roles can be played independently of other roles, places basic roles on the left side of the continuum. Basic roles predetermine most of the positions open to an individual and have implications for behavior in a large number of social settings. Banton's basic role is similar to Colwill's sex role; both see a person's sex role as usually affecting the way in which people respond more than any other role. General roles are more differentiated than basic roles and they have extensive implications for other roles open to their incumbents and for interpersonal relations.

General roles are awarded according to qualifications. A person's occupational role is considered a general role since it affects the way others behave in social settings, particularly in the work setting. Independent roles, which occupy a space on the far right of the continuum, have few implications for other roles either
with respect to access or in the ways other people behave. Banton uses a person's leisure role to describe the independent role since it (leisure role) has few implications beyond the immediate situation.

Both Colwill's and Barton's classification schemes use the continuum as a means of conceptualizing role. While Colwill's scheme is useful for its more descriptive terminology (e.g., organizational role versus general role), Banton's scheme is useful for its depiction of the independent nature of roles, that is, that some roles influence the way in which others behave toward a person more than others.

Attention is now directed toward a discussion of organizational roles. It will be followed by a discussion of the ways in which sex role effects organizational roles, particularly women's effectiveness in organizations.

**Organizational Roles**

Argyle (1967) defines a role as a pattern of behavior shared by most occupants of a position and which comes to be expected of them. Roles include a variety of aspects of behavior: the work done, ways of interacting with other members of the organization, attitudes and beliefs, and clothes worn (1967). Argyle's conceptualization, that is, that roles include a variety of aspects of behavior, is used as a framework for discussing the research relevant to organizational roles.

Considerable attention was directed toward work in an earlier section of the review of the literature, specifically the work of middle managers. The link between work done and roles is described in Mintzburg's, *Nature of Managerial Work* (1973). Mintzburg discusses the ten roles of a manager: figure head, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesman, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource
allocator, and negotiator. Each of these roles has identifiable activities. As a figurehead, the manager attends ceremonies and is the recipient of status requests and solicitations; as a leader, the manager assumes all managerial activities involving subordinates; as a liaison, the manager acknowledges mail, does external board work, and does other work involving outsiders. These three roles constitute the interpersonal role. As monitor, the manager handles all mail and contacts categorized as concerned primarily with receiving information; as disseminator, the manager forwards mail into the organization for informational purposes, and verbally contacts subordinates to maintain information flow; as spokesman, the manager attends board meetings, handles mail, and transmits information to outsiders. These three roles constitute the informational role. As entrepreneur, the manager initiates strategy and review sessions involving initiation or design of improvement projects; as disturbance handler, the manager initiates strategy and review sessions involving disturbances and crisis; as resource allocator, the manager schedules, and attends to requests for authorization of any activities involving budgeting and the programming of subordinates' work; and as negotiator, the manager represents the organization at major negotiations. These four roles constitute the decisional role.

Although these roles may or may not be applicable to middle managers in higher education, the link between work done and role is established. Sagaria and Johnsrud's (1987) description of the responsibilities of middle managers provides some tentative information about the roles of middle managers as implementers, coordinators, liaisons, and supporters of academic functions.
The behaviors necessary for the successful execution of organizational roles are not necessarily explicitly taught. The career socialization research has shown that the informal organization provides opportunities for learning administrative behaviors and attitudes and that women are less likely than men to have access to informal networks of administrators (Atkison, 1981). Sagaria (1985) found that female and male middle managers relied on different career experiences for successful performance in their present positions. Women relied on structured experiences such as committee work and seminars whereas men relied on selected career experiences. Sagaria suggests that for women, committee assignments afford access to observing and analyzing administrative behavior. Alternately, men may value institutional committee work less because they have an informal network for learning administrative behavior.

Attention is now directed toward Argyle's (1967) second aspect of behavior, ways of interacting. Ways of interacting within the organizational setting are discussed using Banton's (1965) themes: the prestige of roles, role changing, and role relationships. Each of these themes is described and relevant literature cited.

Many social relations include some asymmetrical element, for example, the subordinate and the superior. Henley (1977) claims that this asymmetrical relationship determines what gets discussed. The superior can exercise certain familiarities such as touching, whistling, calling, and first-naming. The subordinate, however, cannot exercise these familiarities with the superior. These interactions can be both verbal and nonverbal. As the high status person, the superior is much more likely to wrap an arm around the subordinate's shoulder or pat her on the back. At the same time, many
social relations include some social distance in order to preserve the prestige of the role. Henley found that the superior maintained more social distance than did the subordinate. Superiors, for example, were less likely to disclose information about themselves while asking subordinates about their health, their families, and so forth. Having subordinates make appointments to see the superior is also a means of maintaining social distance.

Within the organization people play many roles. As people move from one role to another it requires that they know the rights and obligations of the role to which they are moving and change their behavior accordingly (Banton, 1965). It also requires that others recognize the change of role and alter their behavior accordingly. While some of these role changes are readily identified through role signs that serve as a means of communicating to others the relationship in which the person is prepared to interact with them, others are not as readily identified. As people move from one role to another it can create problems for social relations.

Sometimes the roles to which a person moves are thought by that person to be beneath them. Goffman (1961) labeled this role distance. As he states,

some of the most appealing data on role distance come from situations where a subordinate must take orders or suggestions and must go along with the situation as defined by superordinates. At such times we often find that although the subordinate is careful not to threaten those who are, in a sense, in charge of the situation, he may be just as careful to interject some expression to show, for
any who care to see, that he not capitulating completely to the work arrangement in which he finds himself (p. 114).

Goffman (1961) also states that the more extensive the trappings of role, the more opportunity to display role distance. Personal front and social setting provide precisely the field an individual needs to cut a figure in - - a figure that "... romps, sulks, glides or is indifferent" (p. 115).

A social relation exists between two or more individuals, but a relationship links two or more roles (Banton, 1965). It is frequently possible for relations between two people to be conducted in terms of several different alternative relationships, for several of a person's roles to be relevant simultaneously. For example, in a work setting, in one interaction the person can enact both a role as a friend and as a manager as the conversation moves from a discussion of transplanting flowers in the garden or buying a new car to a discussion of a new office policy. Sometimes, someone who gets the "worst of an exchange of jests may try to bring their discomforture to an end by putting into evidence their incumbency of a different role that entitles them to a measure of deference" (Banton, 1965, p. 127). Sometimes these roles clash. The manager who disciplines a friend may experience interrole conflict - conflict that is attached to the manager role and to the friend role.

Banton also suggests that where the same two people can interact in many roles, that is a relationship of familiarity; where they can interact in very few roles, this is an impersonal relationship. Most relationships in an organizational setting, Banton concludes are impersonal relationships since some of the roles enacted are not intimate ones.
Attention is now directed toward Argyle's (1967) third aspect of behavior, attitudes and beliefs. Some of the research on middle manager's commitment has been reviewed in the previous section. Based on her survey of 256 middle managers at a public university, Austin (1984) identified three orientation groups: the university-oriented administrators, the career-oriented administrators, and the position-oriented administrators. Of the three groups, the position-oriented administrators were those Austin identified as linked to their role. As a group, they were between the career-oriented group and the university-oriented group in terms of age, tenure in position, general satisfaction, and perception of the university as a caring and fair environment. Thirty percent of the position-oriented administrators were women.

This section began by looking at organizational roles, specifically the link between kinds of work and roles, interactions and roles, and attitudes and beliefs and roles. The next section focuses on sex roles and organizational roles vis a vis women's performance as a manager.

**Sex Roles and Performance in Organizations**

In an earlier section of the literature review (Structural Characteristics of Organizations), it was shown that although the number of middle managers has increased, women are still in the minority. This suggests that in most administrative units women are few in number, and to some extent may be tokens (Kanter, 1977).

As tokens, Kanter (1977) suggests that they are always fighting stereotypes. The characteristics of tokens as individuals are distorted to fit pre-existing generalizations. Consequently they are forced to play limited and caricatured roles. These roles include:
mother, seductress, pet, and the iron maiden. The mother of the work group is comforting, sympathizing, and "sewing on buttons" (Kanter, 1977, p. 233). The seductress of the work group is the willing or unwilling object of sexual competition, whose competence and ability are masked by her sexuality. The pet of the work group is the cute kid sister, the mascot, or the cheerleader at the sidelines of organizational work life. As Kanter states:

Shows of competence on her part were treated as special and complimented just because they were unexpected. Competent acts that were taken for granted when performed by males were often unduly "fussed over" when performed by exempt women, considered precocious or precious - a kind of look-what-she-did-and-she's-only-a-woman attitude (Kanter, 1977, p. 235)

The iron maiden of the work group is the tough "women's libber", for whom no passages are smoothed.

In her study of 168 low- and middle-level administrators, Stokes (1984) discovered that 72% of the women perceived that they served as mother figures either often or occasionally, 66% believed that they were cast as sex objects often or occasionally, and 45% believed that they were treated as pets often or occasionally.

The dynamics of role encapsulation tended to lead tokens to a variety of low-risk responses that influenced their performance (Kanter, 1977). The time and awkwardness associated with correcting mistaken impressions led some tokens to a preference for already-established relationships, for minimizing change and stranger-contact in the work setting. It was also often easier to accept stereotyped roles than to fight them, even if their acceptance meant limiting the
token's range of expression or demonstration of task competence, because they offered a comfortable and certain position in the organization. Kanter (1977) suggests that length of time in an organization may lessen token status.

Relationships

Work has been called a "social behavior" since it involves the interaction of people. Most of the relations that emerge are dictated by the needs of the work setting. However, there are some relations that emerge through daily interaction that result in a strong social bond and provide the foundation for the development of primary informal work groups (Bryant, 1972). Lincoln and Miller (1979) found that both exist simultaneously. They define instrumental ties as those relations that arise in the course of performing appointed work roles, and primary ties as those that arise out of informal social relations. Warren (1975) concludes that relations found in the work site may often be the ones that serve supportive functions of friendship. In academe, it has been found that both males and females tended to have more colleagues/friends of the same sex (Kaufman, 1978). Numerous theories exist to explain the propensity for same-sex colleague and friendship ties. Jackson (1969) concluded that it is based on the wish to communicate with those who make the person feel more secure or gratify the need for reinforcement and reduce threat.

Lipmen-Blumen (1976) proposed her homosocial theory as a way of explaining the same-sex colleague/friend relationship. Lipmen-Blumen defines "homosocial" as the seeking, enjoyment, and/or preference for the company of the same sex. The basic premise suggests that men are attracted to, stimulated by, and interested in other men. It is
noticeable in early childhood and is channeled and encouraged by the entire range of social institutions within which males live. The stratification system, which ranks individuals and groups in terms of their own value to society, systematically places males in more highly valued roles than females. Until recently, the stratification system located men in such a way that they had virtually total and exclusive access to the entire range of resources available in society. Since men controlled the resources, it created a situation in which men identified with and sought help from other men. Women also turned to men for help and protection (Lipmen-Blumen, 1976).

Kanter (1977) used the term "social homogeneity" to explain the propensity for same-sex colleague/friend ties. Same-sex relationships arise out of the homogeneity of class, ethnic background, prior social or organizational experiences. Colleague/friendship same-sex relationships also arise because colleagues of the same sex perceive that they are of the same status and, therefore, do not feel that they must continuously define their role thus making communication smoother and less ambiguous (Epstein, 1970).

Some research in linguistics also suggests that communication patterns differ between men and women, and that the content of women's talk is concerned more for the everyday, practical, and interpersonal (Belenky et. al., 1986; Tannen, 1986).

From minority group research, it has been proposed that men, as the dominant group within the work situation, may want to establish some "social distance" between themselves and the women in the professional setting (Hacker, 1951).

Regardless of the theory, researchers conclude that women are not part of the informal networks, particularly in those organizations

Zacharias (1976) characterized the informal organization as:

the network of people who exchange information over coffee, lunch, or at informal social clusterings for the purpose of stating their beliefs and aspirations. It is the network over which trusted associates, regardless of their organizational status, say to each other what they would not say to their superiors, and give each other lists of convincing reasons why the people around them are erring. Myths and survival strategies are shared. The emphasis throughout this undiagrammed system is upon interpersonal relationships, oral communication, and the sharing of "soft," timely information (p. 204).

Kanter (1977) found that power and prestige within Indesco were determined by access to informal networks and support structures within administrative units. Critical network variables included such items as access to key decision makers; sources of positive reinforcement and sponsorship; presence of role models; presence of peer support groups; and access to recruitment and informal socialization cultures. Lack of access to informal networks may block career mobility and create isolation, alienation, and stress (Kanter, 1977; Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984).

Exclusion from the informal network is not attributable only to males excluding females, but also is a product of self-exclusion. Epstein (1970) found that women lawyers avoided joining colleagues in informal situations: the more informal the situation, the more they accepted the "rightness" of their exclusion. Similarly, Bernard (1964) found that women who comprised 68 of the 673 bioscientists in a
laboratory were less often sought out for informal communication by their male colleagues, and that, women were less apt to seek out their colleagues for informal communications.

In the last decade there has been a resurgence of women's networks (Bernard, 1981; Simeone, 1987), particularly among female faculty. Tickameyer and Bokemeier (1984) noted that research in this area on women administrators is just beginning. Little work has been done on delineating the different kinds of networks in organizations and their relative importance. Nor is it known whether "old girl" networks are forming as women increasingly gain access to administrative positions in higher education and the extent to which these networks have the same functions that are attributed to the "old boy" networks.

Research shows that women face disadvantages in their experiences of organizational relationships in other ways. Miller, Labovitz, and Fry (1975) in a sociometric study of men and women in a professional organization, found that besides being mentioned fewer times as friendship choices, women were mentioned fewer times as contacts for information relevant to work or as giving influential opinions. Although these findings tend to support Lipmen-Blumen's thesis that the stratification system, which ranks individuals and groups in terms of their value to society, systematically places males in more highly valued roles than females and therefore men are the ones to whom people would turn for information and opinions, it is not clear from the study whether the men and women were all of equal status in which case differences that appeared to be explaining behavior may have been masking the effect of other variables (Kanter, 1977).
Linked to the findings of Miller, Labovitz, and Fry (1975) are those studies that show that people in the work setting feel more constrained to communicate with those who will help them achieve their aims and less interested in communicating with those who will not assist those aims (Jackson, 1969; Mintzberg, 1973; Zacharias, 1976). Albrecht (1976) labeled those who can provide relevant information about the situation and how one should act as situational definers, and labeled who because of their position on the power hierarchy are in control of various resources as resource allocators. Because women are generally in positions with less status, this may be a factor in developing informal relationships (Zacharias, 1976). Similarly, people tend to communicate to increase their status, belong to more prestigious groups, obtain power to influence decisions, and expand their authority (Jackson, 1969). Because women are generally in positions with less power to influence decisions, this also may be a factor in developing informal relationships (Zacharias, 1976).

The organizational literature on relationships between administrators and faculty focuses on the tension that has been attributed to different values and frames of reference (Bess, 1978; Scott, 1978). Although some administrators share collegial sentiments and beliefs, this varies with the kind and frequency of contact (Bess, 1978). Halstead (1980) found that among student affairs vice presidents only 4.9% of their contacts were with faculty, suggesting that academic task function influences the frequency of contact. Furthermore, most of their contacts with faculty were through formal meetings. All of those in his study had the opportunity to teach but their administrative workload prevented them from considering teaching or research. Scott (1978) found that the frequency of contact was
inclined to reduce the formality of the relationships between administrators and faculty.

Scott (1978) found that middle managers had regular and substantial contact with other administrators, executive staff of the president, students, and faculty (depending on task function). Despite the regular contact, the scant literature on relationships between middle managers and superiors and faculty revealed that middle managers feel that their role is not highly respected; that there is a lack of consideration or respect (Baumgartel, 1976) and that they occupy a step-sister status (Thomas, 1978).

Authority

The literature review on authority includes the conceptualization of authority that was used to guide the analysis of the data, a discussion of women administrators' authority drawn from the works of Kanter, Colwill, and Lafontaine; and a description of the authority of middle managers.

Presthus (1962) defined authority as the capacity to evoke compliance in others on the basis of formal position and of any psychological inducements, rewards, or sanctions that may accompany formal position. Presthus' framework of organizational authority is composed of two propositions: 1) the process is reciprocal; and 2) it is mediated by four types of legitimation. By reciprocal, Presthus meant that the anticipated reactions of all actors become a datum in the behavior of each. By legitimation, Presthus meant that each party has a set of beliefs, values, and predispositions to act that result in willingness or unwillingness to comply. Legitimation is the process of accepting these values and thereby validating the compliance relation (Presthus, 1962; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978).
Presthus' framework differentiates between compliance based on formal position which is a response to authority, and compliance independent of formal role, which is response to power or influence. Mortimer and McConnell (1978) claim that university administrators seek to avoid excessive use of formal position to gain compliance, but rather use influence and power.

Presthus set forth four bases of legitimation: expertise, formal role or position, personal rapport, and generalized deference. Peabody (1962) drew on Presthus' writing as well as the writings of other major contributors in authority relations (Weber, Urwick, Simon, and Bennis) to further expand on these bases of legitimation. He identified two categories of authority: 1) functional which is based on competence and person; and 2) formal which is based on position and legitimacy (deference to authority). Peabody defined expertise as technical skills and experience, person as leadership and human relations skills (ties into Mintzberg's style); position as sanctions inherent in position such as power to hire and fire, promote and demote; and legitimacy as general deference to authority. Mortimer and McConnell (1978) use examples from higher education to clarify each. For example, one may consider an organization's policies and procedures legitimate, and comply with them, because one believes that those who made the decision know more about the matter at hand (expertise).

Since formal authority is vested in organizational positions, it should be available to all occupants. Haas and Drabek (1973) concluded, however, that the treatment of personal attributes as requisite occupational characteristics can negate the essentially automatic imputing of formal authority. Kanter (1977) maintained that
because of women's small numbers in certain kinds of positions (e.g., managers, administrators) and the resulting saliency of their ascribed role over their achieved and status role, they must continuously define, emphasize, exert, and defend their formal authority in interactions and situations.

Lafontaine and McKenzie (1985) identified several ways in which women may respond to the questioning of their formal authority. They can withdraw from the precipitating position and change positions. A second response is benign resignation which leaves the women administrator vulnerable to manipulation and inclines them not to take risks. In the first case, the nature and quality of their performance is contingent on the goodwill of others, and in the second case, they may be reduced to issuing communications which are in keeping with the desires of those with whom they are interacting (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985).

A third response is the attempt to substitute other types of authority for what is lacking at the formal level. Other types of authority include authorized authority, endorsed authority, and personal repertoire. In the first type, a mentor is sought who, because of his or her position, can authorize the issuance of communications. In the second type, appropriate members of the organization are sought who, because of their respect for her knowledge and expertise, can indirectly establish her legitimate right to influence others. In the third type, which includes admiration, respect, emotional attachment, or control over resources, the personal gain that derives from these essentially a-organizational interactions are used in lieu of formal authority to achieve desired goals (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985).
A fourth response is to fight for formal authority which can take the form of interpersonal confrontations or collective, organized programs to establish institutional legitimacy (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985).

Middle managers do not make institutional policy; however, within their own sphere they hold considerable authority because in their daily activities they shape policy through practice as they implement the decisions made by others such as the dean and the faculty (Austin and Gamson, 1983). Middle managers do not have the freedom to do their own work, for their work is the work of the institution (Austin and Gamson, 1983). They gain considerable influence from this. Their influence is often as information brokers (Anselm, 1980). Through their daily responsibilities they gain access to information and, depending upon the way in which that information is presented, can have considerable influence over the decisions that are made (Austin and Gamson, 1983).

Studies of the Daily Life of Administrators in Higher Education

A review of the literature revealed three studies that focused on the daily life of administrators in higher education. Cohen and March (1974) looked at the daily life of college presidents, Stewart (1978) looked at the major daily activities performed by the university ombudsman, and Halstead (1980) looked at activities and time allocation of vice presidents of student affairs in public universities in the midwest. A brief summary of the methodology and findings are presented.

Cohen and March (1974) looked at presidential leadership in 42 institutions. Their study focused on such variables as location of work, group size, initiation, contact patterns, and time allocations.
Data gathering for their study occurred on two randomly selected days in spring 1970. Each president's activities were recorded by a personal secretary on both a daily schedule and telephone log. Cohen and March inferred from the data that presidents divide their time among three major roles as reflected in their contact patterns and activities: administrator, political leader, and entrepreneur. Furthermore, Cohen and March concluded that the way in which they spent time was regulated by the size of the institution, daily and weekly cycles, expectations within the culture, role expectations, ambiguity, and pleasures of the president. The structure of their work was largely determined by the initiation of others.

Using a similar set of questions to guide his research, Halstead (1980) looked at the nature of the work and time allocations for six vice presidents of student affairs in six midwestern universities that belonged to the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). Using an extensor system, Halstead collected data for one month during which time the vice presidents randomly recorded their activities on several dimensions approximately 4 times per day. That phase of data collection was followed by an interview with each of the six participants. Halstead found that the vice presidents lived predominantly in an oral world, used buffers to limit their attention to important matters and to better control their time, and had very little planning time because of the press of their administrative duties.

Stewart (1978) looked at an ombudsman's day-to-day relationships with clients during the 1973-74 academic year. Using the dramaturgical perspective in sociology developed by Goffman and others, he collected three types of information: information
pertaining to special cases; information pertaining to the background of those cases; and information pertaining to follow-up on those cases. The activities of the ombudsman were categorized into three areas: appearance activities, activities for the construction of definitions of client problems, and activities for the resolution of client problems.

Although each of these studies focused on the daily activities of administrators, the purpose of the study framed the methodology for collecting the data on daily life. While Cohen and March (1974) and Halstead (1980) looked at the daily life of administrators on a more macro level, Stewart (1978) looked at the daily life of the ombudsman on a more micro level; focusing specifically on the social interactions between client and ombudsman. In macro studies, interaction is looked at as a medium through which the external world is reported and analyzed, whereas in micro studies, a macro consideration, such as role, is treated as a feature that emerges and recedes during the course of interactional encounters (Mehan, 1987). Some studies use both approaches within the same study and across studies (Evertson and Green, 1986).

Sociolinguistic Perspective

The underlying premise of this perspective is that conversations are more than random strings of words whose purpose is the simple verbal exchange of ideas, opinions, observations, and sentiments (Green and Wallat, 1981). Conversations are complex social phenomena that include nonverbal and social properties of an interchange in addition to, or concurrent with, the verbal characteristics of the exchange (Markel, 1975). The complexity is reflected in the view of a message in a conversation as a tripartite entity that functions
simultaneously as a "saying," a "making," and "doing" (McClellan, 1971). The saying part of a message is related to the form and semantic content of the utterance and the co-verbal and nonverbal cues to message realization. The making aspect is concerned with the relationships that exist between some messages and not others, that is, with the conversational obligation placed on either speaker to continue or another person to respond. The doing aspect of this description is concerned with the conversational intent of the message (Green and Wallat, 1981). Green (1983) has been instrumental in furthering the development of this premise through the identification of a series of common constructs that she has applied to teaching but are relevant to all conversation (Gumperz, 1982). These constructs are briefly described now so that the description of the system for capturing the sequential development of conversational and social processes of planned meetings are understood (see Question 5.0: Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings).

First, face-to-face interaction is rule-governed, that is, that there are rules of conversational participation and discourse construction that have been shown to be culture specific and learned from interacting with others (Green, 1983). Some of the patterned or rule-governed ways of interacting that have been identified include gaining access to conversations, taking turns speaking, constructing narratives, interacting appropriately, demonstrating group membership, and interactional synchrony. Rule-governed does not mean following a fixed script. Rule-governed means that expectations for performance exist that are culturally determined, and these expectations guide participation and act to constrain options for what can occur (Green, 1983). For example, in a planned meeting if someone asks a question
about the deadline for submitting data to the dean of the college, the
dean is expected to respond. While the expectation is there, the form
of the response cannot be predicted, for the dean might respond, "It's
due tomorrow" or a participant in the meeting may jokingly say, "It
was due yesterday."

Second, contexts are constructed. Contexts are not simply given
in the physical setting nor in combinations of persons (Erickson and
Shultz, 1981). Rather contexts are constructed by the participants'
actions as part of the interaction (Erickson and Shultz, 1981; Green
and Wallat, 1981). For example, by observing how people hold each
other accountable to what is occurring and how they signal it through
verbal and nonverbal actions, the observer can begin to identify
differentiated phases that make up a planned meeting. Three
constructs are related to the view of contents as constructed:
contextual cues (Gumperz, 1982) which are the verbal and nonverbal
cues people use to transmit meaning; participation structure (Philips,
1983) which refers to the demands for participation and the varying
rights and obligations that occur; and communicative competence
(Hymes, 1974) which is the ability of an individual to enter a
situation and engage in appropriate behaviors, that is, when to talk,
to whom to talk, and how to talk within a given situation.

The third construct is meaning as context specific. From this
perspective, how a behavior "means" is determined by considering how
it is used, what precedes it, and what follows (Green, 1983). All
behaviors are not considered functionally equivalent (Green, 1983).
For example, in Atkinson, Cuff, and Lee's (1978) analysis of a
business meeting, the chairperson states "Right-e:r-.
. ." The utterance
"right-e:r" by the chairperson might have meant "The meeting is about
to start so pay attention," it might have been his closing remark in a conversation with others, or it might have been meant as a place holder as in "Hold on. Stay with me." The meaning is signaled by the verbal and nonverbal aspects of the delivery (Green, 1983).

The fourth construct is comprehension as an inferencing process. Two constructs underlie this. First, meaning is extracted from face-to-face behaviors. As discussed previously, conversations are constructed by participants. They are not scripts to be followed rote (Green, 1983). Participants in face-to-face situations, therefore, must continually process information across various channels (verbal and nonverbal) in order to participate appropriately in and acquire cognitive knowledge from the evolving conversation (Green, 1983). To accomplish this, participants must use their communicative, social, and cognitive abilities to construct meaning (Green, 1983). By processing contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982), a participant is able to infer what is required. Meaning, therefore, is viewed as a process of extracting verbal and nonverbal information so that a person can "make sense" of the evolving events and gain access to the cognitive, social, procedural, contextual, and communicative knowledge provided during these face-to-face interactions (Green, 1983).

The inferencing process is made complex by two characteristics of conversations (Green, 1983). First, different forms of messages can co-occur. For example, in one planned meeting, the leader aimed a nonverbal message (a frown) toward one member as he was about to eat a donut while the leader presented information to the group verbally. Second, messages can serve multiple purposes, that is, they can function as controls on behavior simultaneously with providing
information (Green, 1983). For example, in a planned meeting, the leader might say, "Let's turn to page 21 of the standards."

One additional concept related to inferencing is frame of reference. People in conversations bring resources and frames of reference to the situation to help them interpret the conversation (Green, 1983). A frame of reference is developed for events and for general conversational participation (Green, 1983). Frames are established by extracting from face-to-face situations the expectations of behavior. That is, from participating in a variety of situations, a participant develops a frame of reference or set of expectations for what should or might occur in similar situations. Therefore, frames can be formed for local events and/or can come from past events (Green, 1983). An example taken from planned meetings is the practice of side engagements while "official talk" is going on. People bring to the meeting a set of expectations about side engagements, when it can occur, with whom, and so forth. That this frame of reference can be modified through overt as well as covert feedback (Frederiksen, 1981; Tannen, 1979) can also be illustrated using the example of side engagements during meetings. The leader may signal nonverbally (frown) or verbally ("pardon me") that that participant's expectations for side engagements at that meeting are incorrect.

In the preceding paragraphs a series of constructs that underlie the sociolinguistic perspective were presented. While these may not be a complete set of constructs, they are the ones which directly inform the methodology that guided the analysis of planned meetings in this study.
SUMMARY

Chapter II presented a description of the theoretical frameworks that have guided the research on women, a description of the research pertaining to the dimensions of this study, a description of the studies that have looked at the daily life of administrators in higher education, and the underlying premise and constructs for the sociolinguistic perspective that guided the analysis of planned meetings. The next chapter presents the methodology.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The general purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the experiences that the woman administrator had in the work setting. The purpose suggested the need to consider the everyday life of a woman administrator: what she did, how she did it, with whom, under what conditions, for what purposes, and with what outcome (Weade and Green, in press). As discussed in Chapter II, the underlying conceptual framework is that experience is multi-layered and derived from meanings that individuals make from happenings (Erickson, 1986). Both the purpose and the underlying conceptual framework led to the primary goal:

The identification of factors that contribute to the woman administrator's experiences within and across the four settings that comprise the work environment: the office, the college, the university, and outside the university.

Five major research questions guide the process of observation and analysis of data:
1.0 What is the nature of the work in which the woman administrator engages while in the work environment?
2.0 What is the nature of the roles the woman administrator plays while in the work environment?

3.0 What is the nature of the personal relationships the woman administrator has with people while in the work environment?

4.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's authority in the work environment?

5.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings?

The ways in which the experiences of the woman administrator are examined depends upon the manner in which experience is conceptualized. The conceptualization of experience as multi-layered (personal, social, professional) and derived from the meanings that individuals make of happenings (Erickson, 1986) had implications for what phenomena would be observed, how they would be observed, and how the data would be analyzed. Chapter III, therefore, is a discussion of the methodology for conducting the research. These major areas are discussed:

- design of the study;
- locus of observation;
- procedures for collecting the data;
- analysis process;
- establishing trustworthiness of the data;
- procedures for establishing trustworthiness;
- role of the researcher in the setting; and
- confidentiality

The theoretical and methodological approach to the research, as in all approaches to research, provided a partial picture of the
experiences of a woman administrator as revealed through her everyday life, in other words "a grammar not the grammar" (Mead, 1975) of a woman administrator. Recognizing that any research approach provides only one representation of the phenomenon under study, the attempt in this study was to "collect sufficient and appropriate evidence to ensure that the description [was] as accurate as possible given the representational process used" (Evertson and Green, 1986) (p. 165). Attention is now directed toward a discussion of the design of the study.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

As Figure 2 shows there were five identifiable stages in the design of the research. Each of these stages was interactive-reactive (Corsaro, 1981) in that each stage built upon the preceding one, and informed the ones that followed. Since the parts interacted, decisions in one stage were grounded by decisions made in the preceding stages as well as in the questions that guided the research.

The first stage consisted of identifying the purpose of the research, developing the major research questions, and conceptualizing the research process. The identification of the topic, women administrators in higher education, was based upon earlier research done with a member of the researcher's committee. During this stage, a timeline for conducting the research was developed (See Figure 3). Identification of the woman administrator was also decided upon during this stage. An explanation of that process is now described.

Initial discussions were undertaken with members of the researcher's committee in Spring Quarter 1986. Several women administrators in middle-level and upper-level positions at Harrington
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Research Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Winter 1986</td>
<td>Identifying Purpose of Research, Conceptualizing Research Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 1986</td>
<td>Identifying Subject and Setting for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Summer 1986</td>
<td>Gaining Entry into the Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting Data: Observations, Interviews, Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1: Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn 1986</td>
<td>Phase 3: Event Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Winter 1987</td>
<td>Analyzing the Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 1987</td>
<td>Collecting Further Data: Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn 1987</td>
<td>Writing the Research Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
Time Line for Research
University (pseudonym) and other colleges and universities were suggested. Harrington University was selected as the research site because of the many women administrators employed there. One administrator suggested for the study was eliminated from the list because she was in the process of changing positions and felt that having a "shadow" for six months would add to an already stressful situation. The second administrator on the list was contacted by a member of the researcher's committee, introductions were made, and arrangements were made to meet in the latter part of spring quarter to discuss the study. During the meeting the researcher explained the purposes and procedures of the study. Since the researcher needed access to certain documents during the observation period, the administrator felt her secretary should know about the general purpose of the study, and was, therefore, present for part of the meeting. During the meeting, the administrator and researcher discussed projects that the researcher might be assigned during the observation period, since her role was as a participant observer. This role is discussed in further detail later.

The second stage in the research design consisted of gaining entry into the setting in which the woman administrator worked. This involved multiple entries on the part of the researcher since the woman administrator's life involved several settings which are described in the next section, Locus of Observation. During this stage, the researcher was introduced to members of the staff by one of the staff members. Later at a staff meeting, the woman administrator informed her immediate staff about the researcher's general reasons for being there. Other people in the college were informed on a need-to-know basis about the general purpose of the study. In those
instances, either the administrator explained or she permitted the researcher to explain the general purpose of the study.

The third stage in the research design involved collecting the data. During this stage, the researcher took field notes, audiorecorded events, interviewed the woman administrator, and collected documents that would serve as the raw data to be analyzed in stage four.

Stage four consisted of analyzing the raw data collected in the preceding stage. As the researcher analyzed the data, new insights and understandings were gained about the experiences of the women administrator. As this occurred, the original questions were refined and new ones added, and the data were once again re-analyzed in light of the new understandings. This stage also included returning to the woman administrator with questions that were gleaned from these new insights. Thus the process was an interactive-reactive one (Corsaro, 1981).

The analytic process used involved multiple stages, which is briefly explained here. Question 5.0, which was an in-depth look at planned meetings, explored the experiences of a variety of administrators and faculty as they interacted through the oral work of planned meetings. The situation-specific patterns that were identified through the woman administrator's experiences as evidenced through talk at planned meetings were applied to other administrators' and faculty members' experiences (as evidenced through talk at the same meetings) to determine commonalities across cases.

Stage five involved writing the research report. This report presents the findings and conclusions from this study (Chapter IV and V).
LOCUS OF OBSERVATION

The locus of observation for this study is examined along the two dimensions: settings and subject. Since Question 5.0 contained multiple steps (i.e., analysis of the oral work of a variety of administrators and faculty at planned meetings), the rationale for selecting both the meetings and the participants as loci for observation are discussed here.

Setting

The administrator's life was viewed as occurring in multiple settings: the office in which she worked, the college of which the office was a part, the university of which the college was a part, and the community of which the university was a part. Community was defined here in the broadest sense, because there existed a community of professionals who were connected to the woman administrator through affiliations in professional associations. The four settings are now described.

Setting IV: Outside the University

Setting IV included the metropolitan area within which Harrington University was located and the community of professionals outside the university with whom the woman administrator was affiliated through professional associations or through her work.

Setting III: Harrington University

Harrington University was located in a metropolitan area in the midwest. It employed a large number of faculty, administrators, and support staff, and had a large student body. Harrington University was selected as the site for this research because of the number of women administrators that it employed.
Setting II: The College

The college was one of a number colleges on the campus of Harrington University. The college was administered by a dean and several other administrators, including the woman administrator. The college had its own faculty.

Setting I: The Office - 215 Frost Hall

The office that the woman administrator managed was composed of professional staff, support staff, and student workers.

Subject

The subject, who is hereafter referred to by her pseudonym Kennon Abbott, was an administrator by training and by profession. An employee of Harrington University for over ten years, Kennon had worked in the same capacity with the college since coming to the university. Kennon was selected as the subject of this study for several reasons: 1) she was a middle-level administrator; 2) she managed a large staff which allowed for greater density of data; 3) she was one of six who administered the college which allowed for greater density of data among those holding positions similar to her's; and 4) the gender of those who administered the college was predominantly male.

As previously mentioned, Question 5.0 contained multiple steps that enabled the researcher to explore the experiences of a variety of administrators and faculty as they interacted through the oral work of planned meetings. The locus of observation for this part of the study is examined along these two dimensions: planned meetings and subjects.
Planned Meeting

This stage of the study involved the analysis of six planned meetings. Planned meetings were defined as a pre-arranged convening with one or more people arranged by one of the parties or a third party to share information or to perform a task. This locus of observation or sampling unit was selected for the following reasons: 1) planned meetings represented a significant part of Kennon's experience in the work setting; 2) each of the three meeting types was convened multiple times allowing for intra-cultural comparisons across meeting types (Pelto and Pelto, 1970); 3) the participants had a "history" together as a group; 4) the meetings were illustrative of the roles Kennon played in other planned meetings that she attended during the observation period.

Each of these three meeting types met four times during the observational period for a total of twelve meetings. Two of each type of meeting were selected randomly by a colleague for further analysis. The six planned meetings not selected were used as a means of verifying what was found in the six meetings were selected for further analysis.

The planned meetings selected for further analysis are described in greater detail in Chapter IV.

Subjects

Within each of the three meeting types, two people were selected (in addition to Kennon) for further analysis. In order to avoid researcher bias in the selection of subjects for further analysis the following guidelines were observed: 1) each subject had to have been present at all of the meetings contained within that meeting type (each meeting type convened four times during the observational
period); 2) the audiorecordings of each subject's conversation during the meetings had to have been audible; 3) subject pairs included one man and one woman, if it was possible given the composition of the meeting types; 4) each subject had to have been equal in status to Kennon (except in Meeting Type 1: #3 and #4 which was a staff meeting of Kennon's subordinates); and 5) each subject had to have had administrative responsibilities.

By using these guidelines the following subjects were selected: two males (Meeting Type 1: #1 and #2); two males (Meeting Type 1: #3 and #4); and one male and one female (Meeting Type 2: #5 and #6).

PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA

This section contains information about the duration of the study, the observation schedule, and the strategies for collecting the data.

Duration of the Study and Observation Schedule

Harrington University operated on a quarter system. The researcher observed during the summer and autumn quarters of 1986. These quarters were selected because they provided a picture of a low and high density period of activity. In addition, beginning during the Summer Quarter permitted the researcher to establish rapport and gain entry on a systematic basis. The two-quarter observation period permitted an exploration through two complete cycles of a school year. Although it did not sample the whole year, it provided the opportunity to observe Kennon in a range of activities.

Ninety-six days were spent observing Kennon in the work setting. In addition to the scheduled observation periods, which averaged four and a half hours a day for a total of 411.5 hours of observation, the
researcher met with Kennon on seven separate occasions for interviews. Each interview averaged an hour and a half.

The observation period was divided into three phases: Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III. Each of these phases are now discussed.

**Phase I: Mapping**

The first step upon gaining entry to the setting was to become familiar with the setting and Kennon's place in it. The first day, Kennon facilitated this process by introducing the researcher to a member of the staff who introduced her to most of the people in the setting. Phase I consisted of 17 days (June 24-July 18). During this phase, the researcher spent at least 2 hours a day "mapping" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973) the setting to gain a working conception of the "classes of things, persons, and events" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973) in the setting. During this mapping operation, the researcher moved among various locales recording numbers and varieties of persons, divisions of labor; locating persons, equipment, and specialized centers of work; noting the ebb and flow of people and services; and asking about schedules of daily and weekly activities. Since at this time the researcher did not have her own desk, her movement from one empty desk to another did not seem out of place to those in the setting. Although once the researcher did acquire a desk, whenever she sat at another desk, her presence was greeted with looks of surprise or comments such as "Oh you've changed your seat today," or "Did you get kicked out of your office?"

A decision was made during Phase I to observe work around the clock by "overlapping" time (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973) on consecutive dates; for example, 7:30 am to 9:30 am (day 1), 8:30 to 10:30 am (day 2), 9:30 to 11:30 am (day 3), and so forth, so that over
a period of days the researcher covered the setting across the work
day. The researcher had used this strategy in a previous study and
found that it prevented being overwhelmed by a mass of new happenings
and trying to record it all. Mapping the operation continued until
such time as the researcher felt that she had a sense of the setting
in which Kennon worked.

Phase II

For the 27 days (July 21-September 19) in this phase, the
researcher observed Kennon for four hours a day. Once again, the
researcher elected to observe Kennon's work across the work day
overlapping time on consecutive dates. In this way, the researcher
observed both time and activity including Kennon's routines.
Sometimes it was not possible to accompany Kennon during the regularly
scheduled observation period; for example, during lunch if she went
with a friend or a colleague. In these instances, the researcher
asked Kennon to reconstruct that time period during an informal
interview.

Phase III

For the 49 days (September 22-December 2) in this phase, the
researcher did selective observations. Schatzman and Strauss (1973)
state:

selective sampling is a practical necessity and is
theoretically mandatory; it is shaped by the time the
researcher has available to him, by his framework, by his
starting and developing interests, and by any restrictions
placed upon his observations by his hosts. (p. 39)

During this phase the researcher attached herself to Kennon, and
followed her through parts of her work day. The decision as to what
parts of the work day to observe was initially based upon what Schatzman and Strauss (1973) refer to as "event sampling."

In truth, this dimension (sampling events or situations) is at the heart of research insofar as time, place, and even people represent - sociologically speaking - merely a context for situations and activities. (p.42)

Since the researcher had spent 44 days observing Kennon in her own setting, the researcher was interested in observing those events that took Kennon out of her own domain, and into the larger setting of Harrington University. Observing Kennon in meetings and conferences was a means of doing so. Each week the researcher checked Kennon's calendar to get a list of the meetings she was to attend. Then Kennon and the researcher discussed the researcher's access to the meeting; restrictions placed on the observation (e.g., presence or absence of an audiorecorder); and who the researcher was to contact to gain access to the meeting. From the array of meetings to attend, the researcher arranged a four-hour block of time around the meeting(s). During this phase the researcher attempted to get an equal number of morning and afternoon, and even some evening and weekend observations. The observation schedule permitted the researcher to collect the three orders of events: routine, special, and untoward. Schatzman and Strauss (1973) define routine events as the regularly scheduled situations wherein people meet to work or to discuss their activities; examples include regular meetings, conferences, and ordinary daily activities of work. Special events include fortuitous but anticipated occurrences, which, though not necessarily routine, are organized for moving the organization through successive stages of its activities; examples are: special meetings, outings, pre-arranged visits by
outsiders, and the like. Untoward events include those that are entirely unanticipated, of an emergency nature, or to some extent anticipated but untimed.

Although the issue of when to observe Kennon was settled the end of the third week, how to observe Kennon in the office was more problematic. Attention is now directed toward those decisions and reactions to the researcher.

Observations

During the preliminary discussion Kennon stated that she had no objection to the researcher sitting in her office with her. Her office appeared to be a good location since it enabled the researcher to observe Kennon doing her paperwork, meeting with staff in her office, meeting with constituencies, and so forth. The reality of that arrangement set in quickly, however, after the researcher observed the number of staff who "stopped in" Kennon's office during the two-hour mapping period. It seemed to the researcher that not only would Kennon grow tired of the researcher's presence day in and day out for 96 days, but that the staff would not feel as free to enter Kennon's office. To test her "gut feelings" about what might occur, the researcher sat or stood in Kennon's office to observe the staff's reaction to her presence. Remarks such as "Oh you're here" or "Oh you're busy" were common, and furthermore, staff would turn around and leave. Kennon suggested that perhaps the researcher could use the office next door to her to at least hear what was going on. The offices in the complex were conducive to this arrangement since the walls were partitions which did not extend to the ceiling. Part of the researcher's observations consisted of listening to unsolicited
sounds from Kennon's office, which to Schatzman and Strauss (1973) is "functionally equivalent to watching the ongoing activity." The professional and support staff and student workers were aware of the researcher's presence in the next office. The researcher checked with Kennon prior to meetings and after meetings about the use of conversation for the research.

The researcher noted who entered Kennon's office, when they entered and the duration of their stay, and the nature of the visit. This was supplemented with audiotape. The quality of the recording of these activities varied considerably because of the proximity of the researcher's and Kennon's offices to a corridor that was used by the staff as an informal gathering place and as a result tended to be noisy.

At other times, the researcher watched from other vantage points in the office, sitting at the secretary's desk, sitting in other offices, standing in the corridor, and sitting in Kennon's office. Observation from some of these other vantage points was not as conducive to audiotaping; therefore, the researcher took field notes. Sometimes the researcher was able to jot down notes on the spot in a 6X4 bound index cards that was easily carried in her pocket; other times the researcher had to jot down notes after the observation because she was engaged in an activity.

The researcher attended 56 meetings with Kennon that took place outside of her office. During these meetings the researcher took field notes and supplemented 27 of these meetings with audiotape. The audiotape, external microphone clipped to the researcher's collar or sleeve, and bound index cards were visible at all times. Occasionally participants asked the researcher what she was doing. She told them
that she was taping the meeting for Kennon. Sometimes the participants tried to second guess the researcher's reasons for audiotaping, at which point Kennon said, "Oh she's shadowing me." The quality of the recordings was generally good.

For the other 29 meetings, the researcher took field notes. She did not audiotape them either because Kennon requested that they not be or because the researcher felt that the use of the small compact cassette recorder was too distracting to the audience involved.

Reactions to the researcher's presence varied depending upon the frequency of the participants contact with her. Kennon, for example, during the first four weeks asked the researcher to write down for her when she was to observe and when she was to work so that she "wouldn't interrupt by asking me (the researcher) to do something." After week four, the researcher's work, which consisted of projects that Kennon assigned and, therefore, required working together, was integrated into the observation period. This arrangement, which enabled the researcher to become a participant observer, had its difficult moments as the researcher attempted to keep field notes of her observations whether they be written on the spot or noted mentally and jotted down later. To check her "going native" status, the researcher incorporated her own actions and actions toward her in the field notes. The researcher's role in the setting is described in another part of this chapter. By week 14, Kennon admitted to colleagues that, "sometimes I forget like when Susan asks can I go with you like to here I say to myself why." By week 19, Kennon admitted to me, "You're like an appendage I don't think about it."

Kennon's immediate staff, particularly the professional staff, expressed some initial concern about the researcher's presence until
she assured them that the researcher was only interested in her. During week 10, a staff member asked the researcher at a staff meeting where her audiorecorder was. When she learned that "the mic was on the blink" and the researcher commented that "now she could say anything she wanted," the staff member responded, "Oh it doesn't bother me cause you're so discrete about it. You're a good girl." At subsequent staff meetings, the researcher had staff members ask her if she was going to tape certain meetings because they wanted to hear it afterward or see the transcription. During weeks 10 and 13 the researcher had two different staff members ask her "how's your writing?" and "how's your research?" One staff member, during week 15, asked the researcher what she was doing her dissertation on and followed up with "Oh that's right you're observing Kennon." Week 19 brought a slightly different reaction to the researcher's presence by one staff member, "Oh you're almost finished here aren't you? We'll miss you."

Professional staff in other parts of Frost Hall were "alerted" by Kennon to the researcher's presence. Kennon typically said, "She's trailing me for a quarter who knows where she'll turn up next" or "She's helping me out." At the conclusion of a meeting during week 12, a staff member commented to the researcher "You shadow very well." During week 17, the researcher was told she need not feel out of place, "You're part of the staff." One staff member said prior to a meeting the following week, "I see you everywhere."

Generally those outside Kennon's immediate domain did not know why the researcher was there unless Kennon said, "She's shadowing me for a while" or "She's observing" or "She's with me." From one person, during three different weeks, the researcher was asked what
she was doing there, followed by comments such as "Oh here's the interloper" and "She doesn't work here but she's always at the same meetings we are." To these remarks, Kennon smiled and quipped, "She's checking up on you." Three other people who saw the researcher at meetings asked what she was doing there; one of them said, "Tape recorder, I get paranoid everytime I see a tape recorder I think it's a xxxx reporter." Kennon replied to the concerned person, "It's ok she's with me."

Attention is now directed toward strategies for collecting the data.

**Strategies for Collecting the Data**

Described below are the strategies that were used to collect the data.

**Systems for Recording and Storing Observation Data**

The components of the system were original hand written field notes, audiotapes, expanded field notes, documents, diagrams, and reflective journals. Interviews supplemented the data collection. Each will be described in terms of its recording and storage features.

**Original field notes**

The researcher wrote field notes on spiral bound 6X4 ruled and perforated index cards (trade name "Wire-in-dex"). These notes consisted of words, phrases, times, and drawings. Included in the notes were words and phrases about the researcher's activities in the setting. The original field notes served as the basis for the expanded field notes after which the original field notes were indexed and filed by date.
Audiotapes

A compact audiorecorder with an external microphone was used to record meetings, presentations, conversations, and interviews. As mentioned previously, not all meetings and conversations were taped, either because Kennon felt it was not advisable or the researcher felt that the tape recorder was too conspicuous to carry. A back-up tape recorder was used during interviews.

Sixty-minute tapes were used. The researcher was advised that 60 minute tapes were the most durable for the conditions under which the tapes were made. Equipment malfunctions were experienced 23 times, the field notes were then the prime source of data. Ten times the researcher was interrupted during the recording to chat with colleagues in the setting, to answer the telephone in her office, to provide her expertise on the computer. One hundred and fifty (150) tapes were recorded in the setting.

After leaving Harrington University each day, the researcher went directly home and labeled and dated the tapes. The tapes were used extensively in compilation of the expanded field notes, after which the tapes were stored in chronological order.

Expanded Field Notes

From June through early October, the researcher was able to expand the original field notes (Spradley, 1980) that same evening by typing them on a word processor, and integrating them with transcriptions from the audiotapes. The audiotapes were played on a foot-operated transcriber as the researcher read the original field notes. Integration of the field notes and the audiotapes enabled the researcher to include in the expanded field notes direct transcriptions from meetings and conversations in which Kennon was
involved in the chronological order in which they occurred. This was important in determining a routine to Kennon's day.

The transcriptions were recorded in the order people spoke without any grammatical symbols.

The symbols used in the expanded field notes and data analysis to indicate the speaker or the actor were Ke (Kennon) or whatever her pseudonym was at the time (two prior to deciding on Kennon), and initials for the other actors unless they already had a pseudonym in which case those initials were used.

The expanded field notes had consecutive page numbers beginning with Day 1, and line numbers (beginning June 24) that began anew each day. There was a total of 3595 pages of expanded field notes. Included in the expanded field notes were methodological notes (designated as MN), interpretative notes (designated as IN), theoretical notes (designated as TN), and role notes (designated as RN). Methodological notes were noted in the chronological order in which they occurred. Methodological notes referred to activities of the researcher such as changing an audiotape or changing location. The interpretative notes were the subjective reactions of the researcher to a situation, for example, Kennon looked tired. The theoretical notes were the researcher's attempts to derive meaning from the observation notes. Shortly after the observations began, however, the researcher abandoned this practice since it made the text of the notes too disjointed. Theoretical notes were included in her journal. Role notes were an effort to keep track of the researcher's activities since she was working in the setting, for example, "SY asked to help on an emergency special project."
The expanded field notes were filed chronologically in a ring-bound notebook and indexed by date and day number, for example, November 3, 1986, day 79, observations. Interviews were filed chronologically in manila folders and indexed by date, for example, August 17, 1987, interview.

The expanded field notes served as the data source for the data analysis.

From early October through the end of the observation period in early December, the researcher found it necessary to alter the plan for expanding field notes because of the time it took to transcribe all of the meetings Kennon attended; for example a two-hour meeting took the researcher approximately eight to twelve hours to transcribe. Concerned that if she did not keep up with expanding her field notes, the words, phrases, and drawings appearing in her notes would not be enough to substantially reconstruct the observed scene, the researcher wrote the expanded field notes in longhand the same evening or as soon as practical. Later, as time permitted, the researcher went back and integrated the handwritten expanded field notes with the transcriptions.

**Journals**

The researcher and Kennon each wrote journals.

The researcher dated each entry and kept them in a ring-bound notebook. There were no entries between July 28 and August 8 and October 7 and October 17. The journal served as a record of the researcher's reflections on analysis, method, dilemmas and conflicts, and frame of mind. In addition, the researcher recorded her decisions for taking certain actions, for example, electing not to sit in Kennon's office during office hours to observe. As the observations
proceeded the researcher routinely scrutinized her journal to ensure
that she acted upon the entries, specifically the methodological
notes.

During the preliminary briefing, Kennon agreed to write a journal
of her activities each day and reflect on how she experienced those
activities. Each entry was dated. The 98 entries varied in length
from a half a page (8 1/2 by 11) to 6 pages. There were no entries
July 18, August 8, August, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, November 19, 20, and
21. Kennon kept her journal in spiral ring notebooks supplied by the
researcher. At the completion of each notebook (4 in all) she gave
them to the researcher. The notebooks were returned to Kennon upon
completion of the research.

Documents

The 124 documents collected pertained to Kennon, the unit in
which she was employed and the department that she supervised. The
documents were either originals or photocopies. For each document
collected a document summary form (Appendix A) was completed and
attached. Furthermore, an index was kept of all the documents by
number (of the document) and title. The documents were filed
together. The documents (originals and photocopies) were returned to
Kennon at the conclusion of the research.

The first set of documents -- those pertaining to Kennon --
consisted of things related to: (1) her activities, for example,
photocopies of her weekly calendar; agendas to meetings; and requests
for participation in seminars, presentations, and lectures; and (2)
her roles as decision-maker, colleague, information-giver, friend.
Examples of documents pertaining to her role as information-giver
included letters and memos to constituencies stating policies and procedures.

During the months that the researcher observed, Kennon wrote 138 letters and memos. Rather than photocopy every letter and memo to include in the document file, the researcher created a correspondence log (Appendix B) in which she recorded the date of the letter or memo, to whom it was addressed, the style (memo or letter), a brief summary of the content of the letter or memo, and any notes about the correspondence. In addition, Kennon agreed to keep for and turn over to the researcher any written messages she received. Most of the 317 messages she received were on the pre-printed message forms available through the supplies office at Harrington University. Kennon consented to the researcher's use of each of the types of documents mentioned above.

The second set of documents -- those pertaining to the unit in which she was employed -- consisted of things related to the people, programs, and events in the unit. These items appeared in public documents such as newsletters, newspapers, and bulletins.

The third set of documents -- those pertaining to the department that she supervised -- consisted of items related to the people, programs, operations, and events in the unit. These items appeared in public documents such as bulletins and newsletters. Also collected were forms that pertained to the operation of the department.

**Interviews**

The researcher conducted 7 interviews with Kennon. The first interview was prior to the start of the researcher's observations. The purpose of the first interview was to obtain a personal history of Kennon and a history of the position she occupied at Harrington
University. Since her schedule did not permit the completion of the interview the first day, a subsequent interview was scheduled for two days later.

The second interview concerned Kennon's affiliation with national organizations in her field. This interview took place during week 3.

These interviews were semi-structured according to the guidelines of Sellitz, Wrightsman, and Cook (Kidder, 1981), and Patton (1980).

Discussions between Kennon and the researcher in the setting used the conversational approach to interviewing described by Patton (1980). A strength of this particular form of interviewing is that it enabled the researcher to be responsive to things that she witnessed in the setting for example, when Kennon described the actions of one of her colleagues as "politicking." Through conversation Kennon elaborated on what she meant by "politicking." During these discussions, Kennon was asked to "reconstruct" those events that occurred within the researcher's observation time, but were off-limits to actual observation, for example, luncheons with colleagues and closed meetings.

The interviews after the researcher left the setting and had been able to analyze the data were what Kidder (1981) termed "focused" interviews since their content was drawn from the field notes and Kennon's journal. These interviews occurred during the spring and summer of 1987 and covered such topics as doing paperwork, "stopping in", and "dropping by."

The interviews were transcribed in full by the researcher. Separate files were maintained for each interview. Each transcription had consecutive page numbering. Line numbers were begun afresh for the interviews.
Attention is now directed toward the processes for analyzing the data.

ANALYZING THE DATA

Of central concern in this study was the need to organize the volume of data in a manner that facilitated the data analysis so that the end product, factors contributing to the experiences of a woman administrator in the work environment, met the criteria for adequate observation (Evertson and Green, 1986). The identification of units of observation served as the link between the data collection and the data analysis. There were two broad groups of units. "Natural units" (Fassnacht, 1982; Evertson and Green, 1986) were inductively derived from the observations and specified discrete units of acts, activities, sub-activities, setting, particular sets of interactions with Kennon, overall topic of talk within the interaction, time, and date. These served as the framework for storing the data, especially the expanded field notes (Green, 1983). During data analysis when more explicit details were required the natural units were redefined and constituted deductively derived units. Each of these "naturally" occurring units is now described.

Units of Observation

Acts

Act, using Lofland's (1971) definition, was of short duration encompassing a relatively narrow sector of Kennon's time. Examples of acts included: reading, taking a telephone call, making a telephone call, and getting refreshment.

Activities

Activities, using Lofland's (1971) definition, encompassed a relatively large segment of Kennon's time. Activities were likely to
be engaged in collectively and conjointly in a social setting, instead of individually and privately. Examples included: planned meetings and unplanned meetings.

**Sub-activities**

Erickson, Guzman, and Carrasco (1980) refer to sub-activities as constituent phases that comprise the activity. Examples in this study were: phases within planned meetings, phases within unplanned meetings, phases in arriving for the day, and phases in leaving for the day.

**Setting**

Setting was defined as the environment in which an act, activity, or sub-activity occurred. Examples of settings included: places within the office (corridor, copy room, front desk), college, and university.

**Sets of Interactions**

Sets of interactions (Erickson, Guzman, and Carrasco, 1980) were defined as instances in which individuals talked with Kennon. Examples included: Kennon-faculty, Kennon-administrator, Kennon-student, Kennon-female, Kennon-male.

**Topic of Talk**

Topic of talk was defined as the subject of the talk within the interaction. Examples included: operation of the office, health of a staff member, and academic performance of a student.

**Time**

Time was defined as when an act, activity, or sub-activity took place. Examples included: 8:00 am Kennon arrived or 9:15 am unplanned meeting with office manager.
Date

Date was defined as when an act, activity or sub-activity occurred on the calendar. Examples included: 10/30/86 - planned meeting with the dean, 9/29 - planned meeting with faculty member.

Once the "naturally" occurring units of observation were identified, the researcher proceeded to catalogue Kennon's acts using a system developed by Erickson, Guzman, and Carrasco (1980). Cataloguing the data involved reading through the 3595 pages of field notes and noting each act. To facilitate locating these acts for further analysis an index was created (See Appendix C). This index included the following: act number, page/transcript line number, with whom (interaction set), where (setting), when (date and time), purpose (topic of talk), ways (phases or sub-activities), outcome, context (acts that preceded or followed the act or activity), triangulated (source of triangulation - journal, message slips, correspondence, interview), and notes (theoretical notes of the researcher).

Data Analysis

The major research questions addressed the factors that contribute to a woman administrator's experiences in essentially two ways: the work that she did within the work setting and the relationships that she had with people in the work setting. The units of observation that were used to analyze the kinds of work that she did were drawn primarily from acts, activities, and sub-activities. The units of observation that were used to analyze the kinds of relationships that she had were drawn from interaction sets and from acts, activities, and sub-activities. The subquestions required analyzing the units of observation more in-depth. The process of data
analysis is discussed in detail for each question and its constituent subquestions.

Questions 1.1 and 1.1.1: Kinds of Work and Major Components of Work

To determine the kinds of work in which Kennon engaged while in the work setting, the researcher undertook a domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) of all of the acts, activities, and sub-activities that occurred using field notes, Kennon's journal, documents, and interviews. Domain analysis is a first step in a process of ethnographic analysis through which patterns are derived and the cultural meaning of behavior discovered (Spradley, 1980). Domains, as cultural categories, are made up of three basic elements: cover term, included terms, and semantic relationship. The cover term is the name for the cultural domain, and in this analysis the cover term "activity" was used. The semantic relationship that was used to uncover the included terms within activities was "X is a kind of activity." Spradley identified nine types of semantic relationships, which are shown in Figure 4. To facilitate this process, the researcher prepared a domain analysis worksheet (Spradley, 1980).

Following the domain analysis, a taxonomic analysis was done to discover the levels within the activities, and by so doing uncover larger, more inclusive domains that included as a subset similar kinds of activities. This process led to the identification of the broad categories of kinds of work.

Following the taxonomic analysis, the kinds of activities were once again analyzed for their attributes. This is the next step in Spradley's (1980) analytical process in which contrasts among the members of a domain are discovered, grouped together, and entered as a paradigm of a domain. This step led to the identification, for
### Spradley's Semantic Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strict inclusion</td>
<td>X is a kind of Y</td>
<td>An expert witness (is a kind of) witness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial</td>
<td>X is a place in Y</td>
<td>The grand jury room (is a place in) the county courthouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X is a part of Y</td>
<td>The jury box (is a part of) the criminal courtroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cause-effect</td>
<td>X is a result of Y</td>
<td>Serving on the grand jury (is a result of) being selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rationale</td>
<td>X is a reason for doing Y</td>
<td>A large number of cases (is a reason for) going rapidly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Location-for-action</td>
<td>X is a place for doing Y</td>
<td>The grand jury room (is a place for) hearing cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Function</td>
<td>X is used for Y</td>
<td>Witnesses (are used for) bringing evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Means-end</td>
<td>X is a way to do Y</td>
<td>Taking an oath (is a way to) symbolize the sacredness of jury duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sequence</td>
<td>X is a step (stage) in Y</td>
<td>Making jail visits (is a stage in) grand jury activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attribution</td>
<td>X is an attribution (characteristic) of Y</td>
<td>Authority (is an attribute of) the attorney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from J. Spradley, *Participant Observation*, 1980.
example, of components within such activities as making telephone calls, taking telephone calls, and letters.

**Question 1.2: Distribution of Work Over Time**

Once the six kinds of work were identified through the process described above and definitions derived for each of the kinds of work, (see Chapter IV: Question 1.0) both Kennon's journal and the field notes were re-examined. Episodes within each document were coded using the decision rules identified by the researcher. (See the next section for a discussion of the trustworthiness of categories of activities identified as kinds of work.) Following the coding procedure, the episodes within each code were totaled and descriptive statistics derived showing means, medians, modes, and percentages.

**Question 1.3: Routine and Extraordinary Work**

Once the six kinds of work were identified through the process described in Questions 1.1 and 1.1.1 and decision rules determined for routine and extraordinary (See Chapter IV: Question 1.3), both Kennon's journal and the field notes were re-examined, and a count was taken of the number of instances a category of activity within a kind of work appeared. Following this step, a search was undertaken within each category of activity for the number of times references were made to either a category or to an event within a category. To derive the meaning of these events and categories for Kennon, her journal and interviews were also examined.

**Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles**

To determine the kinds of roles Kennon played while in the work environment, the researcher undertook a domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) of all of the acts, activities, and sub-activities, and topics of talk in which Kennon was observed to engage using field notes,
Kennon's journal, documents, and interviews. For this question, the term "role" was the cover term, "X is a kind of role" was the semantic relationship. To determine the saliency of each role, each role that was identified through the domain analysis was further examined for three components: the work done, ways of interacting with other members of the organization, and attitudes and beliefs. Argyle (1967) identified these as the aspects of behavior that are incorporated within a role.

**Question 2.2: Differentiation of Roles Across Settings**

Once the roles were identified, the units of observation labeled acts, activities, sub-activities, and topics of talk were re-examined and cross-checked with the unit of observation labeled interaction set. In this way, the setting was determined, e.g., if the interaction set was with a faculty member from outside the college, then it was labeled Setting III, and so forth.

**Question 2.3: Role Conflicts**

Once the roles were identified using the steps outlined in Question 2.1, the units of observation labeled acts, activities, sub-activities, and interaction sets were re-examined to determine if Kennon was under conflicting pressure from different groups in an organization (Argyle, 1967).

**Question 3.1: Kinds of Personal Relationships**

Question 3.1 and its constituent parts were the broadest in scope of the three questions and relied on Questions 3.2 and 3.3 for their answer. Therefore, the analytic process for Questions 3.2 and 3.3 are described first.
Question 3.2: Description of Personal Relationships

To describe the people with whom Kennon had personal links while in the work setting, the researcher used the units of observation labeled interaction set and setting. Using both Kennon's journal and the researcher's field notes, the researcher counted all the people with whom Kennon was observed to have had interactions during the 96 days. To mask the identity of those people, each person was given a number, a code to indicate gender (f - female; m - male); a code to indicate setting (I - 215 Frost Hall, II - College, III - University, IV - Outside University); and a code to indicate role (A - Administrator, F - Faculty, FF - Former Faculty, FA - Former Administrator, CSV - Contract or Service Vendor, PA - Professional Association, Al - Alumni, OA - Other Administrator, SS - Support Staff, PS - Professional Staff, SW - Student Worker, CPS - Casual Professional Staff, UKN - Unknown). People were then counted according to their setting, their gender, and their role.

Question 3.3: Frequency of Contact With Personal Relationships

To describe the frequency with which Kennon had contact with those people with whom she had personal relationships, the units of observation labeled interaction set and setting were once again used. Using both Kennon's journal and the researcher's field notes, the researcher counted the number of times Kennon had contact with a person identified in the interaction set. The totals for each person were then reviewed to determine the "on average" frequency of face-to-face contact. Since the researcher spent 21 weeks in the field, contacts made with people greater than or equal to 21 times were coded as weekly; contacts made with people 11 to 20 times were coded as semi-weekly; contacts made with people 5 to 10 times were coded as
monthly; and contacts made with people 1 to 4 times were coded as less than monthly. The same procedure was followed for reported contacts that were found in Kennon's journal. The observation unit labeled setting was then used to identify the people in the interaction set as part of 215 Frost Hall, the college, the university, and outside the university.

**Question 3.1: Kinds of Personal Relationships**

To describe the kind of personal relationships Kennon had, the units of observation labeled interaction set and topic of talk were used. The units of observation labeled topic of talk were reviewed and a domain analysis was done using the cover term "contact" and the semantic relationship "X is a reason for the contact." Four reasons for contact were identified: business, social, business-social, and greeting. Definitions for each kind of contact were developed (see the next section for a discussion of the trustworthiness of this category). Each interaction set was then re-examined to determine the ratio of each of the kinds of contact (e.g., if the reasons for contact were always business than the person with whom Kennon had the contact was labeled a primarily business contact, and so forth). To capture the ongoing nature of the relationship, the word tie (Lincoln and Miller, 1976) was used (e.g., those people with whom Kennon had primarily business contacts were labeled instrumental ties; those with whom she had primarily informal social contacts were labeled primary ties).

Each of the people that were part of an interaction set were then examined further for their role, gender, setting, and frequency of contact with Kennon. This information was then depicted, when it was feasible, through a "web" configuration.
Question 3.1.1: Characteristics of Relationships

To further describe the kinds of personal relationships Kennon had, the units of observation labeled topics of talk were re-examined through a domain analysis. The cover term "contact" was once again used. The semantic relationship "X is an attribute of contact" was used. The domain analysis was followed by a taxonomic analysis to uncover levels within the attributes of the contact. (See the next section for a discussion of the trustworthiness of the attributes of the contact that were identified.) The unit of observation labeled interaction set was then re-examined to determine the people with whom Kennon had these specific kinds of contact.

Question 3.2: Structural Characteristics of Relationships

To further describe the kinds of personal relationships that Kennon had, the units of observation labeled activities and interaction set were used. A domain analysis was done using "activity" as the cover term, and the semantic relationship "X is a means for doing the activity." Through this domain analysis, the researcher identified whether the activity was done as part of a pair or as part of a group. Interaction sets were then re-examined to determine if the ties with people in those interaction sets were primarily in groups or as part of a pair.

Each of the people that were part of an interaction set were examined further for role, gender, frequency of contact, and kind of tie (instrumental, primary, social-business). Findings were reported in the aggregate.

Question 4.1: Kinds of Authority

To describe the kinds of authority Kennon had, the researcher used the units of observation labeled interaction set, setting, and
acts, activities, and sub-activities. Since the literature base on authority relations in organizations is very specific about the definition of the term and its components, pre-determined organizers were used. The field notes, Kennon's journal, interview, and documents were searched using each of the four kinds of authority identified from the literature as a cover term (e.g., authority of position, authority of person), and using the semantic relationship "X is a result of Y," where Y was the specific kind of authority being examined. This particular semantic relationship was chosen for two reasons. First, authority is a dynamic reciprocal relationship in which the actions of the followers play a critical role in defining the authority of leaders (Presthus, 1962). Using that specific semantic relationship captured others' perceptions of the bases of her authority. Second, in her formal position, Kennon had certain powers. Using the semantic relationship, "X is a result of Y," enabled those powers that she exercised to be captured.

**Question 5.0: Patterns of Participation in Planned Meetings**

The question for this section centered on the nature of Kennon's participation in planned meetings. Within this question were four subquestions. The analytic process for Questions 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 involved micro-analysis of planned meetings and is described in detail. Discussion begins with the analytic process for Question 5.1.

**Question 5.1: Roles within Planned Meetings**

To describe the kinds of roles Kennon played within planned meetings, the researcher used the unit of observation labeled activities, and its subset, planned meetings. A domain analysis using the cover term "meeting" and the semantic relationship "X is a kind of meeting" was done in order to uncover different kinds of meetings and
the way in which Kennon participated in them (e.g., Kennon initiated some meetings, others she did not). Another domain analysis followed using the cover term "role" and the semantic relationship "X is a kind of role," in order to uncover the different ways in which Kennon attended the planned meetings (e.g., as participant, as leader, etc.). A taxonomic analysis was done to discover additional levels within those planned meetings.

Question 5.2: Organizational Structure of Six Planned Meetings

The description of the organizational structure of six planned meetings was multi-step, and used both macro-analysis and micro-analysis. Attention is first directed toward the micro-analytic process that was used.

An Overview of Mapping: The Methodology Used to Explore the Conversation of Six Planned Meetings

Grounded in social interaction perspective, mapping was the specific analysis procedure used to capture the ongoing conversation at meetings. Mapping, a form of discourse analysis, allowed the conversation to be reconstructed in the form of a map of the unfolding conversation. The map permitted systematic exploration of messages conveyed via verbal conversation, and subsequently a means for exploration of patterns of participation by Kennon and selected participants.

Map construction was primarily a product of transcription and segmentation of the conversation at meetings. The process used to transcribe and segment the conversation was an adaptation of an analytic system called the Descriptive Analysis System (Green, 1977; Green and Wallat, 1981). This system is a heuristic tool that allowed for the ongoing conversation among the participants to be
systematically segmented so that it could be reflected upon. (See Figure 5 for an example of the way in which conversation was segmented.)

The process of mapping included reviewing the transcripts from each of the six planned meetings and recording the following information: the page and transcript line number (column 1), the potentially divergent units (column 2), the thematically tied conversation units (column 3), and the gloss (column 4). Each of these is now described (see Appendix F).

The first column contained the page and transcript line number from each of the turns at talk taken by a speaker. The second column contained the potentially divergent units, in other words, those messages that did not directly follow the thread of the conversation (Green and Wallat, 1981). The third column contained the thematically tied units of conversation. In this column, messages were recorded using the descriptive system developed by Green and Wallat (1981) to indicate source (speaker), form of the message (question, response), strategies (purpose of the message unit, e.g., clarifying, confirming) and message resolution (whether or not a message from the speaker was completed). In this column, thematic ties or cohesion between messages was also noted. Cohesion occurs because people, in all social situations, talk to achieve certain goals, project outcomes, and social acts (Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz, 1976; Green, 1977). The fourth column, labeled gloss, contained notes about the conversational topics.

As a result of this process, the conversations within meetings were analyzed in the same way, and the researcher was then able to search for recurring patterns within and across meetings. (See the
Gloss
need to spend more on xx
but I do think we need to talk about xx
and a reminder that we go to xx to hear 4mII and um

and the next day is xx

xx is next day but I think you're gone

no I'm going to xx

oh you are couldn't remember I thought you were off um

and 4fI going because placement

do you remember candidate who applied for that position wanted to market

package

package

package

that's it.

Figure 5

Mapping the Conversation of a Planned Meeting
next section for a discussion on the trustworthiness of conversations within meetings).

Further Analysis of Planned Meetings

Analysis of the unfolding conversation through the use of structural maps was accompanied by a domain analysis. The cover term "meeting" and the semantic relationship "X is a stage in a meeting" were used initially. The stages that were identified through domain analysis were then compared with the structural maps for changes in context signaled by verbal cues to the group. This procedure was followed for the six planned meetings that were examined. Hypotheses were generated about the patterns contained in meetings and then tested across all six meetings using a type-case analytic approach (Erickson and Schultz, 1981; Green, 1983). (See Figure 6).

The systematic identification of patterns and the subsequent process of hypothesis generation/testing across meetings provided a means of confirming or disconfirming the emerging hypotheses. As new hypotheses or questions emerged as a result of the identification of discrepant cases, they in turn were tested, and the process repeated.

Question 5.3: Range of Talk

The structural maps were examined to determine the range of talk for each of the six participants identified earlier (See Locus of Observation) and Kennon. Initiating theme and giving an extended response were the two aspects of talk that were examined in-depth for patterns across participants and across meetings. Initiating a theme was defined as a message that shifted the content of what was being discussed (Wallat and Green, 1981). Giving an extended response was defined as one in which the participant responded to a question or
Step 1
Select a recurrent context
Identify the rights and obligations for participation
Identify the participation structures
Identify conversational demands
Identify thematic/content patterns and demands
Etc.

Step 2
For this context, construct an explanatory model for the requirements, participation structures, norms for behavior, content demands, conversational demands, etc.

Step 3A
Apply the model to context 1A, the same context on another day or the same context at a different time

Step 3B
Verify description and model with participants or members of the culture. Triangulate findings.

Step 4A
If the model is not confirmed, return to Context i and check the accuracy of the description in Step 1

Step 4B
If partially confirmed/verified, refine model to include Context 1 and 1A and any information obtained from participants

Step 4C
If confirmed, proceed to a new context, Context 2, and construct a model for that context and/or test the model from context 1 in context 2

Step 5A
Continue testing across all similar contexts and continue verification process

Step 5B
If model is appropriate, add context to model and proceed to examine all similar contexts

Step 5C
If not appropriate, construct a new model and verify

Adapted from J. Green, "Exploring classroom discourse: Linguistic perspective on teaching-learning process." Educational Psychologist, 18, 180-199.

Figure 6
Model for Type Case Analysis
another participant with a message containing at least two consecutive transcript lines.

To make visible the range of talk, a taxonomic analysis was done for both initiation and extended response.

**Question 5.4: Patterns of Participation within Meetings**

The structural maps were examined to identify other patterns of participation within the six planned meetings. Patterns that were identified were explored further through taxonomic analysis to make their elements visible.

**TRUSTWORTHINESS**

Trustworthiness of the data means that the findings are credible, that is, they are worthy of belief and entitled to confidence (Earls, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest four primary questions that should be posed in determining trustworthiness:

1) "Truth value": How can one establish confidence in the "truth" of the findings of a particular inquiry for the subjects (respondents) with which, and the context in which the inquiry was carried out?

2) Applicability: How can one determine the extent to which the findings of a particular inquiry have applicability in other contexts or with other subjects (respondents).

3) Consistency: How can one determine whether the findings of an inquiry would be repeated if the inquiry were replicated with the same (or similar) subjects (respondents) in the same (or similar) context?

4) Neutrality: How can one establish the degree to which the findings of an inquiry are determined by the
subjects (respondents) and conditions of the inquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests, or perspectives of the inquirer? (p. 290)

Within the rationalistic paradigm, the criteria that have evolved in response to these questions are termed "internal validity," "external validity," "reliability," and "objectivity." Within the naturalistic paradigm, the criteria that have evolved in response to these questions are credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Good data, then, are the product of a process of inquiry to which the criteria for respected scientific inquiry have successfully been applied, as those criteria apply to both naturalistic and rationalistic paradigms (Hough and Duncan, 1986).

Trustworthiness of the data was a primary concern. Steps were taken to ensure trustworthiness of the data during the data collection, data analysis phases, and at the conclusion of the writing of the study.

Data Collection Phase

To ensure adequate data collection, the researcher spent 96 days observing Kennon. This prolonged engagement enabled the researcher to become familiar with the setting in which she worked, test for misinformation introduced either by the researcher or Kennon, and build trust (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In addition, during Phase III, the researcher was able, through event sampling, to persistently observe Kennon in one kind of situation, thereby providing depth, and the potential for comparisons across the events. The specific strategies for collecting the data were discussed earlier in this chapter.
In addition, the researcher collected multiple sources of data, including documents and field notes through multiple methods (interviews, observations) that were later used in analyzing the data. This technique of triangulation is one of the ways in which findings and interpretations are made more credible (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The specific sources of data were discussed earlier in this chapter.

Data Analysis Phase

During the data analysis phase the researcher used two primary methods to assess the trustworthiness of the data: interobserver agreement measures (Hersen and Barlow, 1976; Johnston and Pennybacker, 1980; Tavny and Gast, 1984) and triangulation of multiple sources and methods of data (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The specific interobserver agreement measures that were undertaken are described here.

Conclusion of the Study

To provide the woman administrator with an opportunity to correct errors of fact and challenge what she perceived to be any wrong interpretations, she was given written copies of each of the five questions that comprised the findings (Chapter IV) and the discussion of the findings (Chapter V). Her response to the research, upon reading the finds was "sure sounds like 215 Frost Hall to me, go with it."

Interobserver Agreement Measures

Interobserver agreement measures were not undertaken for each research question. Interobserver agreement was sought in three areas: kinds of work, attributes of personal relationships, and conversation in meetings. Interobserver agreement was sought for the construct identified as kinds of work because of its centrality to Kennon's daily life in the work setting. The work she did determined the
people with whom she had contact and the types of relationships she had with them. Interobserver agreement was sought for the specific attributes of relationships that emerged (e.g., feedback, help seeking) because of their centrality to her experiences in the work setting. Interobserver agreement was sought for conversation in meetings because meetings were a significant part of Kennon's daily life and contributed to her experiences in the work setting.

Three different individuals served as external or independent observers in the study. Each of these individuals was asked to serve as an observer for specific reasons. These reasons were based on either their experience in administrative positions and/or their expertise. The backgrounds of each of the observers are presented below.

External Observers

External Observer A

External Observer A was a middle-level administrator at The Ohio State University. The observer had a total of fifteen years of administrative experience at the university.

External Observer B

External Observer B was a middle-level administrator at The Ohio State University. The observer had a total of nine years of administrative experience including four years at a private, liberal arts college prior to coming to the university. In addition, the observer had done a dissertation for her PhD using a qualitative design.
External Observer C

External Observer C was a doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University. The observer had successfully completed a research methodology course in which the system of microanalysis was used.

Each of the interobserver agreement measures are now discussed. Included in the discussion is information regarding the observer used, the procedures followed, and and level of agreement obtained.

**Question 1.0: Nature of Work**

The accuracy of the researcher's categories of kinds of work were assessed by External Observer A.

**Procedures of Establishing Trustworthiness of Data**

1) Entries from Kennon's journal and entries from the researcher's field notes were used.

2) Each of the entries from Kennon's journal had been coded using the letters OW for Oral Work, WW for Written Work, IW for Interpretive Work, PLW for Planning Work, SW for "Social" Work, PHYW for Physical Work, and PW for Personal Work. In addition each of the entries were numbered.

3) Each of the entries in the researcher's field notes had been coded using the above-mentioned letters and number.

4) Numbers were randomly selected by another person. These randomly selected numbers were used to identify which entries from the field notes and Kennon's journal were selected.
5) Entries from the field notes (24) and from Kennon's journal (34) were written on 3X5 index cards, and given to External Observer A with the following instructions:

a) Please sort through these cards and find the ones that you think are (kind of work, e.g., written work, oral work, etc.)

b) Listed below are the decision rules for determining if a card belongs in this category: (See Appendix G for specific decision rules.)

c) On each of the cards you will notice a number in the upper righthand corner. In the space below list the numbers of the cards that you have included in the category. Next to each entry indicate why you thought the card belonged in this category.

Interobserver agreement on the kinds of work was computed using the following formula (Hersen and Barlow, 1976; Tawny and East, 1984; Johnston and Pennybacker, 1980):

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

Agreements were those kinds of work upon which both the researcher and the External Observer A agreed. There was 100% percent agreement on the categories of kinds of work.

**Question 3.0: Nature of Personal Relationships**

The accuracy of the researcher's categories for purpose of talk (social, business, social-business) were assessed by External Observer B.
Procedures for Establishing Trustworthiness of Data

1) Entries from the researcher's field notes were used. Each of the entries in the catalogue of data (see Locus of Observation) were numbered.

2) Numbers were randomly selected by another person. Those numbers were used to select the entries from the catalogue.

3) Once the entries were selected, the researcher returned to the corresponding page and line number in the field notes. Each observation was re-typed, masking the identities of individuals and any words that linked individuals with the setting.

4) The observations were given to External Observer B with the following instructions:
   a) Enclosed are transcripts numbered 1 through 12.
   b) There is only one step in this interobserver agreement exercise: to determine whether the contact is business, social, or business-social.
   c) Listed below are the decision rules for determining the type of contact: (See Appendix G for decision rules.)
   d) At the end of each transcript is a space for you to indicate whether or not the conversation or the situation is business, social, or business-social.
Interobserver agreement on the purpose for talk was computed using the same formula shown in Question 1.0. Interobserver agreement was 92%. As the findings revealed in Chapter IV, the predominate purpose for talk was business. As a result the majority of entries that were randomly selected were those in which the purpose for talk was business. External Observer B agreed on the all the transcriptions coded business (10) and on the transcription coded social (1). She disagreed on the transcription coded business-social (1). The external observer and the researcher discussed the transcription coded business-social. The external observer agreed that the transcript was business-social.

• Question 3.1.1: Characteristics of Personal Relationships

External Observer B was used to assess the accuracy of the researcher's category labeled feedback.

Procedures for Establishing Trustworthiness of Data

1) Entries from the researcher's field notes were used. If an entry was determined to be feedback given the decision rules established by the researcher (see Appendix G) it was coded in the catalogue (see Locus of Observation)(Column 11: Notes) with the letters FB 1 or 2 (FB 1 = feedback to Kennon; FB 2 = feedback from Kennon). Each entry was numbered.

2) Numbers were randomly selected by another person. These numbers were used to select the entries the researcher had identified as feedback from the catalogue.

3) Once the entries were selected, the researcher returned to the corresponding page and transcript line number in the field notes. Each observation was re-typed,
masking the identities of individuals and any words that linked individuals with the setting.

4) The observations were given to External Observer B with the following instructions:

a) Enclosed are transcripts numbered 1 through 12.

b) There are two steps to this interobserver agreement exercise.

c) Step 1 is to determine whether or not the cases are instances of feedback; Step 2 is to determine for those cases you have designated as instances of feedback the nature of the feedback.

d) Listed below are the decision rules for determining whether the case is an instance of feedback: (see Appendix G for decision rules.) And for determining the kinds of feedback are: (see Appendix G for decision rules.)

e) At the end of each transcript is a space for you to indicate whether or not the case is an instance of feedback and the nature of the feedback.

Interobserver agreement on the instances of feedback was computed using the same formula shown in Question 1.0. Interobserver agreement was 67%. Interobserver agreement on the nature of the feedback (e.g., gratefulness, appearance, idea, performance) was computed using the
same formula shown in Question 1.0. Interobserver agreement for the eight upon which the External Observer and the researcher agreed was 88%.

External Observer B was also used to access the accuracy of the categories coded as help seeking.

**Procedures for Establishing Trustworthiness of Data**

1) Entries from the researcher's field notes were used.

The entries that were coded in the catalogue as help seeking using the decision rules established by the researcher (see Appendix G) were labeled HLP in Column 11 (notes) and numbered.

2) Numbers were randomly selected by another person.

These numbers were used to select entries the researcher had identified as help seeking from the catalogue.

3) Once the entries were selected, the researcher returned to the corresponding page and transcript line number in the field notes. Each observation was re-typed masking the identities of individuals and any words that linked individuals with the setting.

4) External Observer B was given the transcripts with the following instructions:

   a) Enclosed are transcripts numbered 1 through 15.

   b) There are three steps to this interobserver agreement exercise.

   c) Step 1 is to determine if the cases are instances of help seeking; Step 2 is to determine for those cases the type of
helpseeking; and Step 3 is to determine for those cases the pattern of helpseeking.

d) At the end of each transcript is a space for you to indicate your response to each of the steps.

e) Listed below are the decision rules for each step. (See Appendix G for decision rules.)

Interobserver agreement on the instances of help seeking was computed using the same formula as shown in Question 1.0. Interobserver agreement was 80%. Using the 12 cases upon which the external observer and the researcher agreed, interobserver agreement on the type of help seeking (who initiated the help) was 100%. Using the 12 cases upon which the external observer and the researcher agreed, interobserver agreement on the pattern of help seeking was 33%. The low rate of interobserver agreement can be partially explained by the fact that the transcripts did not include enough of the context, and that parts of the transcript had to be masked in order to protect the identity of the subject(s). The external observer and the researcher discussed the transcripts. The researcher explained the interactions in greater depth to the external observer, and agreement was reached on half of the patterns of help seeking.

Question 5.0: Patterns of Participation in Planned Meetings

As was previously described in the steps for analyzing the data for this question, maps of the unfolding conversation for each of the six planned meetings were constructed.

The accuracy of the researcher's identification of theme change, managing a meeting through initiating a theme/and or controlling the
interactions or behaviors of participants, and the phases in meetings were assessed by External Observer C.

**Procedures of Establishing Trustworthiness of Data**

1) As previously stated there were six planned meetings (Meeting Type 1 #1 and #2; Meeting Type 1 #3 and #4; and Meeting Type 2 #4 and #5) that the researcher had analyzed using the mapping procedure. Three of these meetings, one from each set of two, were randomly selected by a third party to check interobserver agreement.

2) External Observer C was given the transcript of the each of the meetings. The External Observer read each transcript as the respective tapes from each of the meetings were played. As the External Observer read and listened, the researcher followed along, reviewing the map and noting those instances in which the External Observer agreed and disagreed with the notations the researcher had made on the map. In those instances where there was disagreement the External Researcher and the researcher discussed the reasons for their decisions.

Interobserver agreement on theme changes within meetings, managing a meeting through theme changes and/or controlling the interactions or behaviors of participants, and phases within meetings were computed using the formula described in Question 1.0 (Nature of Work). The percentage of interobserver agreement for theme change, managing a meeting, and phases within meetings are shown in Table 2.

**ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER IN THE SETTING**

For 96 days, the researcher both observed and participated in the setting. As a participant, the researcher worked on these special
projects that Kennon assigned to her; attended office parties; brought in food for parties and other occasions; and performed small tasks such as duplicating, filing, sorting mail, and so forth. Since the researcher was new in the setting and introduced to others as a graduate student intern, she was not presumed knowledgeable about activities and procedures, and was, able to ask many questions of the participants particularly during the early phases of the research. The projects assigned by Kennon were not demanding of the researcher's energies and as a result afforded maximum time to observe Kennon both as subject and as "boss."

One of the researcher's concerns throughout the 96-day observational period was the danger of what anthropologists have sometimes referred to as "going native." "Going native" is described by many as overidentifying with the informant and as a result losing one's research perspective. Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that "awareness" of the potential is a step toward preventing the phenomenon. The researcher was aware, and did several things to maintain that awareness throughout the observational period. First, she included her interactions with Kennon and others in the field notes (e.g., "Talked over the wall with Kennon about the report.") As the catalogue was reviewed for analysis the researcher was able to construct the number of times she had "popped in to see Kennon" or she had "talked over the wall with Kennon" or "Kennon had dropped by to see her." Second, the researcher kept a reflexive journal in which she recorded her reactions to what was happening to her in the field. Finally, she kept a log called "role notes" in which she recorded all the different roles that she played as a result of the ways in which others behaved toward her and the ways in which she behaved. Some of
Table 2
Number of Agreements and Disagreements Between Researcher and Observer for Three Elements of Three Planned Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Planned Meetings</th>
<th>No. of Agreements Between Researcher and Observer</th>
<th>No. of Disagreements Between Researcher and Observer</th>
<th>Interobserver Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme Changes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing a Meeting</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases of a Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interobserver Agreement

Number of Agreements
Number of Agreements + Number of Disagreements = 100%
the ways in which participants behaved toward her in the setting were revealed in a previous section.

The researcher's role as participant did pose some problems particularly in the recording of observations. Throughout the 96 days, the researcher divided her schedule between observations and work. The participants in the setting, however, were not aware of the division in the researcher's time, and so on occasion stopped by to talk to the researcher during the observation period. This occurred particularly toward the end of the researcher's stay when she was identified more as a participant in the setting. Sometimes the observation period occurred when the researcher was working on a special project with Kennon, and as a consequence the researcher had to wait until after the interaction to record her observations.

Attention is now directed toward issues of confidentiality.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The policies and guidelines for review of research, development, and related activities involving human subjects at The Ohio State University were reviewed by the researcher and the researcher's adviser prior to the identification of a subject for the study. A person with the office responsible for administering the above-mentioned guidelines was consulted about the nature of the research. The researcher was informed that the research was exempt given that it was initiated as part of a class (taken in the Spring Quarter) and that it involved observing the ongoing activities of a setting without disruption.

During preliminary discussions with the subject, the researcher explained the purpose of the study. The researcher also explained that at any time during the study the subject was free to withdraw her
consent and discontinue participation without prejudice to her. The subject was given a consent form to sign (see Appendix H). The subject was provided with transcriptions from interviews, a summary of the analysis, and drafts of the dissertation for her review and comment. She had veto power over anything appearing in the documents.

Within the dissertation, efforts to mask the identity of the subject and other people with whom she interacted included reporting the findings in the aggregate, using codes to identify people, and roles, and using pseudonyms for the settings. The intent of the study was not to report on the nature of the subject's individual relationships with people, but rather to identify patterns of relationships.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the design of the research, the locus of observation, the procedures for the collection of data, the specific procedures for analysis, the procedures for establishing trustworthiness of the data, the role of the researcher as participant observer, and issues in maintaining confidentiality of the subject and the people with whom she interacted.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The general purpose of the study was to respond to the need for better understanding of the experiences that a woman administrator has in the work environment by asking the question what does it mean to be a woman administrator? To accomplish this goal it was necessary to consider the everyday life of a woman administrator: what she did, how she did it, with whom, under what conditions, for what purposes, and with what outcomes (Hymes 1974; Weade and Green, in press). The preceding chapters outlined the rationale for and the underlying conceptual framework for looking at women administrators' experiences in the work setting. These chapters presented the theoretical constructs upon which the conceptual framework was based (Chapters I and II) and a methodology for capturing the everyday life of a woman administrator (Chapter III). Both the general purpose and the conceptualization led to the general goal of this study:

The identification of factors that contribute to the woman administrator's experiences within and across the four settings that comprise her work environment -- the office, the college, the university, and outside the university.
The goal was arrived at by exploring three elements: her work; planned meetings, a significant aspect of her work; her roles, and her relationships, and her authority.

The major research questions that guided the observations and analysis were:

1.0 What is the nature of the work in which the woman administrator engages while in the work environment?

2.0 What is the nature of the roles the woman administrator plays while in the work environment?

3.0 What is the nature of the personal relationships the woman administrator has with people while in the work environment?

4.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's authority in the work environment?

5.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings?

One way to view these questions was to see Question 1.0, Nature of Work, as the base of a four-sided pyramid, providing information on the nature of the woman administrator's roles (Question 2.0), the nature of her relationships (Question 3.0), and the nature of her authority (Question 4.0). Meetings (Question 5.0) was considered a part of her work so it is included within the broad dimension of work. These five form the dimensions for examining the woman administrator's experience in this study. One side of the pyramid remains open for future studies that may identify other dimensions. Similarly, the top of the pyramid remains open for future studies that may build on the broader dimensions that have been identified here. The goal, which appears at the top of the pyramid, is to build on the understanding of women administrators' experiences in the work setting. Because of the
Figure 7

Relationship of Research Questions
complexity of understanding the daily life of the woman administrator, four of the five major research questions were subdivided to further capture the elements of her life. Some of these questions were derived from the research on women's experiences in the work setting, others were derived from interaction with the data. The relationships of subquestions to the major research question are explained in separate sections. The subquestions are:

1.0 What is the nature of the work in which the woman administrator engages while in the work environment?
   1.1 What are the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?
      1.1.1 What are the major components of the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?
   1.2 How are these kinds of work distributed over time?
   1.3 What is routine and what is extraordinary in the kinds of work the woman administrator does?

2.0 What is the nature of the roles the woman administrator plays while in the work environment?
   2.1 What are the kinds of roles the woman administrator plays?
   2.2 How are the kinds of roles the woman administrator plays similar and different across four settings?
   2.3 What kinds of role conflicts does the woman administrator experience?

3.0 What is the nature of the personal relationships the woman administrator has with people while in the work environment?
   3.1 What are the kinds of personal relationships the woman administrator has with people?
3.1.1 What are the interactional characteristics of those relationships?
3.1.2 What are the structural characteristics of those relationships?
3.2 With whom does the woman administrator have personal relationships?
3.3 With what frequency does the woman administrator contact those with whom she has personal relationships?

4.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's authority in the work environment?
4.1 What kinds of authority does the woman administrator have?

5.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings?
5.1 What are the roles the woman administrator plays in planned meetings?
5.2 What is the organizational structure of six planned meetings?
5.3 What are the ranges of talk by the woman administrator and by selected members in six planned meetings?
5.4 What are the patterns of participation within six planned meetings?

STRATEGY FOR PRESENTING THE FINDINGS

Administrators' lives do not operate in a vacuum. Their work takes place in different physical settings (offices, conference rooms, and hallways) and in combinations of persons (two administrators, administrator and faculty). Administrators, particularly in middle-management positions, occupy a special place in the mixed organizational structure of colleges and universities (Scott, 1978).
Collegiate middle-managers serve as linking pins between vertical levels (e.g., dean, associate dean, assistant dean) and between horizontal structures, i.e., between colleges and central offices (Scott, 1978).

Since the woman administrator, about whom this research revolved, was a middle manager, her position as a "linking pin" had to be considered in order to capture a picture of the "whole" of her life as an administrator. To do so involved placing the woman administrator, conceptually, in the center and observing the combinations of persons with whom she interacted and the different physical settings in which those interactions occurred. Analysis of the data led to the identification of four settings: the unit that she managed (215 Frost Hall), the college in which the unit was embedded, the university in which the college was embedded (Harrington University), and outside the university. These settings were labeled I, II, III, and IV respectively.

Conceptualizing the woman administrator's life in this way enabled the researcher to observe similarities and differences in her participation in the work environment, and subsequently to report on the factors contributing to her experiences. In some cases, the physical setting and the combinations of persons were not the same, e.g., she took a call from a faculty member in the college while sitting in her office. In those cases, the interaction set priority, and setting was determined by the interaction set. Setting II, college, was therefore determined as the setting in the previous example.

The findings for questions 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 are presented using the framework described above. The findings for Setting I, 215 Frost
Hall are reported separately in questions 3.0 and 4.0 because of the density of interactions with people in that setting and the authority relationship.

Questions 2.0 and 3.0 explore the nature of the woman administrator's relationships from two perspectives. Question 2.0 treats relationships from a structural perspective, that is, her behavior is interpreted in terms of actions appropriate to the positions she occupied (roles). Question 3.0 treats relationships from a personal perspective, that is, her behavior in either structured or unstructured situations is interpreted in terms of the personal links she had with a set of people (Mitchell, 1969).

Question 5.0 revisits the issue of planned meetings which was initially discussed in Question 1.0. Planned meetings provide a specific context (Erickson and Shultz, 1981) in which to explore patterns of relationships that were made visible in the preceding four questions. The question looks at the woman administrator's roles in meetings in order to locate their general occurrence in her life in the work environment. Subsequent questions in this section refine the information as they focus on six planned meetings in which the woman administrator participated which were illustrative of the different roles she played in meetings.

As was mentioned in Chapter II, experience was conceived of as multi-layered, with a personal layer, a social layer, and a work layer. The social and work layers were focused upon in this study, rather than the personal layer. This was done to mask the subject's identity and those with whom she worked. As a result, the findings are presented systematically. Kennon's "voice" was used to provide
the terminology for categories (e.g., "hall visits", pop-ins) and to provide her perception of an event or an activity.

The research process used here permitted the extraction of data from multiple sources to answer the Major Research Questions and their constituent subquestions. Generally these multiple sources of data were brought to bear on each of the questions so that the complexity and demands of the woman administrator's experiences within the work environment could be understood. A discussion of the reliability of the findings was presented in Chapter III. The findings are presented in both quantitative and qualitative format. Quantitative findings are presented using descriptive statistics. Qualitative findings are presented in narrative form. Each subquestion is summarized as are the findings pertaining to each of the settings. An elaborated discussion of the findings is found in Chapter V.
RESEARCH QUESTION 1.0: NATURE OF WORK

The question in this section examines the nature of a woman administrator's work during the 96 days of observation. The general question guiding the analysis in this section is:

1.0 What is the nature of the work in which the woman administrator engages while in the work environment?

The major question was divided into three subquestions:

1.1 What are the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?

The preceding question consisted of one part.

1.1.1 What are the major components of the kinds of work in which the woman administrator engages?

1.2 How are these kinds of work distributed over time?

1.3 What is routine and what is extraordinary in the kinds of work the woman administrator does?

The questions are interrelated. Question 1.1 was the original question identified at the onset of the study. Questions 1.1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 were products of interaction with the data. Question 1.1 was derived from research on managers' use of time. This research reveals that managers in business and academe engage in a variety of activities that are considered within the domain of work (Kanter 1977; Halstead, 1980). Research also suggests that the majority of managers' time is spent communicating with other people (Kanter, 1977; Halstead, 1980). While question 1.1 was rooted in the knowledge base generated by time study research, questions 1.1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 were
derived from interactions with the data. Findings from question 1.1.1 regarding the components of the kinds of work led to questions 1.2 and 1.3.

In order to provide a picture of the woman administrator's range of life in the work environment, considerable attention is directed toward describing the nature of her work. It is detailed here so that future discussion in subsequent questions of her roles, relationships, and activities, i.e., planned meetings, is enhanced.

Analytic Process for Question 1.1

Analytic Process for Question 1.1.1

Data for the exploration of kinds of work (Question 1.1) and the components of kinds of work (Question 1.1.1) were obtained via a multi-step process of macroanalysis of 3595 pages of field notes accumulated during the 96 days of observation; a content analysis of Kennon's 255-page journal; a content analysis of interviews with Kennon concerning certain aspects of her activities; a content analysis of Kennon's weekly calendar from the period of June 30 through December 5; a content analysis of 317 message slips; and a content analysis of 138 letters, memos, and forms. (A detailed description of the specific steps used in the multi-step analytic process was presented in Chapter III).

The analytic process is briefly summarized here. A domain analysis using the cover term "activity" was used. The semantic relationship that was used to uncover the included terms within activities was "X is a kind of activity." From the domain analysis, 44 different kinds of activities were identified, such as: making telephone calls, taking telephone calls, dropping by, and stopping in. Following the domain analysis, a taxonomic analysis was done to
discover the levels within the activities, and by so doing uncover larger, more inclusive domains that included as a subset similar kinds of activities; for example, making telephone calls, taking telephone calls, dropping by, stopping in, and meetings were clustered into a broader category labeled oral work. Following the taxonomic analysis, the kinds of activities were once again analyzed for their attributes. This led to the identification of components within each of the activities; for example, making telephone calls had two components: initiating a call and responding to a call.

**Question 1.1:**

**Kinds of Work**

A search of the 44 different activities that were discovered through a domain analysis of the 3595 pages of field notes led to the identification of six major kinds of work. Work was defined here as the physical or mental effort or activity directed toward the production or accomplishment of something as an employee of the university. The six major kinds of work were: oral, written, interpretive, planning, "social," physical, and personal. The taxonomic outline (see Figure 8) shows the six kinds of work and their components. Each kind of work is now described, using examples to illustrate.

Oral work was any kind of activity that involved speaking or the potential for speaking such as giving presentations, making and taking phone calls, or meetings by chance. Written work was any kind of activity that entailed the writing of letters or symbols on a surface, namely paper; examples included writing letters, memos, or reports. Interpretive work was any kind of activity that involved either
A. Oral Work
   1. telephone
   2. "over the wall"
   3. meetings

B. Written work
   1. forms
   2. letters
   3. memos
   4. notes
   5. cards
   6. summaries
   7. checks
   8. articles
   9. descriptions
   10. agendas
   11. reports
   12. checklists
   13. words
   14. data

C. Interpretive Work
   1. newspapers
   2. newsletters
   3. publications
   4. mail
   5. messages

D. Planning
   1. operation
   2. event

E. "Social" Work
   1. gifts
   2. goodies
   3. cards

F. Physical Work
   1. cleaning
   2. moving
   3. duplicating
   4. repairing
   5. sorting

G. Personal Work
   1. eating and taking refreshment
   2. personal maintenance
   3. "running errands"
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comprehending or attempting to comprehend a message which was encoded graphically (Anderson, Teale, and Estrada, 1980); examples included reading newsletters, reading the mail, or checking messages. Planning work was any kind of activity that entailed arranging details beforehand for the purpose of accomplishing a goal; examples included organizing specific meetings or events, or reviewing operational needs. "Social" work was any kind of activity that involved the health, happiness, and general well-being of others, such as bringing in "goodies," or giving gifts. Physical work was any kind of activity that involved using the body as distinguished from the mind, such as cleaning or moving objects. Personal work was any kind of activity that involved care of self, such as eating or taking refreshment other than at the regular meal time, or "running errands."

Question 1.1.1:

Major Components of Kinds of Work

Data from the four sources (field notes, journal, documents, and interviews) on each of the six kinds of work were examined further through taxonomic analysis. Since data for oral and written work were the thickest, componential analyses were done to discover contrasts.

Analyses of the major components of kinds of work are presented in the following order: oral work, written work, interpretive work, planning work, "social" work, physical work, and personal work.

Oral Work

Oral work was any kind of activity that involved speaking or the potential for speaking. Using the above definition as the decision rule to determine which activities constituted oral work led to the identification of three kinds of oral work: telephone, "talking over the wall," and meetings. The taxonomic outline (see Figure 9)
A. Telephone
   1. making call
      a. initiated
      b. responded
   2. taking calls

B. "Talking over the wall"
   1. initiated
   2. responded

C. Meetings
   1. planned
      a. appointments
      b. meetings
         1. non-repeated
         2. repeated
            a. finite
            b. continuous
      c. luncheon meetings
      d. lunches
      e. classes
      f. presentations
      g. receptions
      h. interviews
      i. dinners
      j. socials
      k. ceremonies
      l. breakfasts
      m. banquets
      n. seminars
   2. semi-planned
   3. unplanned
      a. business
         1. drop-by
         2. stop-in
         3. pop-in
         4. corridor
      b. accident
         1. "hall visit"
         2. corridor
         3. other
      c. ceremony
         1. greeting

Figure 9
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illustrates each of the kinds of oral work and their components. Attention is now directed toward a discussion or oral work.

**Telephone**

The domain analysis revealed two kinds of telephone calls: making a telephone call and taking a telephone call. A taxonomy of telephone calls is presented in Figure 10. As illustrated in this figure, telephone calls were used for business, business/social, and social purposes. Furthermore, it showed that in making a telephone call, Kennon either initiated the call or called in response to a message. A more detailed description of telephone calls follows. The discussion is accompanied by Figures 11 and 12.

**Making Telephone Calls**

During the 96 days of observation Kennon made 281 telephone calls. Whereas the purpose for these telephone calls was predominantly for business (57%), having to leave a message for a person to return her call was not uncommon (31%). Of the 281 times she made telephone calls, 84% were initiated by her and 16% were in response to a message. Kennon used the phrase "we're playing telephone tag" to refer to those telephone calls in which she responded to a message to call, made the call, and had to leave a message. There were eight such calls (2.8%).

**Taking Telephone Calls**

During the 96 days of observation, Kennon took 146 telephone calls. The greatest proportion of these calls were also for the purpose of conducting business (73%). As Figure 10 shows, within the telephone calls designated as business were two special kinds of
Figure 10
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Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal and Documents
Figure 11
Percentages of Kinds of Telephone Calls Made
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calls: announce an appointment and announce the college. The former kind of call was one in which the front desk or Kennon's secretary called her to inform her that she had an appointment waiting to see her. The latter kind of call was one in which Kennon answered the telephone, announced "College of ....", and proceeded to respond to the inquiry or transfer the telephone call to the appropriate person in the office. These two kinds of calls are of significance, as will be seen in later discussions of Kennon's roles and authority. The former case (announce an appointment), reveals general deference to Kennon's position in the office (legitimate authority) and the latter case (announce the college) reveals Kennon's role as office worker. Furthermore, as will be seen in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships) telephone calls between Kennon and the professional and support staffs occurred infrequently.

As will be seen in subsequent discussions of work, initiating actions and responding to actions became a major theme as Kennon performed her work.

"Talking Over the Wall"

"Talking over the wall" was possible because of the physical layout of the office. A large office, its outer perimeters were lined with smaller offices the walls of which were eight feet high and did not extend to the ceiling. This enabled occupants of neighboring offices to talk back and forth. The walls of the smaller offices that faced the interior of 215 Frost Hall were also eight feet high. This configuration enabled occupants of the smaller offices and occupants at the desks immediately outside those offices to talk back and forth. To protect the identity of the subject and the location of her office,
the figure depicting the physical layout of the office is purposefully abstract (see Figure 13).

A taxonomy of "talking over the wall" is presented in Figure 14. As illustrated in this figure and described below, Kennon both initiated and responded to "talk over the wall."

During the 96 days of observation, Kennon "talked over the wall" 226 times. Figure 15 shows that of those 226 times, Kennon initiated the talk 82% of the time. A look at the purpose for "talking over the wall" revealed that it was primarily used to take care of business; for example to announce to her secretary where she was going, to follow-up on the location of a student file, to call a person into her office. The contact was short, perhaps for a few seconds. Longer than a few seconds, and "talking over the wall" was followed by a drop by or a "pop-in." Although "talking over the wall" did not occur as frequently as the other kinds of oral work, its presence as a form of communicating with others in the office was significant. As will be shown in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships), "talking over the wall" occurred predominantly between Kennon and support staff. The support staff with whom it happened most frequently were Kennon's secretary and another person, both of whom had desks right outside her office. As was shown in Figure 15, Kennon initiated "talk over the wall" 82% of the time. Its infrequent use (16%) by other members of the staff suggested the emergence of a rule for "talking over the wall," the rule being "don't talk over the wall to Kennon, you may interrupt her." It also suggested a general deference to her authority in the office.
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An Abstraction of the Physical Layout of 215 Frost Hall
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Taxonomy of "Talking Over the Wall"
Purpose of "Talking Over the Wall"

Figure 15
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Meetings

Re-examining 3595 pages of field notes, Kennon's 255-page journal, and Kennon's weekly calendar led to the identification of three kinds of meetings: planned, semi-planned, and unplanned. Figure 16 shows the percentage of each of the three kinds of meetings. Meetings constituted the greatest proportion of Kennon's oral work as is illustrated in Figure 17. Each of these kinds of meetings is described in detail beginning with planned meetings.

Planned Meetings

Planned meetings were pre-arranged and appeared in Kennon's weekly calendar. A taxonomy of planned meetings is presented in Figure 18. As illustrated in this figure and described below, Kennon attended 14 different kinds of planned meetings. A description of each of these kinds of meetings appears in Figure 19.

During the 96-day observational period Kennon was scheduled to attend 300 planned meetings. The kind and number of meetings the researcher observed are shown in Table 3. As Figure 20 shows, the greatest proportion of planned meetings were appointments (37.3%), meetings (24.3%) and luncheon meetings (9%). These three kinds of planned meetings are discussed in greater detail since they further define the nature of her roles and her relationships. The other kinds of planned meetings are focused on briefly.

Appointments

A closer look at Kennon's calendar of activities during those 96 days of observation revealed that 96% of Kennon's appointments were with students. The remaining 4% were with administrators in the college, professional staff in her office, and contract or service
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N = 1446

- 78.00% Unplanned
- 21.00% Semi-Planned
- 1.00% Planned
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Taxonomy of Planned Meetings

Data Source: Documents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>A planned meeting involving two people arranged by one of the parties to seek or provide information or assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>A pre-arranged convening with one or more people arranged by one of the parties or a third party to share information or to perform a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luncheon Meetings</td>
<td>A pre-arranged convening scheduled around the mid-day meal arranged by one of the parties or a third party to share information or to perform a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting in which the same participants meet regularly to learn about a subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting in which participants meet once to learn a subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptions</td>
<td>A pre-arranged social function to introduce, to celebrate, or to thank a person or persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunches</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting to eat the mid-day meal arranged by one of the parties; intended as an informal get-together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting to access the qualifications of an applicant for employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinners</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting to eat the chief meal of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socials</td>
<td>A pre-arranged informal gathering intended for convivial activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting the content of which was prescribed by ritual or custom; e.g., graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfasts</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting to eat the first meal of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquets</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting that includes a formal meal to honor a person or commemorate an occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>A pre-arranged meeting in which participants meet to exchange ideas on a topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3

Frequencies of Observed Planned Meetings
by Kind of Planned Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Planned Meeting</th>
<th>Number Observed and/or Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luncheon Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinners</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socials</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquets</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N = 300

Meeting Type

Seminars
Banquets
Breakfasts
Ceremonies
Socials
Dinners
Interviews
Lunches
Receptions
Presentations
Classes
Luncheon Meetings
Meetings
Appointments

Percentage
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vendors from outside the University. The administrators who made appointments to see her were below her in the hierarchy, and the professional staff were subordinate to her.

Appointments with students were generally the "special" cases. Special cases included students in the university who needed courses evaluated, policies or procedures on academic matters clarified or acted upon. As is later shown in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority), Kennon had the authority to make decisions on academic matters related to students, however, it was tempered by her "agent" of the faculty status. Sometimes Kennon "turned over" an appointment to one of her professional staff. Appointments that she seldom "turned over" were those she identified as "crises." Although appointments were generally perceived by Kennon to be routine, crises were not. Crises are treated separately in Question 1.4 (Routine and Extraordinary).

In her calendar of weekly activities, Kennon made two appointments herself. These appointments were with the dean to discuss a college event she was coordinating and a request she had received to serve on an evaluation team. All others were made by her secretary.

Meetings and Luncheon Meetings

Meetings are focused upon extensively here since they are re-examined in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings) only as a context for exploring patterns of participation. Attention is directed toward these meetings because participation on task forces or committees enhances power since one becomes more visible (Kanter, 1977; Wheatley, 1981). Furthermore, as will be seen in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships) there were some people with whom Kennon's
only contact was through meetings, and they were predominantly administrators.

The taxonomy of meetings (see Figure 18) shows that within meetings and luncheon meetings there were both repeated and non-repeated types. Non-repeated types were those in which participants met once for the purpose of sharing information or performing a task. As Figure 21 shows, 52% of the meetings Kennon was scheduled to attend were non-repeated. Repeated types were those in which participants met more than once to share information or to perform a task. Forty-eight percent of the meetings Kennon attended were repeated types. Within the repeated type of meeting, two categories emerged: those that were continuous and those that were finite. Continuous meetings were those in which the participants met regularly over a sustained period of time. Finite meetings were those in which the participants met for a limited time (e.g., task forces). As can be seen from Figure 21, 42% of the meetings Kennon attended were continuous.

Just how visible Kennon was through her participation in meetings is revealed in Figure 22. As illustrated in this figure, Kennon's participation in meetings across three settings was about equal, although when office and college were combined, 66% of her meeting time was spent in the college. Most of the meetings Kennon attended centered around her role as Secretary to the College which is discussed in further depth in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles).

As will be further elaborated upon in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings), Kennon was most frequently scheduled to attend meetings that were initiated by others. Those
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- 38.00% Outside University
- 28.00% University
- 34.00% College
- 0.00% Office

N = 50
that she initiated were for professional staff who were her subordinates.

**Classes**

As Figure 20 shows, 7.3% of Kennon's meetings were classes. As part of her professional role and her Secretary to the College role Kennon was called upon to lecture to classes of graduate and undergraduate students. Kennon also attended classes as a student. Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) addresses this role in more depth.

**Presentations**

Presentations comprised 5.7% of her meetings. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles), these presentations centered most frequently around her responsibilities as Secretary to the College and as Director of Student Affairs.

**Receptions**

Receptions comprised 3.7% of her meetings. As will be shown later in this section, receptions were seasonal; that is, they occurred once the fall quarter began and people resumed the hectic pace of the beginning of the new school year.

**Lunches**

Lunches are one of the informal means through which people exchange "soft," timely information (Zacharias, 1976). Kennon's lunch partners revealed with whom she had primarily informal social ties. Both planned and unplanned lunches are examined in greater depth in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships).

**Interviews**

As Figure 20 shows, 3.3% of Kennon's meetings were interviews. She attended some interviews because of her role as leader of a university committee (see Question 2.0: Nature of Roles). During the
autumn quarter she was involved in hiring a replacement for a vacant position in the office. This is discussed in greater depth in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority).

Dinners

The dinners Kennon attended were both formal and informal. The former included dinners that were sponsored by the college, of which there was one during the summer quarter. Informal dinners were those that she had with administrators, faculty, and former administrators. As will be shown in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships), Kennon had a network of people with whom she informally socialized, and some of these same people were those with whom she went to dinner.

Socials

Socials included all those activities that she attended that she labeled as "gathering of so-and-so department." Sometimes these gatherings were on weekends, sometimes during the week but their purpose was convivial.

Ceremonies

During the 96-day observational period, Kennon attended several ceremonies. One was graduation, where as a representative of the dean's staff, she distributed diplomas to students. Kennon also attended the funeral of a former faculty member. In an informal interview with Kennon, she remarked "that a representative of the college should go." As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles), one of Kennon's roles was member of the college, and this role had implications for the kinds of work she did and the expectations she had for herself.
Breakfasts

Kennon attended two breakfasts during summer and autumn quarters. One breakfast preceded the graduation ceremony. The breakfast was one of the responsibilities of Kennon's office. The other breakfast was for a scholarship recipient and the donor of that scholarship. Kennon's role as Director of Student Affairs, as will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) included scholarships.

Semi-Planned Meetings

Meetings of this kind were pre-arranged but not written in Kennon's weekly calendar. During the 96-day observational period Kennon attended nine such meetings. Included in this category were office parties of which there were six.

Kennon's role as initiator and responder were evident here. Whereas the office parties were at the initiation of the support staff, two of the three meetings were at her initiation. One of the meetings involved a subordinate and centered on planning an event, and the other involved an administrator in another administrative unit and centered on academic matters related to students. The third meeting was initiated by a professional staff member on her staff and centered on student affairs issues.

Unplanned Meetings

Meetings of this kind were not pre-arranged, they were spontaneous in that neither party could have predicted the meeting. Field notes taken during the 96-day observational period revealed 1137 unplanned meetings. Further analysis of these unplanned meetings led to the identification of three categories of such meetings: business, fortuitous, and greeting. Although the categories were inductively derived from the data, the labels for the categories were obtained
from Goffman (1971). Further discussion of each of the categories and their components follows.

**Business**

Goffman (1971) used the term "business" to label those sober or non-ceremonial reasons for making contact, namely, business at hand that requires the participants of a relationship to get in touch.

Further analysis of the data led to the identification of four types of unplanned meetings: drop-bys, stop-ins, pop-ins, and corridor. A taxonomy of the types of unplanned meetings is presented in Figure 23. As illustrated in this figure, each of the types of unplanned meetings had four purposes: business, business/social, social, greeting, and unknown. As Table 4 shows, business comprised 73% of the reasons for a drop-by, stop-in, pop-in, and corridor. A taxonomy of the business done during any of these unplanned meetings is presented in Figure 24. The range of talk included: assignments, academic matters, operation of 215 Frost Hall, projects, and messages. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) each of these was strongly tied to her roles as manager of 215 Frost Hall, Secretary to the College, and Director of Student Affairs. The giving of assignments, which is discussed further in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority), reflected her authority relationship with those in 215 Frost Hall. The types of unplanned meetings are now described in greater detail.

**The Drop-By**

In the drop-by, Kennon made contact with persons in and around their desks or office space. As Table 4 shows, Kennon dropped by
Unplanned Meetings

- Drop-bys
  - Business
  - Business/Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown
- Stop-ins
  - Business
  - Business/Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown
- Pop-ins
  - Business
  - Business/Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown
- Corridor
  - Business
  - Business/Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown
- Ceremony
- Greetings
- "Hall Visit"

- Accident
  - Corridor
  - Business
  - Business Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown
- Other
  - Business
  - Business Social
  - Social
  - Greeting
  - Unknown

Figure 23

Taxonomy of Unplanned Meetings
### Table 4

#### Percentages of Unplanned Meetings by Purpose of the Meeting

Data Source: Observations Triangulated With Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Percentages of Unplanned Meetings by Purpose of the Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus/Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 24

Taxonomy of Purposes for Unplanned Meetings: Business
394 times. This constituted 35% of the unplanned meetings. Further analysis revealed that 95% of the time the drop-by was initiated by Kennon. The drop-by, although most often used for business purposes (80%), was used also for social and business/social purposes. That Kennon initiated the drop-by 95% of the time suggested a pattern that support staff, who it will be shown in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships) accounted for the greatest proportion of drop-bys, were free to have their time and work interrupted without notice by the person with the greatest authority, Kennon. Drop-bys were not limited to people within 215 Frost Hall, but included faculty and administrators as well.

The Stop-In

The stop-in was used to describe contacts that Kennon had with faculty and administrators from the college, the University, or outside the University. The stop-in comprised 8% of the unplanned meetings that occurred in and around Kennon's office and were with people from outside the office. Only 4.5% of these were initiated by Kennon. This pattern suggested that faculty and administrators, including the dean and members of the dean's staff, were free to interrupt Kennon's time and work. Kennon, in a later interview, revealed that only under certain conditions was such an interruption considered an intrusion: when she had someone with her in her office and when she was concentrating on a project.

The Pop-in

Kennon coined the phrase "pop-in" in an interview to differentiate between those inside and outside 215 Frost Hall who stopped in. Pop-ins were people from inside the office who made contact with Kennon in and around her office space. Pop-ins comprised
41% of the unplanned meetings. As Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships) will show, support staff with questions about the operation were the most likely to pop-in, followed by professional staff. Further analysis revealed that 12.7% of the pop-ins were initiated by Kennon. As will be shown in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships), Kennon encouraged pop-ins through her open door policy.

The Corridor

In this type of unplanned meeting, Kennon made contact with people inside 215 Frost Hall in any of the corridors or in space designated as open, i.e., copyroom, file cabinet area, mailbox, water fountain, and the lobby. The corridor visit constituted 12.1% of her unplanned meetings. Although corridor visits were used primarily to conduct business, 32% of the time it was for social purposes, suggesting that while in the corridors or in open space, people felt more free to socialize. As Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships) will show, corridor visits were more likely to occur between Kennon and support staff than between Kennon and professional staff. Some of this was explained by the physical layout of the office: support staff desks were located outside the offices of the professional staff.

Accident

Goffman (1971) used the term "accident" to label those contacts that occur when the parties to the relationship make independent but simultaneous use of the same street, service establishment, public transportation and the like or when they find themselves participating in the same social occasions. Three types of unplanned meetings in
this category emerged upon further analysis of the data: "hall
visits," corridor, and other places.

The "Hall Visit"

Kennon used this term to describe those contacts that she made
with faculty and administrators in the halls of Frost Hall. "Hall
visits" constituted 1.1% of the unplanned meetings. "Hall visits"
were used to conduct both business and business/social talk.

The Corridor

Corridor visits, unlike those mentioned earlier, were those
unplanned meetings in which Kennon made contact with faculty and
administrators inside 215 Frost Hall. Corridor visits constituted
1.4% of Kennon's unplanned meetings. Corridor visits were primarily
used to conduct business and business/social talk. The corridor visit
(16) and stop-in (89), when combined, revealed that 9.2% of Kennon's
unplanned meetings with faculty and administrators occurred within 215
Frost Hall.

Other

Kennon made contact with faculty and administrators outside the
walls of Frost Hall. Less that 1% of Kennon's unplanned meetings
occurred in other places.

Ceremony

Goffman (1971) used this term to label those contacts that occur
because the avowed or controlling purpose of one of the individuals is
to perform a supportive ritual to the other. Although Goffman spoke
of both greetings and farewells as supportive interchanges, only
greetings are focused upon here.

Greetings included any verbal salutation, embracing, handshaking,
or other bodily contact that was not followed up by what Goffman
called a "spate of joint activity." In other words, the contact did not result in further talk that could be categorized as business, business/social, or social. Greetings comprised 1.3% of Kennon's unplanned meetings.

Summary

Examination of oral work led to the identification of three kinds of oral work: telephone calls, "talking over the wall," and meetings. As the different kinds of oral work were examined, patterns began to emerge about the nature of Kennon's roles and relationships. 1) Organizational roles, specifically, manager, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, and member of the college were predominate in her oral work. 2) Some transient roles, such as office worker, were reflected in her oral work. 3) The authority relationship with those in 215 Frost Hall was revealed in both formal and informal ways, formal through the assigning of tasks and informal through patterns of "talking over the wall," and dropping-by. 4) Her visibility through participation in planned meetings was predominantly in the college. 5) Certain kinds of oral work were initiated primarily by her, such as telephone calls, "talking over the wall," planned meetings with subordinates, semi-planned meetings with subordinates; and drop-bys. 6) Certain kinds of oral work were initiated primarily by others, such as planned meetings, stop-ins, pop-ins, and appointments by students and a few administrators. 7) Finally, certain kinds of oral work were predominant in each setting. In Setting I (215 Frost Hall) the telephone was seldom used to carry out oral work. Unplanned meetings, "talking over the wall," and the planned meeting were the primary means through which people conducted business with Kennon. In Setting II (college), Setting III
(University), and Setting IV (outside the University) the telephone was the most frequently used means through which people conducted business with Kennon.

**Written Work**

Written work entailed the writing of letters or symbols on a surface, namely paper. Using the above definition as the decision rule to determine which activities constituted written work led to the identification of 13 kinds of written work: forms, letters, memos, notes, cards, summaries, checks, articles, descriptions, agendas, reports, checklists, words, and data. A taxonomic outline of written work, in descending order of frequency, is presented in Figure 25. Because of the observation strategy the researcher was unable to see every form, note, card, summary, check, article, description, agenda, report, or checklist that Kennon wrote or signed. Hence, her 255-page journal, documents, and interviews with her were the sources of data for most of what is contained in this section. A discussion of each kind of written work follows.

**Forms**

Examination of Kennon's 255-page journal led to the identification of two categories of forms: operation forms and people forms. Operation forms pertained to those used in the functioning of 215 Frost Hall. They enabled Kennon to order services, equipment, and supplies. People forms pertained to the forms used by those employed in 215 Frost Hall and by those serviced by that office. Forms for
A. Forms

1. operation
2. people

B. Letters

1. initiated
   a. gives
      1. information
   b. requests
      1. action
         a. information
         b. performance

2. response
   a. to requests
      1. evaluation
      2. information
      3. candidacy
      4. recommendation
      5. approval
   b. to action
      1. feedback

C. Memos

1. initiated
   a. gives
      1. information
   b. response
      1. action
         a. information
         b. performance

2. response
   a. to requests
      1. evaluation
      2. information
      3. candidacy
      4. recommendation
      5. approval
   b. to action
      1. feedback
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both employees and students consisted of two types: 1) those that supplied information to Kennon and required no further action; and 2) those that supplied information to Kennon and required further action. Figure 26 shows that Kennon cited acting on forms in her journal 109 times (51%). A caution is mentioned here in interpreting the data. This figure was not the total number of forms she acted upon during the two quarter observation period, since frequently in her journal she referred to forms en masse, e.g., "signed forms", "acted on forms".

**Letters**

Considerable time is devoted to a discussion of Kennon's letters and memos. As will be seen in the following pages, the initiating and responding theme found in oral work was also found in written work. Furthermore, the content of her letters and memos revealed more about her organizational roles. Analysis of the recipients of her letters and memos revealed information about both her pattern of communication and about the visibility of her position (Kanter, 1977; Wheatley, 1981).

Figure 26 shows that 24% of the references made to written work in her journal were about letters. A content analysis of the 138 pieces of correspondence contained in her "chron file" was done. As Table 5 reveals, Kennon wrote 79 letters. As illustrated in this table and described below, letters were of two types: initiated and response.

**Initiated Letters**

Thirteen of the 79 letters (16.5%) Kennon wrote were initiated letters, that is, they were written without prompting or direction
Figure 26
Percentages of Kinds of Written Work
### Table 5

**Frequencies of Kinds of Letters**

Data Source: Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Letters</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiated:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives information (10)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests information (2)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests performance of task (1)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (13)</td>
<td>(16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for information (42)</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for approval (12)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for evaluation (7)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives feedback (2)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for recommendation (2)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for candidacy (1)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (66)</td>
<td>(83.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (79)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from others. Further analysis of the 13 letters led to the identification of two types: those that gave information and those that requested information, action, or performance. Table 5 shows that 12.7% of these letters gave information. A taxonomy of the contents of letters and memos is presented in Figure 27. As illustrated, the content of the initiated letters that gave information centered primarily on curriculum, academic policies, academic performance, and academic procedures. The content of these letters was linked to her role as Secretary to the College as will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles).

**Response Letters**

Sixty-six of the 79 letters (83.5%) that Kennon wrote were response letters, that is, they were written as a reply to either a request or an action. Table 5 shows that 53.2% of these letters were responses to requests for information. A taxonomy of the content of response letters is presented in Figure 28. As illustrated, the content of responses to requests for information centered on academic matters related to progress, performance, certification, course work, and curriculum requirements. The content of these letters was linked to her role as Secretary to the College. Table 5 shows that 24% of the response letters were requests for approval and evaluation. As illustrated in the taxonomy, these letters centered on academic matters as well. As will be shown in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority), Kennon had authority to act (approve and evaluate) on academic matters related to students; however, it was tempered by her "agent" of the faculty and "agent" of the dean statuses. The predominance of Kennon's role as responder offered evidence of the
Figure 27
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Taxonomy of the Contents
of Response Letters and Memos
existence of a helping role within the organization which is further explored in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships).

Memos

Figure 26 shows that 7% of the references Kennon made to written work were about memos. As can be seen in Table 6, Kennon wrote 53 memos, and furthermore, they were of two types: initiated and response.

Initiated Memos

Whereas only 16.5% of the letters were initiated, 71.6% of the memos were initiated which suggested that with memos (a more informal kind of communication), Kennon was more likely to be the initiator. A taxonomy of the content of initiated memos is presented in Figure 27. As illustrated, initiated memos centered on policies related to the office and staff assignments (her manager role). Twelve of the memos (22.6%) requested performance of a task. As the taxonomy shows, these requests centered on participation of faculty, staff, and alumni at meetings, participation of faculty, administrators, and staff in presentations, and participation of faculty and administrators in recommending students and alumni for committees. Although Kennon was in a position to recommend or request by virtue of her role as Secretary to the College or as Director of Student Affairs, she did not have the authority of position (see Question 4.0: Nature of Authority) to direct people outside of 215 Frost Hall to perform certain tasks.

Response Memos

As Table 6 shows, only 28.4% of the memos were response memos compared to 83.5% of the letters. This suggested that Kennon used
Table 6

Frequencies of Kinds of Memos

Data Source: Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Memos</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives information (25)</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests performance of task (12)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests information (1)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (38)</td>
<td>(71.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for information (11)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request for approval (3)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives feedback (1)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (15)</td>
<td>(28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (53)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the letter, a formal type of communication, as opposed to the memo, a more informal type of communication, to respond to requests for information. As the taxonomy illustrates, the contents of response memos centered on academic matters, and consequently her role as Secretary to the College.

**Recipients of Letters and Memos**

A taxonomy of the recipients of Kennon's letters and memos is presented in Figure 29. As is illustrated and described below, Kennon corresponded with alumni, professional staff (subordinates), administrators within the university and outside the university (state agencies), faculty, students, and members of professional associations. Of particular note here is that Kennon wrote to both colleagues and superiors in the college, but only to colleagues in the university. This suggested that Kennon, was a "linking pin" between vertical levels within the college and between horizontal structures, i.e., between colleges and central offices. However, as a linking pin between horizontal structures, she wrote only to administrators at her level.

A distribution of the recipients by setting of Kennon's letters and memos is presented in Figure 30. As is illustrated and described below, 43.2% of Kennon's correspondence went to people outside the University, 30.3% to people inside the University, 12.1% to people within the college, and 6.1% to people within the office. Further analysis revealed that those to whom Kennon sent correspondence outside the University were primarily students requesting information about certification policies and procedures, course work, course and transcript evaluations and administrators in state agencies concerned with the above information about former graduates. This suggested
Figure 29
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that although Kennon was linked to people outside the University, the information was not central to the college's function.

**Cards**

Kennon cited either sending or writing cards seven times in her journal. An analysis of her journal revealed that Kennon gave cards to faculty, staff, friends, and colleagues, and that they were greeting cards of some kind. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) and Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships), the writing and sending of cards was linked to her friend role.

**Checks**

Kennon cited writing checks four times in her 255-page journal. An analysis of her journal led to the identification of two types of checks: those that were for social events and those that were for professional associations. As will be shown in subsequent questions, the former is linked to the role as friend and the latter to her role as professional.

**Reports**

Kennon cited the writing of a report once in her journal. During the 96-day observational period Kennon wrote one report. The report consisted of the recommendations of a committee that met four times during the autumn quarter. The report is discussed in further detail under Question 1.4: What is routine and what is extraordinary in the kinds of work that the woman administrator does?

**Summaries**

Kennon cited the writing of summaries six times in her journal. Summaries were the recording of actions taken by a committee. During the 96-day observational period Kennon wrote five summaries. Four of the summaries were written for the committee mentioned under the kind
of written work "Reports" and one of the summaries was written for another committee for which Kennon served as recorder.

Articles

Article was used as a cover term for references Kennon made in her 255-page journal to "writing a spot on Elaine" for a printed program for an event and to "writing a story" for a college publication. Kennon made such references three times in her journal.

Descriptions

In Kennon's 255-page journal, she cited the writing of descriptions three times. An analysis of her journal led to the identification of two types: job descriptions and descriptions of services provided by 215 Frost Hall. Both of these descriptions, as will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) were linked to her role as manager of that office.

Checklist

Kennon cited writing a checklist one time in her journal. A checklist was a list of things she had to do to prepare for an event. The checklist is discussed further under Planning Work.

Agenda

Kennon cited writing an agenda twice in her 255-page journal. An agenda was a list of things Kennon had to do in preparation for a meeting. "Talk topics" was another term Kennon used to describe the same thing.

Words

Kennon cited writing "words" once in her journal. Kennon used the term "words" to describe the topics and protocol that she was preparing for another person who was to conduct a special event.
Data

Data was used as a cover term for references Kennon made in her 255-page journal to enrollment figures and to the budget. Enrollment figures consisted of data on student enrollment in the college. Budget consisted of data on what had been spent by her office, and was most frequently asked for by support staff, specifically the office manager. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) and Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships), Kennon was frequently asked by faculty and administrators to supply information on student enrollment.

Summary

Examination of Kennon's journal and documents led to the identification of 13 kinds of written work: forms, letters, memos, notes, cards, summaries, checks, articles, descriptions, agendas, reports, checklists, words, and data. As the different kinds of written work were looked at several patterns emerged that were consistent with those found in oral work, work others emerged that were new. 1) The organizational roles found in oral work continued to predominate. Those roles included: Secretary to the College, manager, and Director of Student Affairs. 2) The role of friend, while only suggested in oral work because of the delineation of purposes of talk into social and business/social, was supported in her written work through the sending of cards and notes and the sending of checks for social events. 3) The role of professional, while only suggested in oral work because of presentations to classes or participation in professional associations, was supported in her written work through the sending of checks to professional associations. 4) The authority relationship with those in 215 Frost
Hall was reflected in more formal ways with the writing of memos to announce staff meetings and policy changes. 5) The authority relationship with those outside of her office was shown to be tempered by her "agent" of the faculty and "agent" to the dean status; 6) Written work was shown not to be the predominant method of communicating to people in Setting I (215 Frost Hall), Setting II (College), or Setting III (university). Written work was the predominant method of communicating to people outside the University (Setting IV). 7) Her visibility outside the university was predominantly to students and state administrators interested specifically in academic matters. 8) As a "linking pin" Kennon communicated to superiors and colleagues within the college (vertical) and to colleagues across horizontal structures. 9) A helping role that was supported organizationally through the establishment of 215 Frost Hall was identified. 10) Certain kinds of written work were initiated by her and these were predominantly memos that gave information, requested information, and requested the performance of a task. 11) Finally, certain kinds of written work were initiated by others to which she responded, and these were primarily requests for information, evaluation, and approval.

**Interpretive Work**

Interpretive work was any kind of activity that involved either comprehending or attempting to comprehend a message which was encoded graphically (Anderson, Teale, and Estrada, 1980). Using the above definition as the decision rule to determine which activities constituted interpretive work led to the identification of five kinds of interpretive work: newspapers, newsletters, publications, mail,
and messages. A taxonomy of interpretive work is presented in Figure 31. A discussion of each of these kinds of interpretive work follows.

Newspapers

Reading Kennon's 255-page journal and 3595 pages of field notes led to the identification of three categories of newspapers that Kennon read during the 96-day observational period. She read the school newspaper, a city newspaper with international distribution, and a professional newspaper. As will be revealed in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) the reading of a professional newspaper was linked to her role as a professional in the field. While the school newspaper and the professional newspaper were read during the work day, the city newspaper was read at home and then various sections of the newspaper were distributed to those on her staff who had expressed an interest in reading it. The distribution of the city newspaper to members of her staff was tied to her role as friend, which is described in further detail in Questions 2.0 and 3.0.

Newsletters

From reading Kennon's 255-page journal and 3595 pages of field notes two categories of newsletters emerged. Figure 31 shows that Kennon read school newsletters and professional newsletters. The reading of school newsletters was linked to her role as a member of the college, which is described in further detail in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles). The reading of professional newsletters was tied to her role as professional in the field, which is also described in Question 2.0.

Publications

Three categories of publications were identified: a training manual, galley proofs for a college publication; and a welcome letter.
Figure 31
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The manual was to be used by administrative units outside 215 Frost Hall for the purpose of training professional staff on the academic policies and procedures of the college and its curriculum. The preparation of the manual was linked to Kennon's role as both Secretary to the College and liaison with other administrative units in the preparation of their professional staffs.

Preparing the galley proofs for the college publication was not among Kennon's primary responsibilities. As Secretary to the College, Kennon was called upon by a fellow administrator in the college to proofread the galleys for information related to that function.

The admission letter was sent to all students admitted to the college by the departments. Although generally a responsibility of one of the support staff, Kennon revised the letter, which contained information about the services provided by 215 Frost Hall.

Mail

From reading Kennon's 255-page journal the cover term "mail" emerged. In her journal Kennon remarked, "read and pitched mail," or "read mail."

Messages

Reading 3595 pages of field notes led to the identification of the cover term "messages." Data from the field notes were triangulated with a content analysis of 317 individual message slips that were collected over the 96-day observational period. The message slip is a form printed by Harrington University and used by people to convey information about telephone calls and stop-ins. Each message slip had to be read by Kennon in order for her to determine what, if any, action needed to be taken.
Summary

Examination of Kennon's journal, documents, and field notes led to the identification of five kinds of interpretive work. These included: newspapers, newsletters, publications, mail, and messages. As the different kinds of interpretative work were examined several patterns emerged that were consistent with those found in oral and written work. 1) The organizational role identified as Secretary to the College was clarified and extended. In that role, Kennon coordinated the preparation of a training manual for professional staff about the academic procedures and policies of the college, and with the assistance of the academic departments in the college supplied information for the manual about their respective curricula. In that role she was also called upon to check the information contained in the college publication. 2) The role of professional in the field was also extended through her interpretive work through the reading of professional newspapers and newsletters. 3) The role of member of the college was clarified through her interpretive work, as it was shown, she read college newsletters; and 4) The role of friend to those in 215 Frost Hall was further revealed as she was seen distributing information contained in the newspapers to which she subscribed.

A new role emerged as a consequence of analyzing Kennon's interpretive work, the role of liaison with other administrative units about academic policies and procedures in the college. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles), Kennon was the principle liaison in the college with all administrative units about academic matters as they related to students.
Another new theme emerged that was indirectly related to her authority, the use of time. Whereas support staff worked at their assigned duties under the eye of the office supervisor, Kennon was not directory supervised at anyone, and was, therefore, able to manipulate her own time. She was able to read newspapers and newsletters that were indirectly related to her responsibilities, but were directly related to the special knowledge that she was expected to possess in her professional role.

Planning Work

Planning work was any kind of activity that entailed arranging details beforehand for the purpose of accomplishing a goal. Unlike oral work and written work, which involved the analysis of discrete observation units (e.g., interaction sets or documents), planning work involved the analysis of interaction sets and documents in order to determine if their purpose was to arrange details beforehand to accomplish a goal. Two kinds of planning were identified: event planning and operational planning. A taxonomy of planning work is presented in Figure 32.

Event Planning

Kennon planned an event for alumni of the college and planned two meetings. One of the meetings was for visiting high school students and the other was for the alumni council of the college. All of these were linked to her role as Director of Student Affairs which is further discussed in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles). As was previously mentioned, planning work did not occur in discrete observation units. As a result some phases in event and meeting planning emerged: the checklist phase (written work); the enlistment phase in which Kennon solicited the help of faculty, administrators,
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and professional staff; the meeting phase in which Kennon met with those whose help she had solicited; and the assignment phase in which people were given specific responsibilities.

Operational Planning

As is illustrated in Figure 32 and described below there were three kinds of operational planning: personnel, equipment, and procedures.

Personnel

This kind of planning included the re-deployment of support staff upon notification of a vacancy within the office, and the reassignment of duties among professional and support staff because of a leave of absence. As will be shown in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles), the aspect of planning was linked to her role as manager, and furthermore, to her authority in the office. As manager she had the power to make decisions about hiring and deployment of support and professional staff.

Equipment

This kind of planning included the assessment of computer needs for the office to accommodate changing University procedures and the assessment of furniture needs. Although Kennon assessed the needs, as Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority) will reveal, Kennon did not have the power to make decisions regarding the dispensing of resources for equipment needs or furniture needs.

Procedural

This kind of planning included the assessment of inter-office procedures as a result of changing University procedures because of computerization of admissions and registration. This kind of planning was linked to two roles. As manager, she had to assess the effects of
changing University procedures on staff (including training) and on equipment needs. As Secretary to the College, she had to access the impact of changing University procedures on the academic procedures and policies of the college.

**Summary**

Examination of Kennon's journal, documents, and field notes led to the identification of two kinds of planning. These included event planning and operational planning. As the different kinds of planning work were looked at several patterns emerged that were consistent with those found in oral work, written work, and interpretive work. 1) The organizational role identified as Secretary to the College was clarified and extended. In that role, Kennon assessed the impact of changing University procedures because of computerization of registration and admission on college policies and procedures. 2) The organizational role identified as Director of Student Affairs was extended to include responsibility for planning events and meetings for students and alumni. 3) The manager role was also extended to include not only the planning but also the implementation of new office procedures that were affected by the University's long range plans. 4) As a "linking pin" Kennon communicated with those colleagues across horizontal structures who were responsible for the changing University procedures in admissions and registration. 5) The ranges of her authority were clarified: she had power to make decisions about staff within the office; and 6) Finally, although planning work was initiated by Kennon, most of the planning was in response to changes in procedures or to events that were at the initiation of some other office (e.g., the alumni council.
and alumni event were college events; the high school visitation was
sponsored by another office).

Oral work, written work, interpretive work, and planning work
were the more formal aspects of Kennon's work. The kinds of work that
will now be focused on were the more informal aspects that had to do
with her particular style of carrying out her work. These included:
"social" work, physical work, and personal work.

"Social" Work

"Social" work was any kind of activity that involved the health,
happiness, and general well-being of others. Using the above
definition as the decision rule to determine which activities
constituted "social" work led to the identification of three kinds: gifts,
goodies and cards. A taxonomy of "social" work is presented in
Figure 33.

Gifts

During the 96-day observational period, Kennon was observed
giving gifts on five occasions. Three of the gifts were given to
professionals or support staff in 215 Frost Hall on the celebration of
a special event: a retirement, a wedding, and a birthday. One of the
gifts was given to an administrator in the college on the celebration
of a special event. The fifth occasion marked the conclusion of a
special event in the college in which the staff had helped.

Goodies

As illustrated in the taxonomy and described below, goodies were
brought for both professional and support staff within the office and
for those administrators and faculty who attended meetings at which
Kennon presided. In addition, Kennon organized or helped to organize
Figure 33
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this activity at meetings presided over by others. This social aspect
to meetings is discussed in greater depth in Question 5.0
(Participation in Planned Meetings).

Cards

As illustrated in the taxonomy, the sending of cards was a kind
of "social" work. Kennon sent greeting cards to celebrate birthdays,
to wish someone well, to wish someone a good trip, to celebrate a
graduation, and to thank someone for a good job.

Summary

Examination of Kennon's journal and field notes led to the
identification of three kinds of social work: gifts, goodies, and
cards. The identification of this more informal aspect of work and
its elements extended and clarified the role of friend that was first
identified in interpretive work and will be discussed further in
Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles). "Social" work and the elements
contained within it were initiated by Kennon.

Physical Work

Physical work was any kind of activity that involved using the
body as distinguished from the mind. Using the above definition as
the decision rule to determine which activities constituted physical
work led to the identification of five kinds: cleaning, moving,
duplicating, repairing, and sorting. A taxonomy of physical work is
presented in Figure 34. Each of the five kinds of physical work are
described in greater depth.

Cleaning

As is illustrated in the taxonomy and described below, cleaning
involved both objects and spaces. Cleaning spaces included: storage
cabinets, space around support staff desks, and her office. Cleaning
Figure 34
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objects included files and personal belongings, e.g., coffee cup. As
will be seen in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles), cleaning spaces and
objects and moving objects were part of an overall orientation toward
keeping the office presentable.

Moving

Physical work also included moving boxes or cans from one space
to another.

Duplicating

Physical work also included duplicating for herself or others.

Repairing

Repairing objects was also a category of physical work. Kennon
was seen repairing the camera lens cover so that she could loan her
camera to someone, and repairing a pull in her dress.

Sorting

As the taxonomy shows, sorting included sorting mail and
messages.

Summary

Examination of Kennon's journal and field notes led to the
identification of five kinds of physical work: cleaning, moving,
duplicating, repairing, and sorting. The identification of this more
informal aspect of work and its elements extended and clarified
several patterns that were discussed earlier. First, it extended the
theme: use of time. Kennon was able to repair a pull in her dress or
a camera lens cover because she manipulated her own time and did not
have to account to anybody about engaging in personal work. Second,
the role of office worker, first identified in written work, is
clarified and extended to include the more menial tasks, not generally
associated with someone in Kennon's position. Third, these were all
tasks that were initiated by Kennon. Fourth, a new theme which is further extended in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority): keeping the office presentable, a theme which was at least informally recognized as a norm by some members of the support staff.

Personal Work

Personal work was any kind of activity that involved care of self. Using the above definition as the decision rule to determine which activities constituted personal work led to the identification of three kinds of personal work. A taxonomy of personal work is presented in Figure 35. As illustrated in this figure and described below, there were three kinds of personal work: eating and taking refreshment, personal maintenance, and "running errands".

Eating and Taking Refreshment

Reading 3595 pages of field notes and Kennon's 255-page journal revealed 42 instances of eating and taking refreshment. These instances did not include references to the mid-day meal. Twelve of the 42 instances referred to finding goodies or treats upon her arrival in the office in the morning.

Personal Maintenance

Personal maintenance included such activities as combing hair, applying lipstick, putting on make-up, and "freshening up".

"Running Errands"

Reading Kennon's 255-page journal and 3595 pages of field notes revealed eight instances of "running errands." "Running errands" included going to the post office, the tailor, the card shop, the bank. In six of the eight instances, Kennon left the office to "run the errands" during her lunch hour. In two of the instances she left the office to "run the errand" at a time other than the lunch hour.
Personal Work

- eating and taking refreshment
- personal maintenance
- "running errands"

Figure 35
Taxonomy of Personal Work
Summary

Examination of Kennon's journal and field notes led to the identification of three kinds of personal work: eating and taking refreshment, personal maintenance, and "running errands." The identification of this more informal aspect of work and its elements extended and clarified a theme: use of time. Kennon was able to "run errands" because as manager of the office she manipulated her own time and did not have to account to anybody about engaging in personal work. Eating in the office combined with bringing in goodies for professional and support staff ("Social" Work) was evidence of a social aspect to work that was recognized as a norm by both professional and support staff.

Summary of Kinds of Work

In order to examine the themes of roles, relationships, and authority in subsequent questions, an analysis of Kennon's work was undertaken. At the conclusion of each discussion of the kinds of work that were identified, a summary was presented. This summary highlights the emerging patterns and themes:

Work

1. Kennon's work had a formal aspect that was reflected in oral work, written work, interpretive work, and planning work.
2. Kennon's work had an informal aspect that was reflected in "social" work, physical work, and personal work.
3. Kennon's work and time was interrupted by superiors (dean and associate deans), as well as faculty, support staff, and professional staff through the unplanned meetings.
4. Kennon's work centered primarily on academic matters related to students.
Time

1. Kennon had control of her own time to the extent that she did not have to account to anybody about engaging in personal work. (Use of time theme).

Roles

1. Kennon had organizational roles that were evidenced by the kind of work she did. These roles included: Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, manager, liaison, and member of the college.

2. Kennon had a professional role that was evidenced by the kind of work she did.

3. Kennon had a friend role that was evidenced through the more informal aspects of work.

4. Kennon had transient organizational roles (e.g., office worker) that were evidenced by the work she did.

Initiator and Responder

1. Kennon initiated certain kinds of work: telephone calls, "talking over the wall," drop-bys, planned meetings of subordinates, memos that gave information or requested information or performance of a task; some elements of planning work; "social" work, physical work, and personal work.

2. Kennon responded to certain kinds of work: telephone calls, stop-in and pop-in, planned meetings of colleagues within the university and superiors, letters that requested information or approval, and some elements of planning work.
Authority
1. Authority relationships were reflected in both informal and formal ways.
2. Kennon made decisions on hiring professional and support staff.
3. Kennon's authority to make decisions on academic matters related to students was tempered by her "agent" of the faculty status.

Patterns of Communication
1. Kennon's primary method of communicating to those in Setting I (215 Frost Hall), Setting II (college), and Setting III (university) was oral, and her primary method of communicating to those in Setting IV (outside) was written.
2. Her memos and letters went to colleagues, faculty, and the dean in the college (vertical and horizontal) and to colleagues in the university, which supported her role as a "linking pin."

Helping
1. The findings supported the emergence of a helping role.

Visibility
1. Participation in planned meetings suggested that Kennon's visibility was primarily in the college.
2. Written work suggested that Kennon's visibility outside the university was to students and state officials.

Question 1.2:
Analytic Process
For the first analysis of distribution of work over time, Kennon's 255-page journal was used; for the second analysis, 3595
pages of field notes were used. Descriptions of the analytic process for both are described below.

Kennon's Journal

Data relative to the distribution of work over time from this source were obtained through a three-step process. First, the kinds of work were identified through a macroanalysis of 3595 pages of field notes and then triangulated with Kennon's journal and documents. (See Question 1.1 and 1.1.1: Analytic Process). Once the six kinds of work were identified a search through Kennon's journal was undertaken. Episodes within Kennon's journal were coded using the letters OW for oral work; WW for written work; IW for interpretive work; PLW for planning work; SW for "social" work; PHYW for physical work; and PW for personal work. The codes for each kind of work were then totaled.

Field Notes

Data relative to the distribution of work over time from this source were obtained through a three-step process. First, the kinds of work were identified through a macroanalysis of 3595 pages of field notes and then triangulated with Kennon's journal and documents. (See Question 1.1 and 1.1.1: Analytic Process). Once the six kinds of work were identified a search through 3595 pages of field notes was undertaken. Episodes within the field notes were coded using the letters OW for oral work; WW for written work; IW for interpretive work; PLW for planning work; SW for "social" work; PHYW for physical work; and PW for personal work. The codes for each kind of work were then totaled. Since there were three phases of observation, totals were derived for each phase.
Question 1.2

Distribution of Work Over Time

The findings for this analysis are reported in two parts: 1) Kennon's journal, and 2) field notes.

**Kennon's Journal**

A content analysis of Kennon's journal from June 30 through December 2, using the six codes for kinds of work, revealed that 77% \((n=1114)\) of the episodes were identified as oral work. As Figure 36 shows episodes identified as written work were the next most frequent \((n=235\) or 16.3 percent). Episodes that were identified as interpretive work, planning work, personal work, and physical work were each less than three percent.

**Field Notes**

The results of the content analysis of 3595 pages of field notes, using the six codes for kinds of work, are reported by phase of observation.

**Phase I: Mapping (two-hour observations)**

Phase I consisted of 17 days of observation (June 24 through July 18). As Table 7 shows, while the number of episodes across all five kinds of work totaled 263, 91% \((n=239)\) of the episodes were identified as oral work. Oral work was followed in frequency of coded episodes by written work, then personal work.

**Phase II: Mapping (four-hour observations)**

Phase II consisted of 27 days of observation (July 21 through September 19). As Table 8 shows, the number of episodes identified as oral work accounted for 89.3 percent \((n=696)\) of the 779 total episodes across all six kinds of work. As in Phase I, written work
Figure 36
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Data Source: Journal
Table 7
Observed Kinds of Work as Revealed in Field Notes

Phase 1 - Mapping (2 Hour Observations)

N=17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Obs</th>
<th>Obs. %</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>0-28</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Social&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>263</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0-28</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
followed by personal work were the next most frequently identified episodes.

Phase III: Event Sampling (four-hour observations)

Phase III consisted of 49 days of observation (September 22 through December 2). As Table 9 shows, although there were 1290 episodes identified across all six kinds of work, 91.4% of them were identified as oral work. Although frequencies were low, personal work and written work were the next most frequently identified episodes.

In summary, an analysis of distribution of work over time using two sources (Kennon's journal and field notes) revealed that oral work was the predominant kind of work.

Question 1.3

Analytic Process

Data relative to what was routine and what was extraordinary in Kennon's work were obtained through a three-step process. First, the kinds of work were identified through a macroanalysis of 3595 pages of field notes, then triangulated with Kennon's 255-page journal and 139 pages of interview transcripts. Once the six kinds of work were identified, a count was taken of the number of instances a category of activity, such as telephoning, appeared in the 3595 pages of field notes. Following this step, a search was undertaken within each category of activity for the number of times references were made to either a category or to an event within a category and the nature of those references to determine what was extraordinary in Kennon's work. The frequency count led to the identification of what was routine and extraordinary. Routine was defined as any activity or set of activities that was customary or recurring. The search for repeated
Table 8
Observed Kinds of Work as Revealed in Field Notes

Phase 2 - Mapping (4 Hour Observations)

N=27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th># Obs.</th>
<th>Obs. %</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>3-46</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>17,21,32,33</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Social&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0-46</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Obs.</th>
<th>Obs. %</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>1-56</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Social&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0-56</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
references to categories and to events within categories led to the identification of what was extraordinary in Kennon's work.

Question 1.3:
Routine and Extraordinary Work

What is routine and what is extraordinary in Kennon's work is discussed in two parts: first, the frequency of categories of activities within the six kinds of work; and second, the search for the extraordinary.

Frequency of Categories of Activities

To show how routine or how extraordinary the categories of activities were within each kind of work, a table was devised for each quarter of observation and for each kind of work. The findings within each kind of work are described in greater depth.

Oral Work

Frequency counts of categories of activity of oral work revealed that the most routine (categories of activities done daily and weekly) were unplanned meetings, telephone calls, "talking over the wall," appointments, and meetings for both summer and autumn quarters. The least routine categories of activities (those done less than monthly or once) were seminars, breakfasts, and ceremonies for both summer and autumn quarters. Other categories of activities such as classes, receptions, interviews, socials/dinners, interviews, presentations, and lunches varied with the quarters under observation. (See Table 10).

Written Work

Frequency counts of categories of activities of written work show that the most routine categories of activities were forms, letters, and memos for both quarters. The least routine categories of
Table 10

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

Oral Work

Data Source: Observations and Documents Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td>Unplanned meetings</td>
<td>Unplanned meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone calls</td>
<td>Telephone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Talking over the wall&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Talking over the wall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Class (as student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointments (46)</td>
<td>Appointments (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings (49)</td>
<td>Meetings (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinners/Socials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>Semi-planned meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinners/Socials</td>
<td>Class (as lecturer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunches</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities, as Table 11 shows, were checks, articles, descriptions, "words," checklists, agenda, summaries, and reports.

**Interpretive Work**

Table 12 shows that the most routine of the categories of activity for interpretive work were reading messages, mail, and newspapers, while the least routine category of activity was reading publications that were offered for sale or distribution by the college or the office.

**Planning Work**

Table 13 shows that planning work was done at least monthly during the Summer Quarter, and less than monthly during the Autumn Quarter. More operational planning was done during the summer than in the autumn, while more event planning was done during the autumn than in the summer.

**"Social" Work**

Table 14 shows that all categories of activities for "social" work were done less than monthly during the summer. However, during the autumn quarter with the increase in the number of meetings within the college, the category of activity known as "bringing goodies" became a monthly occurrence.

**Physical Work**

As Table 15 shows, none of the categories of activities of physical work were routine across quarters. While duplicating remained a monthly category of activity across both quarters, cleaning and moving changed from a monthly category of activity in the summer to a less than monthly activity in the autumn. This suggested that as the tempo of Kennon's activities picked up, less time was spent doing "mundane" work.
Table 11

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

Written Work

Data Source: Observations, Documents and Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td>Letters &amp; Memos (69)</td>
<td>Letters &amp; Memos (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Report for Meeting #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td>Summaries</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter
Interpretive Work

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td>Reading messages</td>
<td>Reading messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-4)</td>
<td>Galleys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;SAM&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents/Handouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

Planning Work

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

"Social" Work

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td>Goodies</td>
<td>Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

Physical Work

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (≥95)</td>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>Duplicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td>Cleaning &amp; Moving</td>
<td>Cleaning &amp; Moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td>Sorting mail</td>
<td>Cleaning &amp; Moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td>Repairing</td>
<td>Repairing Sorting mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Work

Taking refreshment was a routine category of activity as Table 16 shows. It was a daily category of activity when just morning observations were scanned. Neither eating nor "running errands" were routine categories of activities across summer and autumn quarters.

The Search for the Extraordinary

To discover what was extraordinary in Kennon's work, analyses of each of the categories of activities within each kind of work were done. To determine if a category of activity or an event within a category of activity was extraordinary, both the number of references made to the category or to the event within the category and the nature of the references were examined. The data were then triangulated with Kennon's 255-page journal and 139 pages of interview transcripts so that Kennon's perceptions of what was routine and what was extraordinary were taken into account. The results of this analysis revealed what was extraordinary in Kennon's work in three of the seven kinds of work. Further discussion of this dimension of Kennon's work follows.

Oral Work

Although not all of the categories of activities occurred daily, they occurred with enough frequency to be considered routine by both Kennon and her staff. Several times during the 96-day observational period, for example, members of Kennon's staff commented about the frequency of planned meetings, "Oh off to another meeting?" or "Oh back from that meeting already?" One staff member during a casual conversation with the researcher remarked: "I wouldn't like to go to all those meetings Kennon goes to."
Table 16

Frequency of Categories of Activities Within Kinds of Work by Quarter

Personal Work

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily (&gt;95)</td>
<td>Taking refreshment</td>
<td>Taking refreshment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly (12-95)</td>
<td>Eating &quot;Running errands&quot;</td>
<td>Eating &quot;Running errands&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-11)</td>
<td>Repairing</td>
<td>Repairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly (2-4)</td>
<td>Repairing Sorting mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>No Incident</td>
<td>No Incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon reading the descriptions of "talking over the wall" (226), telephone calls (427), unplanned meetings (1137), semi-planned meetings (9), and planned meetings (300), what did emerge as extraordinary within the recurring patterns of meetings was the "Crisis." During the 96-day observational period there were four crises that Kennon identified either in her journal or in talking with the researcher. Kennon labeled them crises, because for the parties involved, the situation was crucial either to their academic progress in the case of students or to the viability of an academic program as in the case of administrators and faculty.

Handling the crisis involved meeting with the people involved, calling on others for assistance, and working on solutions. During the 96-day observational period, more references were made to the crisis itself and the handling of the crisis than any other event within oral work. Table 17 through Table 20 show the number of times each crisis was referred to in Kennon's 255-page journal and in the 3595 pages of field notes.

**Written Work**

As previously shown, forms, letters, and memos were routine kinds of written work. However, in a subsequent interview with Kennon about her repeated use of the word "paperwork" in her journal, she described her perceptions of these more routine kinds of written work. For Kennon, "the signing," "the quick review and approval" of forms, letters, and memos was paperwork, and "paperwork to me generally is the very routine kind of stuff all you're doing is signing your name and generally look at it." For Kennon the less routine kinds of written work were "things that you need to think through need to be
Table 17
What Is Routine and What Is Extraordinary
Crisis I

Data Source: Observations, Journal, and Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/25: Student stops in get</td>
<td>9/25: Kennon drops by</td>
<td>9/25: To 5f2 to get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>file</td>
<td>5f2's desk to see what</td>
<td>file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave message for</td>
<td>problem is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call 6m2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f2 calls back</td>
<td></td>
<td>5f2 calls Kennon about appointment time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call from 71f2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call from 7f2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talks with 13f1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 9/26:                        | 9/26:                     |
| meets with student           | calls 71f2                |
| and 7f2                      |                           |
Table 18
What Is Routine and What Is Extraordinary
Crisis II

Data Source: Observations, Journal, and Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Fieldnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30: unplanned meeting with 6m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m2 stops me in a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gets S.Y. working on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panic over XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get S.Y. and 10f2</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.Y. looks for files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working on it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13m4 stops in after</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon signs out files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a meeting on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took information to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon looks through files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.Y. makes printouts of current enrollments of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students and brings to Kennon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon goes out to corridor to greet 13m4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13m4 and Kennon go to her office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon works on files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drops by 6m2's office with files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19

**What Is Routine and What Is Extraordinary**

**Crisis III**

**Data Source:** Observations, Journal, and Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/3:</td>
<td>10/3: meets with student</td>
<td>10/3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 11f1</td>
<td></td>
<td>talks to 8f1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to 8f1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to 77f2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talks to 77f2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 8f1</td>
<td>10/6:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to 7f2</td>
<td>talks to 8f1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 9f1</td>
<td>10/7:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 8f1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
What Is Routine and What Is Extraordinary

Crisis IV

Data Source: Observations, Journal, and Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/21:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86m2 stops in</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m2 stops in</td>
<td></td>
<td>86m2 stops in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call from 93m3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1m2 stops in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>call from student</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/22:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22:</td>
<td></td>
<td>5f1 announces call from student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon takes call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called 4m2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennon announces to 5f2 when student is coming in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled 4m2 in on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments to S.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student's problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student comes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 4m2 and 1m2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calls 4m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/23:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talked to 4m2 and 1m2</td>
<td></td>
<td>hall visit with 4m2 and 1m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27:</td>
<td></td>
<td>86m2 calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m2 stopped in</td>
<td></td>
<td>4m2 stops in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (continued)

What Is Routine and What Is Extraordinary

Crisis IV

Data Source: Observations, Journal, and Documents

4m2 stopped in
Dropped in to see 4m2

10/29:
4m2 stopped in

11/5:
1m2 stopped in
Saw 4m2

11/12:
1m2 in
Up to see 1m2 about alternatives

11/14:
student in
11/14:
meets with student
11/14:
5f2 announces student
Kennon meets with student

11/18:
calls student

11/20:
5f2 calls

11/25:
calls 55f2
individualized," and things "I was particular about that usually took more time too."

Upon reading the 3595 pages of field notes what emerged as extraordinary within the categories of activities of written work was the report, particularly the writing of the report. During the 96-day observational period, the report was referred to more than any other type of written work. Table 21 shows the number of times the report was referred to in Kennon's 255-page journal, Kennon's weekly calendar, and the field notes. The report's dissimilarity to other kinds of written work was revealed in Kennon's references to it as the "big report" and the "big project."

Physical Work

Table 15 shows that none of the categories of activities within this kind of work were routine, and for that reason could be labeled extraordinary. However, in reading through the field notes and through Kennon's 255-page journal, the category cleaning and moving was cited more than any other category within this kind of work. The content of the references to cleaning and moving more than the number of times the category was cited were evidence of its being labeled extraordinary. Table 22 shows the number of times the category cleaning and moving was cited in the field notes and in Kennon's journal. This category of activity is discussed in further depth in Question 2.0: (Nature of Roles).

Summary

Kanter (1977) and Wheatley (1981) define job activities as extraordinary when they are non-routine, discretionary, and pioneering. As can be seen from Question 1.3, certain aspects of Kennon's formal work (i.e., oral, written, interpretive, and
Table 21

What Is Routine and Extraordinary

The Report

Data Source: Observations, Journal, and Documents

Kennon's Journal:

10/15  "still need to draft report"
10/16  "reviewed XS work needs with S.Y."
10/20  "tried to organize XS materials having difficulty getting handle on it. Quick review with S.Y."
10/21  "started to work on XS"
10/21  "stayed on to draft materials for XS"
10/22  "worked on XS papers"
10/22  "talked with 6m2"  
10/22  "back to work on XS"
10/23  "then on to XS materials"
10/23  "XS signed and delivered"
10/28  "dread final homework"
11/17  "worked on XS report"

Kennon's calendar of activities:

10/20  papers/xs
10/21  papers/xs
10/22  papers/xs

Field Notes:

10/20  made telephone call
10/20  made telephone call
10/21  made telephone call
10/22  made telephone call
10/22  drop-by
10/22  "talking over the wall" to S.Y.
11/12  pop-in  "I didn't get into the big project but got the little stuff done."
11/12  corridor  "I still have to get to that big report too many little things goin on."
11/14  pop-in  "just don't feel like gettin into that big project"
11/17  "talking over the wall" to S.Y.
11/18  corridor
11/18  corridor
11/18  pop-in
11/20  drop-by
11/20  pop-in
11/21  drop-by
11/21  "talking over the wall" discussing format for XS
11/21  "talking over the wall" discussing format for XS
11/21  "talking over the wall" duplicating XS
Table 22
What Is Routine and Extraordinary
Cleaning

Data Source: Observations and Journal

Kennon's Journal:

7/28  "led to house cleaning spree"
7/31  "cleaned files"
8/13  "back to office cleaning"
10/10 "cleaned files"

Field Notes:

8/12  pop-in "found this in the cabinet which is all cleaned up. Yesterday 5m2 came down and said you're doing that?"
8/13  cleaning storage cabinet
8/13  drop-by "fire boxes picked up today?"
8/13  drop-by solicits 15fl and others to come up with a place to envelopes from storage cabinet
9/11  cleaning files
9/11  throwing boxes out
9/22  taking trash cans out to front, picking up paper from floor
10/3  stop-in "around here you have to be a jack of all trades"-lifting boxes
10/10 stop-in 50m2 kids Kennon about "doing windows" as Kennon cleans some of the furniture in her office
11/14 straightens up lamp table in her office
11/25 straightens up furniture in her office
planning), although embedded in the more routine kinds of work, were perceived by Kennon to be non-routine. The non-routine aspects were crises and report(s). Certain aspects of Kennon's informal work (i.e., "social," physical, and personal) were non-routine and were perceived by others to be non-routine because the tasks were considered menial and not within Kennon's formal organizational role(s), as one faculty member remarked to Kennon when he saw her cleaning, "You're doing that?" The discretionary areas of Kennon's work, that is, the aspects of Kennon's formal work where she had power to make decisions, are described in detail in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority).
RESEARCH QUESTION 2.0: NATURE OF ROLES

The question in this section examines the nature of Kennon's roles as they were observed during the 96 days. The general question guiding the analysis in this section is:

2.0 What is the nature of the roles the woman administrator plays while in the work environment?

The major question was divided into three subquestions:

2.1 What are the kinds of roles the woman administrator plays?
2.2 How are the roles similar and different across four settings?
2.3 What kinds of role conflicts does the woman administrator experience?

The questions are interrelated. The original question identified at the outset concerned the nature of Kennon's relationships. As the data emerged, however, it became apparent that Kennon's relationships should be analyzed from two perspectives. Mitchell (1969) suggests the conceptual separation of relationships into three orders: the structural order, the categorical order, and the personal order. Two of these are appropriate to the research here. From the structural perspective the behavior of people is interpreted in terms of actions appropriate to the position they occupy in an ordered set of positions, i.e., roles. From the personal perspective, the behavior of people in either structured or unstructured situations is interpreted in terms of personal links. It is within these two perspectives that analysis of the data on Kennon's relationships was
undertaken. Question 2.1 and its subquestions focus on Kennon's relationships as they were revealed through her roles. All three Questions were products of the interaction with the data.

Question 2.1

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the roles Kennon played during the 96-day observational period were obtained via a multi-step process of macroanalysis of the 3595 pages of field notes, a content analysis of Kennon's 255-page journal, a content analysis of interviews with Kennon concerning certain aspects of her activities, a content analysis of 138 pieces of correspondence; and a content analysis of 317 messages. (A detailed description of the specific steps used in the multi-step analytic process was presented in Chapter III).

To determine the kinds of roles Kennon played while in the work environment, the researcher undertook a domain analysis of all the acts, activities, sub-activities, and topics of talk in which Kennon was observed to engage. For this question, the term "role" was the cover term, and "X is a kind of role" was the semantic relationship. To determine the saliency of each role, each role that was identified through the domain analysis was further examined for three components: the work done, ways of interacting with other members of the organization, and attitudes and beliefs (Argyle, 1967).

Question 2.1:

Kinds of Roles

Fourteen roles were identified as a result of analyzing field notes (See Figure 37). Role was defined here as the pattern of behavior shared by most occupants of a position and which comes to be expected of them. Roles include a variety of aspects of behavior
A. Professional
   1. chairperson
   2. lecturer
B. Liaison
   1. lecturer
   2. presenter
   3. participant
   4. link
C. Member of the College
   1. participant
   2. informer
D. Office Worker
E. Colleague
   1. confidante
   2. teammate
F. Manager
   1. leader
   2. participant
G. Subordinate
   1. participant
H. Secretary to the College
   1. member
   2. leader
   3. participant
   4. presenter
   5. adviser
I. Director of Student Affairs
   1. chairperson
   2. member
   3. participant
   4. coordinator (2)
      a. participant (2)
   5. recorder
   6. adviser
J. Dean's Staff
   1. leader
      a. recorder
   2. member
   3. co-presenter
   4. facilitator
K. Student
L. Friend
   1. companion
   2. associate
   3. confidante
M. Host
N. Woman

Figure 37
Kinds of Primary and Secondary Roles

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal and Documents
such as interacting with other members of the organization, and attitudes and beliefs (Argyle, 1967). Fourteen primary roles and 18 secondary roles were identified as a result of analyzing the field notes. The roles differed in the degree of their formality and social articulation (Lofland, 1976). If viewed along a continuum, the most formal and socially articulated roles were those associated with her title (Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs). The least formal and socially articulated roles were the personal roles such as host and friend.

In the formal organizational roles, her conduct and the expectations of others with whom she interacted about her conduct were socially shared. Thirteen of the roles were achieved through her accomplishments, and one role (woman) was occupied automatically by virtue of gender. Colwill (1982) places organizational roles in the center of her continuum, (see Figure 1) claiming that while they are central self-concept, it is usually possible to set them aside. Sex role, on the other hand, is central to the self-concept and, therefore, lies at the extreme end of the continuum.

That Kennon recognized the variability in her roles was revealed in a comment she made to one of her colleagues from another office who stopped in to see her. As she lifted a box from the floor, Kennon remarked, "Around here you have to be a jack of all trades." Each primary role and its definition are discussed in greater depth. The secondary roles are also identified and discussed. Figure 38, which accompanies the discussion, shows the number of observed instances of each kind of primary role.
Figure 38
Percentages of Interactions & Kinds of Work by Role
**Professional in the Field**

This role included any interactions, kinds of work, and attitudes and beliefs that called specifically upon Kennon's advanced training or her experience in the field of that advanced training. Figure 38 shows that 1.2% of the interactions Kennon had and the work she did were related to this role. As a professional in the field Kennon read (interpretive work) professional journals, newsletters, and newspapers; corresponded with (written work) and talked to (oral work) faculty and administrators in her field of advanced training whom she had met through professional associations; and wrote checks (written work) to renew her membership in professional associations. Her orientation toward the care and treatment of students, an outgrowth of her advanced training, was articulated in three meetings: a staff meeting, committee A, and committee B. Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation Meetings) shows this orientation in Kennon's range of talk at meetings. As a professional in the field, Kennon was called upon to lecture to students pursuing advanced training in her field and was asked to serve as chairperson of a committee for a national association. The secondary roles associated with her role as a professional in the field were: lecturer and committee chairperson.

**Liaison**

This role included any interactions and kinds of work in which she served as a formal link between the college and other administrative units within Harrington University. Figure 38 shows that 4.1% of her interactions and work were related to this role. Kennon served as the liaison for six units within Harrington University. As the data revealed, Kennon's link with these units was primarily in one area: students. As a liaison, Kennon corresponded
with (written work) and talked to (oral work) those responsible for students in those six units; acted upon petitions (written work) from students in five of those units; met with (oral work) either individuals or groups of those responsible for students in those six units; supervised the updating of a manual (interpretive work) for those responsible for students in those six units; and served as a link (oral and written work) between the faculty and administrators in the college and those responsible for students in the six units. In her role as liaison Kennon was called upon to lecture to currently enrolled students about the policies, procedures, and programs of the college; to present information about the college to prospective students and their parents; and to participate in programs sponsored by those responsible for students in the six units. The secondary roles associated with her role as liaison were: lecturer, presenter, participant, and link.

Member of the College

This role included any interactions and kinds of work that showed her belonging to the college. Figure 38 shows that less than 1% of Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role. As a member of the college Kennon attended planned meetings (oral work) such as the dean's state of the college address and college-wide faculty meetings. She also talked to (oral work) appropriate persons about locked doors, plugged up sinks, and conference room availability. The secondary roles associated with her role as a member of the college were: participant and informer.

Office Worker

This role included any interactions and kinds of work in which Kennon was a member of the office staff. Figure 38 shows that 3.9% of
Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role. As a worker in the office Kennon answered the telephone "College of X;" (see Question 1.1.1: Oral Work: Taking Telephone Calls); forwarded calls to staff members; cleaned objects and spaces (see Question 1.1.1: Physical Work); moved objects (see Question 1.1.1: Physical Work); received copies of general office documents; attended office parties (see Question 1.1.1: Oral Work: Semi-planned meetings); shared in bringing food to those parties (see Question 1.1.1: "Social" Work); duplicated; and on occasion, "worked the front desk," because as Kennon stated in a follow-up interview, "it needed help either someone who was assigned there hadn't come or was overwhelmed at the moment by people."

In all but one instance the role of office worker was initiated by Kennon. In other words, she elected to answer the telephone because her secretary was doing something else at the moment when the call came in or she elected to clean because she could not "find any one else to do it." In only one instance was the role of office worker initiated by someone else. The instance occurred during a meeting in which preparations for an event were being made. A discussion ensued about a call that was to be made that day concerning the number of participants at the event. A staff member speaking on behalf of an absent staff member stated "Oh she thought you'd (meaning Kennon) do it since she's not here today." Kennon added quickly, "Well I hope she left me a note to that effect." This follow-up comment re-established Kennon's role as manager.

There were no secondary roles associated with this role since the role "office worker" and its attendant activities ranged over such a short period of time. As Lofland (1976) states, roles require some
reasonable time to develop and play out, and should be more than a few
days duration. Colwill (1982) calls these roles transient roles.

**Colleague**

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon was involved that identified her as a fellow member of a staff or academic faculty. Figure 38 shows that 1% of Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role.

One of the secondary roles that emerged as a result of further analysis was that of confidante. As confidante, Kennon talked to members of her professional staff, administrators, and faculty about private matters that were related to the university, a college, or a department. These private matters concerned, for example, issues related to departmental "politics." (See Question 2.3: Role Conflicts: Secretary to the College and Colleague).

Teammate was the other secondary role that emerged. As a teammate, either Kennon's advice was sought or she sought the advice of an administrator or a faculty member about a work-related matter that was not directly connected with her duties.

**Manager**

This role included any interactions and kinds of work in which Kennon was involved that were related to directing and/or supervising the work of others. Figure 38 shows 35.3% of Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role.

As manager, Kennon wrote memos that pertained to policies and procedures for the office and staffing requests, and announced meetings. Analysis of Kennon's correspondence revealed that she wrote 13 memos as manager. These included announcements of staff meetings
and announcements about changes in office policies. Kennon also acted on various kinds of forms, such as time cards, vacation requests, absence from duty, order, requests to fill vacant positions, evaluation of performance, and travel requests.

Kennon talked to members of her staff about issues related to the daily operation of 215 Frost Hall. These issues concerned places within the office, such as: the front desk, the lobby, offices, and storage area; objects with the office, such as the appointment book (both her's and the office's), the staff calendar, and equipment including typewriters, computers, furniture, copy machine, telephones; and people, including staff and students, about their needs and their activities as they related to the operation. Kennon also talked to administrators within the college about issues related to the operation of 215 Frost Hall. These issues concerned places, such as storage areas; objects within 215 Frost Hall, such as equipment and budget; and people, particularly staff and staffing needs.

Kennon also talked to her secretary. As is shown in the next section, most of the observed interactions within 215 Frost Hall occurred between she and her secretary. In her role as manager, Kennon talked to her secretary about objects, such as appointments, meetings, files, correspondence, appointment book, forms, and equipment (telephones and computer). She also talked to her about people, including students, administrators, and members of the staff as they related to the operation.

As a manager, Kennon engaged in planning work. Categories of planning included personal, equipment, and procedures (see Question 1.1.1: Planning Work).
As manager, Kennon performed some kinds of "social" work. She brought goodies to the staff meeting (once), and provided the cold cuts for one of the office parties. Kennon revealed in an interview that given her role as manager she felt she should provide the more expensive kinds of food at these functions.

Kennon, as manager, performed certain activities that crossed several kinds of work, and were clearly linked to her managerial role. These were: "walking the office," "eyeing storage space," "checking staff," securing the premises, and keeping the office presentable. Each of these activities are described briefly below.

"Walking the Office"

"Walking the office," as Kennon revealed in an interview, "tended to be at the beginning or end of the day." When done at the beginning of the day it was "to see who's in and do you need to make any shifts in coverage the big one being is someone working the front desk or not." At the end of the day it was "more to say goodnight and see people out and by that time and to remind someone if they're working overtime..."

"Eyeing Storage Space"

"Eyeing storage space" involved checking areas of 215 Frost Hall and other places in the building for storage areas for old files. It also included looking around the office for space to house some acquired files from another building on campus.

"Checking Staff"

Although closely allied with "walking the office," it was different in that it occurred anytime during the day. It too involved checking to make sure who was in and seeing if any shifts in coverage needed to be made.
Securing the Premises

This particular aspect of managing emerged during a period early in the Autumn Quarter when, for three consecutive days, the staff door was open in the morning when Kennon arrived. To secure the premises, Kennon contacted the appropriate administrator within the college, spoke to the dean prior to a meeting about the security problem, and spoke to the night clean-up crew.

Keeping the Office Presentable

Acts associated with keeping the office presentable were observed four times. Sometimes she made reference to it, such as "Looks like we're collecting more junk back here," other times, however, keeping the office presentable led to her cleaning a space or moving an object (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Physical Work).

Secondary roles that emerged as a result of further analysis of the manager role were leader of staff meetings and participant in staff training. Kennon's role as leader of staff meetings is further explored in Question 5.0 (Patterns of Participation in Planned Meetings).

Subordinate

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon was subject to the authority or control of the dean of the college. As Figure 38 shows less than 1% of her interactions and work were related to this role.

Analysis of Kennon's correspondence revealed that she wrote one memo at the direct request of the dean that concerned the numbers of her staff who had attended a meeting. In addition, the dean forwarded letters to Kennon that requested information about the college, its policies and procedures, and curriculum. Kennon sent two memos to the
dean, one informed him of actions taken on a crisis involving a
student, and the other reminded him that he needed to confirm
appointments to the alumni council (a draft of the letter she had
written for him was attached).

As a subordinate, Kennon was asked (oral work) to attend two
meetings as a representative of the dean. One of the meetings she
attended was the university senate meeting, the other was a reception
in the community. Although Kennon was requested to attend these
meetings as a subordinate, she was also asked because she was a member
of the dean's staff. On other occasions she talked to the dean or to
the dean's secretary about seeing him and subsequently set up
appointments to do so or dropped by.

One secondary role was identified through further analysis, that
of participant at a university senate meeting (repeated, continuous).

Secretary to the College

This role included any interactions and kinds of work that
involved Kennon in interpreting college or university policies,
curriculum, academic standards, and certification procedures to the
public. Figure 38 shows that 25% of Kennon's work and interactions
were related to this role. In this role, much of what Kennon did
involved written work. Kennon acted on forms for grade changes, for
admission to the college, and for payment of late fees; evaluated
courses; verified academic progress and certification requests; wrote
letters and memos informing students of their academic status,
welcoming them to the college; and informing administrators and
students about the college, programs, and courses. Examination of
Kennon's correspondence revealed that 86 of her letters and memos were
written as Secretary to the College (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Written Work).

As Secretary to the College, Kennon talked to administrators, faculty, members of her staff, and students (oral work) about college and university policies, curriculum, academic standards, and certification. Further analysis revealed that in some of the interactions between Kennon and faculty, administrators, and members of her staff, she asked for help while in others she was asked for help. This particular dimension, seeking help, is examined in greater depth in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships).

As Secretary to the College, Kennon also read (interpretive work) galley proofs for the college bulletin (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Interpretive Work). Of the 317 message slips that Kennon received and read, 55 of them were related to this role.

In this role, Kennon served as a member of three university committees: two repeated and continuous committees (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Oral Work: Planned Meetings) and one non-repeated committee. The work of these committees centered on academic policies, procedures, and curriculum, as they related to admission and registration. She also led two meetings, both of which were staff meetings, in which representatives from the university and from an outside agency were invited by Kennon to update staff on policies and procedures. Kennon presented information to a group of graduate students about her role and the services of 215 Frost Hall. Kennon served as a member of a college committee (repeated and continuous) that was chaired by a member of her staff; the work of the committee centered on the awarding of honors contracts to students. Kennon also participated in a reception for high school students and in a meeting
for students about a phase in their curriculum. She served as adviser to students with problems that pertained to curriculum, academic standards, certification, and academic policies and procedures. The secondary roles that emerged as a result of further analysis were: member, leader, presenter, participant, and adviser.

**Director of Student Affairs**

This role included any interactions and kinds of work in which Kennon was involved that were related to but outside of matters of academic policy. These primarily included, but were not limited to, recruitment, scholarships and financial aid, alumni, and honoraries. Figure 38 shows that 11% of Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role.

As director, Kennon wrote letters and memos (written work) to faculty, administrators, alumni, and students. Analysis of Kennon's correspondence revealed that 33 letters and memos were written in this role. These letters and memos pertained to meetings of the alumni council, the alumni event, scholarships to students, recruitment plans, and honoraries. In addition, she wrote "words", articles, checklists, and agendas (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Written Work).

Kennon talked to faculty, administrators, members of her staff, and members of other staffs (oral work) about enrollment, recruitment, scholarships, financial aid, and the college event (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Planning). She talked to students and members of her staff about the honoraries, and to students about the social (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Oral Work: Planned Meetings). As director, Kennon also planned the college event for alumni and two meetings. One meeting was for the alumni council and the other was for visiting high school students.
Further analysis of the field notes led to the identification of six secondary roles. Kennon served as chairperson of a university committee (repeated and continuous) that dealt with scholarships; member of a university committee (repeated and continuous) that dealt with recruitment; participant in two university meetings (non-repeated) that dealt with special groups of students; participant in a university seminar; coordinator of a college event; participant in meetings (non-repeated) related to that college event; member of a college committee (repeated and continuous) that dealt with alumni issues; recorder for that college committee; and adviser to an honorary.

**Dean's Staff**

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon was involved that identified her as a member of that staff. As Figure 38 shows, 3.2% of Kennon's interactions or work were related to this role.

As a member of the dean's staff Kennon wrote faculty and administrators. An analysis of Kennon's correspondence revealed that she wrote four memos as a member of the dean's staff and one report (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work). The memos were related to announcements about committee meetings.

Kennon talked to faculty, administrators, and a member of her professional staff about the activities of the committee for which the report was being written. She talked to faculty and administrative members of one committee about "promoting a little bit of fun" to celebrate an award one of the members had received. As a member of that staff she talked to faculty about the services of 215 Frost Hall.
Kennon also did "social" work as a member of the dean's staff. On one occasion Kennon helped the secretary "promote a little bit of fun" for the above-mentioned committee by contributing toward the food, and on another occasion volunteered to bring food to a specially-called committee meeting.

Further analysis of the data revealed that Kennon enacted several secondary roles. These were leader of and recorder for a college committee (repeated, finite) that dealt with college recruitment. She served as a member of two college committees (repeated, continuous), one of which is discussed further in Question 5.0. In this role, Kennon also participated in a college reception, co-presented at a college meeting for new faculty, participated in a college faculty meeting, served as recorder and facilitator for a group within that college faculty meeting, and was asked to serve as a member of an evaluation team. This last secondary role is briefly discussed under "Mistaken Roles."

**Student**

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon made a study of something, in this case a foreign language. As Figure 38 shows, less than 1% of Kennon's interactions and kinds of work were related to this role.

In this role, Kennon attended foreign language classes and special classes related to the region she was studying, and reviewed for class. No secondary roles were identified through further analysis.

**Friend**

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon behaved amicably toward others. As Figure 38 shows, 12.9% of
Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role. Purposely broad, this role included three kinds of interactions. One kind included those interactions in which Kennon or others devised an activity in order to generate the desired forms of social interaction (Argyle, 1967); examples included: going to lunch, going to dinner, going to the theater. This secondary role was labeled companion. This role is examined further in Question 3.0 (Nature of Relationships).

The second kind of interaction included those in which Kennon displayed sociable behavior such as joking, quipping, telling stories, or inquiring about one's well-being. This secondary role was labeled associate.

The third kind of interaction included those in which Kennon or others discussed private matters related to family, health, career changes. This secondary role was labeled confidante.

In this role, Kennon sent cards, wrote notes, and gave gifts to administrators, faculty, and members of her staff.

Host

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon provided the food or facilities for a meeting. As Figure 38 shows, 0.35% of Kennon's interactions and work were related to this role.

In an interview with Kennon, she stated that providing food at meetings "often kind of helps get a friendlier tone at the beginning that if you're getting faculty in to do something they seem to kind of like it if they get a little treat." Furthermore, Kennon stated that "it's almost expected that whoever was from central administration in the college would do it."
Kennon's role as host was recognized on one occasion when a female faculty member, who served on a committee Kennon chaired, remarked, "Oh your usual hospitality Kennon."

Further analysis did not lead to the identification of any secondary roles.

**Woman**

This role included any interactions or kinds of work in which Kennon was involved that identified her as a woman. As Figure 38 shows, 0.63% of Kennon's interactions or work were related to the role.

In this role, Kennon talked to several administrators about a women's group that needed a representative from the university and talked to another administrator about attending a meeting for women administrators.

In this role, Kennon also did personal maintenance (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Personal Work).

Secondary roles that emerged as a result of further analysis were those of participant at a meeting of women administrators and member of a women's professional group.

**Summary**

A taxonomy of Kennon's primary and secondary roles is presented in Figure 39. As illustrated and described below, through Kennon's interactions and work, 14 primary roles and 18 secondary roles were identified. All of the roles but one (woman) were organizational roles, although some were transient and less salient than others. Eight of these roles, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, manager, liaison, member of the college, professional, friend, and office worker were identified in Question 1.1.1 through
Figure 39

Taxonomy of Primary and Secondary Roles
the kinds of work that she did. The secondary roles were derived by looking at the activities (i.e., planned meetings) in which Kennon participated. The taxonomic outline (see Figure 37) shows that the primary role, Director of Student Affairs, had six secondary roles that were linked to it (chairperson, member, participant, coordinator, recorder, and adviser). The same figure shows that the primary role, Secretary to the College, had five secondary roles that were linked to it, (member, leader, participant, presenter, and adviser). Kanter (1977) and Wheatley (1981) claim that visibility, particularly in large institutions, is derived from participation in meetings and task forces. Therefore, the primary roles labeled director of student affairs and Secretary to the College offered the greatest opportunity through which to gain visibility in the university. As was shown in Question 1.1.1, however, most of Kennon's visibility (6%) through planned meetings was through participation in the college.

Kennon's role as a "linking pin" between horizontal structures was further extended and clarified through the liaison role. Her link, however, was not from the college to central offices but from college to college(s). Her link from college to central offices was through her role as Secretary to the College.

Mistaken Roles

In not all cases were the kinds of work that Kennon did as part of those 14 roles clear to those around her, particularly to those outside the college. As was shown in Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work), Kennon's visibility through planned meetings was primarily in the college. Further analysis of the field notes led to the identification of a category called mistaken roles. These were cases involving students, projects, or issues that either were directed to
Kennon and should not have been or directed to someone else within the college instead of Kennon.

There were four instances of the first type. An example of the first type was when Kennon was called as a member of the dean's staff, to serve as a member of an evaluation team. Although Kennon agreed to serve on the team, she repeatedly advised the other administrator that an administrative colleague should go since it fell within his role. Eventually it was agreed that that administrator should go once Kennon talked to him and the dean.

Three instances of the second type were found in the data. An example of this type was when a student was directed by a university administrator to an administrator within the college for a matter that was within Kennon's role as Secretary to the College.

Attention is now directed toward the question: how are the 14 primary roles similar and different across four settings?

Question 2.2

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the differentiation of Kennon's primary roles across settings were obtained through a multi-step process. Once the 14 roles were identified and coded through the analysis of Kennon's interactions and kinds of work found in the field notes, message slips, and correspondence, the interactions and kinds of work found in those documents were reviewed to determine if they belonged in Setting I: 215 Frost Hall; Setting II: The College; Setting III: The University; or Setting IV: Outside the University. Each of the 1423 instances identified in the first step were then coded accordingly.
Question 2.2

Differentiation of Roles Across Settings

Each of the 14 primary roles are discussed within the four previously identified settings.

Setting I: 215 Frost Hall

Table 23 shows that of the multiple roles Kennon enacted, 32.3% of the interactions and work done in this setting were related to Kennon's role as manager. This was followed by a less articulated role, that of friend (8.7%). The majority of the interactions and kinds of work related to the role of friend were labeled associate because they involved purely sociable behavior such as quipping, telling stories, and inquiring about one's well-being. Five percent of Kennon's interactions and work were related to the role of Secretary to the College. Members of Kennon's staff, particularly the professional staff, came to Kennon for interpretation on matters related to academic policies and procedures, curriculum, academic standards, and certification. The role of office worker accounted for 3.9% of her interactions and work, and included primarily answering the telephone herself, duplicating, and cleaning. The Director of Student Affairs role followed (3.1%), and included primarily those instances and kinds of work related to the special event that she coordinated. The six instances under the role of woman pertained to personal maintenance.

Setting II: The College

As Table 23 shows, the role of Secretary to the College predominated in this setting, (7.8%). Kennon was called on by both faculty and administrators in her college to interpret matters related to academic policies and procedures. Her student affairs and dean's
Table 23
Percentages of Primary Roles by Setting

Data Source: Observations and Documents Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>215 Frost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall I</td>
<td>College II</td>
<td>University III</td>
<td>University IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of College</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Sec'y</td>
<td>(350)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Staff</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>(184)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(1423)</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
staff roles accounted for 3.2% and 3% respectively of her interactions and work. Her role as manager was different in this setting in that she was not supervising or directing anyone as she was in Setting I (215 Frost Hall), but rather informing administrators in the college about issues related to her managerial role, such as equipment and staffing. Eight percent of her interactions and work were related to this role. The friend role was different in that some of the interactions with faculty and administrators in the college were labeled companion. Her professional role was also recognized by faculty and administrators in this setting and accounted for 0.5% of her interactions and work. As a liaison in the college, Kennon served as a link in student-related matters between faculty and administrators in the college and administrators in the six administrative units within Harrington University.

Setting III: Harrington University

Setting III (University) was similar to Setting II (College) in that Kennon's role as Secretary to the College predominated. 4.9% of her interactions and work with students, faculty, and administrators were related to this role. This role was followed by the Student Affairs and liaison roles which accounted for 2.3% and 1.9%, respectively, of her interactions and work. In the latter role, Kennon interacted with administrators in the six units concerning student-related matters. Once again her role as manager (0.5%) did not involve direct supervision of anyone, but rather informing administrators in the University about issues related to her managerial role, such as equipment and staffing. Kennon's role as a woman in this setting had to do with her participation as a
representative to a women's group and with her attendance at a luncheon meeting for women administrators. The friend role in the university was different than in the office and the college because most of the interactions were identified as companion rather than associate. The nature of Kennon's personal relationships are described in greater detail in the next question.

**Setting IV: Outside the University**

As in the two previous settings, Kennon's role as Secretary to the College predominated (6.8%). Unlike the college and the university, however, more instances of written work were found than oral work as Kennon wrote letters to administrators in state agencies and to students. Her role as Director of Student Affairs accounted for 2.2% of the interactions and work, and involved primarily her work with alumni. Her role as manager did not involve direct supervision of anyone, but rather issues related to her managerial role, such as furniture. It accounted for 0.7% of Kennon's interactions and work. As in the College, her professional role was recognized by faculty and administrators outside the university whom she knew through her involvement in professional associations. The friend role outside the university resembled the university in that more of the interactions were labeled companion than associate.

Analysis of data for Question 2.2 revealed that Kennon's role as manager predominated in only one setting, while the two most articulated roles, that of Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs, predominated in the college, the university, and outside the university. The role of friend changed across settings, going from the purely sociable behaviors found in the secondary role, associate, to those behaviors identified in the companion role.
Kennon's role as a professional also changed across settings. People within the college and outside the university recognized her professional role through interactions and work more than the office or the university.

The discussion now turns to role conflicts with Question 2.3: What kinds of role conflicts does the woman administrator experience?

Question 2.3

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of role conflicts were obtained through a multi-step process. Once the 14 roles were identified and coded through the analysis of Kennon's interactions and kinds of work found in the field notes, message slips, and correspondence, the interactions and kinds of work for each role were reviewed to determine if any of them showed Kennon under conflicting pressure from different groups of people in the organization (Argyle, 1967).

Question 2.3

Role Conflicts

Despite the multiplicity of roles that Kennon performed, only five instances of role conflict were identified through observation. Role conflict was identified as occurring when two or more role expectations were in opposition. Colwill (1982) identified two different kinds of role conflict: interrole and intrarole. In the latter case, two different expectations about the same role are at cross-purposes. In the former case, two different roles may clash. Three of the five instances of role conflict involved her roles as manager of 215 Frost Hall and dean's staff member, one involved her roles as Secretary to the College and colleague, one involved her roles as Director of Student Affairs and manager of 215 Frost Hall.
Secretary of the College and Colleague

As revealed in Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles the role of Secretary to the College necessitated working with all faculty and administrators as she interpreted university and college policies, curriculum, academic standards, and certification procedures to the public. The public here included students, faculty, and administrators both inside and outside the college and the university. (See Question 2.2: Differentiation of Roles.) In her role as colleague, Kennon was sometimes the confidant of faculty and administrators about issues related to departmental "politics," as Kennon labeled it in her journal. When asked in an interview how she felt in this role, Kennon said,

Departmental politics is not one of my favorite things particularly and I need to work with all groups so it's not the best thing for me to get visibly involved with one political faction or another I mean in an office we have to work with all the faculty um so I'm not particularly keen being seen as a supporter of one particular group. I'd like any of them to feel comfortable to come in to talk about their own particular points of view without my having to get out and support one or another.

During the 96-day observational period, her roles as Secretary to the College and colleague were brought into conflict twice. The resolution to the role conflict was revealed in a comment she made during the same interview:
My effectiveness in the long run will be far more based on how I do my work how well we can work with both the faculty and the students in our own areas than whether I'm involved in their politics or not.

Manager of 215 Frost Hall and Dean's Staff

Analysis of the data revealed three instances in which Kennon's roles as manager of 215 Frost Hall and dean's staff member were brought into conflict. Two of the three instances involved resources, and one involved the presentation of 215 Frost Hall as an efficient operation. The role conflicts that centered on resources are discussed first.

Resources

Role Conflict 1: Telephones

In her role as manager, Kennon supervised and directed the operation of 215 Frost Hall including such objects as equipment (see Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles: Manager). Equipment included telephones, computers, furniture, copy machines. Of all the types of equipment, telephones were the most discussed. The topics of telephones, telephone service, and the need for additional telephones in the office were brought up during casual discussion in 215 Frost Hall and in meetings of the professional staff. This is further revealed in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings). Although Kennon acknowledged the need for additional telephones, as a member of the dean's staff she was aware of the cost-cutting measures by the dean, particularly telephones. In her role as manager, therefore, she conveyed the dean's decision to the staff and
suggested alternatives both in casual discussion and in staff meetings.

**Role Conflict 2: Staff**

In her role as manager, Kennon supervised and directed the operation of 215 Frost Hall, including the support and professional staff who worked there. During two professional staff meetings the topic of changing procedures for certification and the implications for staffing to accommodate those changes were discussed. This is further revealed in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings). Kennon casually remarked to the staff during one of the meetings, "I think they thought we were underworked back here," and thus publicly acknowledged the staff's sentiments. As a member of the dean's staff, however, Kennon recognized that the college's resources did not permit adding new staff even though the dean publicly acknowledged at a dean's staff meeting the increasing demands that these changes would bring to her office.

**Role Conflict 3: Presentation of 215 Frost Hall as an Efficient Operation**

As a member of the dean's staff Kennon felt pressure to run an efficient operation: her reward in the form of salary depended on it. Sometimes, therefore, Kennon had to shift from manager to office worker (see Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles: Office Worker) to fill the void when a job was not getting done, particularly those kinds of jobs that involved accommodating the public such as taking telephone calls and working the front desk. Sometimes Kennon also had to shift from manager to office worker to keep the office presentable. In the case of the latter, the role conflict was recognized by a faculty member who had stopped in to see Kennon and saw her clearing out a cabinet,
and said incredulously: "You're doing that?" Kennon replied, "Can't find anyone else to do it at the moment."

**Director of Student Affairs and Manager of 215 Frost Hall**

In her role as Director of Student Affairs, Kennon was asked to supply data about enrollments to faculty and administrators. During the 96 days of observation there were three such instances. Kennon identified these three and one other instance in her journal. Some of the data that were requested required additional work on the part of one of the support staff in 215 Frost Hall. In her role as manager, Kennon had to protect this staff member's workload since at that time she was performing two jobs. Earlier, in fact, this staff member had popped in to see Kennon about helping her to prioritize her workload. Kennon informed the administrator, who had requested the information, of the situation and promised to get the data to him as soon as it was feasible for the staff member.

As can be seen from this discussion of role conflicts, Kennon did not experience many role conflicts given the multiplicity of roles she occupied. Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962) claim that role conflict is never too frequent since individuals usually occupy positions successively rather than simultaneously.

The discussion will now turn to Kennon's personal relationships in the four settings.
RESEARCH QUESTION 3.0: NATURE OF PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Whereas Question 2.0 focused on the relationships from the structural perspective (Mitchell, 1969), Question 3.0 focuses on relationships from the personal perspective (Mitchell, 1969). The general question guiding the analysis is:

3.0 What is the nature of the personal relationships the woman administrator has with people while in the work environment?

The major question was divided into three subquestions:

3.1 What are the kinds of personal relationships the woman administrator has with people?

The preceding question consisted of two parts:

3.1.1 What are the interactional characteristics of those relationships?

3.1.2 What are the structural characteristics of those relationships?

3.2 With whom does the woman administrator have personal relationships?

3.3 With what frequency does the woman administrator contact those with whom she has personal relationships?

The questions are interrelated. Question 3.1 was the original question identified at the onset of the study. Questions 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 were products of interaction with the data. Question 3.1 was derived from research on relationships within work settings. This research suggests that relationships are a critical thread running through a person's experience in the work environment.
(Kanter and Stein, 1979). Furthermore, it suggests that relationships with peers, subordinates, and superiors are important to one's experience in the workplace because they can be a source of support, influence, and information (Easton, Mills, and Winokur, 1982). Research on women in work settings, particularly in male-dominated professions, suggests that the nature of these relationships may be different for women. Hughes (1944) posits that relationships may be formal and specific in order to reduce the status dilemma between having to choose whether to treat the woman administrator as a woman or as an administrator (Epstein, 1970) or to shun her (Hughes, 1944; Wolman and Frank, 1975). The effect of either of these approaches is to exclude women from the informal organizational structure (Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). Research also suggests that when woman are alone in a group of men or very small in number they occupy a position that Kanter (1977) identified as token which accounts for many of the difficulties they face in fitting in, gaining peer acceptance, and behaving "naturally."

Whereas Question 3.1 was rooted in the knowledge base questions, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2, and 3.3 were products of the analysis of the data.

Question 3.1 is the broadest in scope of the three questions and relies on the other two questions for its answer. Questions 3.2 and 3.3 provide a descriptive picture of those with whom Kennon had personal relationships. Since Question 3.1 relies on the other questions for its answer, it will be dealt with last. This section will, therefore, begin with Question 3.2.

Since data on the personal relationships Kennon had with subordinates in 215 Frost Hall were the densest and confounded by
authority relationships (see Question 4.0), it is treated separately in this section.

Question 3.2

Analytic Process

To describe the people with whom Kennon had personal relationships while in the work environment, the researcher used the units of observation labeled interaction set and setting. Using both Kennon's journal and field notes, the researcher counted all the people with whom Kennon was observed to have had interactions during the 96 days. To mask the identity of those people, each person was given a number, a code to indicate gender (f - female; m - male), a code to indicate setting (I - 215 Frost Hall, II - College, III - University, and IV - Outside the University), and a code to indicate role (A - administrator, F - faculty, FF - former faculty, FA - former administrator, CSV - contract or service vendor, PA - professional association, Al - alumni, OA - other administrator, SS - support staff, PS - professional staff, SW - student worker, CPS - casual professional staff, UKN - unknown). People were then counted according to their gender. Students, as a group, were excluded from this analysis since Kennon's contacts with them were transitory.

Question 3.2

A Description of the Personal Relationships

During the 96-day observational period, Kennon had face-to-face contact with 206 people. Face-to-face, in this case, included contacts made by telephone, "talking over the wall," and unplanned, semi-planned, and planned meetings. Kennon's "chron file" was reviewed in order to determine with whom she had had written contact. People to whom letters and memos were addressed with the general
heading To Whom It May Concern or with no heading (e.g., members of committee A) were excluded. Kennon had written contact with 36 people. Of those 36, Kennon had had face-to-face contact with 31 of them.

A description of those people with whom Kennon established personal relationships during the 96-day observational period follows. The description includes a look at the roles they occupied, their gender, and their setting.

Roles

Kennon had face-to-face contact with faculty, administrators, support staff, former faculty, former administrators, contract or service vendors, alumni, other administrators, and members of professional associations. Brief descriptions of these roles follow.

Faculty

Faculty included those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function was to teach or instruct at Harrington University or other universities.

Administrators

Administrators included those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function was noninstructional. These included those people classified as executive, administrative, or managerial at Harrington University or other universities (Scott, 1978).

Support Staff

Support staff included all those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function was clerical or secretarial.
Former Faculty

Former faculty included all those people with whom Kennon had contact who at one time were employed as teachers or instructors at Harrington University.

Former Administrators

Former administrators included all those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function at the time they were employed at Harrington University was noninstructional. These included those people classified as executive, administrative, or managerial.

Contract or Service Vendors

Contract or service vendors included all those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function was to sell or service a product (e.g., insurance, furniture).

Alumni

Alumni included all those people with whom Kennon had contact who at one time attended Harrington University as undergraduate or graduate students.

Other Administrators

Other administrators included all those people with whom Kennon had contact whose primary function was noninstructional. These included those people classified as executive, administrative, and managerial who were outside a university setting, e.g. administrators in state and local agencies.

Members of Professional Associations

Members of professional associations included all those people with whom Kennon had contact who she knew through her participation in professional associations.
Table 24

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Face-to-Face Contact by Role

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract or Service Vendors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 shows the distribution by role of the people with whom Kennon was observed to have had face-to-face contact during the 96-day observational period. Kennon had significantly more contact with administrators and faculty than any other group.

**Gender**

As Table 25 shows Kennon had face-to-face contact with 109 men and 97 women during the 96-day observational period.

**Setting**

Table 26 shows the distribution of Kennon's face-to-face contacts across three settings. Setting II (college) included all of those people whose primary location for carrying out their duties was the college. Setting III (university) included all of those people whose primary location for carrying out their duties was the university. Setting IV (outside) included all of those people whose primary location for carrying out their duties was outside the university.

Kennon had contact with 34 from outside the university, 83 from the university, and 89 from the college. Analysis of setting and role (see Table 27) shows that although Kennon had approximately equal contact with people in the college (89) and the university (83), the distribution of contact by role was significantly different. The difference between the settings was partially explained by the small number of administrators in the college. However, several other factors accounted for the difference. Each of the administrators within the college had defined roles (e.g., business officer, research, alumni) that brought Kennon into contact with them only as their roles intersected by virtue of shared issues. Sharing information and ideas is explored in further depth in Question 3.1.1. Furthermore, as was shown in Question 2.0 (Nature or Roles), Kennon's role as Secretary to
Table 25
Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Face-to-Face Contact by Gender

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Face-to-Face Contact by Setting

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College (II)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (III)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside University (IV)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Face-to-Face Contact by Setting and by Role

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>College (II)</th>
<th>University (III)</th>
<th>Outside University (IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>Outside University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract or Service Vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the College necessitated being in contact with faculty in the college (as opposed to administrators) to interpret academic policies and procedures as they related to students. Within the university, her contact with predominantly administrators arose from similar job responsibilities within roles that brought them together at planned meetings. Her position as a "linking pin" across horizontal structures also contributed to the contact with administrators.

Figure 40, which shows distribution of setting by gender, revealed that 56% of Kennon's contacts within the university were with women and 42% of her contacts within the college were with women. The higher percentage of contacts within the university was partially explained by the number of women in middle-management who occupied similar jobs and attended the same planned meetings as Kennon. It was also partially explained by the fact that relationships outside those of the superior-subordinate (college) and immediate colleagues (college) are likely to be lateral relationships with equal status people where the contact is often friendly and relaxed, and is usually the basis for the "grapevine" (Argyle, 1967). The kinds of personal relationships are explored in greater depth in Question 3.1.

As Kennon's contacts are examined, they can be partially explained by the various roles that she played. For example, contact with contract or service vendors was related to her role as manager of 215 Frost Hall, with alumni, her role as Director of Student Affairs, with other administrators at state and local agencies, her role as Secretary to the College and with professional associations, her role as a professional in the field. Her contacts with former administrators and former faculty were related to a variety of roles. In some cases, her contacts with them were as a friend, in others as
Figure 40
Percentages of People With Whom Kennon Had Face-to-Face Contact by Gender and Setting
Director of Student Affairs, and in still others as Secretary to the College.

Question 3.3
Analytic Process

Examination of the frequency with which Kennon made contact with those 206 people identified in Question 3.2 involved counting the observed interactions. To do this, all data relevant to Kennon's oral work was reviewed. This included: telephone calls (427); planned (74), semi-planned (9), and unplanned (1137) meetings; and "talking over the wall" (226). The observed interactions with each person were then totaled. These totals were then reviewed to determine the "on average" frequency of face-to-face contact. Since the researcher spent 21 weeks in the field, contacts made with people greater than or equal to 21 times were coded as weekly; contacts made with people 11 to 20 times were coded as semi-weekly (that is semi-weekly but less than weekly); contacts made with people 5 to 10 times were coded as monthly (that is monthly but less than semi-weekly); and contacts made with people 1 to 4 times were coded as less than monthly. As can be seen the last category included those people with whom she had contact only once, and that contact may very well have been the only contact Kennon would ever have with that person.

As a means of triangulating the observed face-to-face contacts, Kennon's journal was reviewed, and a list of all those people with whom Kennon reported having face-to-face contact was composed. The lists of observed face-to-face contacts and the reported face-to-face contacts were compared. Fifty-one people on the list generated from Kennon's journal did not appear on the observed face-to-face list, and 52 on the list generated from observed face-to-face contacts did
not appear in Kennon's journal. The difference between the observed contacts and the reported contacts was related to the observations and the schedule for observing. The researcher noted contacts such as greetings and chance meetings that Kennon did not report in her journal. Although the researcher observed Kennon 96 days, she was not with her during the entire work day. Some of the contacts Kennon had with people were in special situations (e.g., receptions, banquets) that were not repeated.

Question 3.3
Frequency of Contact

Table 28, Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact on Average, shows that Kennon had weekly face-to-face contact with one person; semi-weekly face-to-face contact with eight people; monthly face-to-face contact with 20 people; and less than monthly face-to-face contact with 177 people. Kennon's reported contacts revealed that she had weekly face-to-face contact with five people; semi-weekly contact with five people; monthly face-to-face contact with 20 people; and less than monthly face-to-face contact with 178 people.

Further analysis was done to show the differences across settings. As Table 29 shows, the college was the only setting in which Kennon had face-to-face contact with people weekly and semi-weekly. These findings supported earlier ones (see Question 1.1.1: Components of Kinds of Work) that showed Kennon's visibility to be primarily in the college. Furthermore, it suggested the situated nature of her role. As will be shown later in Question 3.1.2, most of the less than monthly face-to-face contacts were in planned meetings that she attended because of her role as Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs.
Table 28

Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact on Average

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Face-to-Face Contact (≥ 21)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Weekly Face-to-Face Contact (11-20)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Face-to-Face Contact (5-10)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly Face-to-Face Contact (1-4)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29
Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact on Average by Setting

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>College (II)</th>
<th>University (III)</th>
<th>Outside University (IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact (≥ 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact (5-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3.1
Analytic Process

To describe the kind of personal relationships Kennon had, the units of observation labeled interaction set and topic of talk were used. Interaction sets included: telephone calls made and taken (427); planned (74), semi-planned (9), and unplanned (1137) meetings; and "talking over the wall" (226). The units of observation were reviewed and a domain analysis was done using the term "contact" and the semantic relationship "X is a reason for the contact." Four reasons for contact were identified: business, social, business/social, and greeting. Each interaction set was then re-examined to determine the ratio of each of the kinds of contact (e.g., if the reasons for contact were always business than the person with whom Kennon had the contact was labeled a primarily business contact, and so forth).

To capture the on-going nature of the relationship, the word tie (Goffman, 1971; Lincoln and Miller, 1976) was used. People with whom Kennon had primarily business contacts were, therefore, labeled instrumental ties; those with whom she had primarily informal social contacts were labeled primary ties; and those with whom she had a combination of business and social contacts were labeled business-social ties. Each of the people within these categories was then examined further for role, gender, setting, and frequency of contact with Kennon. This information was then depicted, when it was feasible, through a web configuration. The findings are discussed in further detail.
Question 3.1
Personal Relationships

An analysis of the content of the interactions led to the identification of three kinds of contact with people: those with whom Kennon had primarily business contact, those with whom she had primarily social contact, and those with whom she had primarily social/business contact. Lincoln and Miller (1976) have labeled these contacts "ties". Lincoln and Miller further identified these ties as primary and instrumental. Primary ties are those informal social relations that have been shown to both enhance and impede the attainment of formal organizational goals. Instrumental ties are those arising in the course of performing appointed work roles. The Lincoln and Miller scheme, however, does not differentiate sufficiently between those primary ties that are always social and those ties that are equally business and social. For the purposes of this study, those ties that were equally business and social were labeled business-social ties. Each of these kinds of ties are focused on separately, beginning with primary tie, then business-social tie, and finally instrumental tie.

Primary Ties

Primary ties are defined as those in which the contact was primarily social. When looked at in terms of roles (See Question 2.0: Nature of Roles) these were the people to whom Kennon was a friend and a companion. In the role of companion, Kennon or the other person devised an activity in order to generate the desired form of social interaction. As Figure 41 shows, Kennon had primary ties with 9 people. Primary ties are now examined in light of role, gender, setting, and frequency of contact with Kennon.
Figure 41
Primary Ties

Data Source: Observations
Role

Forty-six percent of Kennon's primary ties were with administrators, 33% were with people tied to a professional association, 1.1% were with faculty, and 1.1% were with former administrators.

Gender

Seventy-eight percent of Kennon's primary ties were with women. There were no male faculty or administrators within Kennon's primary ties. All the males within this group were tied to a professional association.

Setting

Figure 41 also shows that two of Kennon's primary contacts were in the college and that one was a faculty member and one was an administrator. Kennon had three primary contacts in the university, all of whom were female administrators. Outside the university, Kennon had primary ties with four people, two male and two female, and three of the four were tied to a professional association. The other was a former administrator.

Frequency of Contact

To look at frequency of contact with primary ties, both observations and Kennon's journal were examined. Since most of the activities were devised in order to generate the necessary social interaction, and the researcher often did not accompany Kennon to these kinds of activities, the journal served as a source of triangulating observations. Using just observed face-to-face contact as the measure of frequency, Kennon had contact with three people monthly and six people less than monthly. Using reported face-to-face contact (Kennon's journal), Kennon had contact with two of the people
semi-weekly, two of the people monthly, and five of the people less than monthly. Kennon's most frequent contacts were with women, two of whom were administrators and the other was a faculty member. The faculty member and one of the administrators were from the college. The two administrators occupied positions that were not linked directly to Kennon's organizational roles. Neither the faculty member nor Kennon shared information or concerns related to Kennon's organizational roles, although they did discuss a request from one of Kennon's colleagues in a professional association.

Kennon's less than monthly contacts were with both men and women. Two of these were women administrators from within the university. Four of these were with men and women outside the university. One of the woman (2fIVFA), used to work in 215 Frost Hall.

Kennon's associations with other professionals in the field were as a result of having served on executive boards with them. The two men lived out-of-state, and worked in other universities. They called Kennon and they visited her when in town for special meetings.

Summary

These findings showed that in the informal interactions that characterize primary ties, Kennon's relationships were predominantly with women. Part of the findings were explained through what Lipman-Blumen (1976) identified as a "homosocial" theory of sex roles, that is, that there is a seeking, an enjoyment, and/or preference for the company of the same sex. Kanter (1977) labeled this same phenomenon "social homogeneity," that is, that similarities such as social background and characteristics or similarity of organizational experience form the basis upon which people form informal, and often closed circles. Epstein (1970) maintains that in many cases the
exclusion of women from the "club context," that is, the informal male network that prevails in most professions, is a result of women themselves limiting the interaction. This behavior results largely from the image of a profession as a society of men.

The relationships with the men from the professional association are partly explained by the literature which suggests that men and women in professional associations may relate to each other more as equals since they are away from their structured campus roles (Elder, 1984).

Business-Social Ties

Business-social ties are defined as those in which the contact was equally business and social, that is, Kennon contacted these people as many times for business purposes as for social purposes. As Figure 42 shows, Kennon had business-social ties with nine people. These were the people to whom Kennon was a friend (See Question 2.0: Nature of Roles) as well as associate and companion.

Roles

Fifty-six percent of Kennon's business-social ties were with administrators, 22% were with faculty, 1.1% were with people tied to a professional association, and 1.1% were support staff.

Gender

As Figure 42 shows, all of Kennon's business-social ties were with women.

Setting

Figure 42 also shows that two of Kennon's business-social ties were in the college and that both were faculty members. Kennon had six business-social contacts in the university, five of whom were
Figure 42
Business-Social Ties

Data Source: Observations
administrators and one of whom was support staff. Outside the university, Kennon had business-social ties with one person who was affiliated with a professional association.

Frequency of Contact

Kennon had monthly contact with the faculty member from the college. Her contact with the other women in this group occurred less than monthly. Kennon attended meetings that were related to her role as Secretary to the College with two of the administrators and one of the faculty members. She attended meetings related to her Director of Student Affairs role with one of the administrators. Two of the women, one of whom was a faculty member and the other a member of a professional association, called upon Kennon in her professional role. Two of the women were linked to Kennon through her liaison role with other administrative units. One of the women, the support staff member, was linked to Kennon through her manager role. With the exception of two of the women (20fIVPA and 102fIIISS), all of the women went to lunch with Kennon at least once during the two-quarter observational period.

Summary

The findings showed that in the formal and informal interactions that characterize business-social ties, Kennon's relationships were entirely with women. Although all of these women were linked to Kennon either through her organizational and/or professional roles, they were what Argyle (1967) labeled lateral relations. These are relations with equal status people outside the immediate work group (e.g., superior-subordinate and immediate colleagues). Lateral relations "are useful in stimulating rapid fire information flow and cooperation, and are the basis for the grapevine" (Argyle, 1967).
These findings, when combined with the previous findings, suggested that Kennon's world was predominantly a world of women.

Instrumental Ties

Instrumental ties were defined as those in which the contact was primarily business and arose as a result of performing appointed work roles. These were the people to whom Kennon could be a friend, an associate, or a confidante, but more than likely she related to them in any of the other 13 primary roles and/or 17 secondary roles. (See Question 2.0: Nature of Roles.) Attention will now be directed toward this category of ties by examining the roles, gender, setting, and frequency of Kennon's contact with them.

Roles

Table 30 shows that of the instrumental ties, 44.1% (n = 83) were administrators, 38.8% (n = 73) were faculty, 1.6% (n = 3) were support staff, 2.6% (n = 5) were former faculty, 1.6% (n = 3) were former administrators, 2.1% (n = 4) were contract or service vendors, 4.8% (n = 9) were alumni, 1% (n = 2) were from a professional association, and 2.6% (n = 5) were other administrators from state or local agencies.

Gender

Table 31 shows that 56.9% (n = 107) of Kennon's instrumental ties were with men and 43% (n = 81) were with women. Since faculty and administrators comprised 82.9% of Kennon's instrumental ties, only those two roles were further examined to determine if there was a gender difference by role. Further analysis revealed that 74% of the faculty with whom Kennon had instrumental ties were male, and 26% were female. Forty-six (46%) percent of the administrators with whom Kennon had instrumental ties were male, and 53% were female.
Table 30

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Instrumental Ties by Role

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract or Service Vendors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Instrumental Ties by Gender

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting

Table 32 shows that 45.2% of Kennon's instrumental ties were from the college, 39% were from the university, and 15.4% were from outside the university.

Frequency of Contact

Table 33 shows that of the instrumental ties, 86.2% (n = 162) had less than monthly contact with Kennon; 4.2% (n = 16) had contact with Kennon semi-weekly, 8.5% (n = 8) had contact with Kennon monthly, and less than 1% (n = 1) had contact with Kennon weekly. Since the more frequent instrumental ties are focused on in the next section, attention here centers on the less than monthly contacts. Of those 162 who had less than monthly contact with Kennon, 48.8% were administrators and 43.2% were faculty. Within this same group, 47.5% were female and 62.3% were male.

Summary

Kennon had instrumental ties with 188 people, 44.1% of whom were administrators and 38.8% were faculty. Most of the instrumental ties were with men (56.9%). There were more male faculty with whom she had instrumental ties (74%) than male administrators (46%). Just the reverse was found with female instrumental ties: 26% of her instrumental ties were faculty, and 52% were administrators. Among those with whom she had infrequent contact (less than monthly), the distribution between administrators and faculty was about equal; 62.3%, however, were male and 47.5% were female.

Attention will now be focused on those people with whom Kennon had instrumental ties and with whom she had contact weekly and semi-weekly. Roles, gender, setting and frequency of contact will be examined.
Table 32

Number of People With Whom Kennon Had Instrumental Ties by Setting

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College (II)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (III)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside University (IV)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33

Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact on Average With Whom Kennon Had Instrumental Ties

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Face-to-Face Contact (≥ 21)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Weekly Face-to-Face Contact (11-20)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Face-to-Face Contact (5-10)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly Face-to-Face Contact (1-4)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instrumental Ties: A Closer Look**

Kennon had frequent contact (weekly or semi-weekly) with nine people. Although Kennon had primarily business contacts with these people, some of the contacts with them were also social and business/social.

**Roles**

As can be seen from Figure 43, 56% (n = 5) were administrators, 33% (n = 3) were faculty, and 1.1% (n = 1) were support staff. The reported observations (journal) revealed that Kennon had frequent contact with 10 people, 60% of whom were administrators, 30% of whom were faculty, and 1% of whom were support staff.

**Gender**

Figure 43 shows that 33% of her most frequent contacts were female and 67% were male. Within the group of women, 1 was support staff, 1 was faculty, and 1 was an administrator. As will be shown in the section on sharing information and ideas, Kennon's role as Secretary to the College accounted for the majority of the contacts with the female faculty member, and her role as manager accounted for the majority of contacts with the female administrator. Kennon's contact with the support staff was both at meetings as a member of the dean's staff, as a manager of 215 Frost Hall, and as a subordinate to the dean. Kennon had to contact her in order to make appointments with the dean. Within the group of men, 4 were administrators with whom Kennon had contact at meetings as a member of the dean's staff as well as in the normal course of doing business. The kinds of information she shared with two of the administrators with whom she had the most frequent contact is discussed in the section on sharing information and ideas.
Figure 43

Instrumental Ties

Data Source: Observations
The kinds of information she shared with one of the two administrators with whom she had slightly less contact (13mIIA) concerned her role as manager of 215 Frost Hall. Outside of the meetings she and the other administrator (43mIIA) attended, the nature of their roles within the college did not bring them together in formal ways.

The two male faculty were predominantly linked to Kennon through her role as Director of Student Affairs, and only minimally through her role as Secretary to the College. Kennon had frequent informal contacts with one of the faculty (79mIIF) as well as formal contacts through meetings. The kinds of information the other faculty member (44mIIF) shared with Kennon is discussed in the section on sharing information and ideas.

Setting

All of the people with whom Kennon had frequent contact in this group were from within the college. Part of this was explained by Kennon's participation in planned meetings which earlier was shown to be primarily within the college, and part was explained by the kinds of roles Kennon occupied as manager, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, member of the college, member of the dean's staff, and subordinate, and the information that was needed from these people in order to carry out her responsibilities within those roles.

Frequency of Contact

As Figure 43 shows, 89% (n = 8) of the people with whom Kennon had instrumental ties had contact with her semi-weekly, and one had contact with her weekly. Reported contacts (see Figure 44) show that Kennon had frequent contact with 5 weekly and 5 semi-weekly, and that
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Figure 44
Instrumental Ties

Data Source: Journal Triangulated with Observations
4 of those with whom she had contact with weekly were administrators with whom she had both formal relations through planned meetings and shared information as well as informal relations. She quipped with them and gave cards and gifts to some to celebrate special occasions. This suggested that the more frequent the interchange, the more likely it was informal (Scott, 1978). This is further supported in the section on sharing information and ideas.

Summary

As was shown in Figure 43, Kennon had frequent face-to-face contact with 9 people. Fifty-five percent of those contacts were with administrators with whom Kennon had contact both formally through meetings and through her organizational roles as Secretary to the College, member of the college, manager of 215 Frost Hall, member of the dean's staff, and subordinate, and informally through casual conversation. Her contact with the support staff was through her organizational role as member of the dean's staff and subordinate to the dean. Her contact with the faculty was through her organizational roles as Director of Student Affairs and Secretary to the College. Furthermore, the number of contact between males and females was slightly more balanced than in her primary and business-social ties.

Question 3.1 explored the personal relationships that Kennon had with people while in the work environment. From the analysis of the data, three defined groups of personal relationships emerged, and these were labeled primary ties, business-social ties, and instrumental ties. Within the primary ties (n = 9), 78% were female; within the business-social ties (n = 9), 100% were female. Taken as a group, this suggested that there is support for both Kanter's and Lipmen-Blumen's theories that such similarities as background and
characteristics form the basis upon which people form informal social relations. Furthermore, when looked at as a group, 55% of the women were administrators, which suggested that similarity in organizational experiences also form a basis upon which women form informal social relations. Within Kennon's primary group, there were no male faculty or administrators from the university; however, there were males with whom Kennon had worked in professional associations which suggested that similarity of organizational experience, in this case the professional association, where men and women have the opportunity to relate as equals without the presence of structured campus roles, forms the basis for informal relations.

Kennon's instrumental ties were predominantly administrators and faculty. Within instrumental ties, there emerged two groups, those with whom Kennon had frequent contact (weekly and semi-weekly) and those with whom she had infrequent contact (less than monthly). Most of her contacts with instrumental ties (86.1%) were less than monthly. As the instrumental ties with whom she had infrequent contact were analyzed further, there were some differences. She had instrumental ties with more women in administrative positions than in faculty positions, and more men in faculty positions than in administrative positions. Setting was a factor here, since 92% of the faculty were from the college, and within that group 24% were female and 76.1% were male. Kennon's contacts with the faculty were predominantly through her role as Secretary to the College.

A closer look at those with whom she had frequent instrumental ties revealed a slightly more balanced composition (3 women and 6 men) than in her primary and business-social ties. Her frequent contacts were both formal and informal. Sixty-seven percent of those ties were
directly tied to her roles as Secretary to the College and/or Director of Student Affairs, and the remaining were linked to her role as a member of the dean's staff, subordinate, and manager.

Question 3.1.1

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of characteristics of instrumental ties, business-social ties, and primary ties were obtained through further analysis of the interactions that were categorized as business, business-social, and social (see Question 3.1: Analytic Process). Discussion of the three characteristics that emerged during the analysis follows.

Question 3.1.1*

Characteristics of Personal Relationships

Analysis of the contacts that were labeled business, business-social, and social led to the identification of four characteristics: help seeking, giving and getting feedback, sharing information, and going to lunch. Help seeking occurred within all three kinds of ties, giving and getting feedback occurred within instrumental and primary ties, sharing information occurred within instrumental ties, and going to lunch occurred within all three categories of ties. Seeking help is discussed first, followed by feedback, sharing information, and going to lunch.

Help Seeking

Analysis of the contacts that were labeled business, business/social, and social led to the identification of a characteristic of personal relationships called help seeking. A taxonomy of help seeking is presented in Figure 45. As is illustrated and described below, there were two categories of help seeking:
asking for help and being asked for help. Within each category of help seeking there were five patterns: consultation, information, problem solving, homework, and participation. Figure 46 lists the five patterns of help seeking and their definitions. On a continuum, consultation was the least intrusive on a person's time, while homework and participation were the most intrusive on a person's time since both required time spent over and above the initial request for help. The patterns of help seeking are now discussed, using webs to identify those with whom Kennon had personal relationships that were help seeking.

**Being Asked for Help**

Kennon's helping role was first identified in Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work). Her helping role became more clearly articulated as the patterns of help seeking were examined. As Table 34 shows, 28 cases of being asked for help were identified as interaction sets with faculty, administrators, support staff, former faculty, former administrators, other administrators, alumni, and members of professional associations, and contract and service vendors. These 28 cases are now examined by type of help seeking (see Figure 45) and by person in order to determine the patterns of personal relationships.

**Consultation**

Four of the 28 cases of help seeking were identified as this type. As Figure 47 shows, Kennon was consulted by four people. Three of these were faculty within the college (14mIIF, 73mIIF, and 7fIIF) who consulted with Kennon about academic policies and procedures and curriculum. On the latter issue Kennon conferred with the administrator in the college (6mIIA) whose primary responsibility was curriculum and instruction. The administrator (22mIIIA) from the
Figure 45

Taxonomy of Help Seeking
university consulted Kennon on academic policies concerning foreign 
language instruction in the college. All of these cases were related 
to Kennon's organizational role as Secretary to the College.

Information

Figure 48 shows that there were nine people who sought 
information from Kennon. Seven of the nine were men and two were 
female. Of the females both were faculty members in the college. 
They sought information from Kennon that was related to her role as 
Secretary to the College. Of the males, three were faculty and four 
were administrators. Two of the faculty were from the college and 
sought information from Kennon that was related to her Director of 
Student Affairs role (44mIIIF) and her Secretary to the College role 
(92mIIIA).

The third faculty member (10lmIIIF) was from the university and 
sought information from Kennon that was related to her Secretary to 
the College role. This particular faculty member taught with an 
academic department that was connected to the college, and served on a 
college committee with Kennon. Of the four administrators, only one 
(6mIIIA) was from the college, and he sought information from Kennon 
twice, once concerning student enrollments and once about an article 
that had appeared in a professional newspaper. Two of the university 
administrators requested information that was related to her Secretary 
to the College role, and one requested information that was related to 
her Director of Student Affairs role.

Problem-Solving

Kennon's help in solving a problem was requested ten times. Two 
of the ten people were females. One was a university administrator 
and one was a college faculty member. Both cases centered on Kennon's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Help Seeking</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulation</td>
<td>A pattern of help seeking in which there is an equal exchange of advice of views between parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>A pattern of help seeking in which one party seeks knowledge of a specific event, situation, or procedure from another party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>A pattern of help seeking in which one party's knowledge is sought by another party to work out a situation that presents an uncertainty or difficulty to the other party. Solutions are found during that specific interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>A pattern of help seeking in which one party is called upon to work out a situation that presents an uncertainty or a difficulty to the other party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>A pattern of help seeking in which one party is called upon by another party to take part or share in an event or an activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 46
Patterns of Help Seeking
Figure 47
Being Asked for Help: Consultation
Data Source: Observations
Table 34

Frequency of Kinds of Help Seeking

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Help Seeking</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Help</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Asked for Help</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 48

Being Asked for Help: Information

Data Source: Observations
Secretary to the College role, however, in the latter case, Kennon consulted with a college administrator (6mIIA) whose primary roles were in curriculum and instruction.

Seven of the ten people were male. Four of the seven were from the college. Of the four, three were faculty whose cases were related to Kennon's Secretary to the College role, and the fourth was an administrator whose case was also related to that role. Two of the males were administrators in the university. One (84mIIIA) served on several university committees with Kennon, and his case was related to her Secretary to the College role. The other university administrator needed assistance on a student case that was also related to her Secretary to the College role. One of the males was a former faculty member in the college who stopped to see Kennon and another support staff member concerning some information he had received from a former student. This case was related to her Secretary to the College role.

Homework

As Figure 50 shows, there were three people who contacted Kennon for this type of help. Two of the three were female. Within this group, one was a university administrator whose case centered on Kennon's liaison role. The other case concerned professional information. The latter was one of Kennon's business-social ties who needed information on a special program that the university offered. To supply her with the information, Kennon consulted with a woman who was a primary tie, and who was participating in the program. The third person who contacted Kennon for help was an administrator in the college. This case was identified earlier as a crisis that related to two roles: her manager role because she had to re-deploy staff in order to supply the information to him, and her Secretary to
Figure 49

Being Asked For Help: Problem Solving

Data Source: Observations
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Figure 50

Being Asked for Help: Homework

Data Source: Observations
the College role because the case concerned students' and their academic programs.

**Participation**

Kennon was formally asked to participate in planned meetings. Such formal invitations were kept in her "agenda" file on her desk. This request for participation was informal, because the person asked her during a stop-in. The request for participation was linked to Kennon's professional role. She was asked to serve on a panel of professionals in the field, and provide information on professional associations.

**Asking for Help**

As Table 34 shows, Kennon asked for help 55 times. These 55 cases are now examined by type of help seeking (see Figure 45) and by person in order to determine patterns within personal relationships.

**Consultation**

Figure 52 shows that there were seven people with whom Kennon consulted. Only one of these people (7fIIIF) was one who had requested this type of help from Kennon (see Figure 47). Within this group there were four females and three males. Three of the females were university administrators. The cases were linked to her liaison role (28fIIIA), her Secretary to the College role (82fIIIA), and her Director of Student Affairs role (63fIIIA). The fourth female was a college faculty member with whom Kennon consulted on a student case (Secretary to the College role). Three of the seven were males. Two of the males with whom she consulted were within the college, and their cases were related to her Secretary to the College role. The third male was a former administrator who had worked with Kennon. She
\( N = 1 \)
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**Figure 51**

Being Asked for Help: Participation

Data Source: Observations
N = 7

Figure 52
Asking for Help: Consultation

Data Source: Observations
consulted him on a case concerning a former student with whom he had worked.

Information

Figure 53 shows that there were 14 people from whom Kennon sought information. Two of these people (7fIIF and 6mIIA) had sought information from Kennon (see Figure 48). Within this group there were four females, three of whom were in the college and one of whom was a university administrator. From three of the women, Kennon sought information on issues that were linked to her Secretary to the College role. One of these was a formal request through a memo. Kennon sought information from a college administrator (24fIIIA) that related to her role as manager of 215 Frost Hall.

Ten of the 14 people were males, six of whom were in the college. Within this group, three were administrators. From two of these administrators Kennon sought formal help via a memo concerning an issue related to her Secretary to the College role. From the third Kennon sought information concerning a committee report which she was writing (dean's staff role). Three of the males were college faculty from whom Kennon sought information related to her roles as Secretary to the College (10lmIIIF and 38mIIIF) and Director of Student Affairs (79mIIf). Four of the men were university administrators. From three of them Kennon sought information that was related to her college secretary role, and from the fourth she sought information that was related to a college committee that she was chairing.

Problem Solving

Figure 54 shows that there were 10 people from whom Kennon sought help in this category. Only one of these people (84mIIIa) had previously sought Kennon’s help in this way.
N = 14

[116fIIIF]

22mIIIA
79mIIIF
50mIIA
[48mIIA]
7fIIIF
14fIIIA
24fIIIA

79mIIIA (2)
101mIIIF
[6mIIA]
38mIIIF
85mIIIA
53mIIIA (2)

KEY

# code # of person
F faculty
m male
A administrator
f female
[x] written (instead of face-to-face)
II Setting II
(#) # of times help was sought
III Setting III

Figure 53

Asking for Help: Information

Data Source: Observations
Of these ten people, 5 were female. Three of these women were administrators and two were college faculty. Of the three administrators, two were from the university and one was from the college.

Four of the cases concerned issues that were related to Kennon's Secretary to the College role. One of the cases was related to Kennon's role as liaison. Five of the people from whom Kennon sought help were male. Three were administrators and two were faculty. One of the faculty and one of the administrators were from the university, while the other 3 were from the college. All five of the cases were connected with her Secretary to the College role.

Homework

Figure 55 shows that there were 16 people from whom Kennon sought this type of help. None of the 56 people sought this type of help from her.

Four of the people in this group were female. Three of the women were college faculty and one was a university administrator.

Two of the cases involving homework were related to her role as Secretary to the College (71fIIF and 31fIIF). The other two were linked to a request that Kennon had received from a woman outside the university (see Figure 50), with whom Kennon had social-business ties, who wished information on a special program Harrington University offered for women administrators. Kennon contacted a primary tie (11fIIF) to get information about the program and to have her send information to Kennon's friend. Kennon then called a women university administrator (83fIIIA) who was responsible for the program.

Twelve of the people in this group were men. Six of the men were administrators and six were faculty. Within the administrator group,
Figure 54

Asking for Help: Problem Solving

Data Source: Observations
Figure 55

Asking for Help: Homework

Data Source: Observations
there were five from the college and one from the university. Four of
the five college administrators received formal requests from Kennon
to provide information. These requests were related to her Director
of Student Affairs role. Kennon contacted the other college
administrator concerning a student case (Secretary to the College
role).

**Participation**

Figure 56 shows that there were five people from whom Kennon
requested participation. One of the five people was a female faculty
member in the college. Kennon requested her participation in a
university program (liaison role). She also requested her to
participation in a conference with a student (Secretary to the College
role).

Four of the five people in this group were men. Two of the men
were faculty whom Kennon asked to participate in a university program
(one was through her liaison role, the other through her Director of
Student Affairs role). The two men who were college administrators
Kennon also asked to participate in a university program (liaison
role). The latter two requests were formal requests.

**Overall Patterns of Help Seeking**

Figure 57 shows the people whom Kennon contacted the most
frequently for help. Within this group there were two women. One of
the woman was a faculty member in the college, the other was a college
administrator.

Kennon had 5 contacts with the female college faculty member
(7fIIF). Of these 5, four were related to her Secretary to the
College role, and one was related to her Director of Student Affairs
role.
Figure 56
Asking for Help: Participation

Data Source: Observations
Kennon had 2 contacts with the female college administrator (24fIIA). Both contacts, as it will be shown later in this section, were related to Kennon's role as manager of 215 Frost Hall.

Five of the people Kennon contacted frequently were men. Three of the men were administrators, and two were faculty. Within the administrator group, she contacted one college administrator 4 times, one college administrator 3 times, and one university administrator 2 times. As will be shown later in this section, her contacts with the male administrator (6mIIA) centered on her Secretary to the College role. His responsibilities centered on curriculum and instruction in the college which were closely tied to her responsibilities as Secretary to the College.

Her contact with the other college administrator (50mIIA) were also related to her Secretary to the College role. Kennon and the university (79mIIIA) administrator had similar positions within their respective colleges, and so she saw him frequently at meetings. Her contacts with him were linked to her Secretary to the College role.

Two of the men Kennon contacted frequently were faculty. One was in the college, the other in the university. The college faculty member served on several college committees with Kennon, and was often contacted for issues that were related to Kennon's Director of Student Affairs role.

As the data were examined further, there were patterns of exchange that developed. As can be seen in Figure 58, there was only one woman from whom Kennon requested help and from whom she was asked for help. She was a college faculty member. The seven other people in this group were men. Four of the men were administrators, and
Figure 57

Asking for Help: Most Frequently Contacted

Data Source: Observations
Figure 58
Exchange of Help

Data Source: Observations
three were faculty. Three of the administrators were from outside the college. Two of those university administrators were ones she frequently saw at meetings because of the similarity in job responsibilities. As was previously mentioned she had frequent exchanges with the one college administrator (6mIIA) because both of their positions centered on academic matters. Among the three faculty, two were in the college and one was in the university (101mIIIF). As was previously mentioned, he held a joint teaching appointment with the college in which Kennon worked.

**Summary**

Kennon's helping role was first identified in Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work). Such helping roles are often found in staff positions (Shapiro, 1984). There were clear patterns that emerged from analyzing this attribute of personal relationships. Kennon's visibility both within the college and the university is attached to her Secretary to the College role. In this role Kennon interpreted academic policies and procedures to faculty, administrators, and students primarily. Kennon's visibility within this role is strongest in the college, particularly among the faculty, both men and women. Their requests for help centered around students and their academic programs. Research literature suggests that asking for help often produces a sense of indebtedness to the person providing the help. Shapiro (1984) maintains, however, that when people provide help to others because of role obligations, it produces the least amount of indebtedness on the part of those asking for help, and furthermore, when the person providing the help does so in a manner that does not reflect a negative view of seeking help and of the help seeker, future help seeking is more likely.
The requests for help Kennon received from the faculty in the college were indicative of the nature of her authority as will be seen in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority). Although Kennon had the power to make decisions about academic matters related to students, it was tempered by her "agent" of the faculty status which was first discussed in Question 1.0 (Nature of Work). Her role as a "linking pin," particularly across horizontal structures, was extended as a result of analyzing patterns of help seeking. She frequently contacted other administrators in other colleges and administrative units within the university (e.g., admissions and registration) to solve student problems. A look at help seeking vertically, that is within the college, revealed that a help seeking pattern did not exist between Kennon and the dean (4mIIA). There was a pattern of help seeking, with only one administrator (6mIIA), who was one position higher than Kennon in the hierarchy, and, as was explained earlier that pattern was a result of the overlapping job responsibilities.

Discussion now turns to feedback, another attribute of personal relationships.

Giving and Getting Feedback

Analysis of the contacts that were labeled business, business/social, and social led to the identification of a pattern called feedback. A taxonomy of feedback is presented in Figure 59. As illustrated and described below, there were two kinds of feedback: feedback that Kennon gave and feedback that Kennon received. Feedback was defined here as information directed to a person about the result of a process in which both parties had been involved, and information directed toward a person about some aspect of the person. Within each
Figure 59

Taxonomy of Kinds of Feedback
kind of feedback there were five types: gratefulness, performance, idea, person, and appearance. Each of these are now defined.

**Gratefulness**

A kind of feedback in which either party was appreciative of benefits received.

**Performance**

A kind of feedback in which either party was acknowledged for the completion of an obligation or a requirement. The acknowledgement contained information about how the task was performed.

**Idea**

A kind of feedback in which either party acknowledged a plan, scheme, or method.

**Person**

A kind of feedback in which either party acknowledged the accomplishments or traits to the other.

**Appearance**

A kind of feedback in which either party acknowledged the outward appearance of a person.

Table 35 shows the frequency of each type of feedback that Kennon received and each kind of feedback she gave to others. As revealed in the table, Kennon gave four of the five types of feedback. The most frequent type of feedback that she gave to others was gratefulness, followed by performance, followed by idea. Kennon received feedback of all five types. Feedback for her ideas was the most frequent, followed by gratefulness, performance, person, and appearance.

**Patterns of Feedback**

Figure 60 shows that Kennon most frequently received feedback from six people. All of the people were from the college. Kennon
Table 35

Frequency of Kinds of Feedback Given and Received

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Feedback</th>
<th>Given</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratefulness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 60
Receiving Feedback

Data Source: Observations
received feedback from three faculty members, two of whom were male and one of whom was female. The female faculty member (7fIIF) gave Kennon feedback three times. The type of feedback she gave her concerned her performance and her "social" role (e.g., "I see Kennon is the usual good host"). This comment preceded a committee meeting which is described in greater detail in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings). This faculty member was also one with whom Kennon had semi-weekly interactions, and as well be shown in the next section, dealt with Kennon exclusively in her Secretary to the College Role. They called upon each other for help frequently.

One of the male faculty (14mIIF) had worked with Kennon for several years prior to resuming his teaching responsibilities in the college. His feedback came prior to a presentation that Kennon was to give to a group of his students, and concerned Kennon as a person. His other feedback centered on Kennon's performance as well as acknowledging the time and effort she spent lecturing to his class. The third male faculty member (18mIIF) served on a college committee that Kennon chaired. His feedback centered on the ideas she presented at those meetings.

Three of the people from whom Kennon received feedback were administrators in the college. One college administrator (43mIIA), was one with whom she had very little formal contact because their roles did not overlap. She received feedback from him twice, both times were publicly at meetings. He complimented Kennon on her managerial role after a presentation she gave to new faculty, and he acknowledged an idea she offered at a staff meeting. Another college administrator (4mIIA) also complimented Kennon at the same meeting of
new faculty, and he acknowledged an idea she offered at a luncheon meeting. The third college administrator (50mIIA) acknowledged Kennon's managerial skills at a meeting of students, and he responded gratefully to her efforts to get the dean's staff to that student meeting.

Figure 61 shows the number of people to whom Kennon gave feedback. As can be seen from this figure, only the female college faculty member (6fIIF) was common to both figures. Kennon's feedback came mostly in the form of gratefulness to her for "helping." As was previously mentioned, they frequently sought help from one another. The other faculty member (44mIIF) was a male, and he received feedback from Kennon in the form of gratefulness for his help. The one administrator to whom Kennon gave feedback was the one with whom she had weekly contact, frequently she called on for help, and with whom she had overlapping roles.

Summary

As was shown in Figures 60 and 61, there were some patterns in feedback. Kennon received feedback from faculty on her performance, while she acknowledged their help in solving problems or in participating in ways that helped her carry out her duties and responsibilities as the Secretary to the College or Director of Student Affairs. She did not give them feedback on their performance, in much the same way Kennon's staff did not give her feedback on her performance as will be shown in the next section. Their performance was based on teaching and research, areas that were not mutually shared by Kennon and the faculty members with whom she interacted. Their performance was not based on their service or helping roles.
Figure 61
Giving Feedback

Data Source: Observations
The nature of the feedback Kennon received from some of the faculty about her person and her performance suggested an overall visibility in the college that was not present in the same way in the university. Kennon did receive feedback from administrators in the university, and it came mostly in the form of acknowledging her ideas, and interestingly enough, her appearance. Two men complimented Kennon on her clothing, a pattern that differed in the office as will be shown in the next section. The feedback that Kennon received from administrators centered on her managerial skills, her ideas, and her person.

Another pattern that reinforced earlier findings was the acknowledgement of Kennon's "social" role by the only female faculty member from whom Kennon received feedback. The "social" work theme is extended and clarified in Question 5.0 (Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings).

Sharing Information and Ideas

Analysis of the contacts that were labeled business, business/social, and social led to the identification of an attribute of personal relationships called sharing information and ideas. This attribute of personal relationships paralleled the frequency with which they were in contact. As will be seen, all of the people within this group were people with whom Kennon had weekly or semi-weekly contact.

As Figure 62 shows, Kennon and one college administrator (6mIIA) shared information and ideas on ten issues. This administrator was the one with whom Kennon had weekly contact, and who was identified earlier as the one with whom she had overlapping roles that touched primarily on her Secretary to the College role.
Figure 62
Sharing Information and Ideas
Kennon also shared information and ideas with another college administrator (4mIIA). As is shown in Figure 62, he and Kennon shared information on six issues. These issues had to do primarily with Kennon's role as subordinate. She reported to him on the alumni event she was planning which was related to her Director of Student Affairs role, the status of the college's commemorative display which was also related to her Director of Student Affairs role, and staffing changes which were related to her manager role. They shared other issues that concerned colleagues in other administrative units and in the college which were related to the colleague role identified in Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles). In addition, he shared information about his family which was related to the friend role also identified in Question 2.0.

Kennon shared information and ideas with a female administrator (24fIIA). As Figure 62 shows, the information centered primarily on Kennon's managerial role within the college. Kennon and this college administrator also went to lunch together as will be shown in the next section.

Kennon shared information and ideas with two faculty members. One of the faculty members was a female (7fIIF) with whom Kennon shared primarily ideas related to academic policies within that faculty member's department and academic matters related to students pursuing majors in that department.

The other faculty member with whom she shared information and ideas was a male (44mIIIF). As Figure 62 shows, they shared information on students which was linked to her Director of Student Affairs role and her Secretary to the College role. He also shared
information on departmental "politics" as Kennon referred to them in her journal.

All of the people within this group were instrumental ties.

Summary

Scott (1978) proposes that the more frequent the interchanges the more likely it will be informal. The findings here suggested that among those with whom Kennon had frequent contact there was a certain informality: they quipped, joked, told stories, called each other by their first names, and dropped by to see each other. As can be seen from Figure 62, however, the relationships centered on their organizational roles and seldom deviated from that pattern. Even in the informal context, lunch, talk was centered on the work issues the participants had in common.

Going to Lunch

Analysis of the contacts that were labeled business, business/social, and social and a content analysis of Kennon's 255-page journal led to the identification of this attribute of personal relationships. A taxonomy of going to lunch is presented in Figure 63. As is illustrated and described below, there were two categories: planned lunches and unplanned lunches. Planned lunches included all those that appeared in Kennon's calendar that were not luncheon meetings. Unplanned lunches were those that were hastily decided upon. Each of these is now discussed.

Planned Lunches

Kennon had planned lunches with 10 people. Nine of the people with whom Kennon had lunch were female. As Figure 64 shows, five of the women with whom she had lunch were university administrators, one was a college administrator, one was a former administrator in the
Figure 63

Taxonomy of Going to Lunch
Figure 64

Going to Lunch: Planned Lunches

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal
college who had worked for Kennon, and two were faculty in the
college. Of those with whom Kennon went to lunch, four were primary
ties (11fIIF, 19fIIIA, 20fIIIA, 78fIIIA) and three were business-social
ties (58fIIF, 89fIIIA, 29fIIIA). The remaining two were women
administrators with whom Kennon had primarily instrumental ties. The
man with whom she had lunch was outside the university, and a pastor
at a local church.

Unplanned Lunches

Kennon had unplanned lunches with 9 people. All of the people
were women. As Figure 65 shows, three of the women with whom she had
lunch were university administrators and three were college
administrators. Two of the women were faculty and one was a former
administrator who at one time worked for Kennon. Kennon had
instrumental ties with three of the women (1fIVFA, 17fIIIA, 85fIIF, and
24fIIIA), primary ties with three of the women (20fIIIA, 78fIIIA, and
8fIIIA), and business-social ties with two of the women (22fIIF and
10fIIIA). One of the women with whom Kennon went to lunch (24fIIIA)
was a college administrator with whom Kennon shared information and
ideas that were related to her role as manager.

Summary

As both planned and unplanned lunches were examined, there were
three women with whom Kennon had both unplanned and planned
lunches: (78fIIIA, 1fIVFA, 20fIIIA). All of them were either college or
university administrators. These findings suggested further support
for Kanter's (1977) and Lipman-Blumen's (1976) theory of social
homogeneity which was discussed earlier. It also suggested that while
similarity of organizational experiences served as a basis for
informal personal relationships among women (e.g., administrator to
Figure 65
Going to Lunch: Unplanned Lunches

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal
administrator or college to college), it was not a factor between men and women, at least at the level of college and university administrators and faculty. As Kennon's unplanned lunch patterns are examined in the next section, similarity in organizational experiences and the subordinate-superior relationship were factors since her lunch group was more balanced between men and women.

Question 3.1.1. explored four attributes of personal relationships: help seeking, giving and getting feedback, sharing information and ideas, and going to lunch. Examination of patterns in help seeking extended and clarified Kennon's helping role within the college. It also suggested the areas in which others called upon Kennon's special knowledge and experiences on academic matters related to students that is explored in further depth in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority). Furthermore, it was found that there were certain people from whom Kennon routinely sought help, and that this help seeking was related to her Secretary to the College role. Some of the kinds of help she sought further clarified her "agent" of the faculty status that is examined in Question 4.0 (Nature of Authority).

Examining the feedback patterns that emerged from the data revealed that Kennon received feedback from men more than women, although the female faculty member gave Kennon more feedback than any of the others. Furthermore, it revealed that Kennon's feedback to others, particularly faculty, was in the form of gratefulness for helping her carry out a task that was related to either her Secretary to the College or Director of Student Affairs roles. Kennon did not give feedback on performance to faculty, although she did to one college administrator in an offhand way. She did however, receive feedback on her performance, particularly her managerial skills.
Examining patterns of sharing information and ideas revealed that there was a circle of people with whom Kennon had frequent contact that formed a network for getting business done. Within this circle, which consisted of college administrators, there was an informality that existed that supported Scott's (1978) claim that the more frequent the interchange, regardless of level within the hierarchy, the more likely it will be informal.

Examining Kennon's "going to lunch" patterns revealed that many of the same women with whom she had primary and business-social ties were those with whom she went to lunch. The majority of women with whom she went to lunch were middle managers in the college and university which suggested that similar organizational experiences as administrators were a factor in determining with whom she went to lunch.

Discussion now turns to Question 3.1.2, and a look at the structural characteristics of personal relationships.

Question 3.1.2

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the structural characteristics under which personal relationships occur were obtained in the following manner. The interactions with the 206 people identified in Question 3.2 were reviewed to determine under which conditions they made contact with Kennon. Three conditions were identified: predominantly group, predominantly pair, and a mixture of group and pair. Wellman (1985) refers to the first two as group tie and dyad tie respectively. Group ties included those relationships that occurred primarily in groups such as planned meetings, and dyadic ties included those relationships that occurred primarily in a pair such as
unplanned meetings and telephone calls. The total number of contacts that Kennon was observed to have had with each of the 206 people were recorded as to whether they occurred in a dyad or group. A ratio of dyad contacts to group contacts was established. Kennon's 255-page journal served as a means of triangulating the observations. Attention is now directed toward a discussion of this aspect of personal relationships.

Question 3.1.2

Structural Characteristics of Personal Relationships

Analysis of the conditions under which the contacts between Kennon and the 206 people identified in Question 3.2 occurred revealed that Kennon had contact with some of them only in groups, others only in a pair, and still others in both groups and in a pair. The conditions that are described here are those contacts which occurred in groups, such as planned meetings, and those contacts which occurred in dyads. Analysis of the structural characteristics of personal relationships provided yet another way of exploring Kennon's instrumental, primary, and business-social ties that were identified in Question 3.2.

Group Ties

Those with whom Kennon had contact primarily through such formal conditions as the planned meeting were identified as group ties. Analysis of the data revealed that 34% (n = 70) of Kennon's contacts with those 206 people identified in Question 3.2 occurred under group conditions. As their roles were examined, it was discovered that 39 were administrators, 18 were faculty, 3 were former faculty, 6 were alumni, and 4 were other administrators from state and local agencies. A look at their roles revealed that 45% (n = 32) were men and 55% (n =
38) were women. An examination of their settings showed that the
majority (57%) were from the university, 18 were from the college
(25.7%), and 13 (18.6%) were from outside the university.
Furthermore, 95.7% of her contacts with people in this group occurred
less than monthly. People in this group all had instrumental ties
with Kennon.

**Dyad Ties**

Those with whom Kennon had contact primarily under, perhaps, less
formal conditions such as the stop-in, the "hall visit", or the
telephone were identified as dyad ties. Analysis of the data revealed
that 32.5% (n = 67) of Kennon's contacts occurred as one of a pair. A
look at the roles of the people with whom she had dyad ties revealed a
much broader range than in group ties: administrators, faculty,
support staff, former faculty, former administrators, contract or
service vendors, and professional associations. The majority of
people with whom she had such ties were administrators (44.7%)
followed by faculty (37.3%).

An examination by gender revealed that Kennon had dyad ties with
approximately equal numbers of men and women; the difference, however,
was that 6 of the women formed Kennon's primary ties and 4 of the
women formed Kennon's business-social ties (see Figure 41 and 42).
There were only two men in this group who were part of her primary
ties.

Kennon had contact with only one of her primary ties under both
dyad and group conditions (8fIIIA). These were not formal meetings,
but receptions and luncheons where there were opportunities to
socialize. On the other hand, more of her business-social ties (5)
were under both group and pair conditions. This suggested that she
Table 36

Group and Dyad Ties by Roles

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Group Tie</th>
<th>Dyad Tie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Service Vendors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37

Group and Dyad Ties by Gender

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group Tie</th>
<th>Dyad Tie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Group and Dyad Ties by Setting

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tie</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College (II)</td>
<td>University (III)</td>
<td>University (IV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Tie</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad Tie</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39

Group and Dyad Ties by Frequency of Contact

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Tie</th>
<th>Dyad Tie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly ($\geq 21$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Weekly (11-20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (5-10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-4)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and members of her primary tie group who were in the university did not participate in the same kinds of planned meeting circles.

A look at her dyad ties across the four settings revealed that the majority were from the university (59.7%), followed by the college (25.3%). A further look at the frequency of those contacts revealed that 92.5% of them occurred less than monthly, and that 56 of them were instrumental ties.

**Summary**

Question 3.1.2 examined the conditions under which Kennon had contact with the 206 people identified in Question 3.2. As was revealed in the discussion of the findings, 34% of her contacts were only through the more formal conditions of planned meetings. This suggested the importance of further examining her participation in planned meetings which is discussed in Question 5.0. This is particularly the case when setting is considered, because 48.1% of Kennon's contacts within the university saw her only in the context of a planned meeting. When looked at in combination with the other conditions (dyad and dyad/group), it suggested that she had a tight network, since all three of the conditions were approximately equal. A further look within Setting II (college) revealed that the majority of her contacts (58.4%) were under either group conditions or dyad conditions, and that these were predominantly faculty.

Attention is now directed toward a discussion of personal relationships within 215 Frost Hall.

**Setting I: 215 Frost Hall**

This section of Question 3:0 focuses on the personal links Kennon established with the people in 215 Frost Hall. The density of contact with people in this setting separated it from the other settings. The
Figure 66
Dyad Ties That Were Primary Ties

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal
Figure 67

Dyad Ties That Were Social-Business Ties

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal
authority relationship that existed between Kennon and those who were employed in 215 Frost Hall also separated it from the other settings. Authority is examined in the next section, Question 4.0. Attention is now directed toward question 3.2 which examines personal relationships.

Question 3.2
Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of personal links within 215 Frost Hall were obtained via a multi-step process of macroanalysis of 3595 pages of field notes, a content analysis of Kennon's 255-page journal, a content analysis of 317 message slips, and a content analysis of 138 letters, memos, and forms. To briefly review the steps, first 3595 pages of field notes were read and their contents catalogued using the Erickson, Guzman, and Carrasco (1980) scheme. The catalogue was then read and the names (pseudonyms) of and the interactions with those people with whom Kennon had contact in 215 Frost Hall were coded since they would be reviewed later to answer questions about frequency and nature of contact. Kennon's journal, message slips, and correspondence were also read as a means of triangulating the observational data. The people, with their pseudonyms, were then given code numbers to further mask their identity. In addition to a number, each person was labeled with an m or an f (lower case) to denote the gender, a roman numeral to denote the setting (I=215 Frost Hall), and a letter to denote the role (professional staff=PS; support staff=SS; student workers=SW; casual professional staff=CPS).
Question 3.2
A Description of the Personal Relationships in 215 Frost Hall

To preserve the subject's identity and the place in which she worked the total number of people employed in this office is not revealed, nor is the gender of each of the employees. The office is, however, predominantly female, and the ratio of support staff to professional staff is about equal.

Roles

In 215 Frost Hall, there were four kinds of employees: professional staff, support staff, student workers, and casual professional staff. Each of the roles are defined below.

Professional Staff

Professional staff included all those people in 215 Frost Hall whose primary function was to advise clients on academic matters related to curriculum.

Support Staff

Support staff included all those people in 215 Frost Hall whose primary function was clerical or secretarial.

Student Worker

Student workers included all those people in 215 Frost Hall who were enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program at Harrington University, and who worked part-time in this office.

Casual Professional Staff

Referred to as "casuals" by those in the university, casual professional staff included all those people in 215 Frost Hall whose primary function was to advise clients on academic matters related to curriculum during the "peaks."
"Peaks" were those times in the quarter when demand for professional staff was up because of increased client demand.

So-called "casuals" were people who had worked in the setting before as professional staff, and for reasons, such as raising a family or retirement, had left Harrington University.

Question 3.3

Analytic Process

Examination of the frequency with which Kennon made contact with those employed in 215 Frost Hall involved counting the observed interactions. To do this, all data relevant to Kennon's oral work and written work were reviewed. Oral work included: telephone calls (427), unplanned meetings (1137), and "talking over the wall" (226). Planned meetings were not reviewed since they are looked at in greater depth in Question 5.0: (Nature of Planned Meetings). The observed interactions with each person were then totaled. It should be pointed out here that in some of the observed interactions included in the total of observed contacts for each person the content of the contact may have been inaudible for technical or logistical reasons. Written work included: letters and memos that appeared in Kennon's correspondence file.

Question 3.3

Frequency of Contact

In order to mask the identity of the setting, the results of the analysis for frequency of face-to-face contact are reported for professional staff, support staff, student workers, and casual professional staff, rather than for individuals in the setting. Face-to-face contact as revealed through unplanned meetings, telephone calls, and "talking over the wall," is reported by category of
activity (see Question 1.0.1: Kinds of Work: Oral Work: Unplanned Meetings, Telephone Call, and "Talking Over the Wall."). Analysis of face-to-face contact is followed by analysis of written contact.

Unplanned Meetings

Pop-In

Analysis of the unplanned meeting labeled pop-in revealed that Kennon was "popped-in" on 338 times. As Table 40 shows, there were 181 pop-ins by support staff, 145 pop-ins by professional staff 12 pop-ins by student workers, and no pop-ins by casual professional staff. One member of the professional staff accounted for close to 50% of the pop-ins. Kennon's secretary accounted for 28% of the support staff pop-ins.

Further analysis revealed a type of pop-in that was labeled the foiled pop-in. The foiled pop-in occurred when attempts to pop-in on Kennon were foiled either because she was not there, her door was closed (a signal to those in the office that she was not to be disturbed), or she was with someone in the office. During the 96-day observational period there were six instances of the foiled pop-in.

Drop-Bys

Analysis of the unplanned meeting labeled drop-by revealed that Kennon dropped by a person's office or desk space 349 times. As Table 41 shows the majority of these drop-bys were to support staff. It should be pointed out here, however, that close to 60% of these drop-bys were to her secretary.

Corridor

Analysis of the unplanned meeting labeled corridor revealed that Kennon met with a person in one of the corridors of 215 Frost Hall 133 times. As Table 42 shows support staff were slightly more likely to
Table 40

Frequency of Pop-Ins by Those Employed as Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers, and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41

Frequency of Drop-Bys by Those Employed as Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers, and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have contact with Kennon in the corridor than were professional staff. The physical layout of the office contributed to the ease with which support staff could talk to Kennon in the corridors.

**Telephone Calls**

**Making a Telephone Call**

An analysis of the telephone calls made by Kennon revealed that Kennon made 28 telephone calls to people in 215 Frost Hall. As Table 43 shows, the majority of those calls were to professional staff.

**Taking a Telephone Call**

As Table 44 shows, Kennon took 18 calls from people in 215 Frost Hall. The majority of these were from support staff. It should be pointed out here that 16 of the calls Kennon received were to announce that she had an appointment or a call.

**"Talking Over the Wall"**

As Table 45 shows, "talking over the wall" occurred 111 times in 215 Frost Hall. Kennon "talked over the wall" to her secretary 64.9% of those times. Kennon also "talked over the wall" to a support staff member who sat at a desk close to Kennon's office. Further analysis revealed that Kennon initiated the "talking over the wall" 75.7% of the time.

**Written Work**

**Memos**

Analysis of Kennon's correspondence file revealed that she wrote to professional staff more than she did to support staff. Of the 53 memos Kennon wrote during the 96-day observational period, five of them were to the professional staff. Furthermore, these memos were categorized as initiated memos giving information (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Memos).
Table 42

Frequency of Corridor Visits by Those Employed as Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers, and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43

Frequency of Telephone Calls
Made to Those Employed as
Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers,
and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44

Frequency of Telephone Calls
Taken from Those Employed as
Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers,
and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45

Frequency of "Talking Over the Wall" to Support Staff, Professional Staff, Student Workers, and Casual Professional Staff

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Professional Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
The frequency of contact with the people in 215 Frost Hall was examined by analyzing unplanned meetings, telephone calls, "talking over the wall," and memos. Each of these were looked at across professional staff, support staff, student workers, and casual professional staff. Attention is now directed toward Question 3.1.

Question 3.1
Analytic Process
Data for the exploration of the nature of Kennon's contacts were obtained by looking at each of the contacts Kennon had with the people in 215 Frost Hall. To do this each of the categories of activities of oral work were reviewed: pop-ins (338), drop-bys (349), corridor (133), telephone calls (46), and "talking over the wall" (111). Each of the interactions was coded using a B for business, S for social, SB for social/business, GR for greeting, and UKN for unknown. An interaction was coded business if the conversation had to do with the operation of the setting including the health of other people in the setting as it affected the operation of the setting. An interaction was coded social if the conversation had to do with the health, happiness, and general well-being of the person, including the health, happiness, and general well-being of those close to the person such as family. An interaction was coded social/business if the conversation was made up in approximately equal parts of business and social. The results of the analysis are discussed in further detail.

Question 3.1
Personal Relationships
Analysis of the content of the interactions revealed that Kennon's ties with the people in 215 Frost Hall were predominantly
instrumental, that is they arose during the course of performing appointed work roles. Further analysis revealed, however, that there were different levels of instrumental ties. These different levels were determined by comparing the number of contacts that were coded business with those that were coded social and social/business. Some of the ratios, particularly where the ties were thickest, were all business; others were more social. It is to these different levels that attention will now be directed.

All Business Ties

At this level were those people in 215 Frost Hall whose contacts with Kennon were strictly business (the ratio of social and social/business contacts was less than 10%). Into this group fell all of the student workers, half the support staff, and one quarter of the professional staff.

One Quarter Social Ties

At this level were those people in 215 Frost Hall whose contacts with Kennon were nearly all business (the ratio of social and social/business to business was between 20% and 28%). Those with whom Kennon had one quarter social ties included all but one of the professional staff and all but two of the support staff.

One Third Social Ties

At this level were those people in 215 Frost Hall whose contacts with Kennon were at least one third social or social/business (the ratio of social and social/business to business was between 37% and 47%). Those people with whom Kennon had one third social ties were two support staff members and one professional staff member. Despite the similar ratios, the roles that Kennon assumed with them were quite different. Her role with the professional staff member was one of
friend and confidante to her, while her role with the two support members was one of friend and associate, i.e., stories were told and quips were exchanged.

Summary

Question 3.1 explored the personal relationships with those in 215 Frost Hall. Although Kennon's ties with the people in this office were predominantly instrumental, an analysis of the ratios of contacts coded social and social/business contacts to contacts coded business revealed three different levels of instrumental ties: those that were all business, those that were one quarter social, and those that were one third social. Analysis of Kennon's roles within this last group revealed that the role she assumed with a member of the professional staff was different from the role she assumed with support staff. Discussion will now turn to the dimensions of the contact.

Question 3.1.1

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the characteristics of instrumental ties were obtained through further analysis of the interactions coded business, social/business, and social (see Question 3.1: Analytic Process). Attention is now directed toward the characteristics of instrumental ties that emerged: giving and getting feedback, help seeking, assigning tasks, sharing information and ideas, and going to lunch.

Question 3.1.1

Characteristics of Personal Relationships

Giving and Getting Feedback

Analysis of the 977 interactions (unplanned meetings, telephone calls, and "talking over the wall") revealed 59 instances of giving or
getting feedback. Table 46 shows Kennon gave feedback 47 times; Table 47 shows she received feedback 12 times. The tables also show the kinds of feedback given and received. (See Question 3.1.1: Characteristics of Ties: Giving and Getting Feedback for definitions of the different kinds of feedback). As Table 46 reveals the most frequent kind of feedback Kennon gave was appreciation for benefits received (gratefulness). These included statements such as "Appreciate your follow-through on that," or in one case a note to one of the support staff, in other words, more than just a perfunctory "thanks." Her feedback on performance included two formal evaluation meetings, one with support staff and one with a graduate student doing an internship. When Kennon received feedback, seven out of the 12 instances were for Kennon's appearance, comments such as "Oh I love your sweater" or "What a pretty necklace."

Help Seeking

Help seeking took a slightly different guise in this setting than it did in the other settings. Analysis of the 977 interactions between Kennon and those in 215 Frost Hall revealed only two clear instances in which Kennon asked for help and used the word, "I could use your help" or "I need your help." Seeking help from Kennon was more common, and over a range of topics including operations (role as manager), students (role as Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs), special projects (role as Director of Student Affairs), and professional associations (role as professional). Seeking help from Kennon was what one support staff called "going the gamut." An example of "going the gamut" was when one support staff member after discussing a student problem with Kennon, closed her remarks with "that's why I told her she has to come see you."
Table 46

Frequency of Kinds of Feedback Given to Those Employed in 215 Frost Hall

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratefulness</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47

Frequency of Kinds of Feedback Received from Those Employed in 215 Frost Hall

Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratefulness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assigning Tasks

Analysis of the 977 interactions between Kennon and those people in 215 Frost Hall revealed 163 instances of assigning tasks. Assigning tasks was defined in this study as designating someone in the office to do a specific piece of work, generally of short duration. Kennon assigned tasks that concerned operations (role as manager), students (role as Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs), and special projects (role as Director of Student Affairs). Assigning tasks is discussed further in the Question 4.0: Nature of Authority.

Sharing Information and Ideas

Analysis of the 977 interactions between Kennon and members of her staff revealed that there were two with whom Kennon shared the broadest range of information and ideas. Both were members of the professional staff. Figure 68 depicts the range of topics shared with these two professional staff members.

Going to Lunch

Figure 69 shows the people with whom Kennon went to lunch during the 96-day observational period. All of the lunches with members of the staff were unplanned, and as Kennon reported in her journal, included a mixture of business and pleasure. Two professional staff members were the ones with whom Kennon went to lunch most frequently.

Summary

Question 3.1.1 explored the characteristics of Kennon's instrumental ties with the people in the office. Each of the dimensions was discussed: giving and getting feedback, help seeking, assigning tasks, sharing information and ideas, and going to lunch.
1. professional associations, conferences
2. personal matters
3. operation of 215
4. special program
5. participation in special meetings
6. policies
7. mutual acquaintances

1. staff training
2. family relationships
3. operation of 215
4. client cases (6)
5. policies
6. orientations
7. curriculum
8. sports
9. cars
10. special projects

Figure 68
Kinds of Information and Ideas Shared
$N = 8$
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**KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Setting I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Setting IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>casual prof. staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 69**

Going to Lunch with Those in 215 Frost Hall

Data Source: Observations Triangulated with Journal
Discussion will now center on Question 3.1.2, the structural characteristics of relationships.

Question 3.1.2
Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of structural characteristics were obtained by examining the 977 interactions (unplanned meetings, telephone calls, and "talking over the wall"), the semi-planned meetings (8), and the planned meetings (8) to determine under what conditions she made contact with the people in 215 Frost Hall. A ratio of dyad contacts to group contacts was established; if over 75% of the time Kennon and a person were observed in a dyad tie, they were coded as a dyad tie (DT) or if over 75% of the time Kennon and a person were observed in a group tie, they were coded as a group tie (GT). Kennon's journal served as a means of triangulating the observations. Attention is now directed toward a discussion of the structural characteristics of Kennon's ties with those in 215 Frost Hall.

Question 3.1.2
Structural Characteristics of Personal Relationships

Analysis of the interactions with those in 215 Frost Hall revealed only one person with whom Kennon's contacts were predominantly within a group situation. The person was a graduate student doing an internship during one of the quarters Kennon was being observed. Further analysis revealed that Kennon had predominantly dyad ties with all members of the support staff. While Kennon also had predominantly dyad ties with professional staff, the ratio of dyad contacts to group contacts was much higher (18% to 25% range compared to 2% to 4% range). The higher range of group contacts
is attributed to staff meetings and other planned meetings in which Kennon met with only the professional staff.

Summary

Question 3.1.2 examined the structural characteristics of the personal relationships that Kennon had with those in 215 Frost Hall. With the exception of one person, the predominate tie was the dyad. Further analysis within the dyad tie revealed differences in the ratio of dyad contacts to group contacts between professional and support staff.

This section of Question 3.0 examined the personal relationships Kennon had with those employed in 215 Frost Hall. The density of the contact between Kennon and the staff in 215 Frost Hall coupled with the authority relationships warranted the separate discussion. Question 3.2 looked at the roles of those in the office. Question 3.3 examined the frequency of the contact between Kennon and the staff. Question 3.1 examined the nature of the contacts with the people in this setting.

Further analysis of the contacts revealed that while Kennon's ties were predominantly instrumental, there were different levels within those ties. Question 3.1.1 examined the characteristics of those ties, specifically help seeking, giving and getting feedback, assigning tasks, sharing information and ideas, and going to lunch. Finally, Question 3.1.2 examined the structural characteristics of Kennon's ties with those in 215 Frost Hall. Discussion will now center on authority.
is attributed to staff meetings and other planned meetings in which Kennon met with only the professional staff.

Summary

Question 3.1.2 examined the structural characteristics of the personal relationships that Kennon had with those in 215 Frost Hall. With the exception of one person, the predominate tie was the dyad. Further analysis within the dyad tie revealed differences in the ratio of dyad contacts to group contacts between professional and support staff.

This section of Question 3.0 examined the personal relationships Kennon had with those employed in 215 Frost Hall. The density of the contact between Kennon and the staff in 215 Frost Hall coupled with the authority relationships warranted the separate discussion. Question 3.2 looked at the roles of those in the office. Question 3.3 examined the frequency of the contact between Kennon and the staff. Question 3.1 examined the nature of the contacts with the people in this setting.

Further analysis of the contacts revealed that while Kennon's ties were predominantly instrumental, there were different levels within those ties. Question 3.1.1 examined the characteristics of those ties, specifically help seeking, giving and getting feedback, assigning tasks, sharing information and ideas, and going to lunch. Finally, Question 3.1.2 examined the structural characteristics of Kennon's ties with those in 215 Frost Hall. Discussion will now center on authority.
RESEARCH QUESTION 4.0: KINDS OF AUTHORITY

This section focuses on a very specific kind of relationship, the authority relationship. The question in this section examines the nature of Kennon's authority. The general question guiding the analysis is:

4.0 What is the nature of the authority the woman administrator has? The major question was divided into one subquestion:

4.1 What kinds of authority does the woman administrator have?

This question was the original question identified at the onset of the study. Question 4.1 was derived from research on women's authority in the work setting. Research suggests that women in higher education administration when denied formal authority attempt to substitute other types of authority for what is lacking at the formal level (Lafontaine and McKenzie, 1985). Research also suggests that women seek authority through informal channels such as having a mentor who can authorize the issue of communications, demonstrating expertise, and using personal charm, such as likability, charm, and feminine wiles (Johnson, 1976; Colwill, 1982). Although Lafontaine, McKenzie, and others see demonstrating expertise, for example, as exercising informal authority, contributors to the study of authority relations in organizations such as Weber, Urwick, Simon, and Bennis, see expertise as one of the premises on which subordinates accept authority. They would broaden the meaning of authority to include additional bases beyond formal position and the sanctions inherent in office, most notably, professional competence, experience, and human
relations skills (Peabody, 1962). Authority of competence and of person are labeled functional bases of authority that in many cases facilitate the acceptance of formal authority. The density of contacts and the nature of the authority relationship between Kennon and those employed in 215 Frost Hall warranted separate treatment of that setting. Discussion will begin with Setting I (215 Frost Hall) where evidence of the kinds of authority Kennon had is the thickest. Discussion of Settings II (college), III (university), and IV (outside the university) follows.

Question 4.1

Analytic Process For Setting I: 215 Frost Hall

Data for the exploration of kinds of authority was obtained through a multi-step process of macroanalysis of the 3595 pages of field notes accumulated during the 96-day observational period, a content analysis of Kennon's 255-page journal, a content analysis of interviews with Kennon concerning certain aspects of her activities, a content analysis of 317 message slips, and a content analysis of 138 memos, letters, and forms. (A detailed description of the specific steps used in the multi-step analytic process was presented in Chapter III).

To briefly review the steps, first 3595 pages of field notes were read and their contents catalogued using the Erickson, Guzman, and Carrasco (1980) scheme. Once the contents were catalogued, a search was begun through the interactions that Kennon had with those employed in 215 Frost Hall. The interactions included semi-planned (8), and unplanned meetings (820), telephone calls (46), and "talking over the wall" (111) to discover the kinds of authority. Planned meetings are analyzed separately in the next section, Question 5.0: (Nature of
Participation in Planned Meetings). Kennon's correspondence (138) and message slips (317) as well as her 255-page journal were used as means of triangulating the observations. Since the literature base on authority relations in organizations is very specific about the definition of the term and its components, pre-determined categories were used, and the field notes were searched for evidence of that kind of authority by using the semantic relationships: "X is a result of legitimate authority", "X is a result of authority of position, "X is a result of authority of competence", "X is a result of authority of person".

This particular semantic relationship was used for two reasons. First, authority is a dynamic reciprocal relationship in which the actions of the followers play a critical role in defining the authority of leaders (Presthus, 1962). Using this particular semantic relationship captured the perceptions of those employed in 215 Frost Hall toward the authority relationship. Second, in her formal position as Secretary to the College, Kennon had certain powers that were within her authority. Using the semantic relationship, "X is a result of authority of position" enabled those powers that she exercised to be captured. Table 48, adapted from Peabody (1962), shows the pre-determined organizers and some of the different words contributors to the study of authority of relations in organizations have used to describe each of the bases of authority. Attention will now be directed toward a discussion of the kinds of authority, both as the authority relationship was perceived by others and as Kennon was observed to exercise it in the office. Discussion will begin with authority of position in 215 Frost Hall.
## Table 48
The Bases of Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Authority</th>
<th>Functional Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber*</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Rational authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>order</td>
<td>authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>office</td>
<td>knowledge, experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urwick**</td>
<td>Formal,</td>
<td>Technical, implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conferred</td>
<td>in special knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the</td>
<td>of skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon+</td>
<td>Authority of</td>
<td>Authority of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legitimacy,</td>
<td>sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social</td>
<td>(technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approval</td>
<td>competence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis++</td>
<td>Role incumbency</td>
<td>Knowledge of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presthus#</td>
<td>Generalized</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deference</td>
<td>role or position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Authority of Position

Authority of position which Presthus (1962) described as authority by virtue of one's position or role is examined from two perspectives. The first looks at what powers Kennon exercised in her position during the 96-day observational period, and the second examines the nature of the authority relationship as revealed through interactions with those in the setting.

Power Within the Position

Simon (1957) extends Presthus' description of authority of position to include the "most important sanctions of managers over worker" which are a) power to hire and fire; b) power to promote and demote; and c) incentive rewards. Attention will be directed toward the first two powers as Kennon experienced them. It will be followed by a discussion of other powers including some which encompassed Simon's third sanction, incentive rewards, and additional discrete powers which emerged from the analysis of the data.

Power to Hire and Fire

During the 96-day observational period there was one instance of hiring or attempting to hire. A support staff member left, leaving a vacancy. To fill the vacancy Kennon worked with the office manager. Kennon completed a form that was required by the university to fill a vacant position (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Forms), wrote a job description to accompany the request (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Descriptions), and submitted it to the college business office. From the college business office it went to the personnel office of Harrington University. Some problems arose in the personnel office over the classification of the position. Kennon worked with an administrator in the college and a member of her
professional staff to resolve the problem. Once the personnel office approved the classification of the position, applicants' names for the position were sent to the office manager. Interviews of candidates followed (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Oral Work: Planned Meetings: Interviews). The interview procedure, as Kennon explained during a casual conversation, began with the office manager interviewing the candidate. Following her interview, the candidate was introduced to Kennon, and Kennon interviewed the candidate. At the conclusion of the interview, Kennon conferred with the office manager about the candidate, and decisions about hiring were made at that time. At the conclusion of the 96-day observational period a person was hired for the position.

Power to Promote and Demote

During the 96-day observational period there were two instances of promoting or attempting to promote. The position that was vacated (see power to hire and fire) was promptly filled by a member of the support staff, thereby leaving that position vacant. Kennon attempted to fill that position with a member of the support staff, which would have been a promotion.

The other instance involved a member of the professional staff whose position was to be reclassified. Kennon worked with an administrator in the college to write a description to submit to the personnel office. An administrator from that office conferred with Kennon about the description of the position. Kennon, who had discussed it with the dean, remarked to the administrator that "it would have to go back to the dean."
Other Powers

As stated earlier, Kennon had other powers that emerged through analysis of the data. These other powers included power to evaluate the performance of workers, power to distribute resources, power to set policy, and power to distribute assignments. The discussion will begin with power to evaluate the performance of worker.

Power to Evaluate the Performance of Workers

During the 96-day observational period, Kennon met with three of her support staff to formally evaluate them. For a formal evaluation an appointment was scheduled and Kennon reviewed the results of her written evaluation on a university form (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Forms).

Power to Distribute Resources

Although the dean controlled the overall budget, Kennon controlled the budget for her operation (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds for Work: Written Work: Data). Kennon controlled such things as supply purchases. Major equipment purchases, such as copiers, computers, typewriters, furniture were handled through another administrator in the college.

Kennon also had the power to deploy human resources within the office. This was accomplished through the more formal channels of promotion (see above), acting on vacation request forms, absence from duty forms, and travel request forms, and through the more informal channels accomplished by doing the "walk through." (see Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles: Manager).

Power to Set Policy

Kennon had the power to set policy within her operation. During the 96-day observational period, Kennon set one policy that concerned
student appointments. The policy was written down in a memo and sent to all members of her operation (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Memos).

While the above-mentioned policy was written and formal, there were other policies that were unwritten, and guided the behavior of the staff. These are discussed briefly.

Keeping the Office Well-Staffed and Trained

This category included the more informal kinds of things related to staffing such as seeking permission from Kennon to attend meetings. This unwritten policy was reinforced at staff meetings by Kennon. Kennon's "walk-throughs" were also a means of determining how well staffed the office was at any given time.

Training was discussed in several meetings of the professional staff and included such topics as telephone training, computer screen training, and a three day professional development workshop. The orientation of the training discussions was toward making sure that "everyone was prepared to help each other."

Keeping the Setting Presentable

This category included those instances in which Kennon cued others as to what needed to be done to keep the office presentable. On one occasion a support staff member remarked to Kennon that she had cleaned around her desk because she knew what Kennon would say if she did not. This was also reinforced at staff meetings with remarks to the effect that "we really oughta take those boxes out of that office."

Taking Care of Clients

This category included those instances in which Kennon made known her wishes to have clients taken care of promptly. Remarks to members
of the professional staff, such as "so-and-so is out there to see you," or "it's backed up out there" were such examples. This usually occurred if Kennon was "working the front desk" or if she was doing a "walk through" (see Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles: Manager).

Power to Make Assignments

Analysis of the 977 interactions that occurred between Kennon and her staff revealed 163 instances in which Kennon made an assignment. The corollary to Kennon's making the assignment was that the staff members accepted it, and it was in this way that Kennon's authority was recognized. Further analysis of this category revealed that the assignments concerned special projects, operation of 215 Frost Hall, client cases, and information of both a general and technical nature.

Related to this were the conditions under which Kennon was given an assignment. Analysis of the 977 interactions revealed two conditions under which Kennon was given an assignment. The first condition was when Kennon volunteered. A search through the 977 interactions revealed 21 of this type: "Oh I'll look into that," or "I'll follow-up on that." "Doing late duty" and "doing phone duty" were examples of the second and more formal condition under which Kennon was given an assignment. In both examples, a member of the professional staff assigned Kennon dates for the duty and then checked with her first before any of the other professional staff members to make sure Kennon's plans permitted it.

Kennon was given some assignments because of her position as manager, Secretary to the College, or Director of Student Affairs. There was one time, however, when it was assumed by a staff member that Kennon would follow-up: "Oh she thought you'd (Kennon) do it since she's not here today." Kennon added quickly, "Well I hope she
left me a note to that effect." This follow-up comment re-established Kennon's authority relationship.

Making assignments also included attendance at staff meetings. During the 96-day observational period there were 10 staff meetings. Kennon announced staff meetings through memos (see Question: 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written: Memo) in which the expectation was that members would attend.

Nature of the Authority Relationship

"Going the Gamut"

That members of the staff recognized Kennon's authority of position was revealed through several statements they made. One support staff member referred to it as "going the gamut." These included all those instances in which members of the office staff went to Kennon for decisions and judgments. Statements by staff, such as: "thought you could do that;" or "that's why I came to you;" or "that's why I told her she had to see you," were evidence of the authority relationship.

Summary

This section examined the base of authority labeled authority of position. Analysis of data revealed both specific and general instances of such authority. The specific instances, as spelled out by Simon (1957) included: power to hire and fire and power to promote and demote. Other specific instances emerged from the data and included: power to evaluate performance of workers; power to distribute resources; power to set policy; power to make assignments. Staff members perceptions of the authority relationship were revealed in the category "going the gamut". A discussion of authority of competence follows.
Authority of Competence

Presthus (1962) defined authority of competence as technical expertise. Also included in this base of authority is experience: familiarity with certain operations gained from day-to-day confrontation. Instances in this category included those in which Kennon was consulted more than asked to render a decision, since the latter was included in authority of position. Analysis of the interactions with those on Kennon's staff revealed 38 instances in which Kennon was clearly consulted about a situation. The range of situations included clients, procedures, operation, and policies.

Also included in this category were instances in which Kennon was given feedback about her performance or an idea. During the 96-day observational period Kennon received feedback 12 times from members of the office staff (see Question 3.0: Nature of Personal Relationships). As Table 47 shows she received feedback on her ideas 4 times; all but one of these was from professional staff. She did not receive feedback on her performance.

Authority of Person

Presthus (1962) defined this authority of person as rapport with subordinates. Evidence for this kind of authority is drawn from previous discussions in Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: "Social" Work; Question 2.1: Kinds of Roles: Friend; and Question 3.1.1: Nature of Personal Relationships. As Question 1.1.1 revealed, "Social" Work included giving gifts to staff on special occasions, providing "goodies" both at office parties and on other occasions, and sending notes and cards to people (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: Written Work: Cards). Halpin (1966) refers to this dimension as consideration, more specifically, "doing little things to make it
pleasant to be a member of the staff." As Question 2.1 revealed in her role as associate (a secondary role to friend) Kennon shared stories, exchanged quips, and inquired about the health and general well-being of staff members and their families. Finally, Question 3.1.1 examined the giving of feedback. As Table 46 showed, Kennon gave feedback 47 times to those in 215 Frost Hall. Six of those were directed to a person's appearance, such as "That's a really pretty color on you." The other type of feedback was for benefits received (gratefulness-25), which included such statements as "Appreciate your follow-up on that"; in other words, the feedback was more than a perfunctory "thank you."

Authority of Legitimacy

Presthus (1962) described authority of legitimacy as general deference to authority. Included in this base of authority are the stimuli that validate authority among them: titles and the use of them, accessibility, secretarial buffers, and degree of supervision (Presthus, 1962). Some of these are discussed briefly:

Accessibility

Kennon's accessibility to those on the staff is revealed by the number of pop-ins (463) that she had during the 96-day observational period. Kennon stated in an interview, that an "office walk through" also let people know that she was accessible, and people in 215 Frost Hall often used that time to ask her a quick question. The door signaled whether her not Kennon was accessible. In an early interview with her, Kennon said: "But I think they basically know that if the door is open, um they're free to come and go. The signal is when it's closed, don't interrupt unless it's an emergency...but I try to if I'm at my desk doing things here that really are interruptable to leave it
open." Sometimes the closed door resulted in a foiled pop-in (see Question 3.0: Nature of Personal Relationships).

**Titles**

Kennon was called by her first name by members of the staff, when they spoke to her directly. In an early interview, she remarked that "most of them are pretty good at calling me Dr. in front of the students, or when introducing me to a student or um the general public."

**Secretarial Buffers**

Kennon had a secretary, who, according to Kennon, "protects me from the outside world pretty much or helps sort out do people really need to see me or go somewhere else." Analysis of the data revealed 11 instances in which her secretary "buffered" Kennon by making appointments for them. On two occasions Kennon had to drop-by the secretary's desk to soothe a student who wanted to see Kennon immediately.

Her secretary also buffered members of the staff from seeing Kennon if her door was closed. As Kennon explained in an early interview, "She has a little system with me on her spindle, that she'll have a little note on there that says so-and-so needs to see you for a few minutes um so-and-so needs you before her next person."

**Telephone Calls and "Talking Over the Wall"**

Triangulation with findings from Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work: Oral) and Question 3.0 (Nature of Personal Relationships) provided further insight into this aspect of authority. Kennon seldom received calls from members of the office staff unless they were to announce an appointment. Kennon also initiated "talking over the wall" 75.5% of the time.
Summary

This section of Question 4.1: Kinds of Authority, examined the authority relationships within 215 Frost Hall using pre-determined organizers drawn from the literature on authority in the work setting. Four bases of authority were examined: authority of position, authority of competence, authority of person, and authority of legitimacy. By using the semantic relationship "X is a result of competence", for example, a search through the 3595 pages of field notes led to the identification of instances in which that type of authority was observed. Attention will now be directed toward the other three Settings, and how these bases of authority were observed.

Question 4.1

Analytic Process

The analytic process for settings II (college), III (university), and IV (outside the university) was the same as that outlined in the analytic process for Setting I (215 Frost Hall) except that the interactions that were used were those that occurred between Kennon and those people in the college, the university, and outside the university. The interactions included planned (68), semi-planned (2), and unplanned meetings (127), telephone calls (372), and "talking over the wall" (17). Kennon's correspondence (138) and message slips (317), as well as her 255-page journal were used as a means of triangulating the observations. As described in the analytic process for Setting I (215 Frost Hall), the literature on authority relations in organizations was used to guide the analysis. The field notes were searched for evidence of authority by using the semantic relationships: "X is a result of legitimate authority," "X is a result of authority of position," and "X is a result of authority of
competence." Authority of person is not included as a part of the analysis since Presthus (1962) refers to its applicability only in the superior-subordinate relationship. Once all of the semantic relationships were completed, taxonomic analyses were done to identify parts of the particular kind of authority under analysis. Attention will now be directed toward what was discovered as a result of the analysis according to setting, beginning with Setting II, the college. Table 49 shows the different kinds of authority, whether or not they were observed, and the ways in which they were observed.

**Setting II**

**Authority of Position**

Authority of position is examined from two perspectives. The first looks at what powers Kennon was observed to exercise in her position during the 96-day observational period, and the second examines the nature of the authority relationship as revealed through interactions with those in Setting II (college).

**Power Within the Position**

Kennon did not have the power to hire and fire, promote and demote, give incentive rewards, or any of the other powers described Setting I (215 Frost Hall). Kennon was called upon to make recommendations about tenure and promotion for faculty and was also called upon to interview and make recommendations about candidates for administrative positions in the college. Early in the observations, Kennon was called upon to meet with a perspective faculty member in the college.

Kennon did have power to make decisions on academic matters related to students. Further analysis revealed two conditions under which Kennon made decisions on academic matters. In one condition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority of Position:</th>
<th>Setting I</th>
<th>Setting II</th>
<th>Setting III</th>
<th>Setting IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>power to hire</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>(interview) recommends administrative and faculty appointments</td>
<td>observed (interview) recommends for tenure and promotion</td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to fire</td>
<td>did not observe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to promote</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>(interview) recommends for tenure and promotion</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to demote</td>
<td>did not observe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to evaluate</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of workers</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to distribute</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to set policy</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to make assignments</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observed: &quot;agent&quot; of faculty and position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to make decisions on academic matters related to students</td>
<td>observed: (policies, procedures, clients, operation)</td>
<td>observed: (clients, policies &amp; procedures as they related to clients; professional affiliations)</td>
<td>observed: (clients, policies &amp; procedures as they related to clients; professional affiliations)</td>
<td>observed: (clients, policies &amp; procedures as they related to clients; professional affiliations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of Competence</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of Person</td>
<td>Halpin (1966)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of Legitimacy</td>
<td>observed: accessible through pop-in appt. personal identity except in front of students</td>
<td>observed: accessible through telephone, stop-in appointment letter</td>
<td>observed: accessible through telephone, stop-in appointment letter</td>
<td>observed: accessible through telephone, stop-in appointment letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observed: personal identity/ social identity</td>
<td>observed: personal identity/ social identity</td>
<td>observed: personal identity/ social identity</td>
<td>observed: personal identity/ social identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kennon acted as an "agent" of the faculty, as she described it in an interview, and in the other condition she acted as Secretary to the College. Examples of the former were found in Kennon's correspondence file and included actions to admit students to the college, to make curricular modifications to academic programs, and to alter the student records (e.g., grade changes). Another example of the latter included actions to verify normal progress of special populations such as athletes.

**Nature of the Authority Relationship**

Kennon's relationship to faculty as their "agent" in academic matters concerning students was revealed through her seeking help from them (see Question 3.0: Nature of Personal Relationships). A review of the interactions with those whom Kennon had asked for help revealed that six of them were situations in which Kennon was serving as an "agent," that is to say she did not have the authority to make a decision on an academic matter without first consulting a member of the faculty.

**Authority of Competence**

Presthus (1962) described authority of competence as consisting of both technical expertise and professional attitudes. Kennon's expertise or specialized knowledge was related to students (by professional training) and to policies and procedures as they related to academic matters and students.

Triangulation with findings from Question 3.0., indicated that faculty and administrators from Setting II (college) sought Kennon's specialized knowledge, specifically through those patterns identified as consultation and problem-solving. Statements from faculty such as "I told her to see you" or "I'll do whatever you suggest" were
indicative of this base of authority. Sometimes Kennon was called
upon for advice that was not within the range of her authority, and on
those occasions she had to consult with an administrator, a colleague
with whom she shared information related to academic matters, or had
to refer the person to that administrator. In the former cases when
reporting back to the person, Kennon prefaced her remark with "so-and-
so and I discussed it and...."

Triangulation with findings from Question 3.0, provided further
insight into ways in which this base of authority was legitimized. As
Table 35 shows, Kennon received feedback on her ideas, person, and
performance, and that those from whom she received feedback (Figure
60) most frequently were faculty and administrators from this setting.

Triangulation with findings from Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles)
revealed that with Kennon's expertise in the profession she was called
upon to lecture to classes. As Table 23 shows, Kennon was called upon
eight times (0.5% of the total) in her professional role in Setting II
(college). Because of her special knowledge on students and policies
and procedures related to academic matters she was also called upon to
serve as chairperson of a college committee.

Authority of Legitimacy

Accessibility to Kennon by people in Setting II (college) was
revealed through the number of stop-ins that were observed during the
96 days. Kennon had 89 stop-ins from faculty and administrators in
the college.

A look at her calendar of activities for the same time period
revealed that three appointments were made by administrators from the
college to see her (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work) Students also
made appointments to see Kennon. A review of Kennon's calendar of
activities during the 96-day observational period revealed that Kennon had appointments with 89 students. There were three times during the observations when a student stopped in to see Kennon without an appointment.

Triangulation with findings in Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work) indicated that Kennon seldom used her social identity (i.e., her title) when talking to administrators, faculty, or support staff in this setting.

**Summary**

Analysis of the authority relationship in Setting II (college) revealed that although Kennon had power to make decisions on academic matters related to students, the power was most frequently as an "agent" of the faculty. Help seeking, feedback, and roles were discussed as elements of this base of authority. Finally authority of legitimization was examined through Kennon's accessibility to faculty and administrators and use of her social identity in talking to faculty, administrators, and support staff. Attention is now directed toward Setting III (University).

**Setting III**

**Authority of Position**

In Setting III (university) Kennon's power to make decisions on academic matters effecting university students was as an "agent" of the faculty in Setting II (college). Kennon was given the authority by the faculty to evaluate transfer credit. The credit she could evaluate was restricted to general college courses rather than specific departmental offerings. The nature of this "agent" relationship with faculty in the college was reflected in patterns of
help seeking. In two cases Kennon had to request faculty to make decisions about students' course work.

Triangulation with findings from Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work: Written) provided further insight into this base of authority. Kennon's signature was required on numerous forms within the university in order for them to be processed. These included both forms related to equipment, and supplies, and people, specifically students and staff.

**Authority of Competence**

Triangulation with findings from Question 3.0 (Nature of Personal Relationships) indicated that administrators and one faculty member from Setting III (University) sought Kennon's specialized knowledge on students, but more frequently on policies and procedures of the college and its operation as they related to students. These requests for Kennon's help were revealed through patterns identified as consultation and problem-solving.

Triangulation with findings from Question 3.0 provided further insight into ways in which this base of authority was legitimized. As Table 35 showed, Kennon received feedback for ideas and performance, although it seldom occurred in Setting III (university). At one meeting, composed of six administrators, Kennon put forth an idea. The chairperson of the committee repeated Kennon's idea at three different times during the meeting, each time looking at Kennon. As discussion ensued, two other members of the committee picked up the idea. At the conclusion of the meeting, the chairperson remarked to Kennon, "I hadn't thought about that idea, let me give it some thought."
Her specialized knowledge was called upon to serve as a member of a university committee (see above) and as a chairperson of a university committee.

**Authority of Legitimacy**

Accessibility to Kennon from people in Setting III (university) was seldom through a stop-in. During the 96-day observational period only 2 of the 89 stop-ins were from people from this setting. People from this setting either made appointments (as in the case of students) or called. On one occasion employees of a university office came to the college for a special staff meeting which they had requested. A representative from that office had called Kennon to see if it was possible to arrange such a meeting.

Triangulation with findings from Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work), indicated that Kennon seldom used her social identity when talking to administrators and faculty. She sometimes used it with support staff if she left a message.

**Summary**

Analysis of authority relationships in Setting III (university) revealed that although Kennon had power to make decisions on academic matters related to students, it was often as an "agent" of the faculty in the college. Help seeking, receiving feedback, and role relations were examined for their relationship with this base of authority. Accessibility and use of social identity as aspects of general deference were examined.

**Setting IV**

**Authority of Position**

In Setting IV (outside the university) some of Kennon's power to make decisions regarding academic matters was as an "agent" of the
dean. As Kennon stated in an interview: "the xxx will accept from Harrington University two signatures on any piece of any information that they want official - the dean's and mine." In some cases Kennon had to seek help from faculty if she was unable to verify the description of a course. Her signature, however, had to be on the form so that "the xxx is satisfied that it's my signature or the dean's...what that does is if there's any question about the course description I should have raised the question with the faculty member and resolved it...they can have some sense that it's been looked into and that's acceptable." Triangulation with findings from Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work) indicated that these decisions concerned academic matters related to the verification of courses and transcripts for non-university students and for agencies.

Triangulation with findings from Question 1.1.1 (Kinds of Work) revealed that the response to request letters Kennon wrote to other administrators in state agencies and students regarding policies and procedures of the college were a function of this authority.

Authority of Competence

Kennon's experience in her professional field was called upon by members of a national professional association to which Kennon belonged. At the time of the observations, she was asked to serve as a committee chairperson. Examination of Kennon's correspondence file revealed that she wrote to those on the committee and outlined the committee's charge.

Authority of Legitimacy

Similar to Setting III (university), Kennon's accessibility to those in Setting IV (outside the university) was seldom through an informal stop in, but rather through more formal means, such as
telephone calls or appointments. Unlike the other settings, accessibility to Kennon was predominantly through letters that requested information. The responses to these requests were formal (written in letter as opposed to memo form) and signed using both her personal and social identity (Goffman, 1971).

**Summary**

Analysis of authority relationships in Setting IV (outside the university) revealed that the power to make decisions on verification of courses and transcripts was as an "agent" of the dean. In those instances in which she was not called upon to make a decision, but to provide information to students and agencies, authority by virtue of her position prevailed. Authority of competence as revealed through her affiliation with a professional association and authority of legitimacy as revealed through, her accessibility were also examined.

This section explored the authority relationships for the four settings using pre-determined organizers from the literature on authority in the work setting. Position as a basis of authority was most strongly realized in Setting I (215 Frost Hall) since she had the power to hire, promote, evaluate performance of workers, distribute resources, set policy, and make assignments. Some of these powers, such as those pertaining to personnel and resources, were limited given the policies and the procedures of the university and Kennon's position in the hierarchy. As other settings were examined, Kennon's power to make such decisions was limited to making recommendations. Kennon's power to make decisions on academic matters related to students, a function of her position, was limited in that she was acting as an "agent" of the faculty or as an "agent" of the dean.
Competence, as a basis of authority, was a predominant factor in Kennon's relationships with faculty and administrators in three settings, less so in Setting IV (outside the university), where the authority relationships relied on formal title and position, because her experiences and specialized knowledge were largely unknown, except to those affiliated with the professional association to which she belonged.

Authority of legitimacy was examined by looking at mechanisms within Kennon's work setting (including titles, secretarial buffers, and accessibility) that validated her authority to others. Authority of person was examined only within Setting I (215 Frost Hall) since Presthus (1962) maintains that its applicability can only be examined in the superior-subordinate relationship.

Attention is now directed toward Question 5.0: Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings.
RESEARCH QUESTION 5.0: NATURE OF PARTICIPATION IN PLANNED MEETINGS

The question in this section examines the nature of Kennon's and selected members' participation in six planned meetings during the 96 days of observation. The general question guiding the analysis in this section is:

5.0 What is the nature of the woman administrator's participation in planned meetings?

The major question was divided into three subquestions:

5.1 What are the roles that the woman administrator plays in meetings?

5.2 What is the organizational structure of six planned meetings?

5.3 What are the ranges of talk by the woman administrator and by selected members in the six planned meetings?

5.4 What are the patterns of participation within six planned meetings?

The questions are interrelated. None of the questions stated here were part of the original study. The questions were derived from interactions with the data. The reason for including a research question on Kennon's participation in meetings was twofold. The primary reason was that planned meetings were a signification part of Kennon's life as an administrator (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds for Work), and to ignore her experiences, as revealed through her participation, in planned meetings was to ignore obtaining a picture
of the "whole" of her life (Green and Weade, in press). The second reason for focusing in-depth on Kennon's and selected members' participation in planned meetings is the role that committees play in the governance of universities and the colleges within them (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley, 1978; Keller, 1983). Research also suggests that women's contributions in groups, particularly when they are in a numerical minority (Kanter, 1978; Finnigan, 1979) is inhibited. Attention is now directed toward Question 5.1: What are the roles the woman administrator plays in planned meetings? The issue of planned meetings is revisited in Question 5.1 in order to locate their general occurrence in Kennon's experiences in the work setting. Subsequent questions further refine the information as they focus on six planned meetings in which Kennon participated, and were illustrative of the different roles she played in meetings.

Question 5.1

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the roles that Kennon played in meetings were obtained by examining the planned meetings that Kennon attended. For the purposes of this analysis only those meetings that were previously defined as a pre-arranged convening with one or more people arranged by one of the parties or a third party to share information or to perform a task (including luncheon meetings) were examined. Kennon was scheduled to attend 100 of these meetings during the 96-day observational period. Also for the purposes of this analysis only those meetings in which Kennon was observed (48) were included. These meetings included both non-repeated and repeated types, and of the repeated types, both continuous and finite. A domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) was conducted using "meeting" as the
cover term, and the semantic relationship, "X is a kind of meeting" (Spradley, 1980). A second domain analysis was done to determine the kinds of roles Kennon played within the kinds of meeting. Further taxonomic analysis was done to discover additional levels within the kinds of meetings and their relationship to Kennon's roles within them. The findings of these analyses are described below.

Question 5.1

Roles within Planned Meetings

Analysis of the 48 observed planned meetings led to the identification of two categories: those meetings that were initiated by Kennon and those meetings that were initiated by others. Discussion begins with the former.

Meetings Initiated by Kennon

Kennon either chaired or participated as a recorder in those meetings which she initiated. As Figure 70 shows, these meetings all occurred in the college. In those meetings that she chaired (9), those who were involved included: alumni, contract or service vendors, support staff, and professional staff. The latter two were people from within 215 Frost Hall, and were subordinate to her in position. In the one meeting in which she participated as recorder, those who attended included: faculty, alumni, and administrators. The latter, in this case, were administrators both subordinate to her and superior to her in position.

Meetings Initiated by Others

Kennon either chaired or participated as a member in planned meetings that were initiated by others. As Figure 71 shows, these meetings occurred in the college and in the university. The meetings in which she participated that occurred in the university (10)
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involved administrators at various levels in the university hierarchy. The meetings in which she participated that occurred in the college involved faculty, professional staff, and administrators. The latter included administrators both subordinate to her and superior to her in position.

At the university Kennon led one committee. At the time of the observations, Kennon was completing her term as chairperson. As chairperson, she and the committee were engaged in interviewing candidates for a position within an administrative unit in the university. The interviews were arranged by the unit. Members, both faculty and administrators, attended as their schedules permitted. In the college, Kennon led one committee. This committee, composed of faculty, was charged with the task of reviewing recruitment and admissions plans in the college. This particular committee is examined in further depth in Question 5.2.

**Summary**

This question looked at the roles Kennon played in the 48 planned meetings that were observed. Although Kennon led 9 of the 10 meetings she initiated, the meetings were all with people subordinate to her. During the observational period, there was no evidence of Kennon convening superiors. As will be shown in the findings to subsequent questions, since Kennon did not convene superiors she worked within convened meetings initiated by others to "get business done." As findings to previous questions have shown, Kennon also used the informal meeting (Hall Visits and Stop-Ins) to "get business done." Attention is now directed toward a discussion of the organizational structure of six planned meetings.
Question 5.2

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the organizational structure of meetings were obtained via a multi-step process of microanalysis and macroanalysis of six planned meetings. (A detailed description of the specific steps used in this multi-step analytic process was presented in Chapter III.) To review briefly, first a domain analysis (Spradley, 1980) was done. The field notes from each of the six meetings were read using the cover term "meeting," and the semantic relationship "X is a stage in a meeting." This step was followed by a taxonomic analysis that identified the phases within meetings. This step was accompanied by a microanalysis of the unfolding conversation as it occurred in the six meetings. To conduct the microanalysis of the six meetings, the sociolinguistic approach to discourse analysis developed by Green and her colleagues (Green, 1977; Green and Harker, 1982; Green and Wallat, 1981) was used. The analysis resulted in a structural map of the unfolding conversation. The structural map for each of the six meetings was reviewed for changes in context. Examination of changes in context was accompanied by examination of the verbal cues that signaled changes to group. These were looked at across all six meetings, using the test case analysis model (Green and Harker, 1982) to determine if the observed stages coincided with verbal signals. The analyses resulted in a stable organizational structure of meetings that was then checked against six other meetings of the same type for similarities and differences. The findings from the analysis are discussed in question 5.2. A description of the six planned meetings, including their composition, Kennon's role in them,
their purpose, and chronology (if known) are found at the conclusion of this section.

**Question 5.2**

**Organizational Structure of Six Planned Meetings**

The macroanalysis of the six planned meetings led to the identification of a three-part organizational structure to a meeting. Figure 72 illustrates this structure. As indicated each meeting contained:

- a) Pre-Meeting Part
- b) General Meeting Part
- c) Post-Meeting Part

Within each of these major parts, there were stable subpatterns in meeting organizational structure that occurred in each of the six meetings. These subpatterns, like the macro pattern, were extracted in each meeting. Findings, regarding each macro part, and its subpatterns, are presented separately.

**Pre-Meeting Part to Meeting**

The Pre-Meeting Part to Meeting always consisted of three phases (see Figure 72). One phase that was stable across all meetings was the "Entering the Room" phase.

The "Entering the Room" phase in any of the meetings, consisted of the participants entering the room from the hallway. This phase was marked by participants coming in the room at various times prior to the start of the meeting (and shortly after the meeting started), finding a seat, and sitting down. Participants used this time to get refreshments or cookies (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: "Social" Work). When refreshments and cookies were not part of the meeting, participants brought their own refreshment. Participants used this
Figure 72
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time to organize their personal effects, including coats, hats, briefcases. The "Entering the Room" phase was followed by the "General Talking" phase which is described next.

The "General Talking" phase, the second phase in any of the meetings, consisted of participants talking among themselves. Conversations during this phase took several forms. Analysis of the conversations that were audiorecorded revealed three basic kinds of conversations: "getting business done," sharing anecdotes and stories, and greetings. Each of these is described below.

"Getting Business Done"

"Getting Business Done" included those conversations in which a participant discussed a problem or situation, not related to the purpose of the meeting. Kennon referred to this as "politicking."

Sharing Anecdotes and Stories

Sharing anecdotes and stories included those conversations in which participants shared student cases, discussed their current activities, or shared stories about themselves or others.

Greetings

Greetings included any verbal salutations, embracing, handshaking, or other bodily contact that was not immediately followed by what Goffman termed a "spate of joint activity," that went beyond "Hi. How are ya? Fine. How are you?"

The "Signaling to Start" phase was also always part of the Pre-Meeting. It was marked by a nonverbal or verbal cue by the leader that the meeting was about to get underway. Analysis of the signal to start included two kinds of messages: direct and indirect. Direct messages included such statements as: "I'd like to get underway," "The chief task for today is..." Indirect messages included standing
up, using a focusing remark directed to the entire group "All right um one of the things I thought we ought to talk about." This phase was not included in the General Meeting Part because an analysis of the conversation of meetings revealed that the message did not always result in participants' immediate attention to the business of the meeting.

The Pre-Meeting Part to Meetings included a variable phase that occurred in some meetings prior to the "Signaling to Start" phase. Two variations were observed. One was labeled the "Expectation" phase. This phase occurred in three of the six meetings, and included messages to the participants that the meeting would begin when all of the participants were present. The "Starting to Get Down to Business" phase was the second variation found in three of the six meetings. This phase was marked by passing out agendas, documents, and checking to see that participants had all the materials necessary for the meeting. As the agendas and documents were distributed, participants talked among themselves or asked questions of the leader. This phase was sometimes used to introduce new participants to the group.

General Part to Meeting

The General Meeting Part to Meeting always included three phases. One of the phases that was consistent across all meetings was the "Getting Down to Business" phase.

The "Getting Down to Business" phase was marked by the leader focusing the discussion on the written or unwritten agenda. The unfolding conversation of this phase is analyzed in greater depth in Question 5.3: Ranges of Talk.
Within this phase there was some variation across meetings. These variations included: "turning the meeting over" and "breaking." Each of these variations is now described.

"Turning the Meeting Over"

This event was marked by the leader formally "turning the meeting over" to a participant in the meeting or to a visitor at the meeting. As happened in one meeting, a participant in the meeting "turned the meeting over" to another administrator who was a guest at the meeting.

"Breaking"

This event was marked by a transition in the business of the meeting that was accompanied by the leader announcing "let's take a break."

Another phase that was found across all meetings was the "Wrapping It Up" phase. This phase was marked by the leader changing the focus to control the interaction of the participants with such statements as: "I ah suspect we need to wrap up where we are today and set an agenda for next time." In those meetings where there were props such as books, the books were closed and the pens capped. This phase generally consisted of announcing subsequent meetings, or announcing that so-and-so needed to be seen after the meeting to "get some business done," or in one meeting consisted of introducing participants.

The "Signaling to Close" phase was also consistent across all meetings. It was marked by a cue from the leader that the meeting was over; such statements as: "I think we've identified enough problems and concerns," "Sweepers man your brooms," or "Thanks, I appreciate everyone's....I'll see you next week."
**Post-Meeting Part**

The Post-Meeting Part consisted of people getting up from their chairs and collecting their personal effects. As people walked around the room, they stopped and chatted with each other (Phase VII). "Getting business done," sharing anecdotes and stories, and saying farewell were among the conversations overheard. People left the room through the same door as they entered (Phase VIII).

**Description of the Kinds of Meetings Analyzed**

As revealed in the Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work, Kennon attended 100 meetings. Some of these meetings were repeated and some were unRepeated. Of the repeated meetings, some were labeled continuous and others were labeled finite. The meetings that were selected for further analysis consisted of those meetings labeled repeated, that is they met at least twice during the 96-day observational period. Repeated meetings were of two types: continuous and finite. Continuous meetings were those in which the participants met regularly to share information or to perform a task, e.g. staff meetings. Finite meetings were those in which the participants met to share information or to perform a task more than once, but the participants did not meet beyond a certain number of meetings, e.g. task forces. The six meetings selected for further analysis included two sets of two repeated-continuous meetings, coded Meeting Type 1: #1 and #2, and Meeting Type 1: #3 and #4; and one set of two repeated-finite meetings, coded Meeting Type 2: #5 and #6. These meetings were selected for two reasons. First, there was a "history" to the group. Second, by using repeated meetings "intra-cultural comparisons" (Pelto and Pelto, 1970) could be made within and across each meeting, giving a fuller picture of meeting life. Further
descriptions of the meetings, including their participants, their purpose, and Kennon's role within the meeting are provided

Meeting Type 1: #1 and #2

Composition, Purpose, and Kennon's Role:

As Figure 50 shows, this meeting type included eleven regular members: three women and eight men. The members included faculty and administrators and one support staff. The ratio of faculty to administrators was about equal. The purpose of this meeting type was to share information. Kennon was a member. Prior to each meeting, the leader called for agenda items. At the time of observation, the leader was setting the dates for the meetings. Because the proposed meeting day conflicted with Kennon's regularly scheduled staff meeting, she met with the leader to discuss an alternate day, but without success.

Meeting Type 1: #3 and #4

Composition, Purpose, and Kennon's Role:

This meeting type included seven regular members: four women and three men. The members included professional staff. The purpose of this meeting type was to share information. Kennon was the leader. At the time of the observations, professional staff were usually informed of meeting dates by memo.

Meeting Type 2: #5 and #6

Composition, Purpose, and Kennon's Role:

This meeting type included 13 regular members: five women and eight men. The members included faculty and alumni. The
Table 50

Description of Six Planned Meetings
by Type of Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meeting Type I</th>
<th>Meeting Type II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>#1 #2 #3 #4</td>
<td>#5 #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>Share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennon's Role</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 11 7 7</td>
<td>13 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
purpose of this meeting type was to make recommendations on admission and recruitment standards. Kennon was the leader. At the time of the observations, plans were being made to form this committee. To place the committee in a broader context, a brief chronology of the committee's formation and meeting is described with the aid of Table 51.

Pre-Meeting

Organization of this committee and two others were the responsibility of an administrator in the college (6mIIA). During one quarter, he met once with Kennon to discuss representation from the alumni. Later in the quarter, dates for the meetings were selected by him and letters sent to the members. Kennon sent a subsequent memo to the members informing them of a change in the date of the meeting.

Meeting One

The same college administrator attended the first meeting and gave the committee its charge. Present at the meeting were members of the committee, Kennon, who was the designated chair (by role and task) of this committee, and a professional staff member from 215 Frost Hall, who was to chair the second of the three committees organized by him. Although the two committees met jointly for the first meeting, in subsequent meetings the committees (one chaired by Kennon, the other chaired by the professional staff member from 215 Frost Hall) met separately.

Meeting Two and Subsequent Meetings

Kennon led the second meeting and subsequent meetings. At the conclusion of each meeting, Kennon sent summaries of the meetings (see Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work) to members. At the conclusion of the four meetings, Kennon wrote a report summarizing the committee's
Table 51
Chronology of Planned Meetings: Type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Meeting</th>
<th>Meeting 1</th>
<th>Meeting 2</th>
<th>Meeting 3</th>
<th>Meeting 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kennon and 6mIIA meet/ discuss alumni representative to committee</td>
<td>1. 6mIIA convenes meeting</td>
<td>1. Kennon convenes committee</td>
<td>1. Kennon convenes committee</td>
<td>1. Kennon convenes committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 6mIIA sets dates for committee meetings</td>
<td>2. Kennon as designated chair is present</td>
<td>1. Sends summaries to committee members</td>
<td>2. Prepares documents for committee members on current procedures between meetings 2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 6mIIA sends memos to committee members announcing meetings</td>
<td>3. 16mIPS as designated chair of another committee is present</td>
<td>3. Prepares final report including recommendations from committee; sends to committee members and 6mIIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kennon sends memo to committee members announcing change in meeting</td>
<td>4. 6mIIA gives charge to committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


recommendations (with copies to the members of the committee). (See Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work)

Summary

The findings in this section revealed a stable organizational pattern to six planned meetings that included a pre-meeting part, general meeting part, and a post-meeting part. Two of the three parts contained both stable phases and variable phases within them. Comparisons with the six other planned meetings of the same type revealed the same stable organizational pattern. This section concluded with a description of each of three types of meetings that were selected for further in-depth study. To further refine the data, attention is now directed toward an exploration of Kennon's participation in these six planned meetings and selected members' participation in these same meetings through their range of talk.

Question 5.3

Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of the patterns of participation, specifically range of talk, were obtained via a multi-step process of microanalysis and macroanalysis of six planned meetings. To briefly review the steps, first transcriptions from audiotape, including the expanded transcripts which included notes made by the researcher, were reviewed. Once the transcriptions were completed, a map of the structure of the evolving conversation for each meeting was constructed. This map represented the thematic development of the conversation. The structural maps provided the basis for the exploration of patterns of organization and demands for social participation (Weade and Green, in press). The map of the structure for each of the six meetings was then examined further, and a
taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1980) was done to make visible the range of talk by Kennon and the pre-selected members of each of the six meetings. (See Chapter III for a discussion of the selection procedures for the members.) Range of talk was defined for the purposes of this study as initiating a theme or giving extended responses within a theme (Green, 1981).

Question 5.3

Patterns of Participation: Range of Talk

The findings for this section are described by meeting type. Further distinctions are made as to whether the theme was initiated or whether it was an extended response within a theme. As will be revealed in the findings of the next question initiating a theme overlapped with a pattern labeled managing a meeting. This is discussed in greater depth in Question 5.4.

Meeting Type 1 #1

As the taxonomy in Figure 73 shows, Kennon initiated two themes: international recruiting program for students and notification to students about future curriculum changes. As an introduction to the former theme, Kennon remarked "you (looking at the leader) need to remind them about...." and then proceeded to describe the responses to the requests for participation in the program. One male college administrator (13mIIA) gave extended responses within the theme equipment. As Figure 74 shows, computer software constituted the whole of his talk on equipment. The other male administrator (6mIIA) gave extended responses within the theme of enrollment. Within that theme, he talked about setting department enrollment limits, including preparation of a report to central administration, setting deadlines for the information from
**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type 1: 2</th>
<th>Meeting Type 1: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiated Theme</td>
<td>Initiated Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Theme**
  - International recruiting program
  - Notification to students about future curriculum changes

- **Theme**
  - *(2)* Students opportunities to schedule classes

*indicated number of times theme was initiated

---

**Figure 73**
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departments, procedures for approving the enrollment limits, and enrollment effects on budget.

Meeting Type 1 #2

As the taxonomy in Figure 73 shows, Kennon's range of talk concerned student's opportunities to schedule classes. She initiated this theme. One administrator (13mIIA) gave extended responses within two themes: equipment and personnel. Further taxonomic analysis revealed that computer software and theft of equipment constituted the whole of his talk on equipment. Talk of personnel consisted of notification of deadline dates for position vacancies. The other administrator (6mIIA) gave extended responses within four themes: class scheduling, long range planning, recapitalization, and consensus building among faculty. Further taxonomic analysis of the theme labeled class scheduling revealed that in addition to information about class scheduling, he talked about a memo he had sent concerning this issue and a deadline for submitting information about class scheduling.

Summary

The three participants of this committee, Kennon, the two administrators, differed in their range of talk. Kennon initiated themes about students and student concerns; one administrator (13mIIA) gave extended responses within themes about equipment and personnel; and the other administrator gave extended responses within themes about class scheduling, long range planning, recapitalization, and consensus building. The (6mIIA) had the broadest range of talk. Kennon was the only one to initiate a theme. Themes related to students and student-related issues never emerged unless Kennon initiated them.
### Figure 74
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Meeting Type 1: #1 and 2
Administrator 13mII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type 1: #1</th>
<th>Meeting Type 1: #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiated Theme</td>
<td>Initiated Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Response to Theme</td>
<td>Extended Response to Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software</td>
<td>software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theft</td>
<td>theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel</td>
<td>personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacancy postings</td>
<td>vacancy postings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Type 1: #1 Initiated Theme</td>
<td>Meeting Type 1: #2 Initiated Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting department</td>
<td>memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment limit</td>
<td>class scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme(s)</td>
<td>deadlines for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation of report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deadlines for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures for approval of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Response to Theme</td>
<td>Extended Response to Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget ratios</td>
<td>long range planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>recapitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Response(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting enrollment limits</td>
<td>consensus building among faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 75
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As can be seen from the taxonomy of Kennon's range of talk (Figure 73) in both meetings, the themes were convergent with her roles as Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs. Similarly, the extended responses given by both administrators to themes were convergent with their roles within the college.  

**Meeting Type 1 #3**

As can be seen from the taxonomy in Figure 76, Kennon both initiated and gave extended responses to multiple themes, including: space, personnel, special events, equipment, curriculum, training manual, other administrative units, departments within the college, and student cases. One of the professional staff members (16mIPS) initiated four themes: student case, equipment, personnel, and a department within the college. He gave extended responses to two themes: personnel and special event. As Figure 77 shows, the whole of his talk on a student case had to do with scheduling; on equipment, the need for more telephone lines; on personnel, the composition of the support staff within 215 Frost Hall; on a department within the college, the planning for student files; on personnel, staff changes within another administrative unit; and special event, the arrangements for entertainment. The other professional staff member (12mIPS) initiated two themes: student case and field placement. He gave extended responses to three themes: equipment (telephones), personnel in other administrative units, and curriculum (department A and field experience).  

**Meeting Type 1 #4**

As can be seen from Figure 76, Kennon initiated and gave extended responses to multiple themes including: curriculum, other administrative units, departments within the college, equipment,
Figure 76
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Figure 76 (continued)

Participation in Planned Meetings:

Meeting Type 1: #3 and 4

Kennon
Meeting Type 1: #4
Initiated Theme

- academic
  - curriculum
    - student case
  - certification changes
- office
  - equipment — computer training
  - training
    - manual — contents
  - forms — students
  - files
    - meeting student
      - department "P"
  - special events
    - meeting
  - departments
    - assignments
      - faculty changes
    - advisor
      - problems
      - staff changes

Figure 76 (continued)
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Figure 76 (continued)

Participation in Planned Meetings:
Meeting Type 1: #3 and 4
Kennon
Figure 77

Participation in Planned Meetings:
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Professional Staff 12mII
Figure 78
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Professional Staff 16ml
Meetings Type 1: #4
Initiated Theme:

- Certification standards
- Academic
- Consortium
- Office appointments
- Special events

Extended Response to Theme:

- Certification standards
- Academic
- Forms
- Printed materials
- Brochures
- Office
- Student files
- Department "P"
- Meeting
- Department "P"
- Admissions
- Computer screens
- Dates
- Training
- Assignments
- Faculty changes
- Adviser problems

Figure 78 (continued)
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students, office forms, personnel, cleaning, student case, changing standards, special meeting for personnel in other administrative units concerning changing standards, training manual, printed material, and procedures. One of the professional staff members (16mIPS) initiated four themes: student appointments, H event, changing standards, and consortium. He gave extended responses to six themes: personnel, students, department A within the college, equipment, forms, and changing standards. One of the professional staff members (12mIPS) initiated two themes: changing standards, and the A department, specifically its courses. He gave extended responses to one theme: changing standards, specifically courses and relaying information to students.

Summary

As can be seen from the taxonomy of Kennon's range of talk in both meetings, the themes were convergent with her roles as manager (A department, space, personnel, procedures, equipment, training, and training manuals); as Secretary to the College (printed material, changing standards, students, student case, forms, A department, curriculum, special event A and C); as Director of Student Affairs (special event B); and as liaison (training for other administrative units). Further analysis revealed that the themes were convergent with specific activities that she performed within the manager role, such as keeping the office presentable (removing the boxes from the office to the storage area and removing burn boxes); keeping the office well-staffed; and helping support staff (calendar noting busy times for staff), students, and faculty.

As can be seen from the taxonomies of both professional staff members, themes such as individual student cases, equipment, and
personnel were shared by both members in the first meeting. Unshared themes centered on the A department and its student files, entertainment for the special event (16mIPS) and curriculum, specifically, the A department and field experience (12mIPS). In the case of one of the professional staff members (16mIPS), both themes were within his specialized role as a professional staff member in 215 Frost Hall. In the case of the other professional staff member (12mIPS), the theme related to curriculum, specifically field experience, was linked to his previous responsibilities in another position. In meeting #4, both of them shared two themes, changing standards and the A department. One staff member (16mIPS) gave extended responses to five themes that were within his specialized role as a professional staff member in 215 Frost Hall.

Meeting Type 2 #5

As previously stated, a college administrator (6mIIA) met with this committee at its first convening. He gave the committee its charge and answered questions related to that charge. As designated chair, Kennon was present at the first meeting. As the taxonomy in Figure 79 shows, Kennon initiated two themes: materials needed for future meetings by the committee and enrollments within academic departments. She responded in an extended manner to three themes: implementation dates for new standards and H; future committee meeting dates; and student records. The male faculty member (93fIIF) initiated two themes: committee assignments and a specific test (Test B). The male faculty member (18mIIF) initiated three themes: a specific test (Test D), the approval process for the new standards, and student records. He gave extended responses to themes related to testing and specific kinds of tests.
Meeting Type 2 #6

Kennon both initiated and gave extended responses to multiple themes in this third meeting of the committee. Some of the themes she initiated overlapped with her role as chairperson and these are discussed in Question 5.4. She initiated six themes: testing for nontraditional students; new standards (admissions criteria and measures); academic departments (enrollment and implications for grade point average changes); career education at Wx; role models for career fields; and curriculum (name change for course). She gave extended responses within the seven themes that are shown in the taxonomy (Figure 79). The female faculty member initiated two themes: Faculty testing (three different kinds of tests) and curriculum (specifically course A). The male faculty member initiated one theme: tests (specifically cut scores) and gave extended responses to two themes: evaluation (multifactored) and tests (descriptions, cut scores, scores, and correlations with grade point averages).

Summary

As can be seen from the taxonomies from these meetings some of the themes were convergent with Kennon's role as Secretary to the College (new standards, curriculum, student records) and Director of Student Affairs (student financial support). Other themes were convergent with her role as chairperson of the committee (materials for future meetings and future meeting dates). Other themes such as career education at Wx, role models for career fields, incentives for career field, enrollment limits within departments, and issues within some of the other themes were tangential to her role as Secretary to the College. Initiating these themes or giving extended responses within these themes were convergent with the findings from Question
Meeting Type 2: #5
Initiated Theme
materials for future planning
committee
enrollment limitations
Theme(s)
Extended Response to Theme
meeting dates
committee
student records
Extended Response(s)
program
implementation dates
new standards

Meeting Type 2: #6
Initiated Theme
testing-nontraditional students
criteria
new standards
measures
enrollment
departments
grades
careers
role models
name change
course A
curriculum

Extended Response to Theme
grades
requirements-hours
courses
exceptions
cut scores
testing
tests
course A
course B
course C
career incentives
student
financial support
strategies
student
structure
recruitment
implementation
grades
new standards
approval
procedures

Figure 79
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Kennon
Figure 80
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93fiIIF
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**Participation in Planned Meetings:**  
*Meeting Type 2: #5 and 6*  
*Faculty 18mII*
4.0 (Nature of Authority: Setting II: Authority of Competence). Themes initiated by the female faculty member (93fIIF) centered on her professional expertise (test C) and her experience with curriculum and tests (tests A and B). Themes initiated by and given extended responses to by the male faculty member (18mIIF) were also centered on his area of professional expertise.

This section explored six kinds of meetings and the range of talk by Kennon and pre-selected participants in those meetings. Summaries were given at the conclusion of each meeting type. As can be seen from the taxonomies of Kennon's range of talk, in Meeting Type 1 (#1, #2, #3, and #4) regardless of her role in the meeting, the range of talk was centered around her role(s), while in Meeting Type 2 (#5 and #6) her range of talk was centered less on her role(s) and more on her experience and expertise.

Attention will now be directed toward the broader patterns and themes found in these six meetings.

Question 5.4
Analytic Process

Data for the exploration of broader patterns and themes within the six planned meetings were obtained via a multi-step process of microanalysis and macroanalysis. To briefly review the steps, first transcriptions from audiotape, including the expanded transcripts which included notes made by the researcher, were reviewed. Once the transcriptions were completed, a map of the structure of the evolving conversation for each meeting was constructed. The map represented the thematic development of the conversation. The structural maps provided the basis for the exploration of patterns of organization and demands for social participation (Weade and Green, in press).
Patterns were explored further through taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1980) to make visible their elements.

Question 5.4

Patterns of Participation within Meetings

Examination of the structural maps of evolving conversation within meetings led to the identification of five patterns: "getting business done," mini-conversations, "social" work, managing a meeting, and confirming and continuance. These are now discussed in further detail.

"Getting Business Done"

A taxonomic analysis of this pattern within the six planned meetings revealed two ways to "get business done:" before the meeting and after the meeting. As previously stated "getting business done" included conversations in which the participants attended to problems and issues not related to the purpose of the meeting.

Before the meeting

Examination of the structural map revealed three instances of "getting business done" before the meeting. In Meeting Type 1 #3, a professional staff member (12mIPS), while sitting at the table waiting for the meeting to start, said to the other professional staff member (9fIPS), "real quickly I got a call from xxx about a student named xxx, is she coming this fall?" She answered that she did not know, and then remarked, "I wonder why xxx would call here? What began initially as a question "to get business done," became a group concern as members listened to the male staff member talk about the student. While this first instance became a topic of the group, the other two instances discussed below did not. Prior to the meeting coded Meeting Type 1 #1, Kennon, upon entering the room, walked up to the
dean and said, "There's a security problem..." and proceeded to outline the problem. The dean asked if she had spoken to a member of the dean's staff (13mIIA) about it. When the conversation ended, Kennon returned to her seat. Prior to the meeting coded Meeting Type 2 #6, Kennon talked to a male faculty member (18mIIA) about a particular test that another university was using. At the end of the conversation, Kennon returned to her office to get the information for him.

**After the meeting**

Examination of the structural map revealed six instances of "getting business done" after the meeting. A taxonomic analysis revealed further that there were two ways in which "getting business done" was initiated. One occurred when the leader of the meeting announced to the members: "Kennon, Mark, Roger I need to catch you for just a moment" or "Rich when we finish here could you stick around I want you to relay a message for me." After the announcement was made, the members named stood at the end of the table waiting for the leader to begin. The second occurred when either the leader or a member started a conversation with another member. At the conclusion of Meeting Type 1 #1, Kennon asked a male administrator (48mIIA) a question about moving some student files. Once he and Kennon had "gotten business done," another administrator (13mIIA), also a member of the committee, talked to Kennon about the space for the files. At the conclusion of Meeting Type 2 #5 and #6, Kennon talked to an alumni (25MIVA1), member of the committee, about getting parking stickers for subsequent meetings. Attention is now directed toward the next element of meeting, the mini-conversation.
Mini-Conversations during the General Meeting Part

Analysis of the expanded transcripts for each meeting revealed that there 26 instances in which participants in the meetings talked to each other during another participant's turn at talk. Table 52 shows the frequency of mini-conversations by type of meeting. Mini-conversations among participants were more frequent in meetings attended by more people and in meetings in which contact among participants was less frequent (semi-weekly or monthly as opposed to daily). Further analysis revealed that mini-conversations among participants in Meeting Type 1 #3 and #4 were discouraged; for example, Kennon, as leader, said "I beg your pardon" when a mini-conversation occurred at the same time a professional staff member had her "turn at talk". Mini-conversations in Meetings #3 and #4 were open to the group as was observed in Meeting #4 between two professional staff members (9fIPS and 12mIPS).

When mini-conversations occurred in the meetings attended by more people, they were between participants seated within close proximity to one another. Kennon, for example, at Meeting Type 1 #1 sat between two college administrators (13mIIA and 75mIIF), and three mini-conversations occurred between one of the administrators and Kennon (13mIIA), and four mini-conversations occurred between the other administrator (75mIIA) and Kennon. Although these conversations were short, they could be potentially divergent to the thread of the the unfolding conversation (Green, 1981). The topics of the mini-conversations were unknown. Further analysis of the structural maps, however, revealed that in Meeting Type 1 #2, at least one of the times Kennon initiated a theme it was supported by one of the administrators (75mIIF) with whom she had had mini conversations (sitting next to
Table 52
Frequency Of Mini-Conversations
By Type of Meeting
Data Source: Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meeting Type I</th>
<th>Meeting Type II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
her). Furthermore, it was found that comments she added to themes that were within one of the college administrator's (6MIIA)'s provinces were supported by him. Of the 26 observed mini-conversations, there were three in which a participant carried on mini-conversations with other participants not within close proximity, and these occurred "on the way to getting coffee."
"Getting coffee" leads naturally into the next element of meeting, "social" work.

"Social" Work During Meetings

"Social" work, as it was discussed previously (See Question 1.1.1: Kinds of Work: "Social" Work), concerned the attention to the health, happiness, and well-being of others. Analysis of the structural maps of the six planned meetings revealed two kinds of "social" work at meetings: the introduction of participants and guests and the attention to food and refreshment. Each of these kinds of "social" work are discussed below.

Introduction of Participants and Guests

The introduction of participants and guests occurred in three of the planned meetings (Meeting Type 2 #5 and #6 and Meeting Type 1 #1). The introduction of participants and guests are described as they were observed at each meeting.

Meeting Type 2 #5

As previously stated, Meeting Type 2 #5 was the first meeting of four the primary purpose of the meeting was to recommend changes to existing admission and recruitment standards. A college administrator (6mIIA) convened the meeting and gave the charge to the committee. After he concluded his remarks he sat down and a question and answer period followed. Kennon, (designated chairperson) as the end of the
meeting time approached, said "help me I don't know everyone in the room." The administrator (6mIIA) said "Oh I'm sorry should have gone around now that we have spare time." Simultaneously Kennon started to introduce herself "I'm Kennon Abbott" and the administrator (6mIIA) said "Mick (sitting to his left) would you start." The administrator followed up with: "Oh Kennon." At that point Kennon repeated her name and said "I'll be meeting, convening with this group." As she finished she signaled the next person that it was his turn to talk by saying his name. Each of the participants in turn introduced themselves, the administrator being the last. With that, the administrator (6mIIA) explained the presence of a particular participant who was a faculty member from another college.

Meeting Type 2 #6

Meeting #6 was the third of the four meetings of this type. Before the "signaling to start phase" (See Question 5.2: Organizational Structure of Six Planned Meetings), Kennon, who was leading the committee, said

KE AND I DON'T KNOW GAIL I THINK YOU I DON'T KNOW THAT YOU
KNOW EVERYONE YOU AND I DON'T KNOW IF THEY ALL KNOW YOU
GAIL WAS NOT ABLE TO BE WITH US LAST WEEK UM HELEN I FORGOT
WERE YOU WITH US LAST WEEK?

Helen YES I WAS (page 2034 L# 101)

With that, one member sitting next to the female faculty member (identified above) confirmed that she had been there and sat next to him. At that point everyone began to talk.

Meeting Type 1 #1

Meeting #1 was the first meeting of four that occurred autumn quarter. As previously stated, this meeting type was repeated and
continuous. The members were the same from meeting to meeting, unless one of the faculty sent a substitute. The substitutes were known to the members, therefore, introductions were not given. Meeting #1 was different, however, in that there were two graduate students present. What follows then is a description of the graduate students' introductions to the members.

A college administrator (6mIIA) had concluded his remarks on enrollment. At that point he said, "I would like to introduce you to xxx who is......" Once the introduction was concluded, another administrator (SmIIA), revisited the theme on enrollment by asking a question. Once the question had been answered, the dean (4mIIA), who was leading the committee, said "Kennon why don't you introduce..." Kennon said, "Yes. I'd like to introduce you to Susan Yutzey....who is trailing me for a quarter. Who knows where she'll turn up next." The participants laughed. The dean then introduced a new theme.

Attention to Food and Refreshment

Although attention was directed to food and refreshment in three meetings, there was food and/or refreshment at five of the six meetings. The attention to food and refreshment is described as it occurred in the three meetings.

Meeting Type 2 #5

Attention to food and refreshment occurred as the announcements for future meetings were being made by Kennon (prior to the introduction of participants).

KE THIS ROOM 9 TO 12 WE'LL HAVE COFFEE AND MAYBE EVEN AN INSPIRED COOKIE OR DONUT HERE TO ENCOURAGE YOU. (page 1488 L# 1508)
Meeting Type 2 #6

Attention to food at this meeting was initiated by Kennon and extended upon by a male faculty member (18mIIA) prior to the "signaling to start phase."

KE AND ONE APOLOGY I PICKED UP 2 BAGS OF COOKIES AND ONE LABELED PEANUT BUTTER ONE LABELED CHOCOLATE CHIP AND DO YOU KNOW THEY'RE BOTH PEANUT BUTTER?

LAUGHTER

18mIIF WELL THAT'S GOOD THAT'S GOOD FOR US

LAUGHTER

KE BETTER THAN ANYTHING

18mIIF PEANUT BUTTER IS GOOD FOR YAH

KE THAT'S RIGHT

LAUGHTER (page 2035 L# 125)

Meeting Type 1 #4

Attention to food also occurred in this meeting. Unlike the previous meetings discussed, the theme was introduced by participants at the meeting, before and after the General Meeting Part.

9fIPS WHAT KIND ARE THOSE?
KE THEY'RE PEANUT BUTTER
9fIPS OH NO WONDER I LIKE EM
SUSAN THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BE CHOCOLATE CHIP
KE I WAS SO MAD I BOUGHT
9fIPS YOU'RE KIDDING
KE TWO BAGS OF COOKIES YOU KNOW THOSE THOSE XXX SOFT BATCH
9fIPS AH HM AH HM
KE I BOUGHT 2 BAGS ONE WAS LABELED IN BRIGHT ORANGE PEANUT BUTTER AND THE OTHER WITH THE BRIGHT ORANGE STICKER SAID CHOCOLATE CHIP. TWO PACKAGES OF PEANUT BUTTER

9fIPS OH THEY ARE GOOD

KE SO 18mIIF STOPPED IN LAST NIGHT AND I STAYED PART OF THE EVENING 18mIIF STOPPED TO TALK ABOUT THE COMMITTEE MEETING YESTERDAY MORNING I SAID WHAT SHOULD I BRING NEXT WEEK GOTA KEEP THIS COMMITTEE HE SAID OH BRING THE CHOCOLATE CHIP YOU DIDN'T BRING (chuckles) YESTERDAY

9fIPS OH SHOOT THAT'S CUTE. WHAT COMMITTEE IS THIS? (page 2170 L# 070)

As participants of the meeting entered the room, one of them remarked "food." Kennon repeated the word "food," and proceeded to return to her conversation with a member of the professional staff (9fIPS).

During the Post-Meeting Part, one of the staff members (12mPSI) asked Kennon, "these are good who made these?" Kennon responded, "XXX." They both laughed as they left the room. Although five of the six planned meetings observed had food and/or refreshment, little attention if any was directed toward its presence. Participants got up during the meetings and helped themselves to coffee and/or food from a credenza. The triangulation of findings from Question 2.0 (Nature of Roles) provided information that increased understanding of Kennon's attention to food at meetings.

Attention is now directed toward another element of meeting, managing a meeting.
Managing a Meeting

A review of the structural maps of the six planned meetings revealed ways in which Kennon (Meeting Type 1 #3 and #4; Meeting Type 2 #6) and 4mIIA (Meeting Type 1 #1 and #2) used strategies (as revealed through message units) to control the interaction and/or behavior of participants (Green, 1981). The meeting labeled Meeting Type 2 #5 was not used in the analysis, since it was led by a college administrator who was observed in the role of leader only at this meeting and, therefore, for whom intra- or inter-meeting comparisons were not possible.

A taxonomic analysis of managing a meeting led to the identification of multiple messages, some directed toward the group others directed toward a person. Each of these is described in greater detail.

Messages to Group

Figures 82 and 83 show the strategies (as revealed through message units) that Kennon used to control the interaction and/or behavior of participants. As the figures show, Kennon made statements that initiated and closed themes and asked questions that initiated and closed themes. In Meeting Type 1 #3 and #4, she used a non-verbal message (closing a book) to indicate the close of theme. In Meeting Type 2 #6, she gave messages that prioritized themes and that directed the order of theme. As Figure 84 shows, the dean (4mIIA) made statements that initiated themes and closed themes and asked questions that initiated themes. The dean gave messages that indicated boundaries for the discussion of a theme and that directed the order of theme.
Figure 82

Taxonomy of Managing a Meeting

Meeting Type 2: 6

Kennon
Figure 83

Taxonomy of Managing a Meeting

Meeting Type 1: 364
Kennon
Figure 84
Taxonomy of Managing a Meeting

Meeting Type 1: 162
4mII
Messages to Person

Messages to a person are messages to the group in that they indicate to the whole whose turn it is to talk. They are separated here for discussion purposes. As Figure 82 shows, Kennon gave messages that indicated "turn to talk," and these messages included calling on a person "Helen" or "Helen's been trying to get a word in here," and granting permission to speak when asked, "sure go ahead." The dean also gave messages that indicated "turn to talk" and these messages included calling on a person and granting permission to speak when asked. A third message that indicated "turn to talk" was initiating a theme that was person-specific. Kennon gave this message in Meeting Type I #3 and #4, where the roles and responsibilities of each of the participants was clear. For those six participants whose range of talk was analyzed (See Question 5.3: Range of Talk), extended responses to a theme were often a result of the leader initiating a theme that was person-specific. The messages to person that excused either lateness or leaving during the meeting (see Figure 83) were seen only in Meeting Type 1 #3 and were indicative of the subordinate-superior relationship. Attention is now directed toward the final pattern: confirming and continuance.

Confirming and Continuance

A review of the structural maps for the six planned meetings revealed ways in which participants and leaders used two specific types of messages (confirming and continuance). Confirming refers to verbal and nonverbal acceptance of a preceding response (Green, 1981). Continuance refers to a nonverbal or verbal message which can provide a cue to the speaker that the listener is following the speaker's message and that the listener may continue his turn. This is referred
to as backchanneling in the sociolinguistic literature (Green, 1981). In this study, particular attention was directed to confirming messages that were to responses rather than questions, for example, in this conversation between a professional staff member (16mIPS) and Kennon:

KE OH I THINK IT WILL BE IN THE LONGTERM, BUT THEN AT LEAST WE'LL HAVE ALL THE RECORDS...

16mIPS YAH. HOW'S THE FACULTY GONNA FEEL. NEED TO THINK HARD ABOUT LOGISTICS. (P. 612 L#951)

A look across the three types of meetings revealed some differences in this pattern. Table 53 shows the frequencies of messages that were identified as confirming and continuance. In Meeting Type 1 #1 and #2, there were 74 message units identified as confirming, 50 of these messages came from the dean who was the leader. There were 43 message units identified as continuance, 42 of them came from the dean. In Meeting Type 1 #3 and #4, there were 188 messages identified as confirming. A closer examination of these messages revealed that Kennon gave 35 of these messages. Of the remaining 153 messages, 81 were directed toward Kennon's messages. The continuance messages numbered 40, four were given by Kennon and the remaining 36 were given by members to other participants and Kennon. Finally, in Meeting Type 2 #5 and #6, there were 103 messages that were identified as confirming and 19 that were identified as continuance. Further analysis revealed that there were three people who gave the majority of these messages, Kennon, and two male faculty members (102mIIA, and 98mIIA).
Table 53
Frequency of Confirming and Continuance Messages
by Type of Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Confirming Messages</th>
<th>Continuance Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>#1 and #2</td>
<td>#3 and #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This section examined the patterns found within six planned meetings. "Getting business done," mini-conversations, "social" work, managing a meeting, and confirming and continuance were the patterns that were discussed.
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

In this chapter findings are presented relative to the five major Research Questions and their respective subquestions. Given the extensiveness of the findings, a general summary of the results is presented prior to the discussion of the findings in Chapter V.

Nature of Work

1. While in the work setting, Kennon engaged in seven identifiable kinds of work: oral, written, interpretive, planning, "social," physical, and personal.

2. Within the three phases of observation, oral work was found to constitute the greatest proportion of Kennon's work.

3. Within oral work, the most frequently occurring category of activity was the unplanned meeting between Kennon and administrators, faculty, professional staff, and support staff.

4. Although certain categories of activities within the seven kinds of work occurred frequently, Kennon perceived some as less routine than others based upon the degree of individual attention required.

5. Three factors determined how extraordinary a category of activity within the seven kinds of work were:
   a) Kennon's perceptions of the relative magnitude of one task to another as revealed through observations, interviews, and her journal. An example was the report which she categorized as the "big project", was while other kinds of work was categorized as "little stuff".
b) Kennon's perception of the time and resources involved to solve a problem as revealed through observations, interviews, and her journal. An example was the crisis.

c) perceptions of others as to the appropriateness of the category of activity to her role as revealed through observations. An example was cleaning the office.

Nature of Roles

1. Within the work setting, Kennon played multiple roles.
2. Relationships with others were based primarily on her organizational roles.
3. Relationships with others were based primarily on three organizational roles: manager, Secretary to the College, and Director of Student Affairs.
4. The saliency of these roles varied by setting.
5. Kennon experienced role conflicts.

Nature of Personal Relationships

1. Kennon had three kinds of ties: primary ties, business-social ties, and instrumental ties.
2. Within Kennon's primary ties (those with whom Kennon had primarily informal social relations) the following was found:
   a) they were predominantly women administrators within the university; those who were from outside the university were men and were tied to a professional association to which Kennon belonged; and
   b) the frequency of contact varied from semi-weekly to less than monthly.
3. Within Kennon's business-social ties (those with whom she had equal informal social relations and business relations) the following was found:
   a) they were all women within the university; and
   b) the frequency of contact varied from monthly to less than monthly.

4. Within Kennon's instrumental ties (those with whom she had primarily business relations) the following was found:
   a) they were predominantly men administrators from within the university; and
   b) the frequency of contact varied from weekly to less than monthly.

5. A closer look at those with whom Kennon had frequent contact and with whom she had instrumental ties revealed that they were predominantly men in both administrative and faculty positions within the administrative unit in which Kennon worked.

6. Help seeking, feedback, sharing information and ideas, and lunching were attributes of Kennon's relationships.

7. Kennon had relationships that occurred only within a group (i.e., planned meetings) relationships that occurred only in pairs, (i.e., unplanned meetings) and relationships that occurred within a group and in a pair.

8. Because of the density of contact with people in the office setting in which Kennon worked and the nature of the authority relationship, this setting was examined separately and the following found:
a) Kennon had instrumental ties with all those employed in this setting, although there were different kinds of instrumental ties.
b) although help seeking, feedback, sharing information and ideas, and lunching were attributes of Kennon's relationships with those employed in this setting, the nature of these attributes was different than that found in other settings.
c) assigning tasks was an attribute of Kennon's relationships with those employed in this setting that was not found in other settings.
d) Kennon's relationships with people in this setting occurred primarily in a pair, i.e., unplanned meetings.

Nature of Authority

1. The nature of Kennon's authority, using pre-determined organizers from the literature, was examined across settings and the following was found:
   a) the authority relationship was the strongest in the setting in which Kennon managed by virtue of the powers she exercised (authority of position) and the perceptions that those employed in the setting had about her power (authority of position), special knowledge (authority of competence), and her authority in general (authority of legitimacy).
   b) in the other settings (the college in which she was employed, university, and outside the university) authority relationships were based primarily upon her special knowledge (authority of competence). Authority
relationships based on position which consisted solely of her power to make decisions on academic matters as they related to students was limited in that she was serving as an "agent" to the faculty and to the dean.

Nature of Participation in Planned Meetings

1. Planned meetings comprised a significant part of Kennon's experience in the work setting.

2. Kennon attended meetings initiated by others and initiated by her, and those meetings Kennon initiated and presided over were composed of subordinates.

3. Since Kennon could not convene meetings of her superiors, one of the means she used to "get business done" was the meeting initiated by others.

4. The organizational structure of the six planned meetings that Kennon attended that were analyzed in depth had both stable and variable patterns.

5. When the primary purpose of a planned meeting was to share information, participants who were analyzed for their range of talk either initiated a theme or gave an extended response to themes that were linked to their organizational roles.

6. When the primary purpose of a planned meeting was to undertake a task, participants who were analyzed for their range of talk either initiated a theme or gave an extended response to themes that were linked to their organizational role and/or to their special knowledge.

7. "Getting business done," that is attending to problems and issues not related to the purpose of the meeting by participants, was a
pattern that occurred both before and after meetings. Variations occurred by meeting type.

8. Mini-conversations during planned meetings, that is conversations between participants during another participant's turn at talk, varied according to meeting type.

9. Attention to the "social" tasks within meetings did occur across all meeting types, but primarily in those over which Kennon presided.

10. Patterns in managing a meeting varied according to meeting type.

11. Patterns of continuance and confirming, two types of messages given, varied by meeting type.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

In this chapter we revisit the five dimensions of the woman administrator's experience: work; meetings, an aspect of her work; roles; relationships; and authority. Here we draw a more contextualized picture of her experiences in the work setting, as we look at her experiences through the interpretive frameworks of roles, relationships, and authority. We begin this chapter with a discussion of the woman administrator's roles. This is followed by a discussion of her relationships and then her authority. Recommendations for future research follow. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the practical significance of the study for women administrators.

Roles

The woman administrator played no single role while in the work setting. In fact, she was observed to play 14 different primary roles. These included: professional, liaison, member of the college, office worker, colleague, manager, subordinate, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, dean's staff, student, friend, host, and woman.

Some of these roles were created by the organization: liaison, member of the college, manager, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, subordinate, and dean's staff. Although these roles were individually mandated by the organization she left her individual stamp on them. For example, as we look at the manager role, we saw that for Kennon it was a highly oral role which included informal meetings such as the drop-by, the pop-in, the corridor, the "office
walk-through," and talking over the wall with professional and support staff members. Although it was a highly oral role, it rarely involved use of the telephone. The informal face-to-face interaction within 215 Frost Hall was viewed by Kennon as "a fairly efficient way of getting things done cause I can often get a quicker answer ... some would probably define them as inefficient it's an interruption to ongoing activity but um for many quick answer situations it's a good way to get it done" (Interview 6: page 13). As we look at the Secretary to the College role, which was primarily enacted in settings outside 215 Frost Hall, we saw that within the university it was a highly oral role which included informal meetings with faculty as they stopped in to see her or telephone calls from faculty and administrators about academic matters related to students. Outside the university, the role was primarily a written role which involved writing letters to former or prospective students and administrators at state and local agencies. What we can see from these two examples is that role alone is not adequate to describe what actually occurred. One must look in a more detailed way to see the manner in which roles were differentially played out. The ethnographic perspective provides such a detailed view.

Some roles were created by the woman administrator in the organization: professional, office worker, colleague, student, friend, and host. One role, woman, was assumed automatically by virtue of her gender. A question remains as to whether some roles were created by her as a result of her gender. For example, some people would see the role of host as gender specific and as a cause for interrole conflict. The findings from this study showed, however, that the role of host was not gender-linked, for the dean of the
college also played a host role. At dean's staff meetings, the dean walked around the table and poured the coffee for those who wanted it, and according to Kennon "frequently provided treats of some kind particularly if he had us meet extraordinarily early or extraordinarily long...he's pretty good about that" (Interview 6: page 31). At the recruitment meetings (Meeting 2: #6) over which Kennon presided, she provided the food and the refreshment. In an interview she explained that as the convener she was the "official host in terms of the institution" and that "it was almost expected that whoever was from central administration in the college would do it (provide the food)" (Interview 6: page 13).

As can be seen here, the host role was not gender specific, however, it was played out differently by the dean and Kennon. Furthermore, it was differentially recognized by those present at the meetings. At the dean's staff meetings there was no verbal recognition of the dean's role as host while at the recruitment meeting one of the female faculty members remarked to Kennon prior to the meeting, "see you're the usual good host." This comment suggests that Kennon was perceived by others in the college as often playing the host role, and furthermore, since Kennon was a woman it was socially acceptable for it to be acknowledged by others even in an official setting. The presence of a host role that is played out by both men and women suggest that it is an area for further research, particularly to determine if it is discipline specific. Are there some disciplines, for example, which have been thought of as more female-dominated (home economics, social work, education, nursing) in which the host role is more prevalent? Or is the host role unique to the individual?
It was also found in this study that there were some role behaviors that were exhibited in one setting more than others. In Setting I (215 Frost Hall) the work done, the ways of interacting with professional and support staff, and the attitudes displayed (Argyle, 1967) were those of manager. The roles of friend, Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, and office worker followed in their saliency within the setting. In Setting II (college) the role behaviors exhibited were those of Secretary to the College followed by Director of Student Affairs, dean's staff, and friend. In Setting III (Harrington University) the role behaviors most performed were those of Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs. In Setting IV (outside the university) the role behaviors most performed were also those of Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs.

Although the primary roles that were played in the last three settings mentioned were the same, they were played out differently. For example, in the college and the university the role of Secretary to the College was a highly oral one with an audience consisting of students, faculty, administrators, and professional staff, all of whom were in rather close physical proximity to Kennon. Outside the university, however, the role of Secretary to the College was a highly written one with an audience consisting of former and prospective students and state and local administrators, all of whom were physically distant from Kennon.

The written correspondence that was involved in each case was also different: within the university Kennon used the memo as a way of communicating decisions whereas outside the university she used the letter. As can be seen from the example above, while Argyle (1967)
gives us the construct that roles are patterns of behavior, he does not go beyond to give us some of the factors that influence role. What can be seen from the detailed look in this study is that one must go beyond roles as patterns of behavior to look at setting, task, and relationships.

One way to interpret the density of reference in her journal to the activities related to her roles as manager, Secretary to the College, and Director of Student Affairs and the frequency of the observed occurrence of these roles within the work setting was to look at them as forming her "organizational self-conception" in that she selectively identified these three organizational roles from her repertoire more than any others. In other words, she perceived these to be more characteristically "herself" than other roles (Gordon, 1972). Since self-conception also takes on the evaluative aspects of the roles which are incorporated into the self-conception (Gordon, 1972), it is conceivable that her general self-esteem would be wrapped up in these roles more than other roles. This may account for some of the behaviors that were observed such as working the front desk during busy times. By working the front desk herself she was assured that clients were taken care of efficiently and effectively, and that the image of 215 Frost Hall as a smooth and efficient operation was maintained. It was an image that was recognized verbally by faculty and administrators in comments to her such as "She runs an efficient office and an effective office" (page 976 L# 127). Further research is needed here since this study did not examine the motivational or self-perception aspects. Additional research in this area would extend Colwill's (1984) contention that organizational roles are
central to the self-concept and would clarify which ones, since it has been shown in this study that people in organizations enact many roles.

An interesting point here is that of all the organizational roles, that of office worker was the one which appeared to the researcher to contradict Kennon's self-conception the most since the tasks that were performed were those that the support staff carried out such as answering the telephones, cleaning spaces, or moving objects. It is the contention of both Gordon (1972) and Goffman (1961) that roles that contradict the self-conception are assigned role distance, and mechanisms of demonstrating lack of personal involvement are employed. Based on the findings of this study, the researcher hypothesizes that a key element in understanding role distance is whether the person "volunteers" to play the role or is "expected" to assume the role. The findings revealed that Kennon voluntarily assumed the role of office worker on several occasions, even donning an apron to cue those around her of her intention to clean the file room. The findings also revealed that at one staff meeting, a professional member remarked "Well Nodine thought you could do it since she's not here today." The expectation from the support staff member (Nodine) was that Kennon would perform the task that was Nodine's responsibility. Kennon's response was quick and pointed: "Well, I hope she (Nodine) left me a note to that effect." Kennon, rather than agreeing to do it distanced herself from the staff member by assuming the manager role and, furthermore, indicated that she hoped that the request was formally transmitted through a written note in an office in which the norm for "getting business done" was face-to-face and informal.
When voluntarily enacted, however, the role of office worker did create interrole conflict. The conflict was more apparent when those from outside 215 Frost Hall witnessed her doing office worker tasks. Several examples from the observations suggested that she resolved the conflict by rationalizing (i.e., somebody's got to do it, it may as well be me). When observed by a faculty member cleaning the file room, she responded "Well I can't get anybody else to do it." When observed by an administrative colleague dusting her office she responded "I do (clean my office) when I have a cold and I don't feel like getting into anything else." When observed by another administrative colleague while moving boxes, she responded "Well ya gotta be a jack of all trades around here." These were all verbal actions which she used to alleviate the role strain arising out of the conflict she saw between her role as manager and the responsibilities that it entailed, and her role as office worker.

As noted previously, the findings revealed that organizational roles were played out differently across settings. In her role as manager in Setting I, for example, she directed and supervised professional and support staff, while in the other settings she neither supervised nor directed, but informed other administrators about issues related to her role as manager, such as equipment and staffing needs. In her role as liaison, she supervised the compilation of the advising manual that was to be used by advisers in other administrative units. As she performed that role in the college, we saw her contact faculty and administrators about participating in various events sponsored by those administrative units with which the college had links.
As the woman administrator's relationships are examined through the interpretive framework of roles, a continuum can be constructed which illustrates the degree to which relationships were driven by formal organizational roles. On the left side of the continuum are those relationships that were role-driven. These relationships were identified in Question 3.0, Nature of Personal Relationships, as instrumental ties. The roles that were called upon were roles that were created by the organization, specifically manager, Director of Student Affairs, and Secretary to the College. There was role complementarity in that both Kennon and the other persons adopted a given role for the duration of their interaction.

On the far right side of the continuum are those relationships that were non-role driven, that is, they were not driven by Kennon's formal organizational roles. These relationships were identified in Question 3.0, Nature of Personal Relationships, as primary ties. The role found on this side of the continuum was that of friend/companion. These were the persons with whom either Kennon or the other person devised activities in order to generate the desired form of social interaction (Argyle, 1967), such as going to lunch, going to dinner, going to the theatre or opera. There was also role complementarity in these relationships in that both Kennon and the other persons adopted a given role for the duration of their interaction.

In the center of the continuum are those relationships that are somewhat role-driven, that is, sometimes they were driven by Kennon's formal organizational roles and sometimes they were not. These relationships were identified in Question 3.0 as business-social ties and instrumental ties. The roles found in the center were those labeled friend/associate, friend/confidante, and colleague. These
were the relationships in which the interactions were either business, social, or business/social. These were also the kinds of relations in which several roles were played out relatively simultaneously. For example, as we focus on one interaction between the dean and Kennon, the dean is observed talking about planning a staff development workshop and his upcoming vacation to Europe. This continuum is helpful in exploring the link between roles and relationships.

As the different aspects of relationships were examined through the interpretive framework of role, some roles emerged as more dominant, and patterns were found across settings. The feedback Kennon received from those outside 215 Frost Hall was primarily from those in Setting II (college) where Kennon and the work that she did (e.g., attending meetings, talking to faculty about academic matters related to students) were the most visible.

The feedback she received from faculty and administrators in the college was most often related to her roles as manager, Secretary to the College, and Director of Student Affairs. The feedback related to her roles as Secretary to the College and Director of Student Affairs was for work done and for ideas expressed. The feedback related to her manager role was for her managerial skills in supervising 215 Frost Hall and for her as a manager. Comments such as "she is able to delegate and she runs an efficient and an effective office" (page 997 L# 41); "Dr. Abbott is the most efficient person to contact when there are procedural problems" (page 981 L# 89); and "her staff is excellent, really good support" (page 976 L# 127) were among those she received that were related to her role as manager.

Feedback that was related to her role as manager was perhaps the most interesting because of the circumstances around which it was
given. None of the comments came from people whom Kennon directly supervised. The comments were all given by men whom Kennon supervised at one time (page 981 L# 89) or who were superior to her at one time (page 997 L# 41) or who were superior to her at the time of the observations (page 976 L# 127). Finally, all of the comments were made publicly to a group of people who did not know Kennon in that capacity.

This indepth look at feedback suggests first of all that Kennon's token status may have been an issue here, that is, that her "competence was treated as special and complemented just because it was unexpected" (Kanter, 1977, p. 235). This contention is further supported by findings reported earlier which revealed that the Secretary to the College role, not the manager role, was the most visible in the college in terms of the work she did. The Secretary to the College role should, therefore, have been the one for which she received the most feedback.

Kennon did receive feedback for the work done in this role by a female faculty member who stated on several occasions what a good job Kennon had done with a particular student case. It is hypothesized that perhaps the perceived routinized nature of the Secretary to the College position by those who had not observed Kennon "in action" (as did the female faculty member) contributed to the lack of feedback. Kanter (1977) supports this interpretation since "success is seen as inherent in the very establishment of the position...and neither persons nor organizations get credit for doing the mandatory or expected" (p. 177). Such an indepth analysis of feedback is not possible through surveys in which neither the woman administrator's position nor the nature of her work is taken into account.
As previously stated, the feedback Kennon received from those outside 215 Frost Hall was different than that received from those in 215 Frost Hall. Support and professional support staff did not give feedback to Kennon concerning her performance in any of her organizational roles. This suggests that it may be inappropriate for people who are of lower organizational status to give feedback to superiors about performance related to their central domains of work.

Support and professional staff did give Kennon feedback for her ideas that were related to her role as manager. They also gave her feedback related to her gender. They commented on her appearance with such statements as: "What a pretty necklace" or "I like your sweater." Since 215 Frost Hall was a predominantly female office, it may have influenced the giving of such feedback. Research in a more gender-balanced setting is needed to determine the relationship between feedback and gender.

As the feedback Kennon gave was examined, there were patterns that emerged across settings. Once again, Kennon gave feedback primarily to those in the college and in 215 Frost Hall. The most frequent kind of feedback given to those in the college (Setting II) was gratefulness for helping her carry out her responsibilities as Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, and liaison. Some of the feedback given was formal, that is, in a written letter or note to an administrator; most was informal, that is, a verbal "thanks, appreciate your follow-through."

Kennon did not give feedback to faculty or administrators about their performance related to central domains of their work. This supports a general pattern described earlier that it is inappropriate for people of lower organizational status to give feedback to those
who are, in this case, perceived to be of a higher status about performance related to their central domains of work. This pattern can perhaps be labeled a social convention (Goffman, 1971) since it appeared to be a social norm for the setting or institution rather than inherent in the individual actors.

In 215 Frost Hall (Setting I), the feedback she gave was predominantly gratefulness for helping her perform her responsibilities as Secretary to the College, Director of Student Affairs, and manager. On two occasions the feedback was written: a note to a support staff member for doing a small project above and beyond her normal duties and a banner strung across the back wall of 215 Frost Hall, thanking the entire staff for their assistance on the Alumni Event. Most of the time the feedback she gave was informal, a verbal thanks "appreciate your follow-through on that." As can be seen from these examples, the work-related feedback was always private, so as not to highlight the individual over the group. The banner, a collective thank you, was one of the ways in which Kennon attempted to build group spirit. This is discussed in greater depth in the next section.

Kennon also gave feedback to female professional and support staff members that was gender-related as can be seen from such comments on their appearance as "I like your scarf" or "What a pretty color that is on you." Once again, it is suggested that further research in a more gender-balanced setting be undertaken to determine the relationship of this kind of feedback to gender.

Help seeking, another aspect of relationships, is also examined through the interpretive framework of role. In asking for help, differences were found across settings by role and by pattern of
behavior. In 215 Frost Hall, Kennon used the word "help" (as in "I could use your help") twice. Both instances involved student cases in which Kennon requested a professional or support staff member to follow-up on a case so that she could ultimately make the decision on the case. Other requests for help, although she did not use the word help, consisted of requests to get files, to check a student record on the computer, or to type a report. These latter requests for help were not dimensions central to her position, that is, she could have done them but preferred not to. Even the requests for follow-up on a student case, although related to her Secretary to the College role, were not on dimensions central to her position. The dimension central to her role was decision-making.

In the college, Kennon most frequently asked for help from faculty about issues related to her responsibilities as Secretary to the College. Less frequently she asked for help from faculty related to her duties as Director of Student Affairs and as liaison to other administrative units. The requests for help were both formal (written) and informal (verbal) and ranged from the least intrusive pattern of help seeking, which was asking for information, to the most intrusive, which was asking for their participation in an event. Intrusive here meant the amount of personal time involved in helping.

In the college, some of the requests for help did pertain to dimensions central to her position, others did not. Those that did not were related to her Secretary to the College role. In this role, Kennon was an "agent of the faculty," and although she had the power to make decisions regarding academic matters related to students, this power was given to her by the faculty. In some cases, the final decision on an academic matter rested with the faculty, for example,
acceptance to an academic program and waivers of curricular requirements.

Frequent requests for help on dimensions central to one's position can be interpreted as a sign of incompetence by those who are being asked for help (Shapiro, 1984). This raises an interesting question for those administrators, both men and women, who are in middle management positions where they must go to faculty and superiors for final decisions. How do they manage their interactions with faculty and superiors such that they are not perceived as incompetent?

In the university, Kennon most frequently sought help from administrators about issues related to her responsibilities as Secretary to the College. The difference in the source for the requests (i.e., administrator versus faculty) had to do with the nature of her responsibilities which centered on students, specifically on students in the college. Her contacts with faculty outside the college were limited to those in programs that were linked to the college by virtue of shared curriculum. The administrators from whom Kennon sought help were generally responsible for implementing decisions in their respective units. Her requests for help from them were in relation to the expeditious handling of a matter related to a student in the college or familiarity with a problem related to university procedures (e.g., registration, credit from a foreign university). Outside the university her requests for help were infrequent, and those requests for help were to former employees of 215 Frost Hall.

Patterns of being asked for help were similar to those found in asking for help. The college faculty asked for help about academic
matters related to students. While Kennon asked for help on dimensions central to her position, the same cannot be said of the faculty whose central dimensions were teaching and research, not students. Since their requests were not central to their position, faculty members could repeatedly ask for help and not have it jeopardize their perceived competence. Requests for help from administrators in the college were found to be from one colleague whose responsibilities were closely allied with Kennon's.

Noticeably absent from among those who informally asked Kennon for help was the dean. The dean did not request help from Kennon in carrying out his duties, although Kennon did offer on several occasions to follow-up on matters he mentioned. The reasons are unknown, but need to be addressed further with more general questions, such as: Who did the dean ask for help? Are requests for help linked to the administrator's status in the organization (e.g., the dean asks the associate dean rather than the Secretary to the College)? Are requests for help gender-linked? The answers to these questions have implications for expanding women administrator's roles within a setting and increasing their visibility.

As was found in asking for help, those who most frequently asked for help from the university were administrators. They sought help on academic matters related to students and curriculum. Unlike the college and the university, requests for help from outside the university were most frequently written as opposed to oral.

The requests for help in 215 Frost Hall were very different than those found in the other settings. The requests were what one support staff member labeled "going the gamut," that is, help was requested because Kennon was the one who rendered final decisions on all matters
related to 215 Frost Hall in her role as manager. Even as an "agent of the faculty" in her role as Secretary to the College, she was perceived by staff members as an "expert" on academic matters related to students. Support for this assertion was found in such comments made by staff as "that's why I told her she had to come see you."

Further support is found in the number of pop-ins in which "getting business done" was observed.

The indepth look at a woman administrator's daily life revealed help seeking as an important dimension that varied not only in pattern (for example, who asks whom for help, in what ways, and for what purposes), but also across settings. Further questions of an organizational nature need to be addressed such as: Are there helping positions within organizations? Shapiro (1984) contends that there are, and furthermore, that they are generally staff positions. Are these helping positions found in middle management jobs? Are helping positions generally occupied by primarily by women administrators? How do men and women administrators who occupy helping positions differ in their help seeking patterns? Are there helping positions which are more facilitative of upward mobility in the organization? What effect does occupying a helping role have on one's network and on one's perception of upward mobility in the organization? Further questions of an individual nature also need to be addressed, such as: How do women administrators who occupy helping positions perceive helping? Are patterns of help seeking among other women administrators similar to or different from Kennon's?

When the third and final aspect of relationships, sharing information and ideas, was examined through the interpretive framework of role, it was found that the dean was the one with whom Kennon was
observed to enact the most roles. With him she performed behaviors related to the roles of Director of Student Affairs, Secretary to the College, subordinate, manager, colleague, and friend. Some of these roles were performed simultaneously and some were not. With a faculty member (44mIIF) Kennon also enacted a number of roles, those of colleague, Director of Student Affairs, and Secretary to the College.

Although Kennon had the most frequent contact with administrator 6mIIA, she performed behaviors related to only two roles, those of dean's staff and Secretary to the College. Similarly, despite her frequent contact with female faculty member (7fIIF), Kennon performed behaviors related to only her Secretary to the College role. Once again, despite her frequent contact with administrator 24fIIA, the behaviors she performed were related to her manager role, requesting information about staffing and budget.

It was found in 215 Frost Hall that although Kennon had frequent contact with professional and support staff members, there were only two with whom she performed behaviors related to several roles. With professional staff member 4fIPS, her roles included those of professional in the field, confidante, manager, Director of Student Affairs, and colleague. With professional staff member 9fIPS, her roles included those of manager, friend, Secretary to the College, and Director of Student Affairs.

From examining these two settings, the researcher hypothesizes that the breadth of roles played with the dean and the two professional staff members may be linked to the reporting relationship. The friend and confidante roles in these three cases were perhaps a function of the frequency of contact as well as the length of time they had known each other in the setting. Kennon and
the dean, for example, had known each other for approximately then years. This was also the case with professional staff member 9fIPS. Professional staff member 4fIPS and Kennon had known each other for approximately six years. With all three, there were organizational experiences that they shared such as the declining student enrollments in the college, the changing college administrations, and the reorganization of 215 Frost Hall.

These shared organizational experiences were sometimes the focus of conversations at meetings. At dean's staff meetings, for example, Kennon or the dean would occasionally open a conversation with "remember when" and then proceed to swap stories about past administrations in the college. In Figure 5, Mapping the Conversation of a Planned Meeting (see Chapter III), we see another example of focusing on a past shared experience. Kennon opened the conversation with "Do you remember (the) candidate who applied for that position wanted to market?" Professional staff member 9fIPS added: "Package." Kennon repeated the professional staff member's comment and confirmed it. Length of time known and shared organizational experiences and their influence on the roles individuals play among and between each other is a suggested area for future research. Kanter (1977) suggests that shared organizational experiences serve as a key factor in relationships between those in organizations, and suggests further that it is because men and women do not share the same organizational experiences that women are excluded from the informal network.

Among the remaining four with whom Kennon shared information and ideas, the interactions with faculty member 44mIIF were of particular interest to the researcher. Although Kennon did not have the frequency of contact with this faculty member as she did with others,
the range of roles that she enacted was significant. While two of the roles were related to organizational positions, the third was not. It was the role of colleague/confidante. As was reported in Chapter IV, the role was a source of conflict for Kennon because their conversations centered on departmental "politics." At the time the researcher observed these interactions, she hypothesized that Kennon would see his discussions of departmental "politics" with her as a way of being included in the informal male network of the college. When the researcher asked Kennon about her perceptions of these conversations, Kennon responded that "departmental politics is not one of my favorite things and I need to work with all groups so it's not the best thing for me to get visibly involved with one political faction or another..." On the basis of her response, a question for future research must be: if getting involved in departmental "politics" is not perceived as a way of gaining entry to the informal male network, then what is? Do other women administrators feel similarly?

As we move to the specific context of six planned meetings, and look at them through the conceptual framework of role, it was found that within the more informally defined role of speaker, organizational roles were played out as speakers initiated themes and gave extended responses to themes. In the dean's meeting (Meeting 1: #1 and #2), which were informational meetings over which the dean presided, Kennon initiated themes that centered on her role as Director of Student Affairs and Secretary to the College. Administrator 13mIIA gave extended responses to themes about computer equipment and vacancy notifications for faculty positions which were related to his role as overseer of equipment and personnel.
Administrator 6mIIA initiated and gave extended responses to themes about enrollments and classroom management which were related to his role of overseer of all academic matters in the college. His range of talk was more extended than Kennon's or the other administrator's which suggests that role and status of the role within the organization contribute to one's access to conversation in a meeting. Administrator 6mIIA held a higher position in the administration of the college than did Kennon or administrator 13mIIA. Role as well as status of the role within the organization outweighed length of tenure in a position, at least in these meetings, since administrator 6mIIA had been in his position fewer years than Kennon had been in her's. These findings suggest that, for future research in naturally occurring groups, content of talk as well as amount of talk must be considered. Furthermore, subjects' organizational roles, perhaps more than gender, should be considered. Prolonged engagement in the field observing the organizational work people do is a necessary first step in identifying roles for the purpose of understanding their participation in meetings.

We also saw that in those meetings over which Kennon presided, her initiation of themes and her extended responses to themes went beyond her organizational roles. This was particularly the case in those meetings convened for the purpose of completing a task (Meeting 2: #6). From these findings it is suggested that meetings provide an opportunity for women administrators, particularly when they serve as leaders, to be seen beyond their limited organizational roles.

The findings also revealed that Kennon's interactional style in meetings was similar to the dean's. To what extent Kennon's way of managing a meeting was purposefully styled after the dean's is
unknown, but it does raise an interesting question as to the ways in which meetings can provide opportunities for women administrators to observe administrative behaviors.

Relationships

As we looked at the woman administrator's relationships, two major aspects emerged, these were: the existence of networks and the building of personal relationships in the work setting. We begin this section with a description of the findings related to networks, specifically, the kinds of networks, who comprised them, and how they were used. This description is followed by a discussion of the findings and their relation to the existing research which was presented in Chapter II.

The findings revealed that the woman administrator had three kinds of ties with people in the work setting: instrumental, business-social, and primary. Instrumental ties were those with whom Kennon "got business done." As we look outside Frost Hall to Harrington University, these were the people in other administrative units who were implementers, that is, they implemented the policies of the university and their respective units rather than made the policies. These were also the people upon whom Kennon called for help as revealed in this telephone exchange:

KE   THIS IS KENNON ABBOTT IS NEAL AVAILABLE?
HELLO THERE
GOOD
I NEED A REFRESHER. A STUDY ABROAD IN THIS CASE 700, DO WE NEED TO DOCUMENT THAT IN ANY WAY? FOR AWHILE WE WERE HAVING TO (INAUD) RECORDS SENT THEM OVER. (page 1106 L# 100)
The conversation between Kennon and Neal continued with Kennon confirming at one point "that's what I thought" and adding "I wanted clarification on that before I sent it." At the conclusion of their conversation Kennon thanked Neal and added "I always appreciate a consultation with you." This conversation is illustrative of the interaction style that she used when requesting help from administrative colleagues.

Those who were instrumental ties also called upon Kennon for help. In fact, as help seeking patterns were examined in greater depth, an exchange of help pattern emerged between Kennon and four people from the university. Three of the four were administrators and one was a faculty member. Interestingly, only one of the administrators (84mIIIA) was from central administration. The other two administrators (79mIIIA and 22mIIIA) were from another college in the university, and each called upon each other to consult about issues that were mutually shared because of their similar positions. This finding expands Scott's (1978) conception of a middle manager as a "linking pin" between horizontal structures, which he identified as the link between colleges and central administration. Kennon called upon administrators in other colleges for help as much as she did those in central administration. This raises some interesting questions. How common is the practice of consulting with others in similar positions about mutually shared issues? How does the size of the educational institution affect these patterns of help seeking? How does it affect the decision-making of middle managers?

As we look inside Frost Hall, those with whom Kennon had instrumental ties were faculty who taught and advised students on a daily basis and administrators whose duties and responsibilities
overlapped with her's. These were the people whom she called upon for help and who called upon her for help. As in Setting III, an exchange of help pattern also emerged in this setting. Unlike Setting III, however, the majority were faculty members, only one was an administrator. In this network, Kennon was the "expert" on academic matters related to students since she was the only one in the college with this responsibility. When broader curricular issues or policies were involved Kennon consulted with administrator 6mIIA whose responsibilities were to oversee all academic matters in the college.

In the wider university setting, there are more choices available as to whom one consults. Kennon, for example, could have chosen any number of administrative colleagues to contact regarding her "refresher" since it was not a case that specifically required Neal's attention. In the college, however, the range of choices for consultation are more restricted since only one person (and his or her staff) has responsibilities for certain tasks. This leads to a very general question about networks: what were the women administrator's motivations for building those particular help seeking networks? Shapiro (1984) suggests that decisions about whom to ask for help are often related to the personality of the one who is being asked for help.

If a person provides help in a manner which does not reflect a negative view of seeking help and of the help seeker, future help seeking should be made more likely (p. 227).

Kennon had instrumental ties with those in 215 Frost Hall, but the nature of the relationships varied. There were those with whom she went to lunch and who confided in her about family and personal matters. These were professional staff members. Then there were
those with whom she quipped and joked. These were both professional and support staff members. Then there were those with whom she just "got business done." Professional and support staff members as well as student workers comprised this group. Despite the variation, the distance between manager and staff member was never bridged, that is, it never went to a peer level as was seen in Kennon's business-social and primary ties.

It was also shown that those with whom Kennon had frequent contact, that is, weekly or semi-weekly, were all people in the college (Setting II). This finding suggests that Kennon's visibility was within the college, rather than the university or outside the university. A look at the meetings Kennon attended further substantiated her "local" visibility. It was shown that over 60% of her meetings were college meetings. Furthermore, many of those meetings were repeated and continuous which meant that she saw the same people.

As we look at the number of faculty and administrators from outside 215 Frost Hall who had appointments or stopped in to see her, they comprised 16% of those who saw her in her office, the remaining 84% were professional and support staff in 215 Frost Hall. A study of the appointment and stop-in patterns of her administrative colleagues would be necessary to determine the degree to which Kennon was insulated from the activities of the college. Her organizational roles and the nature of her job activities suggest that she was insulated. Her activities, although they straddled organizational boundaries, were not central to the college's purpose which was teaching and research. The situated nature of her role is further supported by the findings which showed that she had infrequent contact
Questions for future research include: How do administrators in such positions present their job activities such that they appear central and relevant to the organization's purpose and thereby increase their visibility? Do men and women in similar positions present their job activities differently? What implications does this have for their perceived power by others since relevance of job activities has been linked to power (Kanter, 1977)? What implications does this have for their visibility in the organization?

It was also revealed that 100% of Kennon's instrumental ties, both in the university (Setting III) and outside the university (Setting IV), were people with whom she had infrequent contact. Over half of those with whom she had infrequent contact in the university were administrators whom she saw in group situations such as planned meetings. This finding suggests the potential that planned meetings have for increasing the women administrator's visibility, particularly in large educational institutions where personal knowledge of everyone is impossible. University meetings and women's participation in them is an important area for further research, particularly as women gain entry into middle management positions where the visibility may be more "local" and the job activities not as relevant to the central purposes of the institution.

Business-social ties were those with whom Kennon had both business and social contacts in about equal number. They met each other for lunch or for dinner, went on trips to visit mutual friends, helped each other on academic matters related to students or professional questions, and saw each other at planned meetings. Kennon's contact with them was monthly or less than monthly. Most of
them were from the university and held administrative positions. It was from this group that the researcher observed how a network can operate to "get business done." In the early fall, Kennon received a telephone call from women administrator whom she worked with in a professional association. Rita called Kennon to inquire about an administrative internship program for women faculty. During the telephone call they chatted about mutual acquaintances, but the primary purpose of the call was to "get business done." Upon hanging up the telephone, Kennon promptly called Julia, a member of her primary group, who was participating in an administrative internship program, and asked her to contact Rita. Julia suggested that Kennon call Christine from another office to get the brochures about the program. Kennon called Christine, an instrumental tie. They discussed Rita's request and Christine agreed to send the materials to Rita. A few days later, Kennon followed up with Julia. Typically networks, such as the old boy's network, are used for advancing in one's career. This finding suggests a different way in which networks can be used and served to raise a larger issue in the process: Do men and women administrators use networks in the same way?

Kennon's primary ties were those with whom she had primarily social relations. These were the people with whom she (or they) devised activities in order to generate the desired form of social action such as going to the theatre or the opera, having dinner or lunch, going on a trip, inviting them to her home for dinner. Her contacts with them were not through the usual channels such as meetings or business-related telephone calls. The frequency of contact with people in this group ranged from less than monthly, for those who lived and worked out of town, to semi-weekly. The majority
were people within the university who held administrative positions. As was the case with her business-social ties, the group was small, consisting of nine people.

What did each of these groups look like in terms of their gender composition? Among those with whom she had instrumental ties, 57% were male and 43% were female. Of those within this group, there were nine with whom she had frequent contact, 67% were male and 33% were female. As we look at her business-social ties, they were all women. Among those with whom she had primary ties, 78% were female and 22% were male. There were no male faculty or administrators from the university among Kennon's primary ties. Both the men in this group were from professional associations.

In looking at Kennon's primary and business-social ties we can conclude that her informal network consisted of women. These women were the ones with whom she "exchanged information over coffee, lunch, or at informal social clusterings" (Zacharias, 1976, p. 204). Although the researcher was not privy at all times to their discussions, Zacharias describes the information exchanged as consisting of "myths and survival strategies" (p. 204) and emphasizing "interpersonal relationships, oral communication and the sharing of "soft," timely information" (p. 204). The absence of male administrators or faculty from either the college or the university raises some questions, most of which are unanswered. Was the exclusion of males by her choice or theirs? Lipmen-Blumen (1976) and Kanter (1977) suggest, through their homosocial and social homogeneity theories respectively, that people have a preference for the company of the same sex. It is easier to talk to those of "one's kind who have shared experiences" (Kanter, 1977, p. 58). Those of one's kind
are more predictable and there is less time spent concentrating on subtle meanings (Kanter, 1977; Epstein, 1970). In settings where the administration is predominantly male, as was the case in this college, the preference for dealing with people who are similar could also explain why there were no men in her primary group.

There are three factors that could further explain the absence of men from her primary group, and these centered on her position in the organization. First, there is a preference in organizations for people to want to speak to higher status rather than lower status people (Jackson, 1969). Second, there is a preference for people to want to communicate with resource allocators. Resource allocators are those who, because of their position in the power hierarchy, are in control of various resources that affect others' mobility (Albrecht, 1976). Third, there is a preference for people to want to communicate with those who can provide relevant information about situations and provide a model of behavior (Albrecht, 1976). Kennon occupied a middle status position, she controlled no resources, and she was the only female in a male-dominated administration and college. There was no external motivation for those who occupied administrative positions in the college, for example, to be part of Kennon's informal network. The absence of men from Kennon's informal network is unanswerable because of the confounding of gender and role. Further research needs to be done.

Exclusion from informal networks in the work setting have both implications for mobility within the organization and for putting individuals in contact with a vital amount of knowledge about the field that might otherwise be missed (Albrecht, 1976; Kanter, 1977; Tickameyer and Bokemeier, 1984). Kennon, by virtue of her role and
parallel peer network, may have been excluded from informal and formal decision-making. Again, further research needs to be done since gender and role are confounding variables. Other questions about women's inclusion in informal male networks need to be addressed, such as: How important do women feel it is to be included in the informal network? If they are not part of the informal network, how do they obtain vital information? Sagaria (1985) suggests that women administrators are more likely to get that information through participation in committee work. The similarity in interaction style between Kennon and the dean in managing a meeting suggests the possibility that committee meetings did afford Kennon an opportunity to observe the dean's administrative behaviors and develop a "suitable" interaction style for conducting meetings. It might further explain the emergence of the host role which was part of their meeting behavior.

Kennon's predominantly female informal network supports Bernard's (1981) and Simeone's (1987) conclusions that women's networks are enjoying a resurgence. Both researchers see the formation of networks as:

not a reaction and a second best alternative to women's exclusion from male networks, but rather speak to the positive valuing of women of each other's work, experience, and support. In fact there are some who argue that these networks constitute the most vital development within the recent history of American higher education (Simeone, 1987, p. 99).

Tickameyer and Bokemeier (1984) also see women's networks becoming increasingly important as women gain access to administrative
positions at all levels, particularly as a means of career mobility. Further research needs to be done, both on how women experience these networks from a personal and professional perspective, and on how such networks form. As we look at Kennon's informal network, for example, we saw that the women within this group were predominantly women administrators from the college and the university who perhaps had similar organizational experiences which brought them together. Included in her informal network were also female faculty members from the college. Since their statuses within the college are different, what brought them together? Was it their shared organizational experience as women in a male-dominated college or was it something else?

The findings also revealed that Kennon had primary and business-social ties with men and women from a professional association. Some preliminary research suggests the importance of participation in professional associations as means of gaining visibility in the university beyond one's organizational roles (Elder, 1984). As was shown in this study, Kennon was called upon several times to give presentations to students about issues in her area of professional training and involvement. This visibility, however, was limited to the college. Her professional in the field role remained untapped in the larger organization. Is this pattern typical or atypical for other women administrators at Harrington University? Is it typical or atypical for women administrators at smaller educational institutions?

Elder (1984) further suggests that professional associations are also important because they permit male and female colleagues to meet in an environment where:
competition between the sexes is less important than teamwork, where one can respond to cues which are likely to be more straightforward than at one's institution, where career concerns are integral to the life one lives, and where planning for future success is inherent in the situation (p. 17).

In an interview with Kennon in the early summer of 1986, she spoke about the sense of team play in professional associations:

the other thing I think it helped most and they usually attribute this to male groups the sense of team play. I mean the leadership of a volunteer organization is a team if you will um you're playing together you may not really like one another but you're needing to work together for the association's best interest and you learn that even though you may not choose to do a lot of things with that person the person can contribute to associational goals so you can often broaden your interpretations abit (Interview 3: line 444).

As was shown in this study the only men who were part of Kennon's informal network were from professional associations. Although she did not have frequent contact with them, when they were in town for special meetings they stopped in to see her, she took them to the airport, she hosted them. Although the findings lend support to Elder's contention, further research is needed to address such questions as: What is the nature of women's experiences in professional associations? Are they different for women who serve as officers than for those who do not? Are their experiences different
depending on the orientation of the association, for example, professional/administrator versus scholar/faculty?

Kanter (1977) suggests that those who perceive their mobility blocked within the organization turn to outsiders for their affiliations (e.g., professional associations). Kennon was actively involved in one professional association, serving in numerous capacities since joining in the early 1970s: board member, committee member, chairperson of a division, editor of a journal, officer, committee chairperson (Autumn Quarter 1986). Kennon was active in the organization: reading its journals and newsletters; keeping up with members of the association, their personal and professional lives; and lecturing to university graduate students about involvement in professional associations. In an interview in early summer of 1986, Kennon revealed that she became involved as a board member of the organization early in her career, shortly after moving to a new position at Midwestern University. She also revealed that her move to Harrington University was a result of her "association contacts." This suggests that there may be some differences between professional associations for those in academe versus those in business. Further research is needed to determine administrators' reasons for joining professional associations, and furthermore, if there are any differences between male and female administrators.

A look at Kennon's participation revealed stages of progressive involvement beginning in the early 1970s and tapering off in the mid 1980s after serving as the association's president. Is this pattern typical or atypical of other administrators' involvement in professional associations? Does the level of involvement coincide with an administrator's perceived blocked mobility? Answers to these
questions would add to our understanding of professional associations and their place in the lives of administrators.

Upon concluding the discussion of networks, we now move to a discussion of the second aspect of the woman administrator's relationships: building personal relationships. To begin, we look briefly at the ways in which Kennon built personal relationships in the work setting. From this more contextual description, we will then look at the competing conceptual frameworks of the developmental theorists (Gilligan and Miller) and the structural organizational theorists (Kanter) that were presented in Chapter II to see how this study refines or expands on those theories.

The findings revealed that inside 215 Frost Hall, Kennon did "social" work. She provided goodies for staff parties and other occasions; she sent cards and notes to those who were on sick leave; she gave gifts or "organized" the giving of gifts to members of the staff on special occasions such as birthdays and weddings. Feedback was given both publicly and privately to staff members for their help. In staff meetings she thanked professional staff member 16mIPS for revising office forms; she thanked the researcher and professional staff member 9fIPS for "doing such a good job on the advising manual." She repeatedly thanked professional and support staff members for their "follow-through" on tasks that she had assigned. She sent notes to some staff members thanking them for their special assistance on a project that was "above and beyond" their normal duties. On a Monday morning after the Alumni Event that preceding weekend, Kennon had strung a computer-generated banner saying thank you across one of the walls in the back of the office. She listened to staff members relay their family and personal problems. She reminded staff, particularly
professional staff in meetings, about the need to "work closely with Robbie" or to "go easy on Lois because she's doing two jobs right now" or "we'll have to be careful how we bring this idea up to Kitty." The connections she tried to build among her staff verbally at meetings was also found in some of the office procedures she established. One of those procedures was the Big Red Calendar which was discussed at length in a professional staff meeting. Professional staff member 9fIPS opened the discussion. Kennon explained that the purpose of the calendar, which was posted on one of the walls in 215 Frost Hall, was so the staff could post their busy times so that others in the office could pitch in and help or defer asking the busy person for help. Although the calendar was being used at that time to post birthdays and vacations, the professional staff members discussed how the calendar could be relocated and used for its original purpose.

Outside 215 Frost Hall, and primarily in the college (rather than the university or outside the university), Kennon also did "social" work. She provided goodies for several meetings over which she presided and she offered to bring a coffee cake to a meeting called by the dean. She sent cards to administrators and faculty who were on sick leave or celebrating special occasions. She gave gifts to administrators celebrating special occasions (e.g., graduation) and was instrumental in "promoting a little bit of fun" at a meeting by calling all the members of the committee beforehand and announcing the plans to surprise the dean. She and the dean's secretary organized the goodies for that meeting. While the male members of the committee "roasted" the dean about his award, Kennon, when it came to her turn, announced that the goodies for the meeting were her contribution to the celebration. What remains unknown is whether Kennon excluded
herself from the "roasting" voluntarily or whether assuming the role of a "roaster" was inappropriate. Is this a gender issue or personal preference?

The developmental theorists presented in Chapter II provide insights into the interpretation of Kennon's professional life. We will see how looking at the everyday life of a woman administrator in the work setting extends and refines these developmental theories. The developmental theorists revealed that the building of personal relationships begins in the early years with the mother-daughter relationship (Chodorow, 1978) and continues to be a central focus in female development (Miller, 1976), which Gilligan (1982) has shown occurs in stages. As Gilligan looked at the "visions of maturity" she found that the "standard of moral judgment that informs the assessment of self is a standard of relationship, an ethic of nurturance, responsibility, and care (p. 159).

As we look at Kennon's personal relationships through the interpretive framework of women's developmental theory, we see that the building of personal relationships in the work setting was more in evidence in some roles than in others. It was more highly developed in two organizational roles: the manager role and the dean's staff role. In the former, it was revealed in the ways in which Kennon tried to build connections among staff members through the verbal talk at meetings and the Big Red Calendar. In the latter, it was revealed in the ways in which Kennon expressed her relationship to members of the dean's staff by sending cards, giving gifts, and "promoting a little bit of fun" to celebrate the dean's award. The building of personal relationships was also more highly developed in the informal role of meeting leader. At the recruitment meetings over which she
presided, for example, Kennon saw to it that new members to the group were introduced each time, that members were given a "turn at talk," and that food, as a recognition of the members' attendance and diligence, was provided. In the informal role of listener at meetings, we also saw Kennon confirm and give minimal responses, such as "mmm," to speakers which indicated her support for the current speaker (Coates, 1986). Several questions are raised here. Does she act in similar ways outside the work setting? This question suggests the need for an ethnographic study that includes significant others such as spouse, family, and friends. Why is the building of personal relationships more highly developed in some roles than in others? Are there particular social conventions in the work setting that preclude it from being more highly developed? Is intrarole conflict a factor? For example, in her role as Secretary to the College are there expectations of that role that are repeatedly placed in conflict when personal relationships are attended to in the same way that they are in her role as manager? Miller (1976) saw helping as an integral part of women's development. How does the helping role in organizations fit in with women's development?

To provide further clarity about personal relationships in the work setting, we now focus on the structural perspective of Kanter (1977). The structural perspective presented in Chapter II makes four points related to personal relationships. First, attention to social relationships is not of major concern to people on the move since they are too busy climbing and figuring out how to relate to those upward in the hierarchy. Second, the building of personal relationships is a function of blocked mobility. Third blocked mobility occurs in three ways: low ceiling occupation, individual failure in a high ceiling
occupation, and wrong route to a high ceiling occupation. Each of these has a corresponding alternative for responding to it. For those in low ceiling occupations, attention is directed to peers; for those who have failed, attention is directed to those outside (e.g., professional associations); and for those who took the wrong route, attention is directed to subordinates or less advantaged. Fourth, there may be gender differences in the attention to social relationships among middle managers in blocked positions since Kanter's population appeared to be predominantly male middle managers. Austin's (1985) study of middle managers at a public university suggests that there may be gender differences. She found that women middle managers perceived their environment as less caring than their male counterparts. The caring environment in Austin's study included perceptions of relations in the work setting.

Findings from this study suggest that Kanter's contrastive scheme (i.e., attention to peer relationships is a function of low ceiling; attention to outside relationships is a function of individual failure; attention to subordinates is a function of wrong route) may be too simplistic to describe relationships in the work setting. Kennon built relationships in all three ways: she built them with peers which was revealed through her primary and business-social ties, she built them outside the university through professional associations, and she built them with subordinates. One thing that we do not know, of course, is whether Kennon perceived herself as blocked. Other questions related to Kennon specifically need to be addressed, such as: What are her personal and professional motivations? What are her commitments? Austin (1984) suggests that commitments in the work setting change over time. Did the building of
Kennon's relationships in the work setting change over time? Does her educational background affect her perception of mobility? It has been shown that mobility in an academic setting is linked to faculty credentials in an academic discipline. On a more general level the following questions need to be addressed: How do women administrators' professional and personal motivations influence their relationship patterns in the work setting? Do men and women administrators in similar positions build personal relationships in the same way?

**Authority**

As we look at the woman administrator's authority in the work setting the following was found: 1) as manager of 215 Frost Hall she exercised certain powers; 2) as Secretary to the College she exercised certain powers; 3) as manager of 215 Frost Hall the authority relationship was acknowledged by subordinates; and 4) she used influence to gain compliance from professional and support staff, administrators, and faculty rather than her formal position. Each of these findings is discussed briefly.

As manager of 215 Frost Hall she was observed hiring a new support staff member; promoting a support staff member; evaluating the performance of support staff members; distributing resources such as funds for supplies; deploying staff members within the office; setting policy having to do with the operation of the office; and assigning tasks to professional and support staff. Setting policy, it was found, had both informal and formal dimensions.

As Secretary to the College she was observed making decisions regarding academic matters related to students. In the manager and Secretary to the College roles, Kennon did not have complete
discretion to exercise the powers described above. For example, although the decision about whom to hire rested with Kennon, the procedure for creating a position had to go through channels, specifically, the dean, the business officer for the college, and the personnel office of the university. At each of these levels her decision to create a position could be terminated. In decisions about academic matters related to students, Kennon was the "agent of the faculty" or the "agent of the dean" which meant that decisions about whom to admit, what to approve in the way of curricular modifications, and whom to graduate were powers given to her by the faculty that she exercised on their behalf. As we look at her powers, the only ones over which she had absolute control were: deployment of staff, assignment of tasks, and setting policy within the office. These findings reveal how deeply authority is embedded in the tasks and roles of the administrator.

Perhaps the most interesting observation related to authority was the staff's perception of the relationship. "Going the gamut," a phrase coined by one of the support staff members, was illustrative of the relationship between Kennon and the staff. It was revealed in many instances when staff popped-in to see Kennon or when Kennon dropped by their offices or desks. Comments such as "That's why I told her she had to come see you" or "That's why I came to see you" or "That's why I left it here for you too see" were illustrative of "going the gamut." Sometimes it meant Kennon had to make decisions about matters, other times it was just for advice. The difference in perception between the professional staff whose supervisor was Kennon and the support staff whose supervisor was the office manager who reported to Kennon needs to be explored further.
As the authority relationship was examined across all settings, it was found that Kennon did not use her formal position to gain compliance from staff, administrators, and faculty. Kennon used influence. This was evident particularly in assigning tasks to members of her own staff and in requesting help from administrators and faculty. Of the patterns of help seeking that were identified, participation and homework required the greatest use of influence because they intruded most on the other person's time. Kennon's influence was also related to her expertise on academic matters related to students. One example illustrates this point. During the recruitment meetings in the Autumn Quarter, one of the faculty members proposed several curricular modifications that his department planned to implement. To each of these proposals Kennon proffered opinions about why the proposals were not workable given the relationships between the college and other administrative units. The faculty member, who was unaware of these implications, responded with "Oh I see." This suggests that future studies about women administrators should look at the personal influence they exercise as well as the influence they exercise by virtue of their role. This discussion has uncovered only a small part of the role of influence. It is a highly complex issue and needs to be more closely examined and traced across settings, tasks, and relationships.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Throughout the discussion of the findings in this chapter, questions for future research have been suggested. In this section, broad general areas for future research are outlined. The reader is referred to subsets of the preceding section to see how the questions
are embedded in the issues. Nine general areas for future research are described. These are:

Activities and Tasks

Questions and issues related to the specific job activities of administrators and implications related to performance of those activities.

Gender Differences

Questions and issues related to differences between male and female administrators; for example, patterns of help seeking, participation in professional associations.

Gender/Role

Questions and issues related to the confounding variables of role and gender; for example, participation in informal networks.

Motivation

Questions and issues related to the underlying reasons for women administrators' decisions or behaviors; for example, personal and professional motivations for career choices and position choices.

Perception

Questions and issues related to the woman administrator's conscious understanding of the roles she plays and the activities in which she engages.

Organizations

Questions and issues related to positions within the organization; for example, opportunity and visibility and the relationship to the woman administrator's position in the organization.
Relationships

Questions and issues related to the woman administrator's relationships with peers, subordinates, and superiors. Specific areas include: managing interactions, help seeking, the influence of shared organizational experiences.

Roles

Questions and issues related to formal and informal roles within the organization and how they are differentially played out across settings and relationships.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes with a summary of its practical significance to women administrators and those with whom they work. First, this study helps us understand the importance of certain kinds of job activities, specifically meetings, as a means of gaining visibility in the organization; as a means for observing administrative behaviors; and as a means of demonstrating competence and leadership. It informs those in positions who make decisions about such job activities about why they are important if women administrators are to become full participants in the governance of the university.

Second, it helps us understand the importance of women's networks in the work setting. These networks can facilitate the development and growth of mentors and role models for women administrators, particularly as more women gain access to administrative positions.

Third, it helps us understand the role of professional associations in enhancing the women administrator's professional life beyond the limited campus roles she may play. Furthermore, they can provide a vehicle for increasing the woman administrator's visibility at her own institution as she is called upon as a professional in the
field. They can provide an opportunity for men and women to come together in relationships that "are more straightforward than at one's own institution, where career concerns are integral to the life one lives, and where planning for future success is inherent in the situation" (Elder, 1984, p. 17). In addition, they can provide an opportunity for men to see women outside "their limited campus roles" (Clement, 1978).

A common thread runs through all three of these practical considerations: role is significant in the structuring of the woman administrator's experiences in the work setting. With this awareness women administrators can seek out opportunities both inside and outside the organization that provide them with chances for personal and professional growth.
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Appendix D

Field Notes

July 11, 1986
Field Notes/Observations

9fl was sitting behind her desk. I was sitting in a chair in front of her desk facing her. We were discussing the manual. 13fl stood in the entrance to 9fl's office. 13fl and 9fl discussed 12mI's absence and he was on "call." They discussed whether 13fl could handle the load while 9fl and I continued to work on the manual. 13fl said she would let her know if things got backed up. 13fl turned left and walked down the corridor. 9fl and I started talking about the manual. 13fl walked down the corridor with her fists clenched and her teeth gritted, making an "ump" noise. 9fl laughed and said, "Kennon thinks 13fl is so even-tempered, she's not." 9fl and I talked about the manual until 9:15 a.m. when 9fl came across a question concerning the name of a faculty member in the x department. She got up from her chair and left the office to "to go see Kennon." She came back a few seconds later and says "Kennon is not there." At 9:22 a.m., Kennon stands in the doorway and says, "You needed to see me?" 9fl asks her whether the faculty adviser in x is xx or xx? Kennon takes a step into 9fl's office. Kennon says, "xx. Any other high level questions?" Kennon turns to face the door, and says,"That's about my speed this morning." Kennon walks out the door. 9fl and I continue to work on the manual. At 10:00 a.m. 9fl gets up from her chair to go ask Kennon about a faculty member in department x. As 9fl walks out the door she says "I don't think that person is coming until January. I'll go ask Kennon." 9fl comes back a few seconds later. I ask 9fl if Kennon was there, 9fl says, "door was closed." A little while later, Kennon stands at 9fl's door. She says, "Did you need to see me?" 9fl says, "Who do students see about x, 16mII, new person won't be here til January right?" Kennon is standing to the
left side of the door. She is talking with 16mI about photos while 9fI is talking to her. 16mI says "1mII is in x, isn't he?" Kennon says, "Yah he's in x." She turns and faces 9fI. She leans her left arm on the bookcase in 9fI's office facing 9fI. "yah the new person doesn't start until January, I'm sure 16mII will do it until then, but you better call 16mII. Better call." 9fI says, "It will either be 16mII or I'm afraid us." Kennon says "yeah." She walks further into 9fI's office. She says, "How ya doin on this?" She looks at the manual on 9fI's office. 9fI says, "to xx." Kennon says, "xx through xx?" I say, "no not xx." 9fI says, "They're with the xx people." Kennon turns toward the door, as she walks out the door with her back facing us she says, "Maybe we ought to put them in there." 9fI and I return to the manual. From over the wall I can hear Kennon ask 13fI "how are things?" 13fI says, "okay, called xx about mary jo xx said she'd take care of it." Kennon responded but it was inaudible.

TN: the interesting thing here is the kinds of things 9fI asked Kennon about. Both instances concerned faculty. Do they go to Kennon about technical issues? If they do which ones? 12mI has talked to Kennon about at least one student since I started observing. Kennon goes to professional staff for technical issues.
October 16, 1986
Field Notes/Observations

Kennon is sitting in the chair at her desk facing the room. 13mII is sitting in the chair next to Kennon's desk. I am sitting in a chair facing them in the middle of the office. Kennon says to 13mII "4mII wants to summarize?" 13mII says, "talk to the staff too." Kennon says, "first off." She tucks her left calf under her her hip. 13mII crosses his legs with the ankle at the knee. 13mII puts his hands behind his head, elbows out to either side. 13mII is dressed in a shirt and slacks. The slacks are gathered at the waist and he has on suspenders. Kennon says, "several things from this baliwick." She starts, "take from xx the awards and recognitions." Her legs are crossed at the knee. 13mII says, "that's a good idea." Kennon says, "a number of fellowships and minor fellowships. Susan do you remember?" She looks at me. 'Ok exactly." Facing 13mII she says, "recognize jerome ringley president of xx." 13mII says, "good, good." 13mII is writing in a pad that he has on his lap. Kennon says, "xx development you can take from 8fl's report." 13mII says, "Ok." He sits up in the chair. Kennon says, "$100,000 endowment for scholarships for academically talented, the xx award for $25,000, alumni activity there were six voted into the xx." 13mII writing says, "ok, good, great, great." Kennon says, the xx is still in the design stage. there were over 200 people who nominated 63 people." 13mII says, "that's good." Kennon says, "xx we started fees." 13mII says, "oh listen, i just talked to xerox, we can get a collater for $9500. so that was good news." He crosses his legs, ankle to knee. Kennon says, "recruiters came last year for xx and the fair you may want to fit that into xx the recruiters for that come from a wide geographical area." 13mII is writing. As he writes he says, "good." He looks up at Kennon, "there's an issue I want to run by you I talked to 48mII about it." Kennon asked questions. "How can we get the best? how can we find more? What is our phase down strategy?" Kennon brings up the hiring record this year, "that's real important on report, better than last year." Kennon adds, "we need to talk
about these implications for student enrollments."

MN: kennon brought up another idea in relation to this but i can't remember

Kennon and 13mII talked about 48mII's comment about a xx.

Kennon looks at 13mII and says, "Is he (4mII) going to highlight faculty participation?" She adds, "In some way he needs to confirm faculty visibility in professional associations and on campus." 13mII says, "let me see if I can get that. that's a good suggestion." Kennon says, "we'll have to work differently with xx in fields with xx. the other thing we need to do is articulate relationships with xx here and other schools."

MN: can't remember who brought up changing standards.

Kennon says, "right now the state is the recommending agent on all...we'll have alot more work in this office and so will the faculty i don't think the college has felt the full impact." Slipping her leg under her in the chair, she brings up xx."

37fII stands at the door. When Kennon looks up she walks in. 37fII says to Kennon as she walks toward her chair "you get money back." 13mII and Kennon are talking. She says to 13mII, "4mII is good and stroking but doesn't say much about himself."

"But xx (see line 195) we're major actor in that...xx center on the second floor in cardinal. oh back in xx oh i suggest xx got the xx award. She asks 13mII "is this the place for 4mII to talk about refurbishing activities?" She says, "relationships to field like the xx and the xx is he inviting xx?" Kennon says, recognition of xx award recipients." 13mII says, "oh yah good" Kennon says, "I trust 75mII will mention the xx." 13mII says, "oh yah 75mII's getting stuff for me on that." Kennon says, "that's all i can think of." 13mII stands up, Kennon says, "an alert when xx left he said it would come that short week of thanksgiving." Kennon, 13mII and I are standing by the chair closest to the door. 13mII shakes my hand and says, "thanks sue." he left at 10:53 a.m.
Message Units. A message unit (MU) is the minimum unit coded in this system. An MU is a minimal unit of conversational meaning on the part of the speaker. Each MU is defined in terms of its source, form, purpose, level of comprehension, and its tie. A message unit is comparable to a free morpheme in structural linguistic terms. The boundary of an MU is linguistically marked by contextualization cues. A message unit can be determined only in retrospect by considering the verbal aspects of the message and cues to contextualization.

The Source. The source identifies the speaker--the teacher, the student, or other person (e.g., parent, visitor). In analysis, the source of a message unit is symbolized by recording a number code selected to represent the speaker. This convention is recorded in the appropriate column of coding form for the MU under consideration (e.g., 2 for teacher, 3 for student, 4 for parent, etc.)

The person to whom the message is directed is also recorded whenever possible. The recipient of the message is assigned a number of letter, and this is then used as a subscript to that of the source. For example, if the teacher (2) spoke to Martin (7 or m), or Martin
and Jane, this would be recorded as 2\textsubscript{7} or 2\textsubscript{m}. If the identity of the student to whom the source is speaking is not possible, then an "0" is used to indicate that the message was addressed to a specific person but that that recipient's identity is unknown (e.g., 2\textsubscript{0}). The omission of a subscript indicates the message was addressed to the group as a whole.

The Form. Two general forms are identified: the question and the response. Each is linguistically marked. The manner of describing message units is based on the assumption that all messages in an instructional conversation which are not questions are responses to either the question, another participant, or internal purpose of the speaker. Not all responses are the same type; therefore, three categories of response types have been identified:

Type A Response +: This category encompasses all responses that could be expected and/or are predictable given the previous contiguous behavior. An expected or predictable response refers to those responses contiguous behavior. An expected or predictable response refers to those responses that meet the social, cultural, psychological, and semantic aspects of the situation. For example, if a teacher asks the question, "How much is one plus three?" a predictable or expected response would be a number. In contrast, an unpredictable response to this question would be "boys" or "bananas." The accuracy of the response is not a consideration. An incorrect response is noted by assigning the number 1 as a subscript to the response (+) code number (e.g., 5\textsubscript{1}). This convention permits retrieval of errors in later levels of analysis (See Table 2, p. 205).
Type B Response 0: This category encompasses responses that are not predictable given the immediately preceding message unit (MU). Two types of responses are recorded as unpredicted responses:
1. a spontaneous message by a student.
2. a response by the student other than the one designated in the previous contiguous behavior.

Type C Response -: This category encompasses student nonresponse and comments, such as "I don't know," and "um."

Note: Questions about the accuracy of responses and about nature of responses (e.g., elaboration, divergence) can be answered after descriptive coding is obtained. These are issues in analysis and not necessarily issues in description of message unit and conversational evolution.

The Strategies
This feature refers to the purpose of the message unit. The categories that compose this aspect of message structure were designed to be identified from sociolinguistic and pedagogical cues rather than from inference. Given that a message unit may serve multiple functions, more than one strategy can be recorded for each message unit.

Focusing: A message is defined as focusing if used to initiate the discussion. Focusing is marked by a shift in content of what is being discussed. It can be a question or response strategy. Although focusing behavior may be coded as confirming, raising, etc., it is also coded as focusing because of the overriding function it performs, the shift of focus.
Focusing Marker: This feature refers to a limited class of items (e.g., OK, now) that are used to hold the speaker's place or turn in the conversation. This feature is identifiable primarily through consideration of the prosodic aspects of the conversational segment in which it occurs. The word will generally occur alone, have pauses on either side of it, and/or be spoken in an extended manner. This feature usually marks the boundary or closure of one aspect of a conversation. This feature is indicated by 8. This feature can be glossed as meaning, "stay with me" or "it's still my turn."

Focusing Frame: This feature refers to a limited class of items (e.g., OK, now, next, do you know what, and then) that precede a focusing statement and that indicate that a new focus will follow. The prosodic feature that accompany the transmission of the word(s) helps define this strategy as a frame for what follows. This feature is indicated by a 8. This feature can be glossed as meaning, "Get ready. Something is coming."

Ignoring: This strategy is solely a response strategy. If a participant asks a question or makes a response that requires a conversational action by the recipient and does not receive one, ignoring is occurring. This message type is
marked nonverbally. This category is not used to "infer" a person meant to ignore a conversational message of the speaker. It is used only when no response occurs and one is required.

Confirming +: This feature refers to verbal and nonverbal acceptance of a preceding response. Confirming + may take the form of a question or a response. It is also used to code the answer to a yes-no question since a yes-no question is viewed as a request for confirmation regardless of observers' inference as to the speaker's intent. For example, the question: "Are you finished with your work?" may get a yes-no response. This response is appropriate, since the message was intended as a directive. That the message was meant as a directive can be determined by its place in the flow of the conversation. By coding of form only, subjective interpretation is avoided.

Confirming -: This strategy refers to nonacceptance of the previous contiguous response or to "no" in response to a request for confirmation.

Confirming - may take the form of a question or a response.

Continuance: A nonverbal or verbal message which can provide
a cue to the speaker that the listener is following the speaker's message and the listener may continue his turn. This is referred to as back channeling in the sociolinguistic literature.

**Extending:** This strategy refers to messages aimed at providing additional or new information about a topic. This information can be spontaneously added, or it may be elicited, therefore extending may take the form of a question or a response.

**Raising:** This strategy refers to a message that is aimed at raising the level of the discussion. This message is required to be tied to preceding ones. This strategy can take the form of a question or a response.

**Clarifying:** This strategy refers to messages meant to bring about explanations or redefinitions of a preceding behavior. This strategy may take the form of a question or a response.

**Editing:** This strategy encompasses shifts or changes in content, form, or strategy after the original message began. This strategy encompasses false starts and words such as "um," "uh," that act to hold place within a message. This strategy indicates internal monitoring and/or mediating of the message is occurring.

**Controlling:** This strategy refers to messages concerned with
the control of the interaction and/or the behavior of the participants. This strategy may take the form of a question of a response.

Refocusing: This strategy reestablishes a previous question or response.

Restating: This strategy refers to repeating all or part of the previous message of the original speaker either by the original speaker or by another individual in the group. It also refers to paraphrases of previous questions or response.

The Levels

Factual: Factual level comprehension is the lowest level of comprehension. It refers to information that was stated in the discussion or instructional conversation. Factual comprehension requires recall of facts from memory.

Interpretive: Interpretive level comprehension requires that information be inferred. This level requires that the participant provide information not specifically stated in the discussion or instructional conversation.

Applicative: Applicative level comprehension requires that the information obtained during the discussion or instructional conversation be used in new ways or in new situations. This is the highest level of comprehension used in this type of micro description.

The Ties
This feature of message unit structure recognizes that a message which occurs in discussion or instructional conversation is related to or builds on behaviors and/or messages of others. Messages may be tied across conversational units and across contexts. Four sources of ties have been identified for instructional conversations: the teacher, the student, the instructional media aide, and the instructional situation.

Teacher: A message is said to be tied to a teacher if the message is (a) to build on the teacher's own purpose or goal (this purpose may be internal or external in nature); (b) to feed back, or response to, the teacher's message.

Student: A message is said to be tied to a student if its purpose is (a) to provide feedback to the student; (b) to extend the student's response; (c) to use the response as basis of the next response; (d) to permit the student to build on his/her own message.

Instructional: A message is said to be tied to the text, material, or media aide if it is observed or be the direct trigger for a message unit. A message is said to be tied to the context (e.g., lesson being constructed or classroom structure being created) if the contextualization cues observed indicate that an iconographic or social structure has been created; that is, all participants have a shared definition of the situation (e.g., lesson or transition).
Contextualization cues that indicate construction of, and adherence to, instructional and social norms provide the basis for determining ties at this level of description. Frequently, ties for this feature exist across time (e.g., across conversational units and/or across lessons).

INTERACTION UNITS

Resolved Interaction Units: Multiple Units

A resolved interaction unit is defined as a series of conversationally tied message units. Which message units tie to form an interaction unit depends on consideration of verbal aspects of the message and cues to contextualization. If the delivery of a message indicates that more is to follow (e.g., the rhythm, pitch, intonation contour), then that message and the one that follows are described as tied. Conversational "pull" rather than syntax and/or semantic tie is the key. Consideration of contextualization cues is critical to the identification of which message units tie to form interaction units and which do not. Interaction units are illustrated in the following example from a transcript of a classroom discussion. Lines 003 and 004 are tied as indicated by message delivery, as are lines 005, 006, and 007. Although the other message units are related thematically, their manner of delivery indicated that they were complete alone. Conversational ties must not be confused with thematic ties. Thematic ties are another level in the hierarchical structure of conversations and will be defined in the sections on instructional sequence units, and lesson units.

Resolved Interaction Unit: Single Unit
An interaction unit may be composed of a single message unit if the message unit is a complete message as indicated by contextualization cues. On the transcript sample, lines 001, 002, and 008 are examples of message units that are also resolved interaction units.

Unresolved Interaction Unit: Single Unit

Four types of unresolved interaction units can occur in an instructional conversation.

Type I: Noncompleted or interrupted units. If a behavior is begun and is not completed, it is coded as a message unit and the structure of the unit is coded for as many features as possible. For example, the teacher begins to ask, "Who can..." and a student interrupts with a question. This unit has been interrupted, but the source and the form can be coded. The identification of the other features is not possible from this fragment; therefore, the message unit cannot be determined, then the message unit is said to be unresolved.

Type II: No response given. If a participant initiates a message that requires a response but receives none, the interaction unit is unresolved or open. For example, a teacher asks, "Who is this?" and receives silence. The teacher then asks the question in another way. "What animal do you think this is?" The interaction unit begun by the first question is unresolved since the teacher does not receive the expected response or closure.

Type III: Expected response not achieved. The teacher or
student in this type of unresolved interaction unit asks a question which is postponed. The question receives no response. The questioner then indicates that the question will be considered at a later point. For example, a student asks, "Why did the tiger do that?" and the teacher responds with, "We'll come back to that later."

Type IV: Overt ignoring. An unresolved unit can occur if the teacher or student who is to respond to an initiation overtly, as indicated by a direct nonverbal gesture, indicates lack of cooperation. For example, if the teacher asks a question of Student B and Student B turns away from the teacher, this unit is said to be unresolved from a pedagogical point of view.

Note: As with message units, boundary for interaction units is determined only in retrospect.

Instructional Sequence Unit

An instructional sequence unit (ISU) is composed of a series of tied interaction units (IU). An instruction sequence is defined in terms of content. All interaction units which focus on the same aspect of the total conversation belong to a single instructional sequence unit. The ties for the instructional sequence unit are ties that exist across units thematically. The end of an instructional sequence unit is marked by a shift in the general content within the lesson. Contextualization cues do not play a central role in the identification of instructional sequence units. This unit corresponds to a step the teacher takes in building the pedagogical structure of a lesson. An ISU is composed of interaction units, which focus on a
single subcontent of the lesson. Like message units and interaction units, the instructional sequence unit is determined only in retrospect. One cannot determine in advance whether or not an interaction unit will be part of the preceding instructional sequence unit or will begin a new instructional sequence unit. Instructional sequence units are generally composed of more than one interaction unit, but there are times in which an instructional sequence unit will be composed of a single interaction unit.

Phase Unit

A phase unit (PU) consists of a series of thematically tied instructional sequence units. Pedagogically a lesson is composed of parts or phases each with a distinct purpose (e.g., introduction, content presentation, evaluation period, or summary). Consideration of the pedagogical and social structure being constructed will determine which instructional sequence units belong to a phase unit and which do not. Consideration of who is group, when is group, and the expectations of behavior provide the structural cues that can be used to determine phase units for a given period of time. Phase units are generally composed of more than one instructional sequence units, but there will be instances when a phase unit will consist of a single instructional sequence unit. Like all previously described units, the phase unit is determined in retrospect.

Lesson Unit

A lesson unit (LU) consists of a series of instructionally tied phase units aimed at accomplishing all lesson goals. Although lesson units are generally composed of a series of a instructionally tied phase units, there are instances when a lesson unit will consist of a single
phase unit. As is true of all the units previously described, the lesson unit is determined via pos hoc analysis.
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Appendix G
Decision Rules Guiding the Identification of Categories of Work, Contacts, Feedback, Help Seeking

Kinds of Work:

Decision rules for determining oral work:
1) a form of communication
2) speaking

Decision rules for determining written work:
1) a form of written communication
2) inscribing letters or symbols on a surface, namely paper

Decision rule for determining interpretive work:
1) involves forms of written communication where the reader must explain to herself the meaning of what is written

Decision rule for determining "social" work:
1) pertaining to the health, happiness, and general well-being of others

Decision rule for physical work:
1) involves the use of body rather than mind

Decision rules for personal work:
1) caring and feeding of self
2) having to do with appearance
3) having to do with nutrition
4) having to do with caring for one's belongings
Kinds of Personal Links:

Decision rule(s) for determining if a contact is business:

1) situations or conversations having to do with the operation of the setting including the health of other people in the work setting as if affects the operation of the setting; for example, one person reports that so-and-so is not feeling well or is out sick.

Decision rule(s) for determining if a contact is social:

1) situations or conversations having to do with the health, happiness, and general well-being of the person, including the health, happiness, and general well-being of those close to the person such as family.

Decision rule(s) for determining if a contact is social-business:

1) conversations or situations that are made up in approximately equal part of the above two descriptions.

Characteristics of Ties:

Decision rules for determining feedback:

1) information directed toward a person about some aspect of the person;

2) information directed toward a person about the result of a process in which both parties have been involved.

Decision rule for determining a category of feedback coded gratefulness:

1) being appreciative of benefits received

Decision rule for a category of feedback coded performance:

1) acknowledging the completion of an obligation or a requirement with information about how the task was done
Decision rule for a category of feedback coded idea:
   1) acknowledging a plan, scheme, or idea

Decision rule for a category of feedback coded person:
   1) acknowledging the accomplishments or traits of a person

Decision rule for a category of feedback coded appearance:
   1) acknowledging the outward aspect of a person

Decision rule for determining instances of help seeking:
   1) either party openly admits to needing assistance or advice

Decision rule for determining a pattern of help seeking coded: information:
   1) either party is asking for knowledge about a specific event or situation;
   2) it is the primary reason for the contact, in other words it did not evolve during the conversation.

Decision rule for determining a pattern of help seeking coded: homework:
   1) either party is overtly asked to undertake a task beyond the instant of that contact;
   2) it is the primary reason for the contact, in other words it did not evolve during the conversation.

Decision rule for determining a pattern of help seeking coded: consultation:
   1) there is an equal exchange of information between parties with each party exchanging views about a particular event or situation.
Decision rules for determining a pattern of help seeking coded: participation:

1) either party is overtly asked by the other to take part of share in an event;
2) it is the primary reason for the contact, in other words, it does not evolve during the course of the conversation.

Decision rules for determining a pattern of help seeking coded: mutual problem solving:

1) either party puts forth a question or a situation for solution;
2) the question or situation is one that is of common interest to both parties;
3) both parties work equally to arrive at a solution;
4) it is the primary reason for the contact, in other words, it does not evolve during the conversation.
Appendix H

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participate in Susan Yutzey's research on how women in administration experience their work environment.

Ms. Yutzey has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation.

I acknowledge that through discussions of her research I have had an opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that questions I have raised have been answered. I understand that Ms. Yutzey will provide copies of her interviews with me, a summary of her analysis, and drafts of her dissertation for my review and comment. Further, I understand that I have absolute veto power over anything appearing in the above-named documents. I understand also that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me. The information obtained from me will remain confidential unless I specifically agree to otherwise by placing my initials here ______.

Finally I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date:__________________
Signed:_________________ (Participant)
Signed:_________________ (Principal Investigator)
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