FEMALE LEADERSHIP AND

NEW TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Lauren S. Topek

August, 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost I want to thank my unbelievable husband, Seth, for without whom I could not have done any of this. Thank you for encouraging me, motivating me, and pushing me forward to do this doctorate program and write my dissertation because you knew how important it was for me. Thank you for being understanding, patient, and the most wonderful, loving, and attentive father any wife could ever dream of in a man. Thank you for sticking by me through this for six whole years. GG always says to me how amazing she thinks I am and says, "Lauren, I just don't know how you do it!" I always reply, "Because I have a wonderful husband." I waited for you my whole life and you were more than worth the wait. You are my love.

This is for my darling sweethearts, Nora Evelyn Topek and Ella Rose Topek, my precious girls. Nora we started this program together when Mommy was pregnant with you, wrote papers together when you were in the baby swing, and defended my candidacy paper. Ella, we did my comprehensive exams and dissertation proposal defense when you were in my tummy ready to come out any minute. I want you to know that I believe in you and that you are the smartest, most capable, beautiful girls who can and will do anything you put your minds to as you grow. Thank you for letting me be your role model for how women can achieve anything! I love you more than life itself.

Thank you to my amazing parents, Susan and Dennis Paley, who always told me and showed me they believed in me and that I could do anything I wanted. Thank you for providing me a cherished childhood in Omaha, sending me to the college of my dreams and giving me the self-confidence to know that I would be somebody. Thank you for loving my girls from afar and making your presence very much known to them. Thank

you for teaching me to hold my head high and never doubt that I have an incredible family who is there always. I love you.

Thank you to my fantastic in-laws, Barbi and Stanley Topek, for being a support system for both me and Seth and our girls through this period in our lives. Thank you for loving us and taking care of us always. Thank you for listening and being a part of our everyday lives. Thank you for always giving of yourselves to and for us. Love love.

I want to acknowledge my grandparents, Arthur and Evelyn Paley. Little Grandpa and Little Grandma taught me about the value of humanity, love, and compassion. I could not be the cut-throat card shark I am without you. I hope your "Little Cookie" has made you proud and know that your legacy lives on through my children. Norman and Joan Rips, Big Grandpa and Big Grandma/GG, taught me the value of family holidays, education, the small moments being together, and being a proper lady in the world. GG you are a big part of my girls' lives. I love you all forever and always.

For my girls, this is also for your great-grandmothers in Houston, Mama, Sadye Maye Garsek, and Grandma, Helen Topek that you both knew as little girls. I want you to know that both of these women were strong forces each in their own ways and for whom family was the most important. We love you.

I have lived much in these past six years and my dear friend Sarah K has been my rock via phone in New York and Chicago. Anna, who my girls affectionately call Aunt Anna, has lived through every moment with me since the age of eight and for the past 24 years. My brother, Phillip, has been stability. And all of my in-law siblings who are very much a part of me, Jean, Jared and Tammy, and Alissa and Michael I thank you for keeping me grounded in the reality that life is most importantly about family.

I could not have lived my professional experiences without my mentors and women whom I truly trust and completely believe in, Kimberly Fonteno and Pamela Farinas. Thank you each for being you and standing me up and standing by me no matter what.

Lastly, I thank my dissertation committee for supporting me, providing honest feedback, and your attention to detail. Dr. Holland, my Committee Chair, thank you for investing a personal relationship in me from the beginning, being there for me to listen and advise, having the hard conversation with me, and knowing that I would finish my dissertation. This experience was and always will be one the best in my lifetime.

FEMALE LEADERSHIP AND

NEW TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

An Abstract
Of A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Lauren S. Topek

August, 2012

Topek, Lauren S. "Female Leadership and New Teacher Professional Development."
    Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Houston, August
    2012.

Abstract

This paper is a self-study that researched women's ways of knowing and female

leadership. Through four episodes, my first year teaching story was shown to be, and

defined as a cover story. I examined differences between men and women in terms of

learning, communicating, and knowing (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1997;

Clinchy, 1996; Hegelsen, 1995; Bateson, 1989). I expanded three issues related to female

leadership: 1) barriers and access to school leadership positions (Lucas, 2003; Friedan,

2001; Hooks, 2000; Stone, 1994), 2) types of leadership not delegated by sex (Atwater,

Brett, Waldman, DiMare, Hayden, 2004; Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Irby & Brown, 1995;

Van Engen, Van Deer Leeden, & Willemsen, 2005) , and 3) influences on teacher voice

and development via the leader (Hargreaves, 1996; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000; Elbaz,

1991).

This research was conducted using narrative inquiry in two ways. I unpacked it as

a way of knowing (Belenky et, al., 1997; Lyons, 1990) and showed how it is a method of

understanding because it situates understanding as contextual to time, place, and

personal/social interactions (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994, 2000; Lyons & LeBoskey,

2002; Craig, 2007). My cover story and the subsequent restorying process happened in

my analysis and were evidenced through lessons uncovered in each episode.

The lesson learned in episode one deals with meaning making. A new female

teacher needs to be a connected knower and part of the web of inclusion on campus. I

recommend campus-specific professional development in order to grow her and help her

become acclimated to the school and its community. This connected knowing time should envelope the new teacher into the ways of knowing specific to that school.

Episode two uncovered that the new female teacher must first be legitimized before being included in the web of relationships. New teachers should choose two or three elements to work on and hone their craft that first year. With guidance from the principal and teacher mentor the new teacher's voice and actions are still her own but they have been accepted before enacting.

The lesson discussed in episode three is that teacher and curriculum maker are not synonymous. New teachers need to learn their teaching strengths for curriculum and instruction implementation as well as their leadership strengths, which will help them with the management and relationship pieces of teaching. This kind of professional development will help sharpen the new teachers' skills and voice.

The last lesson presented in episode four is mentoring for the new teaching within a particular context. I recommend new teachers to be assigned to a mentor and willingly incorporated into the school community both within and outside the walls of the building. Also, the principal should critically analyze who and why one becomes a mentor in terms of the best match for the new teacher and a reciprocal relationship (Schön, 1987). It is the principal's responsibility to select the appropriate on-campus mentor.

To conclude, I presented an epilogue of my first year as a principal. I framed it in terms of lessons learned and those I still seek to understand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

"You should have heard the ooh's and ah's;
Ev'ry one wondering who she was. Henry
You'd think they'd never seen a lady before. Pickering
And when the Prince of Transylvania
Asked to meet her,
And gave his arm to lead her to the floor...! I said to him:
You did it! You did it! You did it!
They thought she was ecstatic
And so damned aristocratic,
And they never knew
That you
Did it!"
– My Fair Lady, "You Did It"

Professor Henry Higgins, England's leading phoneticist, exuberantly details the "expert's", Zoltan Kaparthy's, evaluation of Eliza Doolittle, his flower-selling Cockney peddler and now his speech student, at the ball. This was her test to see if she could pass as what would be deemed a "proper English lady" to other international royals. And she did. But, who was the winner: Professor Henry Higgins for creating the cover story (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) or Eliza Doolittle for executing its delivery? Why was presuming to be someone she was not such an accomplishment?

It was June 2001 when I moved from a large city on the East coast to live with my sister into a highly over-priced apartment in a suburb outside an urban city in the Northeast, and was looking for a teaching job. I had two months time to secure a job and set up my classroom before the students arrived. My professor at the time, now a Dean of a prestigious School of Education, gave me the name of his friend, an elementary male principal in a small town in the Northeast. I called, made the appointment, got suited up for my first interview with my three-inch, three-ring binder of a teaching portfolio in

hand and headed west on I-95 with my 24 year-old sister driving the car. He was the principal of an early childhood Pk-3 school with no vacancies as I quickly learned upon my arrival. But, he was so impressed with my experiences that he gave me the number of his friend a few towns over in Hayes, who he knew was hiring. As soon as I got in the car, I called the principal. She already knew who I was as he had called her right after I departed his office. We made an appointment for later in the week.

The 45-minute drive to Hayes from my apartment was filled with beautiful foliage and yet was uneventful. We, my older sister drove me again, passed places where famous American battles took place and authors lived long ago. I knew nothing about the school or the principal at that time. Walking into the building, I remember looking at the walls and trying to take mental notes of the artwork and plaques hanging so that I could perhaps bring them up in conversation.

I sat in the principal's office and had an individual audience with her. Shirley was White, about my height at five feet, eight inches, and had straight long, grey and white hair which hit right passed her chin. I paper-clipped certain pages in my portfolio in order to make sure to touch on important topics and concepts in my interview while simultaneously showing my capabilities as a teacher from my student teaching experiences such as: responsibility in the classroom, helping peers, cleaning and organizing, inclusion, music in the classroom, classroom arrangement, and my own curriculum I developed for social studies and reading units. These easy-access pages proved helpful because I quickly learned that Muskerry-Burg Elementary School, a K-6 school, was a visual arts-integration school. Oh, how I fit in perfectly! Or so I thought.

Purpose of the Study, Purpose of the Story

The purpose of this self-study is to investigate through narrative inquiry how voice, truth, and authority influenced a female teacher's professional development on a school campus. I will present in my analysis of the telling and retelling of my first-year teaching experience and my university-based experience illuminating cover stories, which can also be identified as the "authorized versions" (Olson, 1995, p. 128) as contrasted with my personal stories, which "do not seem to fit the authorized versions" (Olson, 1995, p. 128). Until graduate school, the story I told, as Olson (1995) suggests, "chose to discount or silence the voice of [my] experience and [I] attempt[ed] to live and tell the authorized cover stories" (p. 128). I will explore my experiences from the perspective of how leadership can support young teachers in developing and articulating their own stories. I hope to find that female leaders' support the development of female teachers through what Baker (1976) defines as "affiliative focus" (p.85), meaning a sense of responsibility and interconnectedness. I, too, like Helgesen (1995) feel that through using her voice, female leaders will also support through care and empowerment, which become "leadership tasks" (p. 226), rather than characteristically a style of leadership. If so, then they would have "done it", helping young teachers become the authority of their own stories rather than what society believes is the authorized version (Crites, 1979 as cited in Olson, 1995) as opposed to what Henry Higgins did when presenting Eliza Doolittle at the ball: presenting her under the auspice of a cover story as an English lady, rather than who she was, a Cockney flower girl.

Background to the Study, Background to the Story

The tension I felt in preparing this dissertation proposal, through trying to conform to someone else's standards of "good" and "right", blurred the lines for me about re-defining female support not in terms of traditional hierarchical leadership values and beliefs but instead in terms of originality and self-authority. I was in fact negotiating my writing style and process for thinking into that very same traditional, hierarchical model while trying not to lose the integrity of my beliefs and my truth: I am a woman whose near-future career goal it is to start an all girls' gifted and talented K-8 public school. My motives for this initiative are prompted by growing up in a traditional Jewish household, where women are revered and hold a distinctive place in perpetuating future Jewish generations. I am also an independent thinker and doer who has always been a top student, president of every club, and a self-starter. I learned early on that if I did not ask or self-advocate, my voice would go unheard, meaning that if I did not do it for myself, no one would. This too, it turns out is a kind of cover story I tell about myself. I learned through this proposal writing process that my truth has not always been from a place of self-authority as I originally thought.

Margaret Olson (1995) defines such self-authority as narrative authority, that view of knowledge which connects the knower and the known in order to represent experience. Understanding this way of knowing makes the self the source of constructing and reconstructing knowledge; thus, the self becomes the authority on experience. Therefore, the more experiences a person has, the more narrative authority she develops as she becomes the author of her own stories, which is why my methodological means is narrative inquiry.

During the early stages of the writing process I found myself at a loss for not only words, but also for motivation. I found myself perceiving my ideas and ideals of competency through other people's lenses. I was living my cover story while meeting the terms of the "sacred story (Crites, 1971 as cited in Craig & Huber) of scientific research upheld by the academy" (p. 270). Their strong sense and definition of skilled writing shifted mine into such a state that my concepts were jilted and my stories lost to a rational, technical (Schön, 1983) way of knowing rather than a narrative way of knowing. However, if writing as Richardson (1994 as cited in Louie, Drevdahl, Purdy, & Stackman, 2003) states is a "way of 'knowing'—a method of discovery and analysis," then I needed this writing experience to unearth my buried voice and to regain my sense of self. Olson (1995) describes this such that "in order to learn from our stories of experiences, we need to inquire into the meanings we have constructed from the stories we live and tell in order to author our lives in more informed way" (p. 125). Therefore, this writing experience was not "mis-educative" (Dewey, 1938) as it initially felt with my quantitative-oriented writing group, those who operated through measurement and numbers, but became, with the support of my second writing group, an opportunity to grow from closely examining prior experience. Revision with my second writing group, a more like-minded (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule., 1997) group of individuals, i.e. qualitative writers and thinkers who operated through expressing voice and personal meaning, helped me realize that I could not just write about the support female leaders give their emerging female teachers as a tool external to the teacher, but rather as something for the new female teacher to experience and interpret through her teaching and thriving in the school environment.

My discovery of losing my voice through inquiry about the respectability and reasonableness of my paper, made me understand more intimately the need for women, particularly new female teachers, to know and understand the barriers they face in being perceived and ultimately legitimized as "leader." Operating in a man's world where value-judgments exist merely on the basis of your sex and not your accomplishments or leader-like qualities, does not help emerging female leaders navigate status or accessibility into such positions of authority. It is therefore reasonable to understand why self-study, through conversation (Rust, 2002) or "grow[ing] in dialogue" (Bateson, 1989, p. 94) in a knowledge community (Olson & Craig, 2000) becomes a woman's strategy for knowing and learning. Many researchers contend that teacher self-study is the conduit for creating better teaching and better schools.

At 7:30 a.m. the very next morning, Shirley called to offer me a sixth grade teaching position. Before she could officially offer this to me though, she explained that the district's procedure was to have all new hires interview with the Superintendent, Jim Evans. So, after the initial adrenaline rush from being offered my first teaching position after only a single interview, I needed to go shopping. I could not possibly where the outfit I interviewed in the day before. My sister and I set out for Macy's.

The Hayes-Waldener school district office was a small building and when I arrived the secretary, too, like Shirley the day before, already knew my name. Jim Evans was a White, male in his late fifties or sixties, had graying hair and was somewhat overweight. I cannot remember the nature of our meeting, but I do remember it being on friendly terms and he officially extended me the teaching position. He also described the school district as a small-town, mostly upper-white class district with five elementary

schools, one junior high school, and a high school that connected with the next town over. It is only now that I have come to research that the year I was hired was only the end of his first year as Superintendent. After the interview I filled out my fingerprinting and background check information with the secretary and walked my contract over to Muskerry-Burg, which was around the corner.

During the few summer weeks left, I practiced my highway-driving to and from school as I prepared my classroom. Shirley allowed me to paint my classroom any way I wanted. Gary, the custodian, did not have extra paint at school for me to use, so my sister and I went to the local Ace Hardware and bought pint-size cans of primary colors, brushes, sponges, a paint-can opener, glaze, and drop-clothes. Before beginning the painting we discussed several options of how to set up my classroom. First and foremost was where I was going to put my classroom library and second was where what I thought was an oversized teacher's desk was going to be placed in order for it to be as inconspicuous as possible. The classroom library was going to be on a two-shelf, low bookshelf beneath the chalkboard upfront where I would develop a student lesson to categorize the novels by genre and place them in clear plastic bins accordingly and my desk was in the back corner near the door connecting to another sixth grade teacher's classroom.

I painted my classroom door bright yellow and sponge-painted blue and red stars on it. I mixed colors together and painted my two bookshelves, my only pieces of furniture given or left for me, magenta and lime green. I painted an orange zigzag around a nook to the right of the chalkboard that was to be my listening center. The chalkboard had alternating colored polka-dots surrounding it and the whiteboard in the

back of the class also got some painted decorations on the sides for some flair. I cut paper circles and put them in a jar for synonyms that the students would think of throughout the year and would create a caterpillar on the wall above where closet doors used to be. In that space I bought plastic bins for the students' "lockers" in order to prepare them for junior high school rather than keep belongings in their desks. Textbooks and other classroom supplies also were stored there. On the chalkboard I placed library pockets with reading genre titles on them for a student-recommended reading system. When Shirley walked in my room before the parents' Back-to-School Night she complimented me on how wonderful it looked and thought that I was ready.

The rest of the summer was devoted to polishing lesson plans and year-long curriculum scope and sequences. For our ancient civilizations' unit in social studies I researched Ancient Egypt, color-copied pictures I thought were helpful about the land and architecture and made a three-ring binder as a resource for the students. I began reading sixth grade novels and designed a rubric for reading difficulty levels so I would be able to appropriately recommend books to each individual student. I gathered experiments we could do for science and reviewed the math textbook.

During my classroom's organization weeks I met several students and parents who wanted to bring supplies in early and meet their child's new teacher. Among those were Kaitlynn and Lilly. Kaitlynn was a physically developed girl with long brown hair and an attitude. Lilly was her mother, an obese, pistol of a woman. She did make me curtains for my classroom though, which shielded the incredibly bright sun from my students' eyes in the middle of the day. Kaitlynn's sister was in junior high and was what the teachers called troubled and moved a bit fast with the boys. They were quite glad to

have gotten rid of her when she went to seventh grade. Trouble with Lilly started almost immediately.

I had 27 children in my general education, inclusion sixth grade class. It was the largest out of the three classes. Jessica, another young teacher who was across the hall from me in a new classroom as I was now in her old classroom, had been out ill for an eating disorder the prior year and no one paid any attention to her. Kay was my neighbor who shared a door connecting our classrooms and had taught there for quite some time, maybe six years. She was a midcareer change teacher. She lived in Littleton, the town closest to Hayes and could quickly go back and forth from home to school. She offered for me to have dinner with her family the night the parents came for back-to-school night as it seemed impractical for me to drive all the way back to Boston and then back out for the meeting later that night. I stayed at school and went to dinner with the counselor and a few teachers instead. Irene was the beloved, yet tough, fifth grade teacher down the hall, whom most of my students had the year before. I knew this immediately when they and their parents soon would claim "That's not how Irene did it last year." Well, this was a new year and I most certainly was not Irene.

Not only did I have the most students, but nine of them were on Special Education plans. Two of them, Dee and Ben, had their own aide assigned permanently to my classroom, Pauline. Pauline's husband had died the previous year from cancer and she was trying to continue on with her life as she was only in her late forties maybe early fifties. She thought, however, that she was the teacher, not the aide. The range of special needs in my classroom was from a reading learning disability to a nonverbal disability to Aspergers's Syndrome. Not only did I not know what Asperger's was, I had no prior

contact or experience with anyone with Autism. I consulted with the Special Education Resource teacher and had her explain what it was; she was not totally sure. Instead she gave me a supplemental book which clarified the spectrum of Autism and where Asperger's fell on it. I had not one, not two, but three boys with this. No one prepared me or helped me. What I did get was a microphone headset to wear around my ear from the speech teacher and Gary placed speakers up near my ceiling because apparently it is hard to filter out other noises for children with Asperger's that most people do not even take notice of, such as the air conditioner or the tapping of a pencil, in order to focus on the learning. It felt like I was Madonna performing a rock concert or worked at the Burger King drive-through, "This is Lauren, your teacher, how may I take your order?"

At Back-to-School Night before school started I prepared a 30-minute presentation introducing myself and our scope and sequence for the year's curriculum and how this would prepare the students for sixth grade. I did stress that their children were in sixth grade and how I valued that experience as their last year in elementary, yet also, enumerated the ways I would have them prepared for junior high school. Immediately after I finished and asked if there were questions, Lilly raised her hand and stated, rather than asked, "That's nice Lauren, but how are you going to prepare our kids for seventh grade?", which was confirmed with head-nods from the other parents. It was as if the parents wanted their kids to already be in junior high school when in fact they had just finished fifth grade and that they had not heard a word of my 30-minute plan. Another parent thought I had gone to the State University of New York, SUNY, rather than New York University, which in that community seemed demeaning. Let the school year begin!

Research Issue

This paper will present my first year teaching story. Through telling this story I will explore how teacher support via the leader can develop the new teacher into an emerging leader. Specifically, I will examine the role of the female leader and how her authentication of the new female teacher impacts the induction of the new teacher into the society of school. My research will strengthen an understanding of females' ways of knowing, learning, and communicating, which translate into how they operate and ultimately lead a school.

Research Process: Restor(y)ing

Through narrative inquiry, I will present my cover story in pieces and then re-story it using this process and to help unpack the meaning; by living my cover story I allowed my knowledge to be hidden (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) and by re-storying it I am freeing my truth. After writing my story, I shifted my paradigm understanding about my experience and the underlying reasons and began to intimately grapple one issue: support and development for new female teachers via the female principal.

Definition of Terms

1) For the purpose of this paper, a cover story is a story about teaching rather than the actual, lived teaching story (Craig, 2004). Specifically, this is my narrative that was told in order to hide my true first year teaching experience.

2) Re-story- For the purpose of this candidacy paper the term re-story will mean to analyze the cover story and uncover the authentic version (Olson & Craig, 2005) or at least what is currently a more authentic version.

3)   Voice- When I use the term voice in this paper, I mean it be understood as the

conduit through which women understand and make meaning (Gilligan, 1982).

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

"But, Let a woman in your life,
and patience hasn't got a chance,
she will beg you for advice, your reply will be concise,
and she will listen very nicely, and then go out
and do exactly what she wants!!!"
–My Fair Lady, "I'm an Ordinary Man"

The major bodies of research discussed in this next section center around women's ways of knowing à la the Wellesley College researchers Belenky et al. (1997) and female leadership. Subject matter that will be elaborated includes: 1) learning, thinking, and relating in the context of women as thinkers, knowers, and communicators, and 2) leadership in terms of females' barriers, access, and legitimacy, non-gendered styles, and female influence on teacher voice and teacher development for emerging female leaders. Each of these concepts is discussed and explained in a way that connects to the unique experience of being a woman as well as a leader who is female.

Women's Ways of Knowing

Females as Thinkers and Knowers

Experience and learning defined: What is knowledge? It is long thought and researched that women are different than men. Biologically, yes. Developmental pathways, yes. Leadership style, yes, but not because this paradigm can be relegated to a sex. Rather, I will argue based on the literature cited below that it is because women come to know truth and power dissimilarly from men. Gaining your own truth and your own power shapes how a female leads.

Before understanding how a person, male or female learns, it is beneficial to understand the particular view that constitutes learning, which informs my study. For the

learner, this means constructing knowledge. Schwab (1971) and Eisner (1988) à la

Dewey (1938) contend that one must use the arts to make meaning out of experiences and

that experiences are really "achievements", which are there "for those who have the skills

to take them" (Eisner, 1988, p. 15). Those skills relate to instinct, which is the innate trait

that one has for the capacity to experience, and learned behaviors, which are the

developed skills needed for one to navigate with through the world (Eisner, 1988).

Therefore, it is through the process of learning that these skills develop for experience

making. This is a non-gendered understanding of how we come to "know."

Opposing these theories, of learning via experience, Piaget (Gardner, 1981),

believed that "action [is] the source of knowledge" (p. 58). People gain intelligence

through schemes, our ways of comprehending the world around us, which become more

complex as we move through stages of development. The two processes we use to adapt

to these new stages are what Piaget (Gardner, 1981) termed accommodation and

assimilation. The first is when we alter our behavior pattern according to the conditions

in the environment versus the latter when we transform the environment to use within our

preexisting cognitive structures (Gardner, 1981, p.75). So, as we understand our schema,

we learn through adapting our experiences, meaning we "actively construct [our] own

understanding of the world and thereby also construct [our] own intelligence" (Fischer,

2003). This way of knowing connotes a process-product orientation rather than a lived

experience way to come to understand. The danger in accepting a process-product

orientation way of knowing is that it discounts personal experiences and interactions from

which you learn and grow as an individual.   It is through experiences that we come to

know.

If we accept understanding as a part of a process via experience then we can begin to frame how a person constructs knowledge. Kelly's (1963) originating theory on personality states that "a construct is a way in which some things are construed as being alike yet different from others" (p. 105). When knowledge is constructed for a person, here a female, it is the way in which she interprets concepts and experiences. Kelly's (1963) work is important because he dispels the notion that constructs are "bipolar," meaning if not one then the other. For example, if a color is black then the opposite is not black rather the opposite of black is white. For females' knowledge construction this point is important because it allows a place for women's ways of knowing. Entry points into understanding how females build knowledge then should not be seen as "not male," but rather as a separate construct.

Making meaning. If we structure our own intelligence, then how do we make meaning out of that construct? In the 1980s, a group of female scholars at Wellesley University (Belenky, et., al, 1997) developed five epistemological categories through which women experience and understand knowledge. These are not developmental stages women move through in their developmental growth as Perry's (1970) sequential stages of adult learning are, rather these are perspectives of how women construct and conceive knowledge, some of which someone may never experience (Lynn, 2005) while some may "shift from one mode of knowing to another" (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 15).

What is important about this research is that it clarifies how women learn, which can be different than men and could impact their leader-like behavior. Additionally, it situates that "knowing" claims "validity" (Clinchy, 1996) rather than stating that "knowing" is how women "believe or think or feel" (Clinchy, 1996, p. 212). Believing,

thinking, or feeling become either dichotomous and essentially leave one part out, or become synonymous and cannot separate parts out (Clinchy, 1996). A belief, a thought, or a feeling, for example, connotes emotion and/or opinion, which excludes fact, a valid claim. So, for a female principal to be effective in executing leadership, knowing how both she and her teachers make meaning from their experiences is important.

From the *silence* perspective, one way of women's knowing, a "mindless and voiceless position, a woman does not try and understand why the authority does what he or she does. She is powerless in her experienced position" (Belenky et al., 1997). This situation can be likened to sex-stereotyping in which women are powerless because men are active while women are passive. This isolating view of understanding perpetuates the notion that culturally men are in a higher stance than women and that men and women are opposites, rather than gender being different from one another. Additionally, Gilligan (1982) furthers this isolating position when she refers to differences in perceiving a danger as "men in connection, women in separation" (p. 42), meaning men see danger in relationships: betrayal, entrapment, intimacy, while women understand danger as a fear of isolation from success. She contends that while women connect through a web of relationships in order to make meaning, men deny this as it appears too enigmatic and unsafe. Accordingly then "rule-bound competitive achievement situations, which for women threaten the web of connection, for men provide a mode of connection that established clear boundaries and limits aggression, and this appears comparatively safe" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 44). When operating in a hierarchical organizational structure, women can be silenced more here because webs are deemed taboo.

The second perspective of knowing, *received knowledge*, happens through listening to others, not oneself, which means that constructed knowledge is through the words of others' participation (Belenky et al., 1997). Truth is then assumed from those in a position of authority rather than self. Originality is confusing when knowledge is made through others' perceptions and judgments because while it can be reproduced, it cannot be created by oneself. Dangerous here for women striving to be leaders is the concept of authentic self versus lock-step administrator. A woman can be a leader as a recoverer of knowledge but only through a man's definition and vision.

The third way of women's knowing is through *subjective knowledge* when the self has a voice and women become the authority. Here, a woman's knowledge and truth are constructed through personal conception or subjective intuition. For a female to be a school leader, one way she needs to learn is through subjective knowledge because schooling is a people-business, where the experiences of children depend on the day-to-day decisions made by adults. If a principal does not have her own voice, her own authority-making power, then she cannot know what is best for others because relying on others' truth limits one's power. However, learning through subjective knowledge can also be isolating because voicing your truth means not supporting another (Belenky et al., 1997), perhaps the authority's, and this then separates the female subjective knowledge seeker from others in a group.

The person who is autonomous acts only in reciprocity toward others while the connected self experiences through responsive interactions with others (Gilligan, 1982). But, if women experience through connection as Gilligan (1982) maintains, then voicing opinion or your truth assumes that females cannot conform to fit within Western society's

framework for "leader," which implies then that this woman will not be legitimized (Lucas, 2003) as leader. What can be powerful for principals in understanding these circumstances is that teachers have varying ways in which they connect with their learning communities—the school and its members. In order have influence as a leader it would be vital then to know how a teacher views him or herself and how he or she experiences learning and knowledge making.

Gilligan (1982) discusses how the self experiences relationships: that of separate, meaning in terms of reciprocity, and connected, meaning in response to others, which can be related to women's ways of knowing. Belenky et al. (1997) take this concept of separate and connected ways of experiencing and apply it to *procedural knowledge*, the fourth way of knowing. This way of knowing elicits objective procedures for receiving and analyzing new knowledge. Procedural knowledge is understood through separate and connected knowing, each of which has its own systematic method of investigation and analysis. For these women, knowledge construction is a process that includes the *what* and the *how* of people's opinions, feelings, and ideas' formulation (Belenky et al., 1997).

The procedural knower can be a separate knower who contextualizes her ideas in doubt (Belenky et al., 1997) and critically scrutinizes them to figure out if the ideas were original or those of someone else. In this way, separate knowers take out the self as part of the meaning making process. Connected knowers, on the other hand, construct knowledge from personal experience and endorse it as truth. They can understand other's perspectives but only in the other's terms, not their own. This way of procedural knowing aligns more closely with Dewey's rationale of how we make meaning from experiences rather than Piaget's structured levels of development. Mary Catherine Bateson (1989)

associates women's continual development with "the discovery through a variety of relationships that social expectations can be changed and that difference can be a source of strength rather than of weakness" (p. 94). Belenky et al. (1997) furthers this understanding that these type of knowers need to engage in collaborative groups of "like-minded knowers" (Clinchy, 1996, p. 233) because they will challenge and benefit from each other. It would behoove a female leader to connect with such peers in order to strengthen her authentic knowing and truth.

Constructed knowledge as outlined by Belenky et al., (1997) is the most integrated, contextual approach to knowing; it incorporates both the self and knowledge learned from others. This form of knowing describes women in a constructivist (Dewey, 1938) position, meaning that while they search for knowledge they, too, are a part of the search—"the knower is an intimate part of the known (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 137)." These constructivists listen in conversation, reflect on their actions, and "work [to] contribute to the empowerment and improvement in the quality of life of others (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 152)." This way of knowing calls a woman to action and female principals would want to seek out teachers who exhibit this form of knowing for leadership opportunities as they are the ones who will want to take such positions in order to contribute to their community.

Unique to understanding women's development and ways of knowing from the research of Belenky et al. (1997) is that women can fluidly move between these ways of knowing. Knowledge construction for women can happen in any of these five ways dependent on the situation

Female communication. Knowing how women construct knowledge can assist in then understanding the communication patterns of women. Communication through "information exchange preferences and patterns" (Westbrook, 2005) is a powerful tool for influencing leadership. Interpersonal communication patterns (Gardner, 1983) among women involve the relationships women develop with other women for emotional support (Burleson, 2003 as cited in Westbrook, 2005). It is through active listening that women make personal connections and subsequently build relationships (Allen, 2007). Since active listening is a mode of communication, female principals would want to actively listen in their leadership position to female teachers in order to build relationships with them. Relationships are a key factor in women's ways of knowing, which in turn can affect a principal's positive influence on her female teachers. It is through relationship building that women can aide other women in overcoming some of the barriers society places in front of them for leadership accessibility and success.

Female and male styles of communication do differ due to their still imbalanced, different positions of power in our Western society (Claes, 1999). Miller (1986) defines temporal inequality as socially constructed, such as the relationship between principal and teacher or teacher and student. Communicating effectively is a struggle between power of the "superior" and the "lesser" (Miller, 1986, p. 5) and having the power does not mean the task will be completed. Understanding women's position in a male-led society uncovers another layer to female communication because if words were literally man-made (Claes, 1999), then when women engage in talk "they have to translate their meaning into words that have been established by the male-defined register" (Claes, 1999, p. 3). Therefore, everyday discourse for women becomes an act of translating a

foreign language, a man-made language. For a leader who is female, language then becomes a participating element in the ways in which one leads and builds relationships.

Additionally, Helgesen (1995) as well as Bateson (1989) describes in her diary studies' analysis that women often position themselves in the center of things and reaching outward, what she terms a "web of inclusion." This web like Gilligan's illustrates the notion that females need to connect, which opposes the traditional, hierarchical path to leadership. The web emphasizes "growth-centered notions of success" (Helgesen, 1995, p. 58), which would affect the path to that success via language. Language is the instrument through which people communicate and if you cannot communicate then you cannot gain access to power, which a leader, here the principal, holds. For women, leading means using your voice and "*leading* with a voice is only possible when one has reached a certain level of development as a person; otherwise the voice will not ring true" (Helgesen, 1995, p. 230).

Additionally, teachers who perceive their principals as engaging in behavior and communication that is effective and consistent rated their school climate higher (Kelley, Thorton, & Daugherty, 2006). Important for female leaders here is the notion that their actions and interactions directly affect the job satisfaction of their employees. So, for a female teacher contentment at her school would be a first step toward opening the possibilities of leadership positions on campus because trust in what the principal does as a leader has been established. My first-year teaching experiences illustrate how this can come to fruition. Therefore, when women find their authentic voice and own their truth through connected and constructed knowing (Belenky et.al., 1997) their power through language and actions as leader can be that much more effective.

In summary, men and women are different but not as defined as opposites. According to the research (e.g. Gilligan, 1982; Miller 1986; Belenky et al., 1997) it has been shown that the psychosocial pathways women take in the development of self are vastly different than that of men. All people learn through experiences in order to build their knowledge. However, it is how women connect to it and develop their self from which their authority and leader-like behavior is cultivated and eventually executed.

<div align="center">

Female Leadership

</div>

Barriers and Access

      Beliefs and perceptions about leadership. In order to understand females as leaders, we must first gain insight into the hierarchical social structures that relate to a person's leadership status. Expectations are self-imposed for oneself and others in the social structure (Lucas, 2003) and this creates status characteristics around which beliefs and expectations are built. Leadership fits this paradigm as described by Lucas. What is accepted as leadership, and the membership led by it, is a characteristic of this type of hierarchical structure, one in which the characteristics of "leader" are thought to be masculine, which imposes expectations that in order to be a leader one must behave like a male. However, a disconnect exists if the leadership in a given structure is disproportionately represented by one gender, male, because the beliefs and expectations built around it are then biased in favor of what are culturally accepted as male gendered behaviors . Additionally, this leadership paradigm purports that this is *the* way leadership exists. It leaves out any other possibilities for leadership structures.

      Lucas's (2003) research focuses on the need to institutionalize new beliefs about leaders: the idea of females as leaders. He states that when this occurs, females' status

characteristics in the hierarchical society will be legitimized, because traditionally men are legitimized as "leader," which implies women are then characterized as "follower." In a social structure where males dominate, such as ours, little space is made available for female leaders and I, too, found as a first year teacher that I was discouraged from acting on my progressive beliefs à la Dewey, my coursework, and constructivist student teaching experiences at NYU. They were not acceptable. In fact, I learned that I needed to conform to the social practices of where I was teaching. Conforming, though, meant losing my sense as a teacher, the leader of a group of children; because if I didn't conform, my livelihood was at stake.

Feminist theory. Two integral and founding feminist authors, Betty Friedan (2001) and Simone de Beauvoir (1989), both identify the biological differences in the sexes, male and female, as the reproductive organs. The term "gender," man or woman, implies a social construction of roles each sex must fulfill (Beauvoir, 1989; Claes, 1999; Friedan, 2001) and characteristics of gender are then described as "masculine" and "feminine" (Claes, 1999), subsequently purporting that sex differences exist.

Feminist theory sprung from what was known as the women's liberation movement in the 1960's. Sexism was brought to the masses through Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, originally published in 1963, whereby Friedan described the "problem that has no name" as a woman's inner voice telling her she wants "more than my husband and my children and my home" (Friedan, 2001, p.78). For Friedan, freedom from sexism meant that white female housewives could and should pursue higher education and a career path. What Bell Hooks rebuts in her book *Feminist Theory, From Margin to Center* (2000) is the concept that these white women feminists, who have led

the feminist discourse, discount other factors in being oppressed such as race, class, sexual preference, etc. For the majority of feminists, particularly white women, oppression is the common thread that unites women together in the feminist movement. Bell Hooks (2000) does not oppose this but rather emphasizes a layer that has often been overlooked or not mentioned in feminist literature:

> Sexism as a system of domination is institutionalized, but it has never been determined in an absolute way the fate of all women in this society. Being oppressed means the *absence of choice*. It is the primary point of contact between the oppressed and the oppressor. Many women in this society do have choices (as inadequate as they are); therefore exploitation and discrimination are words that more accurately describe the lot of women collectively in the United States. (p.5)

This paper is not arguing that a woman has the right to be an educational leader just as much as a man does. Today that choice exists. However what it means to be a leader is in question.

Females can be leaders, which according to Hooks (2000), means women are not oppressed in having the option to be a leader. Rather, women are discriminated against because they lack equal status as men in terms of what is deemed "leader." As a group, "woman" needs to be accepted as "leader" as well as "female leader" needs to be acknowledged as a standard in leadership. It is not a case of woman being the same or equal to a man. More accurately the female leader is about institutionalizing a new, non-gendered, non bi-polar definition of leadership, which helps contextualize one phase of feminism most closely related to this ideal: "Particularist Feminism" (Stone, 1994, p.6).

As feminism has moved in waves or phases throughout history the concepts of equity and difference have changed.

Females gaining legitimacy. This makes gender equality in leadership positions one of social and cultural construction. If "masculine values" in organizations are conventionally perceived as the correct skills' set needed to be a leader (Billing & Alvesson, 2000), then little space is left for a female leader. This can have a strong impact in a field where one gender dominates employment over another. In many ways, female educational leaders parallel what Hooks (2000) describes as the most prominent gap between white feminists and other groups of women, such as black women, that of different rather than shared "lived experiences" (p.11). She details:

> They [white feminists] do not understand, cannot even imagine, that black
>
> women, as well as other groups of women who live in daily oppressive
>
> situations, often acquire an awareness of patriarchal politics from their
>
> lived experience, just as they develop strategies of resistance (even though
>
> they may not resist on a sustained or organized basis). (Hooks, 2000, p.11)

Women, the majority of the workforce in education, who aspire to be leaders in education, know that patriarchal politics is not new.

Historically, institutional discrimination through a feminist framework is understood as one of "dualistic distinctions" (Stone, 1994, p.5) whereby the "patriarchy of power" lies in the social hierarchy placing women as inferior to men. According to Lynda Stone (1994) this discriminates against women as a whole group but also as individuals because it hones in on the theory of essentialism, where everything must be

the same, here women. It discriminates on a second level because it does not account for differences among women as she states

> ...the problem is that proposals of sameness, utilized to fight male bias, hide inequalities among women themselves. New [feminist] concepts are not themselves essentialist dualisms but are instead overlapping sets of ideas around which the continuing uncommon struggles are organized. (Stone, 1994, p.5)

Stone (1994) introduces the term education feminism as a "claim that surround[s] the lives of women in professional education" (p. 1). Professional education she refers to as the realm of education encompassing "teaching candidates and education graduate students, pre-collegiate practicing teachers and administrators, teacher educators and education researchers" (p.2) noting that it is widely considerably different than other spaces in education, such as "the general academy, governmental, corporate and philanthropic arenas" (p.2). What makes education feminism such a complex issue, Stone (1994) says, is simply due to this facet of education being "highly 'feminized,' that is populated primarily by women" (p.2), which should logically then follow that it should be free of discrimination as women are the majority. But, she dispels, this is not true "in subtle and not so subtle ways" (p.2).

Institutional Theory maintains that "structures gain legitimacy when they conform to the accepted practices in their environment" (Lucas, 2003, p. 466). This implies that for female leaders to become accepted, females will need to conform their ways of leading to what is considered acceptable within the current system. But, being accepted and legitimatized is part of understanding structural positioning or "positionality"

(Tisdell, 2002) of the societal member/s, here females. Females are not in the same bargaining-position or achievement-ability status in society as males because, as Ortner (1974) describes, they are recognized as a part of nature through their reproductive functions but also as participants in culture. This duality makes them "appear as something intermediate between culture and nature, lower on the scale of transcendence than man" (Ortner, 1974, p.74), and therefore accorded a lower position in society. Ortner (1974) refers to this belief as "genetic determinism" (p. 71), which means that biological differences between men and women are exemplified in terms of position or levels of superiority within the social values of a cultural system, which makes one wonder where there is space not just female leaders but for females as leaders, meaning both man and woman denote leader. So in order for the position of leader to be legitimized for women, this seems to imply they must fit the masculine mold of how "leader" is defined. However, as argued above, women may think, develop, and act differently, but that should not preclude them from being accepted as leader, not in a dualistic sense of either/or as leader, meaning male, or female leader, but like Gilligan (1982) espouses-different but accepted and legitimized.

Another way to understand sex discrimination on the school level is how teaching versus administrating is viewed. If teaching signifies "instructing and caring for children," and is typically correlated with feminine work and administration means "taking charge of the school or district" (Brunner & Grogan, 2007) or masculine work, jobs in schools are segregated by sex. Since schools are long-thought to be organizations of business, paralleling female school administrators to female managers in corporations is not an unrealistic notion. In management, "the gendering of jobs, positions, groups,

tasks, and locations varies across organizations, and over time, but in any particular organization, at a given time, the vast majority of workers are segregated horizontally and vertically by gender" (Martin, 1990, p. 280 as cited in Fagenson, 1993). It is especially important for women to be able to focus the attention away from sex-stereotyping tasks (Carli & Eagley, 1999; Martin, 1990, as cited in Fagenson, 1993) because when such tasks are confirmed through action, inequities can arise in the treatment of individuals and abilities to work, yielding exclusive opportunities to some and limiting others (Irby & Brown, 2002). Exclusivity relates to obstacles and other barriers for women such as: "1. Absence of role models for women, 2. Lack of support and encouragement from others, 3. Lack of sponsorship within and without the organization, and 4. Lack of supportive network" (Brown & Merchant, 1993, p. 88). Gaining accessibility to leadership positions does not mean just understanding the organizational structure of school systems rather it also means recognizing female's work as quality work.

This need, then, makes the conforming process (Lucas, 2003) more difficult. Structurally, knowing where one's position is in relation to others can influence one's actions and the resulting consequences. This knowledge is especially important for female leaders because it allows them to be aware of the assumptions and beliefs of those they are leading. For female leaders as administrators, knowing that influencing male and female subordinates is not just a challenge of knowing each individual, but is also a challenge to the societal structure in which we live. So, dear Henry Higgins, to answer your question, "Why can't a woman be more like a man?": in all of her attempts to do just that, she will always be seen, be heard, and be considered, a woman and it is from *knowing* that that she can begin to truly take shape as a leader.

Once this awakening and self-acceptance occurs, the next step for a woman trying to attain status as leader would be motivation for movement. According to C. Cryss Brunner and Margaret Grogan (2007), motivation is a predisposition for aspiration, meaning that one must first have the internal drive through self-determination or extrinsic motivation through outside forces such as persons or reward in order to even have aspirations. A female's aspiration to become a leader falls under the category of career motivation, which can be defined as

> …a three-dimensional concept made up of a woman's career commitments, positional goals, and leadership orientations. In other words, a woman's aspirations include what she hopes to accomplish during her career in education, the types of positions she is interested in pursuing, the goals she hopes to realize while in such positions, and the leadership styles she believes she must practice to reach her goals. (Young & McLeod, 2001, p.469 as cited in Brunner & Grogan, 2007, p.21-22)

My aspiration to pioneer my own all girls k-8 gifted and talented public school has been my motivation for earning this doctorate degree. My motivation for applying was two-fold: the desire for more academic knowledge in the field of leadership and the belief that having such a degree would legitimize my leadership and authority as a young, female leader to outside parties, such as parents, community and business partners, and district officials. Similarly, in order to aspire to be a leader, a female teacher would first have to have access to the professional support and development from leadership positions, no matter what type, as well as understand how she, herself, leads.

Lucas's (2003) empirical study found that if women were institutionalized as leaders their leadership would have an influence greater than male leaders who were appointed to that position. This means that if we change the way society believes leaders behave, in this case feminine versus masculine identities, then the ways in which those who are leaders are chosen may dramatically change. Female teacher leaders may have a better chance of becoming administrative leaders or at the very least the chances would potentially become equitable with that of their male counterparts. Additionally, implicit in this research is that those that are being appointed as leaders are often not being appointed because they will have the most positive result on the school or teachers. Instead, many are chosen because they conform to society's beliefs about what a leader should look and act like—masculine. This makes it clear that this belief is applied without validity of leadership capabilities and increases the barriers to women for leader-legitimacy.

Accessing leadership means overcoming barriers and being legitimized as "leader," each of which may occur in steps or more holistically depending on the context per woman. True here as well as with sex-stereotyped tasks are the socio-cultural role definitions of women. Having an aspiration of being a school leader seems to conflict with what society deems accepted leadership styles:

Aspiring women, having no power to challenge or change the requirements, must find ways to convince the men in power positions that their ascribed handicaps are unimportant develop impressions management [our emphasis] repertoires. Because this impressions management requires time, energy and constant vigilance, it constitutes a barrier to women's

entry and mobility in the career. (Marshall, 1985, pp. 133-134 as cited in

Brunner & Grogan, 2007, p. 34)

Irby and Brown (1995) found in their research study of 120 executives with equal proportions of men and women that "men [are] perceived to have legitimate or automatic power or authority based on their gender, while women [are] perceived to have to earn authority through the passage of time and a hard work ethic" (p.6). Therefore, a female can have the motivation and the aspiration to be a school leader, but her path to an upwardly mobile career will be harder than that of a male's.

Types of Leadership

Gendered leadership versus leadership types. If the notion of feminine values and feminine leadership styles, meaning organizers of housework and caretakers of children, continues, then when a female is promoted to an organizational management position, these values and styles have limited, valid transferability to literally what would be deemed non-housework positions (Billing & Alvesson, 2000, De Beauvoir, 1989; Friedan, 1997). Additionally, transferring such notions to roles of principal as masculine and teacher as feminine, regardless of sex, promotes the validity of these values and continues the momentum to maintain them. Preserving such notions limits the quantity and quality of leadership on a school campus. What do exist in the realm of leadership are different approaches.

Instead of relegating leadership types or styles to a gender (Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare, Hayden, 2004; Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Irby & Brown, 1995; Van Engen, Van Deer Leeden, & Willemsen, 2005), leader-like conduct can be viewed as how one interacts toward subordinates, makes decisions, and solves problems. Thinking

of leadership style in these ways enables the confines of gender-stereotyping to break loose. Fondas (1997), building upon Friedan's original (1997) work, explains this well: "When something is labeled *masculine* or *feminine*, it does not necessarily relate to the intrinsic characteristics of actual men or women; it is, however, culturally associated with the categories *male* and *female*" (p. 260). Fundamentally, this connotes that our language needs to change when referring to how a leader leads because feminine would then imply "not masculine" (Fondas, 1997). Problematic to this reference of "not" is the implication that male and female are opposite or bipolar (Kelly, 1963), if not one then the other, which Gilligan (1982) argues does not adequately describe a woman's development. Rather, it is about the voice (Gilligan, 1982) of the "other" and once male and female are understood as not mutually exclusive, meaning either/or, but instead are understood as different points of view in relation to morality, then the cultural trap (Claes, 1999) of sex roles can no longer function as the accepted model of leadership. It is one's voice that is the vehicle through which a leader's vision can be enacted (Helgesen, 1995).

Two types of leadership styles, which are not gendered, are transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer, & Jolson, 1997). These styles of leadership involve how a leader interacts with his or her subordinates and the outcomes based on that behavior. Transformational leaders concern themselves with making unique relationships with individuals by "gaining the respect, trust, and confidence of others and transmitting a strong sense of mission to them (Yammarino et al., 1997, p. 206)." In Bolman and Deal's (1991) organizational structure, this type of leadership style would fit best with the human resource framework, which emphasizes commitment, loyalty, support, and empowerment as well as the symbolic framework,

which emphasizes vision, inspiration, and energy. A transformational leader would then most likely create the campus environment through these frames. This is why transformational leadership is also called transformational-charismatic (Yammarino et al., 1997) because it implies one who likes to create community and work as a team. Stereotypically, this has been identified as a feminine style of leadership because more women than men show these kinds of attributes. But, labeling this kind of leader then precludes anyone who is not feminine from being this kind of leader, which is grave error because it excludes others from potential emerging leadership or current career upward mobility.

Contrastingly, transactional leaders are less concerned with personal relationships and more with an exchange of rewards for work produced. This kind of leadership is "based on formal, institutional rules, regulations, rewards or punishments (Yammarino et al., 1997, p. 206)," which is why it is typically referred to as transactional-contingent leadership. This types of leader would identify more within Bolman's and Deal's (1991) structural framework, which concentrates on tasks, rules, and leaves out emotion as well as the political framework, which focuses on conflict and power. Traditionally, transactional leaders are associated with men, rather than understanding how this leadership type is most effective with one's subordinates, here teachers, both on an individual basis and within a group. Gender-typing this style is exclusive to anyone who does not fit this model; anyone is who is not male. Therefore, gender-typing leadership styles promote exclusivity rather than inclusivity. Identifying teachers' personal leadership styles by types, such as transformational and transactional, rather than by gender, helps a principal meet the needs of the campus' leadership capacity. School

leaders can be in the position of administrator, such as principal and/or assistant principal, pedagogical positions, such as instructional coordinators, content specialists, and department chairs, and classroom teachers (Addi-Raccah, 2007). Now, which sex is most represented in each type of role does not then designate that school leadership position as masculine or feminine. Instead it should make one wonder why a gap exists between a higher percentage of female teachers versus a lower percentage of female leaders.

Influencing Teacher Voice and Development

It must be recognized that leaders' decisions and behavior are important, but of equal importance is the manner in which the leader's actions are perceived. Leadership style plays a major role in creating a school climate, which in turn has a direct effect on teachers. Invitational Educational Theory (Egley & Jones, 2006), IET, emphasizes collaboration and its positive impacts, which leads to Invitational Leadership (Purkey & Siegel (2003) as cited in Egley & Jones, 2006). Therefore, having more quality interactions, or what Purkey & Siegel (2003 as cited in Egley and Jones, 2006) call "communicating caring and appropriate messages intended to summon forth the greatest human potential" (p. 72) between school administrators and their teachers may prove beneficial because Invitational Leadership "invites everyone in the school to experience success" (Egley & Jones, 2006, p. 73). Support then for the new female teacher becomes paramount to her success, which I did not have.

Gender domination is possibly most evident in the education system because in any given city, school districts are typically the largest or one of the largest employers (Ingersoll, Hoxby, & Serupski, 2004) and universities employ another 4% of the

workforce. The teacher work force is dominated by women; in the school setting there are a high number of female teachers and in relation to that number there have historically been a disproportionate number of male principals. Interestingly, these numbers look as if they are shifting from the top down. Usually, more female principals are found in elementary schools than male principals. For example, in Houston ISD in 2007, out of 185 elementary schools about 25% have male principals as opposed to about 75% led by females, while out of 90 secondary schools about 50% of the principals are male and about 50% are female (Houston ISD, August 1, 2007). However, Houston is the fourth largest urban school district in the country, in which more progressive and aggressive action toward change can take place faster than in smaller or rural districts, which comprise the majority of the country's schools.

If teachers, specifically female teachers, do comprise the majority of this workforce it would seem plausible that their voices would be not only heard but listened to as the leaders in education. Llorens ("Action Research," 1994) contends that teacher voice is lacking in the area of action research as women are typically in a subordinate position to a male-dominated administrator. Even with changing ratios, as evidenced by HISD's 2007 data, the historical pattern of authority has not shifted dramatically; there is still a pattern of "masculine" control and dominance, and of top leadership positions being held by men. These voices, these women's voices as teacher voices, have been silenced and marginalized ("Action Research,"1994; Belenky et al., 1997; Elbaz, 1991). Elbaz (1991) notes that "the notion of voice has been central to the development of research on teachers' knowledge and thinking … [and] is used against the background of a previous silence" (p.10). This silence has been due in part to the language of

paradigmatic Science in which the belief of problems having single solutions in a linear path discounts or biases as inadequate the expression of teacher's voice (Elbaz, 1991, p. 10-11). What is important about recognizing these teacher voices is not just the volume with which they are expressed but also the "message of a voice steeped in the relational world of children—the voice of those who cannot (and should not) separate themselves from the world in an effort to understand it" ("Action Research," 1994, p. 7). A teacher's knowledge is "rich with complicated interactional knowledge" ("Action Research," 1994, p. 7) and it should be valued, counted, and supported by its administration. Ellsworth (1989) describes her teaching experiences as critical pedagogue:

> …I as professor could never know about the experience, oppressions, and understandings of other participants in the class. The situation makes it impossible for any single voice in the classroom—including that of professor—to assume the position of center or origin of knowledge or authority, of having privileged access to authentic experience or appropriate language. (p.310)

The socially constructed idea that "teacher" should be the all-knowing expert, that her knowledge is partial, was the prevailing thought at that school. I was the marginalized teacher who did not think as such.

Hargreaves (1996) reiterates this: "Overall the important thing seems to me to be that we do not merely *present* teachers' voices, but that we *re-present* them critically and contextually" (p.16). As we will see, Shirley, my principal during my first of teaching in Hayes, Massachusetts, did not do this. She presented my voice by listening to my concerns and advising me as to how she would handle a situation, but she did not

represent my voice to the school stakeholders, mainly parent constituents and her administrative bosses.

Teachers' voices have been presented in isolation or exclusion so much so that it impairs reforming schools. Sarason (1990 as cited in Hargreaves, 1996) argues that power relationships are extremely embedded in our culture of schooling and that schools will remain as they are until we confront these existing relationships. He further states that "to alter the power status of parents and teachers…without altering power relationships in the classroom, is to limit drastically the chance of improved educational outcomes" (p.14).

This idea of power relationships speaks at full volume to me regarding my first year teaching. Evidence of help from my principal and teaching colleagues to develop me as a teacher did not exist. Years later after reflecting on my practice during that short period of time I realize that I was changing the power relationships of the student-teacher relationship in my classroom. My students had never been challenged to think and grow independently and that threatened the parents' position of power in relation to the teacher, which ultimately threatened to create an imbalance between principal and teacher. While the school espoused itself to be a progressive, visual arts' integration school, it was in fact not looking to change the status quo and I apparently made the stability of the school culture vulnerable.

Hargreaves (1996) would also attribute the struggle of expressing my voice as a teacher, to context. "These contexts of teaching shape not only what teachers can do, but also the knowledge and experience that guide their teaching" (Hargreaves, 1996, p. 15). The strained context of my teaching was situated between my diversified training as a

student teacher at NYU and as a new faculty member in a highly affluent, small town in what was proposed to me to be a setting similar to that of my student teaching. Ben-Peretz's and Halke's (1987) cross-cultural study of Dutch and Israeli teachers illuminates how teachers attempt to make sense of their classroom situations from personal nonverbal cues and situational cues. These cues (Ben-Peretz & Halke, 1997, p. 24) include teacher behavior (e.g. management, tone of voice, movement, attending to students), student behavior (e.g. initiating questions, accepting authority, tone of voice, movement, attending to teacher), classroom organization (e.g. size of classroom, seating arrangement, ornaments/aesthetics), teaching aids (e.g. use of blackboards), classroom climate (e.g. student-teacher interactions, student-student interactions, overall "atmosphere"), and teacher efficiency. They found that there was a shared culture of teaching between these two sets of teachers and that while interpretations may vary even in the same culture due to different cues it is the "personal knowledge of teachers [that] shapes their interpretations (Ben-Peretz & Halkes, 1987, p. 30). While I was not in a different country in Hayes, I was apparently in a culture unlike anything that was familiar, and it is now my belief that my cues and what I was interpreting in my classroom were quite opposite from the interpretations of the parents and principal whose interpretations inhibited my voice from resonating with any sense of truth, authenticity, and validity.

Group behavior. Schools are context-bound by the community and culture they are situated in both physically and psycho-socially. So, too, is leadership. Leadership, how it is defined and how it functions, can vary according to cultural-specific norms, expectations, beliefs, and history (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Carli & Eagly, 1999). If the

expectation of the culture is that women should behave in more subservient positions and demeanor rather than in positions of power and authority, then when a female does not comply, her behavior is seen as illegitimate (Carli & Eagly, 1999) and her qualifications as null. But, what constitutes good leadership should be blind to gender; it should be based on a set of non-gendered expectations and qualifications by which any one person can accomplish.

In order to reverse underlying sex-difference theories, females must assert themselves, even if it is perceived as undesirable. Men are still more commonly perceived as more competent, more authoritative, more task-oriented, which enables them to exert more influence on a group and therefore, places women at a disadvantage, especially in mixed-gender contexts (Karakowsky & Siegel, 1999). If the task is congruent with the majority gender in the group, then the influence of those members, male or female is justified. Yet, if the group task is understood as a gendered task incongruent with the majority-gender members then the minority is still influential, especially if they are women (Karakowsky & Siegel, 1999). This can cause great disparities and barriers in emerging leadership for females.

Even though women in a group setting can defy these sex-difference theories and can assert themselves, they can still be discredited and therefore they must continue to participate because, according to Carli and Eagly (1999), "individuals' leadership and influence are positively associated with the amount that they participate in groups" (p. 214). Females can ascertain from this that while men might participate more in group-task-oriented settings, this does not preclude the opportunities or the quality of

participation from the female members. Therefore, females can obtain and maintain influence through leadership abilities, skills, and experiences.

Supporting this viewpoint further is Eskilson and Wiley (1976) who, using undergraduate students as their participants, tested group dynamics, group leaders, and gender's effect on them. By providing the group leader of either gender with the solution to the problem prior to the group meeting, they intended to enable the leader's role to be legitimized. What they (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976) deemed "leader-like behavior" was defined as "a generally high level of performance output which consists of suggestions, opinions, information, and orienting or integrating statements" (p. 184), which they felt was more congruent with men. Their study showed this behavior to be more concentrated in male leaders than female leaders; yet, there was no significant difference in performance output or leader-like behavior contribution to the group. Therefore, what we can conclude is that leader-influence in terms of productivity is gender-neutral regardless of the perceived behaviors leaders should exhibit. Interestingly, the speed with which the task was completed was fastest for female-appointed leaders, meaning leaders who did achieve that status by achievement, from which we can then speculate that when followers (here group members) self-select their leader, it is possible that females are preferred over males.

This understanding moves us to the next point found in this study: single-sex groups with the leader of the same gender performed at a greater level of effectiveness than did mixed-gendered groups (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976),   These researches suggest that this difference is due to the "hidden agenda" (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976) in which mixed-gendered groups focus more on each other than on problem-solving and

communication. The focus instead is on work productivity and not attractiveness or competitiveness. When applied to schools, this study raises the question whether teachers will perform better for a principal of the same gender as they are? If so, then female teachers will perform at a higher rate for female principals and the same for male teachers and male principals because there is no hidden agenda. However, my experience with Shirley also suggests that a single-sex pairing of principal and teacher is just one factor of many that contribute to a successful relationship.

Just as Jackson (1968) suggests a hidden curriculum in the classroom exists, so too, then a hidden agenda may exist between leader and follower when they are of different genders. Female leaders were most effective in groups of all females or mixed-genders (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976) but not with all males. This again relates back to females as needing to be legitimized as leaders in an already existing societal structure. Lee, Smith, and Cioci (1993) conclude that "while female teachers see themselves as particularly empowered by working for female principals in the case of collegiality and control in the classroom, male teachers believe they are less empowered than when working for male principals" (pg. 170).

Mentoring. Hargreaves and Fullan (2000) outline four stages of teachers' professionalism and the changes that have taken place since the beginning of publicly educating the masses in this country. They express that now in the 21st century we are on the verge of postmodern professionalism, "where teachers deal with a diverse clientele and increasing moral uncertainty, where many approaches are possible and more and more groups have influence" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 52). They further say that the old model of mentoring, where the experts impart their knowledge and craft of

teaching over to new disciples is no longer applicable. New teachers often have newer teaching strategies while more veteran teacher mentors have more expertise in school procedures and classroom management. They therefore, suggest that within the mentor-mentee relationship both parties problem-solve together issues of teaching and learning because "mentoring must be linked to an overarching appreciation that, for better or worse, we are on the brink of redefining the teaching profession" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 52). For example, while not directly a classroom teaching position but for a position like superintendent, women feel that mentoring can make a big difference (Brunner & Grogan, 2007) in preparedness. In fact, the female superintendents they researched viewed their mentoring as somewhat of a professional development opportunity not only for those they mentored, but also for themselves.

Schön (1987) would concur with this sentiment as he describes how a coaching relationship, through engaging in dialogue can transform the relationship into a "reciprocal reflection-in-action" (p. 163). In this way, the roles of the coach, both dialogue and demonstration, enable the coach to ask herself if there is more she can do or suggest to the student, which can turn into spontaneous interventions, or "on-the-spot experiments" (Schön, 1987, p. 164). From this then the student can construct meaning based on her own reflections of what the coach has said and done. The closer the reciprocity of the reflection-in-action, the "broader and deeper and more substantive, holistic, and multiplicit" (Schön, 1987, p. 169) the student's learning will be. What I thought were spontaneous interventions from Shirley, our dialogues in her office, from which I would gain insight into how I needed to adapt and change my behavior as a teacher, was in reality a checklist evaluation.

Ragins (1999) defines three characteristics of mentoring relationships that are vital to understanding the effects of such a relationship: 1) the mentor may or may not be a supervisor to the so-called protégé, 2) mentors may be from within or outside the organization, and 3) relationships between mentor and protégé may be informal, lasting a few years but meeting times are irregular, or formal, lasting one year with the matched-pair (p. 349). However, in order to have these three qualities of a relationship, one must first have a mentor. Initially, women can have greater barriers getting a mentor than men do, but when reported, both men and women are each as likely of having one. Yet,

> Women were more likely than men to report that mentors were unwilling to mentor them, that supervisors and coworkers would disapprove of the relationship, that they had less access to mentors, and that they were hesitant to initiate the relationship for fear that their efforts would be misconstrued as being sexual by either the mentors or others in the organization (Ragins, 1999, p. 350).

Important in their reporting is the understanding of the levels of emotion women go through before even accessing a mentor. Still, mentor relationships do exist among both men and women. But, mentors may seek out relationships that connect with their style of learning and constructing knowledge. If one is a transactional-contingent leader then perhaps he or she may seek out a relationship that is more hierarchical and independent, rather than, the transformational leader who may seek out a more connected, interdependent relationship. Therefore, female mentors may gravitate toward the connected relationships (Gilligan, 1982) with protégés, but this does not then deem interdependent mentor-protégé relationships as "feminine" because it is possible that men

could use this type of mentor-relationship as well. So, while mentor-relationships may yield same-sex or mixed-sex pairings, the task of mentoring should not be gendered.

For female leaders once they have attained status of principal they are a "symbol and role model for other women" (Addi-Raccah, 2006), which could place them in the category of informal mentor. A role model is one whose status can be attained and one whose behavior can be replicated, which for female teachers could be an informal, non-committed mentor-relationship between principal and teacher throughout the school year. For women to be able to mentor other women then is dependent on their leadership position, meaning the context in which they are a leader. Addi-Raccah (2006) contends that "the tendency of women to sponsor similar others is dependent on their presence in leadership positions, which interweaves with the broader sociocultural characteristics of the school environment" (p. 298), which she tested on Arab and Jewish female principals in Israel.

Marshall (1985, p. 133 cited in Brunner & Grogan, 2007) agrees that same-sex mentorship is more effective and conducive to productivity because

> The most powerful training and mobility structure in the educational administration career, the sponsor-protégé relationship, occurs when a powerful person notices, tests, trains, and promotes a protégé. The sponsor-protégé relationship is a close and personal one. Male sponsors are reluctant to invest their efforts in women because women are different and because close male/female relationships most often are seen as nonprofessional. (p.42)

Implicit in his statement is that what is perceived as nonprofessional is the relationship between a male mentor and a female protégé because men, according to society's terms, are in the position of power and women are not. Therefore, a woman in charge such as a principal challenges those sex-stereotypes and enables other women, here teachers, to gain access and power if she is free from society's construct of gender-typing and legitimized as leader, which Shirley was not.

Summary

In an age where teacher voice seems most pertinent to listen to, when the teaching profession is constantly changing and on the edge of reform, female voice is one that is still not completely understood. In order to become a teacher leader a female teacher would first need to understand her own ways of knowing (Belenky et al., 1986) and understanding as well as how she communicates. From there she can launch into a female leader, but it is also with the participation of and guidance from her female principal that will aide this career endeavor. A female leader's influence on female teacher leaders is most important, especially since women connect through a web of inclusion (Gilligan, 1982; Batson, 1989; Helgesen, 1995) and thus make meaning. How a woman leads should not be deemed masculine or feminine, meaning relegated to sex, but rather should be understood and celebrated as a personal leadership style. How she relates to her teachers and how she leads will be based on her experiences with herself and others. It is from this standpoint that female leaders can truly influence.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

"Why can't the English teach their children how to speak?
This verbal class distinction, by now,
Should be antique. If you spoke as she does, sir,
Instead of the way you do,
Why, you might be selling flowers, too!"
-My Fair Lady, "Why Can't the English?"

The purpose of this study is to explore my experience as a first year teacher and

my relationship or rather non-relationship with my female principal as well as to provide

a space for "restorying" my experience, based on my current understanding of women's

ways of knowing and leadership that supports teachers' development. It is through my

experience, I will understand how my voice (Gilligan, 1982) helped construct my

knowledge and how my principal then used her knowledge to influence me, a female

teacher. Building personal knowledge through story construction (Connelly, Clandinin, &

He, 1997) enables the story-teller, here the researcher, to explore her own history. My

experience will be recorded in storied form (Clandinin & Conelly, 1994) because "a story

has a sense of being full, a sense of coming out of a personal and social history

(Clandinin & Connelly, 1994, p. 415)." Therefore, the story provides the vehicle through

which I capture the authenticity of my lived experiences.

Narrative Inquiry as a Way of Knowing

Jerome Bruner (1986) describes how culturally we develop stories that influence

individuals:

> For stories define the range of canonical characters, the settings in which they
>
> operate, the actions that are permissible and comprehensible. And thereby
>
> they provide, so to speak, a map of possible roles and of possible worlds in

which action, thought, and self-definition are permissible (or desirable)

(p.66).

What Bruner does for narrative inquirers is direct us toward narrative as a way of knowing. He distinguishes two modes of thought: one paradigmatic or logico-scientific (p.12) and one narrative. Each has its own function and process for confirmation. A major distinguishing factor is "what they convince of is fundamentally different: arguments convince one of their truth, stories of their lifelikeness" (Bruner, 1986, p.11). Bruner further explains that the paradigmatic way of verifying is through "formal and empirical proof" (p. 11), while the narrative way is to establish "not truth but verisimilitude" (p.11). Each mode of thought has an imaginative application. Paradigmatic imagination, or intuition, he claims is "the ability to see possible formal connections before one is able to prove them in any formal way" (p. 13) while narrative imagination "deals in human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course. It strives to put its timeless miracles into the particulars of experience, and to locate the experience in time and place" (p. 13).

Nona Lyons' (1990) work on ethical and epistemological elements of teachers' knowledge via their environment, perceptions, and forthcoming development speaks to narrative inquiry as a way of knowing. Sources of conflict and aspects of moral dilemmas she researches are captured through interviews, which are narrative ways of relaying, unfolding, and understanding information and experiences. Teachers, like myself in my first year, live with dilemma and conflict that

come out of working relationships between people, like those between student and

teacher that are fed by the everyday interactions between them, that

happen over time, and that have no real guarantee of success even though

they require daily response and action (Lyons, 1990, p. 165).

It is through understanding this about your own practice, that which includes moral

dilemmas and conflict, through narratively self-reflecting, that the teacher can then come

to know herself as teacher and as knower.

How the teacher makes sense of her interpretation of her practice connects to her

ways of knowing. Belenky et al. (1997) contend that essentially all knowledge is context-

bound and constructed by either the knower or one outside the knower, this makes

women "'constructivists,' capable also of making theory" (Lyons, 1990, p.169). Making

your own theory reiterates narrative as a way of knowing and as a way to understand your

knowledge. This "epistemological perspective offers a useful interpretive framework for

conceptualizing teacher's work and development," (Lyons, 1990, p. 170), particularly

when discussing teachers' views about knowledge of their subject discipline and their

students as knowers. My conflict my first year teaching partially stemmed from my

understanding of these two kinds of knowledge, which differed from my principal's and

parents' understandings. My own sense of values directly connected with my ways of

knowing and my knowledge as "teacher." Because of this direct connection my "self"

and my "teacher self" were complexly involved in constructing my knowledge.

The interacting epistemologies, both mine as teacher and those of my students,

were interdependent in the learning process, which Lyons (1990) calls "nested

epistemologies, or nest knowing," (p. 173). Nested knowing is located within

"positionality" (Bartlett, 1990, as cited in Lyons, 1990, p. 174). Here positionality differs

from Ortner's (1974) definition, whereby women as situated in a lower societal position

than men. Here, "truth is 'situated' because it emerges from particular involvements and relationships" (Lyons, 1990, p. 174), which again reminds us that narrative is a way of knowing and is non-linear. Directly connecting to this is what Lyons' coins as a "reductionist categorization" (p. 174), the way some might deduce the relationship between teacher and student and each participant's epistemological perspective as separate and linear rather than as non-linear and connected, from which knowledge is constructed. Shirley reduced the interdependency and intersubjectivity of my relationship with my students and the ways in which we constructed our knowledge together as a community to one which she wanted to be hierarchical, linear, and separate. Narrative was my way of knowing, connecting, and learning in my classroom and it is why narrative inquiry fits best as my methodology because it is the way in which I can make sense of what happened in both the cover story and the restorying.

Narrative Inquiry as Methodology

Ann Brooks (2000) explains Bruner's distinction between paradigmatic cognition and narrative cognition. The former makes meaning from categorization and ordered reasoning while the latter makes meaning from combining elements into a story. Because a woman can move from one way of knowing to another dependent on the circumstances in her life, narrative thinking has transformative learning qualities, which makes transformative learning a narrative process (Brooks, 2000). The reader now understands why narrative inquiry was the chosen research method because my story focuses on how voice, truth, and authority influence female teachers' professional development on a school campus.

Clandinin and Connelly (1994) also explain that "people by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of those lives, whereas narrative researchers describe such lives, collect and tell stories of them, and write narratives of experience" (p. 416). It is through story-telling via narrative inquiry that I will present my story and be able to make meaning out of my experiences. Lyons and LeBoskey (2002) map out for us how narrative has come to mean more than the traditional way to tell a story. They tell how narrative has now come to be understood as a way to know as well as a mode of inquiry, a methodology, through research in many fields, such as the social sciences, cognitive psychology and education. In education, in particular, in the early 1980's, interest in narrative shifted from an understanding of a means to carry a message to "a means to capture the situatedness, the contexts, and the complexities of human action in teaching and learning. Narrative was more than a story, a teller, or a text" (Lyons & LeBoskey, 2002, p.3).

Narrative inquiry induces a metaphorical three-dimensionalism (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Craig, 2007), which implicitly makes an inquiry applicable and boundary-less to others. The three dimensions that connect are "interactions" both personal and social, "continuity" of time in past, present, and future, and "situation" with a sense of place (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 50). Any inquiry, according to Clandinin and Connelly (2000) then can use this three-dimensional space, such as my first year teaching story: it occurs in a specific place, addressing temporal matters that focus on my personal and social interactions. Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) also identify these dimensions: attention to temporality, sociality, and place, as the three ways to compile knowledge with narrative inquiry. "Knowing" and "understanding" is therefore

situational and the subsequent decision-making process can only be confirmed through telling your story.

Craig (1995) relays that "narrative acts about particular texts" (p.156), meaning that one's narrative acts in relation to the medium in which the narrative is told, here story, and that the "telling of stories themselves were texts mediated by narration" (p. 156). If practical knowledge is "bound by time, place, or situation" (Fenstermacher, 1994, p.28), meaning one-dimensional, then personal practical knowledge is "in the past experience, in the present mind and body, and in the future plans and actions. Personal practical knowledge is found in the practice. It is, for any one, a particular way of reconstructing the past and the intentions of the future to deal with the exigencies of a present situation" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1998, p. 25 as cited in Connelly et al., 1997, p. 666), meaning three-dimensional (Craig, 2007). Three-dimensionalism allows the researcher to view storied-lives from all perspectives, including the space in-between the connecting points. The 3-D approach provides space for connectivity as well as individualism, which fits well with women's ways of knowing and constructing knowledge.

Craig (1995) ascertains "relationships between and among narration, story, and teacher knowledge" (p. 156) in her work with Tim, a first year teacher in Canada. Like Tim, my first year teaching experiences are the text of the inquiry which are presented here as telling stories rather than the cover stories I lived with for many years. I will show how I negotiate meaning in my beginning year as a teacher within knowledge communities: my classroom, the school, and the district. This negotiation is nested in professional knowledge contexts. I make use of the narrative inquiry approach in order to

find my personal practical knowledge in my "interpretation and reinterpretation" (Craig, 2000) of my first year teaching experiences; it is through the narrative act of reinterpretation or restorying, one which Craig and Huber, (2007) state is an "evolving process" (p.253), that I renegotiate my knowing now. Narrative methodology can help inform and/or shape narrative knowing. This allows for me as the researcher to then frame my professional experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996) around my personal practical knowledge, which is my context for understanding and constructing knowledge. However, Craig (1995) brings to light how a first year teacher can discount his/her own personal knowledge when discussing teacher knowledge by trying to validate your personal knowledge with other teachers' experiences, making your personal knowledge then not your own, much like received knowledge (Belenky et al., 1997). I wanted Shirley to validate my knowledge, which could never truly occur because we did not overlap in our ways of knowing. The tension then lay between the two knowledge contexts where I had been cultivated (Craig, 1995): my teacher education program at NYU where reflection and constructivism were encouraged and Muskerry-Burg where bureaucracy and linear-thinking were espoused.

While Clandinin and Connelly (1996) argue that professional knowledge landscapes are inhabited by teachers, I feel the same concept can be extended to principals since they too live a life behind their office door and in other professional spaces. Professional knowledge landscapes then create epistemological dilemmas that we understand narratively in terms of secret, sacred, and covered stories. Conceptualizing a professional knowledge landscape provides a way to contextualize the teachers' personal practical knowledge.

Cover Stories and the Re-storying Process

Elbaz-Luwisch (2007) ascertains that "teacher knowledge is deeply personal, so research that studies teaching from a narrative perspective has no choice but to go in close" (p.376), which is why I chose narrative inquiry as my methodology. Craig and Huber (2007) affirm for us that it is because the narrative inquirer researcher is so invested and involved with the people whom she is studying that subjectivities become "managed" (Peshkin, 1986, as cited in Craig & Huber, 2007) rather than negated. You cannot study relationships via experiences without contextualizing your own values. The researcher's "inquiring in relation" (Craig & Huber, 2007, p.259) is an important vantage point because it weaves together what we come to know as our "narrative understandings" (Craig & Huber, 2007, p.259), which can only be known through the continuous process of storying and restorying, one which I will use.

Part of this restorying includes a "commonplace of experience," (Lane, 1988 as cited in Craig & Huber) here the first year teacher experience, from which I have developed my narrative authority (Olson, 1995). Lyons and LaBoskey (2002) share that while teachers "frequently and almost naturally turn to story to communicate their classroom experiences and their knowledge of teaching, it is just as likely that in doing so they have been easily dismissed and often demeaned" (p.15). The two issues they deem problematic for teachers, much like my first year of teaching, are that teachers are non-objective, meaning "insider inquirer" (p.15) and the subsequent knowledge produced from such narrative inquiry can be believed to not be validated knowledge. Bateson (1984 as cited in Craig & Huber, 2007) would refute this claim as she finds that reporting on personal experience has "rigor in 'asserting, claiming, acknowledging'" (p. 266).

Through this restorying process, I will now have multiple ways of knowing Muskerry-Burg's complex school situation. Because narrative inquiry is a "fluid form of research" (Craig & Huber, 2007), restorying is the process that will help me better understand the gradations of my experiences as well as a conversation with myself as narrative inquirer and self-study participant. As Elbaz-Luwisch (Craig & Huber, 2007) puts, "the ultimate purpose of narrative inquiry into schooling is the restorying of practice on both the individual and the school levels" (p.371).

Bruner (1986) describes how culturally we develop stories that influence individuals

> for stories define the range of canonical characters, the settings in which they operate, the actions that are permissible and comprehensible. And thereby they provide, so to speak, a map of possible roles and of possible worlds in which action, thought, and self-definition are permissible (or desirable) (p.66).

It is these stories and roles deemed acceptable or "socially authorized" (Olson & Craig, 1995, p.165) that become a reason why cover stories are created. Crites (1979, p. 126 as cited in Olson & Craig, 1995) initiates the definition and creation of cover stories as

> two different renderings of experience [that] can co-exist in a single consciousness [as a] double-storied type of self-deception. A person has two images or scenarios in mind, the one so unacceptable…that the other image or scenario is artfully fabricated in order to suppress it. The story that cannot be faced is the real story, in the sense that it continues to assert itself in motivating one's course of action, with the more acceptable

scenario constantly being put forward as a cover story to rationalize the

course of action, however awkwardly it may be made to fit. The cover

story, of course, must also offer a plausible rendering of the person's

action and experience (p. 164).

He furthers this by saying:

What makes it a cover story in a particular case is that it functions…as a

secondary growth constantly called into play to counter and suppress the

real story. We are justified in calling the latter the real story precisely

because the cover story (or stories) must be steadily invoked in order to

suppress it. The two co-existing stories do not simply stand side by side.

The real story, though, never, avowed, is the one that is actually believed

and acted upon (Crites, 1979, p. 126 as cited in Olson & Craig, 1995, p.

164).

For the purpose of this paper, a cover story is a story about teaching rather than

the actual, lived teaching story (Craig, 2004). Specifically, this is my narrative that was

told in order to hide my true first year teaching experience. The discussion of secret,

sacred, and cover stories provided a map useful for studying the dynamics of the relations

between personal practical and professional knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996, p.

2-3). Central to the narrative inquiry will be the interactions between the principal and

teacher and the teacher and self. This interweaving of such interactions and relationships

allows space for thoughtful exploration to emerge through theory about narrative inquiry.

Procedures

The procedures I will use for this research will be to tell my teaching story in four episodes, all of which were major focal points for me that first year. These episodes were chosen for two reasons: 1) They highlight me as "teacher" in a variety of relationships and 2) the episodes closely connect with major themes in the literature: learning defined and meaning making, gaining legitimacy and types of leadership, group behavior, and mentoring. Woven into the story will be a triangulation of moments of tension between: me and the administration, me and my students' parents, or me and my students. This was where my cover story began, when those moments were covered up and never confronted or resolved. They were the moments I left out when telling my story out loud. They were the moments I hid to cover why I was fired. The unspoken moments became part of my hidden truth.

These moments will be unpacked through retelling my story and discussing the implications of those episodes. The lens through which I will examine each episode and guide my overarching restorying will be the metaphorical three-dimensionalism (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) mentioned above: interactions, continuity, and situations. The retelling will occur in the analysis of each episode where new meanings and cover stories are exposed. Finally, the analysis of each episode will have a lesson learned from the experience that relates to the literature and reframes the restory. Specifically, the actual three-dimensional inquiry process provides the physical and existential space for the restorying.

My original cover story will be presented through the four episodes, which are autobiographical field texts, which are from memory and artifacts from my classroom,

i.e.: authentic student work, lesson plans, notes from the principal, etc. The restorying

part of the process places these field texts into this research text (Clandinin & Connelly,

2000), my dissertation, which will enable me "to uncover [my] taken-for-granted

assumptions and move beyond the prescribed versions of knowing in order to investigate

more fully [my] tacit narrative knowing" (Olson & Craig, 2005, p. 166).

The restorying or uncovering the cover stories (Olson & Craig, 2005) will be most

evident in the temporal and situational dimensions because my story episodes begin in

the Fall of 2001 located in the Northeastern town of Hayes and are being retold and

further then restoried nine years later in present day in Houston, Texas. Between this time

gap I have lived more life and become a different person than I was that first year

teaching yet simultaneously I am reliving that life through the analysis of each episode. I

am currently as Clandinin and Connelly (2000) put it, researching an experience or

"experiencing an experience," all over, but my location is no longer as first person, but

rather as inquirer looking inward. The third dimension of personal and social, thus

interactions, will be woven throughout the episodes as the relationship between myself as

first year teacher and myself as researcher is negotiated and renegotiated through

restorying. The metaphorical three-dimensionalism will serve as my framework through

which I will navigate my analysis and discussion.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

"Alfred The Lord above gave man an arm of iron
So he could do his job and never shirk.
The Lord gave man an arm of iron-but
With a little bit of luck, With a little bit of luck,
Someone else'll do the blinkin' work!" –My Fair Lady, "With a Little Bit of Luck!"

Introduction

This chapter will include a detailed analysis of several episodes of my first year teaching story. The complete story can be found in the appendix. The episodes were strategically chosen because they connected closely with themes in the literature. The sections below are presented in chronological order of how and when my story happened.

In order to grasp the researcher's vantage point we must now understand hermeneutically. If narrative is both the research methodology and the researcher's way of knowing then hermeneutics is a way to understand this understanding. Central to hermeneutics is the ontological claim that "human beings are their history" (Wachterhauser, 1986, p.7). Wachterhauser (1986) introduces the concept of "historicity" (p.7) as:

> Historicity does not refer to the incontestable but obvious fact that we live out our lives in time. It refers instead to the thesis that who we are is through and through historical…who we are is a function of the historical circumstances and community we find ourselves in, the historical language we speak, the historically evolving habits and practices we appropriate, the temporally conditioned problems we take seriously, and the historically conditioned choices we make.

My story exemplifies historicity as two-pronged: 1) as the teacher in that classroom at that time and 2) as the researcher writing and reflecting back on that period. Therefore, the intersection of two dimensions, time and place, occur at a point where the construction of my first year of teaching may in fact exist now only in my memories and artifacts I saved from that time.

To begin, back in 2001 during the time of this experience, I was a first year teacher and my only frame of reference and the knowledge I constructed of teaching was from my previous circumstances and community in which I belonged: student-teaching and learning at NYU. My understanding of the logistics of teaching and best practices was from this perspective and the language I spoke was educationally progressive but from a perhaps academic standpoint, which I did not know then but do now was a limited viewpoint. I do recollect feeling quite capable and assured that I knew what was appropriate and best for my teaching and my students' learning.

As I moved from graduate school into my teaching career and back to graduate school, the cycle of my learning and constructed meaning making changed according to my experiences. I once thought of myself as a strong and independent woman, a leader, however, I now know that those terms need not be exclusive from connecting with others because it is that context that will propel a woman to and in leadership. As a first year teacher I was a procedural knower but as a learner I was a connected knower. I was not being my authentic self. For me, authenticity and truth come from connecting with other and through personal experience I can understand clearly and make true meaning from it.

Both hermeneutics and narrative are interpretive processes. Lyons and LaBoskey (2002) recognize five characteristics and purposes which identify narrative practices and

inquiry as exemplars: 1) Intentional reflective human actions includes narrative not just as a history or telling of a story but also as a way of knowing, 2) are socially and contextually situated which happen in real time with relational interactions to construct knowledge, 3) this constructed knowledge of teaching comes from "storying" the experience via engaging participants, 4) personal and professional identities can be implicated meaning they can be "discovered, redirected, or affected,", and 5) toward constructing meaning and knowledge (p.21-22).

The narrative interpretation of my first year teaching experience via the four episodes in this chapter will be hermeneutically analyzed through the three dimensional lens (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), which directly connects to the historicity of my first year teaching. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) discuss using their three dimensions of time, space, and interactions: "In terms of the grand narrative, we might imagine the terms as an analytic frame for reducing the stories to a set of understandings" (p. 54). Lastly, I will also analyze the episodes in conjunction with the literature review.

Episode One

When we dug into our curriculum, it was important to me that my students had a comprehensive literacy connection between reading and writing as that was my training at NYU. But really, it was an opportunity for me to more intimately know both who my students were as individuals in the world and as academic students in my classroom. In college we did a self-evaluation measuring Howard Gardner's then seven multiple intelligences. My strongest intelligence was "interpersonal" and it was no surprise that building a classroom community was the most important objective for me in those first few weeks of school.

The students filled out reading surveys I created with questions such as "If you had to guess…How many books would you say you owned? How many books would you say there are in your house? How many books would you say you've read in the last twelve months?" Alyssa, a quiet girl who wore glasses answered these questions quite maturely for an eleven year-old. For example, Question #3 asked, "Why do people read? List as many reasons as you can think of." Her response was "1. It's fun 2. It helps your vocabulary 3. Text books help you learn 4. It tells you what's happening in the world (newspaper) 5. Voting 6. It passes the time."

On another reading survey, Walker, a boy with Asperger's counted that he had read one book by October. "What do you think about this number?" was the question on the form. His response was "I think this number is puny and insufficient for a 6th grader but I don't blame myself because the book is really, really long." Walker filled out another reading log entry with finishing the sentence "Sometimes when I read, I compare a character's life to my own…" His response not only gave me insight into how socially-awkward Asperger's kids can be but also into how he struggled as a reader to comprehend. He was a fluent reader, but was not a student for whom comprehension, even small amounts in a story, came easily.

I do compare the chactor (sic) life to my own, I compare the chapter I just read to the previous, I try to figure out what the chactor might be thinking. I Imagine (sic) if I were iN the scence (sic), and I sometimes I canN't (sic) figure out if the character is mad or just being sarcastic. I usually have to read things over, aNd over, aNd over (sic) to actually get what is happening if it is really confusing. But I usually enjoy

(sic) reading the book. Most of all, I try to figure out what they're

thinking, how they're feeling, how they're doing something iN (sic) the

book, If it doesN't (sic) explain very well how they do it in the book. And

sometimes how fst (sic) they're doing something is really confusing.

Sometime I forgot that some of the other chactors (sic) are there is they

haveN't (sic) said anything for a couple chaptors (sic). But that doesN't

(sic) happen often. But Most of all, I just try to eNjoy (sic) the book and

have a good time.

     After we read <u>Island of the Blue Dolphins</u> as what Hayes called a "Reading in

Common" book, I spontaneously remember dividing the class by gender and having a

debate, including timed-responses and rebuttals. I sat on a student's desk to mediate and

the kids were so enthralled in the learning moment that they did not care when lunch time

came around. I tied the reading to their writing and it was then when we created a class

newspaper. Each student chose what kind of article they wanted to write: editorial,

feature, sports etc and for each sets of chapters assigned for reading the students wrote

another article. It was through this writing process that the student's learned about

honing their craft with editing and revising. While some found this laborious, they were

very conscientious. I used the Lucy Caulkin's Writing Workshop model from Teachers'

College Columbia University and this was a brand new way of writing for them. They

had never before been challenged to extend their thoughts and make their writing more

comprehensive.

     Cody was a small boy whose mother had been an active parent volunteer in the

school for over ten years as his older sister was now in junior high school. It was his

mother's last year to be a mom of an elementary school-age child. She was someone I was told you did not want make enemies with because she gossiped—to anyone and everyone. Cody was quote resilient to writing because he felt he was not good at it and had not had previous success. His first "Survivor Tribune" article was three paragraphs long with five sentences in each paragraph. My concluding comments on his first paper were:

> *Cody,*
>
> *This was a nice job following the pattern, but for this one you were to your own ideas. You can and should be writing longer, more detailed sentences.*

The comments were followed by a smiley face. By Cody's third article he had four paragraphs each with six to seven sentences.

Trouble begins here, or so I thought.

On a handwritten note dated October 24 from a Muskerry-Burg notepad, six days before my first parent-teacher conferences, Shirley (my principal) communicated with me about Cody. Her note read as follows:

Lauren-

I spoke with Daphne M. She was upset. I think you should try and find a time that works for her and her husband [for parent teacher conferences. They could not seem to make any of the six dates I had available for sign-up]. That may help to mend fences.

I looked at the H.W. for this week.

-Does each child write 4 articles or choose one?

-The Rumplestillsken article is a long- I think the kids should read the story and then choose a section 2-3 paragraphs to find and change verbs.

-Math seems fine.

On another topic, several parents have mentioned that when their children asked you questions about HW, etc. you would not help them. I would expect you to answer questions kids have about their work. Sometimes they think they know what to do and then they get home and are confused. If lots of kids are calling one another about the HW then I think more time should be spent explaining/doing examples/starting it in class etc. If there are still questions- answer them, while trying to figure out what the confusion is.

Let me know if you want to talk about any of this.

<div align="center">

Shirley

</div>

During this two-week writing cycle the class in general worked on adding detail to sentences, combining sentences, topic sentences, and concluding sentences while each child received specific feedback from me on throughout each paper, each revision, and at the end of each final draft. Cody's mother expressed her concerns to me quite often through hand-written notes and in-person parent-teacher conferences about my writing assignments and the quality of the product I required from her son. I believed that she was not happy because Cody was upset that someone not only set high, yet reachable academic expectations for him but also that I was holding him accountable. This was sixth grade after all, how else would I prepare them for seventh grade? But, I truly believed that the writing process worked and that Cody would become a better, more self-confident writer. He just needed the tools to know how to do it.

This came to a startling junction point in my first year of teaching. One day after school around four o'clock, while cleaning up and preparing the next day's lessons, Cody's mother came into my room and berated me to the point that she was yelling in a

loud voice at me about how unhappy she was with me as Cody's teacher and about the writing assignments. He did after all, have other commitments afterschool, like baseball and these assignments were keeping him up too late. One of my two teacher aides witnessed the worst part of it toward the end of the berating as she was standing in my doorway. I was so startled and stunned I did my best to keep my composure and reassured her I would continue working with Cody. As she stormed out, I remember my aide asking me if I was alright and then giving me a hug. This was the first time in my life and in my teaching career I felt I was being discriminated against due to my young age. However, wasn't I a competent, responsible adult with a college degree and the highest graduating honors from a top-tier university? Didn't they know what potential I had?

Three Dimensionalism

Dimension 1: Space. In terms of Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) three dimensions, the situational space where this occurred was in my classroom, which was very insular during instructional hours yet external factors, such as Shirley's observational note and Cody's mother, kept crashing in like uninvited guests, which cyclically impacted my teaching and my relationships with my students. The "topological boundaries" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p.51) I thought were the four walls of my classroom, but I did not understand that they extended to the landscape of the school and its community. This contributed to my situation of teacher isolation. I could not understand this back then because I had never been a teacher of record.

Dimension 2: Time. The temporal issues I faced then in terms of the second dimension, continuity, were as the teacher I was a curriculum maker but an employee of the school I was tackling being validated and legitimized as "teacher." These issues were

happening simultaneously, which is why while I was executing writing workshop Cody's mother was coping with an uncomfortable child as he was being challenged out of his comfort zone, which she knew was not his strength, yet was doing so by an unknown, untrustworthy entity, namely me. I thought being hired by the school was the stamp of approval, but it was the day-to-day business and dealings with the membership that approved your status. The students and parents connected to the past from the 5th grade teacher, Irene, and their projected growth was to GW Sage Junior High School, the only school in the district for 7th and 8th graders, which then meant I was then disconnected from them. My past connected back to New York and my future was undetermined and free to connect with a myriad of possibilities.

Dimension 3: Interactions. The last dimension not yet discussed is that of personal and social matters or interactions. While composing this first episode I was forced to look "inward," (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) and analyze what I was feeling then but yet when forced to look "outward" made me realize that that was something I could not do then or did not know how to do then. Then my moral dilemma was how do I reconcile knowing I am a capable teacher and have good ideas and systems for teaching with the parental adverse reaction to me? Thinking back, I did not even contemplate or fathom how Cody's mother was feeling and what she needed from me. Rather than plowing on with my curriculum, I should have involved her in the process more in order to gain a true understanding of her feelings. As a mother now but not then I have a deep appreciation for knowing your child will make mistakes, will pick himself up if he falls, and will learn from his life experiences, yet wanting to shield him as much as possible from those pitfalls and failures. Cody's mother was conceivably overprotective and too

confrontational, but had I listened more to what she was not saying I may have not

avoided the situation, but assuaged it more to guide it to fizzle out or fade away.

A second interaction was also occurring then, mine with Shirley, my principal. As

I reflect on my interactions thus far I had with any type of school administrator, I realize

that they are narrow. However, one major one is at the forefront of those memories, what

I called then "being fired from student teaching." In my last semester of NYU, instead of

opting to change student teaching sites, I decided to stay in my current placement, a 5th

grade Upper East Side classroom, in order to live and experience a student's and

teacher's full school year. I became quite close and comfortable with the cooperating

teacher, Dara, with whom I had many conversations about her teaching and teaching in

general. She had taught for roughly five years and the more time I spent with her and

with her students, who had looped with her from the previous year, the more open she

was to my teaching and my creativity. She allowed me to develop and execute a social

studies unit involving media and music and take part in all lessons. By December, my

student teaching supervisor stated that we were more like co-teachers than cooperating

teacher and student teacher.

While Dara and I forged on with our lesson planning and teaching, we got into a

rhythm as teachers, but what was developing was a rift with the students. Some were now

acting out and having more discipline issues when I took over the class. We did not think

it was a major problem. We felt it was happening the more I asserted myself as the real

teacher, but Dara felt the students just needed to get used to it. However, one fateful

February morning around 7:30 a.m., I bounced into Dara's classroom and she looked like

she was going to cry, which was quite atypical for her. We were called into the

principal's office whereupon I was told because some o the students were having problems with me as of that exact moment I was being placed in a 3rd grade classroom as a student teacher. No warning was given and this was the only solution the principal gave with absolutely no room for discussion or collaboratively problem-solving.

Dara and I sat the students down together when they came in a told them, which then brought an onslaught of questions and wonderings why I had to go. I packed up my bags and by 9:30 a.m. was sobbing hysterically on the subway back downtown to NYU. The director of my program, who was friends with this principal, was so enraged she not only cut off her friendship with this woman but also took that school off the official student teaching sites' list. She and the director of student teaching placement assured me I did nothing wrong and that the principal cannot make those decisions without first consulting one of them. I had an excess of hours and had fulfilled my stat requirements for student teaching. I could conclude my student teaching for the semester.

This similar experience with regard to being fired with no forewarning initiates pause for discussion. Outwardly, both set of conditions contained a student-centered teacher and a set of students yet these apparently did not connect as a class unit except by the physical boundaries of the classroom. My interactions as teacher with my students seemed to have caused some sort of discomfort with the students, which was then red-flagged to the administrator in charge. This message though was not relayed to me as such, but rather became the conditions around which I was defined as teacher. Communication was abruptly halted rather than used as a means of professionally developing me as a new teacher.

Theme of the Episode: Meaning-making

In this episode, we have three different ways of defining learning and meaning making. First, we have how I, the female leader of a class of students, made meaning about who my students were as individuals and as learners. Second, we have how the students were making new meaning from experiences previously not had. Third, we have how the principal via the parent constituency made meaning about their children's learning from my daily lessons. While the first and second ways of defining learning and meaning making are more closely connected through the constant, day-to-day classroom interactions, the students learning and meaning making was truly caught between my way of experiencing versus those on the outside of the classroom, the principal and parents.

I was learning about my students through the process of my experiences as Eisner (1988) contends and it was those experiences that became my achievements as a first year teacher. My students, however, never had the skills made available to them to learn in this way. They had only been taught in a manner related to Piaget's learning theory, a process-product way to understand. It was only through understanding their schema, which could have been how to learn writing, do an assignment, what typical homework looked like, and how teachers were supposed to give information to them, etc., that they understood their role and requirements as a student in school and as a learner of academia. Personal experiences were never validated as significant in not only what they learned, but how they learned it. It was this discontinuity in their schooling experience between PreK-5th grades and now their 6th grade experience that fractured their understanding from the time they were in the classroom to the time they went home and tried to complete their homework with their parents' assistance.

At this point in the story, Shirley and I conflicted due to our individual meaning making via our ways of knowing. Shirley was receiving knowledge (Belenky et.al, 1997), or what she deemed knowledge, from parents, about my lessons and homework assignments. The truth about these situations was from the external authority, the parents, rather than from me, the classroom leader. What she understood as her original understanding of what was happening, was in fact not original, it was through the verbal and written words of the parents. Shirley never observed me teaching or asked what my thought process was for decision-making in my classroom. I was always second-guessed and never trusted as a) an authority figure and b) a valid decision-maker. Seemingly, Shirley was open with me and answered all my questions. I thought she was actively listening each time I sat in her office across from her desk and asked for advice on issues from the mundane to the outlandish. Upon reflection, I now think every conversation was used as ammunition against me as a source of young, immature incompetence. Connecting to the school community was happening for me in a negative way. I was an outsider and would not ever have true entrance into it.

The schism that occurred in our relationship stemmed from this dissimilar way of knowing. I, on the other hand, was a procedural knower (Belenky et al., 1997), who made truth from connecting personal experience (Gilligan, 1982) to knowledge constructed. I tried to empathize with my students, not in a way that was feeling sorry for them or make excuses for them, but in the way Belenky et al. (1997) describe as trying to share their experiences in order to understand what led them to formulate their ideas and understandings. I believe I did not do this with Shirley because I accepted her as the authority and assumed her to be making meaning procedurally, connectedly through

"experiential logic" (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 115) as I did, which was not wrong, but rather immature to presuppose. I did not know then that Shirley could in fact be making meaning and understanding my teaching from a truth outside herself.

If I then use this new-found construction as new knowledge I could also use it "not so much as generating a list of understandings achieved by analyzing [my experience as a first year teacher], but rather as a pointing to questions, puzzles, fieldwork, and field texts of different kind appropriate to different aspects of the inquiry" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 54-55). This is a second way I am using the three dimensions to engage in my narrative inquiry. The terms of my remembered first year teaching stories structured my unanticipated narrative inquiry into my student teaching, which leaves me wondering not just why the same event would happen twice to me in one year, but also what piece I was missing back in those days? While I was shielded from the pain of the act of being fired by my NYU program and my family's encouragement, I not given or maybe not allowed the space to inquirer further with a mentor. I did have the support system on a personal level but not in the professional landscape. Had I been in such a relationship I wonder what the advice à la Hargreaves, the reflecting and the coaching à la Schön, and the learning and sub sequential knowledge would have been and furthermore what effect it would have had on me as a teacher? I do question the path I would have chosen had that occurred, such as increasing the number of my years of teaching, which total four, each in a different city, school, and grade level as opposed to the five years as a content coach in the same district and with the same boss for four of those.

The implications here for a new teacher's learning are multi-layered. First, a new teacher may not know how her voice is being heard and understood by multiple stakeholders in the school. She needs to advocate for herself and ask for support when she does not know, but this, too could be misconstrued. Therefore, the new teacher cannot be left alone. She cannot be told to ask for help when she needs it because she may not know what she should be asking or simply that she should be asking in general.

Second, in terms of her own learning, a new teacher needs to not only know policies, procedures, classroom management and curriculum implementation, but also how she relates to others and communicates her meanings. If, for example, I had known myself to be a connected knower, I might have then understood that the principal may not learn in the same manner and in fact may not communicate to other school constituents in the same way in which she learns. This process of knowing and learning yourself as a learner and communicator though takes time for reflection, which a new teacher needs to build into her day. This is not just reflection on the day's activities and successes or failures, like getting your class to lunch on time; rather this is a reflection that breeds inquiry into her interactions with her students, colleagues, parents, and administrators. However, this is not a skill that can be learned in a practicum. This is a lived experience. I needed this reflection time. I needed the time and space to think about my actions, their consequences, and how to engage in dialogue that was productive and stimulated further active engagement in my classroom.

These differing views, stemming from differing ways of knowing and learning, could have been acknowledged from Shirley in a conference with me. She could have confronted the issues in a manner that explained the dissension to me yet provided me

with a way to problem-solve the situation with her. Removing me from the decision-making process when I was in an integral position presented another layer to the cover story at that time of which I was unaware. Reconciling our learning differences may not have helped directly solve the underlying issue of trust, but it would have shifted my understanding and the ways in which I operated which then could have helped solve the problem or help it to fade away.

Episode Two

Then came the official parent-teacher conferences half-way through the first nine weeks for a progress report. Ruth was a maturely developed student and so was her best friend Lucy. Ruth asked good questions, was conscientious, and loved reading, so much more than the typical sixth grader that I created a special reading project for the two of them with an advanced-level book list. I thought this would please the highly-demanding parent constituency that I had in my class. Ruth's dad came alone. I can't remember the reason why her mom could not make the appointment. After I said my spiel and showcased Ruth's work, my second ageism berating came toward me. "Oh Lauren, I know Ruth is a good student. But you are just not like Irene. Have you even talked to Irene to see how she teaches and runs her class? I think it is much better than what you are doing." And he went on and on and on. After he finished talking at me I said to him as calmly as I could "Irene has taught for 25 years. This is my first year teaching and at some point she had to have started somewhere, too. Just give me some time to get to that point." His rebuttal was "I don't have time. This is Ruth's only year in sixth grade to get prepared for seventh grade." And with that, we ended the conference and he somewhat

stormed off. He didn't care that I was specifically designing rigorous learning opportunities for his child. I was not Irene. I never would be.

Essie, another one of my special education students, was a tomboy with short hair who did not relate to girls. Her best friend was a gruff boy named Tom, also in a special education resource class. They had a love-hate relationship. Tom had trouble reading and she had a non-verbal disability. I suspected he would grow up to be a football star and she some sort of free-spirited artist with a sharp wit. Her parents began the conference rather than letting me speak first to her progress thus far by asking me, "Lauren what is your philosophy on education?" While replying I threw in the words "New York University" and that seemed suffice for them. Another boy's father made reference in a demeaning tone that I had attended "New York State University," to which I quickly, for credibility purposes, corrected him. This made him stop mid-sentence and say "Oh" and it was as if you could see him shift gears in where his conversation was headed with me.

Then there was my conference, or rather confrontation, with Pauline, my paraprofessional. This was case number three of ageism, in a less than three month time period. I needed to set the tone with Pauline that it was indeed I who was in charge in the classroom and not she. I was a different teacher than the one she was paired last year and we needed to get on the same page. She slammed her fists down and said, "I am twenty years older than you and I demand respect from you." Well, this was clearly not going in the right direction. We actually came to an understanding of duties she was to do and communication modes we were going to take from now on. I would not ask her again to staple, laminate, grade papers or do clerical work unless her three students

were fine on their own or she had free time because I did have aides for that. The funny

thing was, the three of them were all the same age, all with school-age children, and

Pauline was the only one who thought the managerial side of teaching was demoralizing.

Dynamics Change

It was after parent-teacher conferences that there was a shift in some students'

attitudes towards me and our classroom work. Ruth and Lucy seemed more apprehensive

about assignments, but they wanted to please and were taught to respect adults, so they

complied. Cody was actually a bit more compliant but seemed to have an internal

struggle between Mom and Teacher.

Three Dimensionalism

Dimension 1: Space. Space in this episode is not bound by physicality, but rather

is more intimate. The situational space was in relation to these parents' very personal

feelings, worries, and concerns about their children's learning. However, the reason I

could not understand their perspective then was because our positions during those fateful

conferences were in different places. My stance as teacher during these conferences was

located in a teacher's personal construction of knowledge whereas the parents were

located in the educational landscape in which teachers work (Clandinin & Connelly,

2000, p. 126). To explain this further it makes sense to introduce the phenomenological

term "horizons of intelligibility" (Carspecken, 1996, p.103). If an experience's central

structure is the experience of or about some object, here the student's classroom

experiences and academic progress, and the experience, here the parent-teacher

conferences, is directed toward an object worthy because of its content or meaning, here

the student, then the distinctive form within this perceptual experience varies due to the

background within which it is perceived. Therefore, we were never going to connect because our points of origin coming into the conferences were vastly different and not close to intersecting. The parents and I did not share a common set of symbol systems, which when present at the conferences, did not foreground our conversation with intelligible claims (Carspecken, 1996). Our surrounding background assumptions were not same either, which resulted in any claims I made about a student being perceived as invalid or illegitimate because we were not assuming the same knowledge perspective.

In many ways, my classroom was a narrative research field and the phenomena within that text were the children and, according to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), these phenomena "are a kind of shifting ground" (p.126). My inquiry into the lives of my students was about what academic accomplishments they had achieved thus far, their individual continuing progress cycle, and how they learned. These were the in-classroom experiences that were backgrounded for me as I spoke with parents.   For the parents, however, it was their children's' out-of-school experiences, i.e.: feelings of frustration, hours of homework, and attempts at challenging my authority that were background at the conferences. Due to this incongruence, our focus in terms of our questions, concerns, and claims about their children was not foregrounded in the same way. Therefore the three dimensional space in which we were conferencing did not coincide.

Dimension 2: Time. In this episode time is two-pronged: 1) as a view of the objective of sixth grade and 2) as real-time during the conferences. As the classroom teacher, I saw my job as connecting to the past, present and future learning experiences of my students. I needed to understand where they came from last year in particular, i.e.: learning objectives and expectations, knowledge held, and grades received. I also felt it

very important for me to honor their encounter with sixth grade as unique and stand-alone yet within the realm and spectrum of their schooling. That continuation into seventh grade was not just an end point for my classroom it was also a constant formative assessment.

However, the parents did not connect with the present sixth grade situation as I did. I have come to realize that the parents' constant thought was about seventh grade. Sixth grade was just the precursor for what was to come. The only purpose of sixth grade was to be prepared for seventh grade and therefore there was no special dispensation given to honor the experience in present time. It served its purpose as the bridge from fifth grade to seventh grade. "This tension between seeing things in time [the parents' view of sixth grade] versus seeing things as they are [my teacher's view of sixth grade] became an issue at the boundary everywhere we turned" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p.30).Time then in terms of sixth grade and for those of us in the parent teacher conferences ran parallel to each other and did not overlap.

This relates rather well to the phenomenological handling of time in which perception and knowledge are moments that are not simultaneous (Carspecken, 1996, p.13). Therefore being present at the conference versus the moment I was aware that the parents were sitting before me drilling me and questioning my competence and authority were not the same. This oscillation though is possible and the simple knowledge awareness that ensues shifted my attention. Once my attention was shifted the ways in which I handled and/or composed myself during these conferences was different. Time kept running currently while the conversations were taking place yet concurrently my shift in awareness and resulting dialogues were happening as well.

Dimension 3: Interactions. In this episode, the dimension of interaction crosses outside the interactions between me and the parents and is more closely connected to the bureaucratic imposed notions of leadership. It was the concept of leader as the Hayes school district saw fit that then interacted with every one of my communications and relationships. The literature supports leadership styles not being assigned per gender. From the most intimate member of my teaching environment, Pauline, to the outermost member, parents such as Ruth's, expectations were implicitly imposed on me: I was a young, female new teacher. This was supposed to mean that I was to fall in line with authority, here the top male authority of superintendent, which also meant being relegated to sex-stereotyping as "female", here one who is good at household work and raising children (Billing & Alvesson, 2000, De Beauvoir, 1989; Friedan, 1997). In this manner, women are docile and limited in their capacity as leader. This notion was legitimized in the Hayes education system and social system of teaching through previous teachers my students had, such as Irene. I was not Irene and this was not previous years. Plus, being young and inexperienced added to my low authority position, which in turn intensified my non-legitimization as teacher, knower, and authority.

Thinking narratively versus the grand narrative (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 29) is what led to my demise during these crucial conversations. The universal, context-free interest from the parents' and central office's perspective of sixth grade would have been future achievement in the seventh grade. On the other hand, as the classroom teacher I was thinking narratively, meaning within the context of my sixth grade classroom which included temporal and spatial boundaries that interacted within the confines of my classroom. For me contextualizing learning objectives happened

constantly according to the experiences of my students either prior to sixth grade or while in sixth grade while the performance on said objectives were viewed as context-free from a district stand-point. These contextual factors are what excluded me from legitimization because parents and district constituencies only wanted "measures of certainty attached to the importance of various contextual factors" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 32). I could not verify with certainty at that point in time what the parents wanted and needed me to say: "Your child is 100% ready for seventh grade."

Theme of the Episode: Silence and Isolation Versus Legitimization

The concepts of silence and the isolation it creates have helped me shape the following understanding of my experience. I was an innovative, progressive thinker who guided my students to their own individual understandings and knowledge constructs, which Belenky et al. (1997) call a "connected teacher". Rather than being applauded for preparing my students as 21st century thinkers, those able to problem-solve, critically think, and analyze decisions, I was shut down. My web (Helgesen, 1985; Gilligan, 1982) of relationships included my students, but I was not included in the greater school community web. Due to this I was a threat to the pre-existing web and I needed to either fit in or be torn apart from the web completely. Had I chosen to fit in I would have been legitimized as leader on this campus, but since I did not select this, I was isolated even further from the web of inclusion. Rather, I was excluded. I knew then I was not choosing to behave as parents had wanted to me to, meaning in terms of their prior experiences with teachers such as Irene, but I did not know the catastrophic implications it bore on my employment and status at the school.

Additionally, Lucas (2003) asserts that in order for a structure to be legitimized it must conform to the environment, here Hayes's positionality (Tisdell, 2002; Ortner, 1974) of female versus male employees, teachers and administrators alike. This then meant that I could not be nor would I be legitimized as "teacher", leader of a classroom of students, because I would not conform to their structures they put in place. It was not as if I was the outrageous teacher standing on tabletops shouting poetry or the teacher who threw away her desks and the students sat only on the floor to do whatever work they chose to do. I followed the curriculum guidelines; I used the district and school resources; I maintained contact with parents; I arrived early everyday and stayed late to prepare for the next day's lessons; and I *knew* my students. But this was not the type of teacher Hayes wanted for their children. They wanted one who followed rather than lead. They wanted the new teacher to be in the bottom position of the school structure and not to differ from a veteran, moreover beloved, teacher by any means via lesson plans, creative activities, relationships with students, or planning preparatory time for lesson execution. This was never stated explicitly, but the behavior that ensued through my interactions and the subsequent consequences for my newness, being fired, would explain it.

I had the motivation and aspiration Brunner and Grogan (2007) describe as a new teacher and a new female leader, however the type of leadership I needed from a principal was not aligned with these. I did not have the time to convince The Man in charge, Superintendent Jim Evans, that I was indeed worthy of and capable of being in this position. He was ultimately the one who made the decision to fire me, or rather gave

me the choice to resign, which was the ultimate act of silence and isolation from the Hayes educational community.

Lack of clear communication and structure for a new teacher in Hayes relates to the kind of approved leadership in the district. The kind of leadership that was relegated to educational leaders in Hayes was more transactional (Yammarino et al., 1997), that concerned with rules, procedures, and regulations, rather than transformational, that which focuses on relationship building. Although this again was not publicly stated it was shown through the actions of Shirley and Mr. Evans. Shirley did not provide the space and time to learn about me as a teacher or as a new teacher to the profession as shown by her limited interactions with me and null classroom observations that I can recollect. I not only had the same requirements placed upon me as the other members of the faculty, I also was held to a different standard-- that against the veteran teachers like Irene. Rather than pairing me with Irene as a mentor I was compared against her in terms of my teaching style, my teaching philosophy, and everything I enacted in the classroom.

I was not provided support of any kind to help guide me through that first year of teaching. Rather, when she called me to her office to fire me, I was not given an evaluation of my teaching, which would have supported and included me in the profession; instead I was quoted the State Law that claimed new teachers are considered "at-will" teachers for the first 90 days of employment. Stating this was strategic in order to consistently follow through with excluding me from legitimizing my status on campus.

This experience indicates that the needs of new teachers are unique. New teachers are expected to bring high energy and enthusiasm but not innovative ways of conducting themselves as leaders. They should fade into the previously established mode of this.

However, in order to verify leader-like potential before being legitimized as leader first-year teachers needs first-year teachers need specialized professional development, which centers on coaching and specific language about such things as how to deal with parents, specifically difficult ones. They should have a teaching partner conference with them when having parent conferences, perhaps even the last year's teacher so that parents see the academic relationship from one grade to the next but also see the connection and interactions between his or her child's teachers. It would be this visual connection for parents that would help solidify the new teacher as a legitimate leader. While schools need teachers to teach children they also need teachers who can speak with and interact with adults in ways that align with their district curriculum standards yet also understand and address the needs of their students' parents. While some may say that comes with more teaching experience, my experience should be proof that more time is not always allotted to learn such things.

Episode Three

Then there was Kaitlynn, whose nickname was Kayla, with The Crazy Mother, Lilly. Shirley had gone to Italy for a few days when things started to get messy with Lilly. Kaitlynn was giving me a lot of attitude, more than an acceptable amount from a pre-teen, and was not forthcoming about doing homework. So, her mom Lilly wrote me a letter, a hand-written letter about how she used to be a copy-editor for a magazine and they never had to do as many revisions for a writing piece as Kaitlynn has had to do for her sixth grade writing assignments. She would decide what was sufficient and satisfactory for homework revisions to Kaitlynn's writing assignments. And that was that.

After much thought and deliberation over what to do, I decided not to write a note back to Lilly. Instead, I decided to talk with Kaitlynn about her potential. I talked with my sister into the late hours of the evening and I asked Kay, Jessica, and Irene what they would advise or suggest based on their years of experience and expertise with the family, especially with the principal out of town. They all agreed not to go head-to-head with Lilly because it was well-rumored that she was mentally unstable with bouts of depression; they had seen this behavior from Kaitlynn's older sister when she was in elementary school and now her sister was "one of those girls" in junior high school who wore lots of make-up, short skirts, low-cut shirts and an academic delinquent. Maybe Kaitlynn was afraid she would turn out the same way?

Within the next day or two as Kaitlynn announced she did not have to do the assignment during writing time "because her mom said so" I kept her behind during ancillary. I talked with her about her attitude and how it was disrespectful, but also how I knew she had so much talent and a bright a future ahead of her and this attitude would only get in the way. I told her that we would compromise on what her mom wanted for homework and what we would do in class and she seemed alright, yet still a bit wary, of what we agreed on together.

Shirley returned refreshed from her European vacation. We chatted outside at recess about what she and her husband had visited and how wonderfully thrilling the whole visit seemed. I also went to her office to apprise her of the details of the situation the day she returned. I do not remember her exact reaction, but it was not shock or disbelief. I even think she said I handled myself well and she would take care of Lilly from now on.

Three Dimensionalism

  Dimension 1: Space. The component of location in this episode lies between

school and home. This intersection was not smooth but rather jagged. While Kayla was

the overlapping element, she did not connect the two. Rather these places were separate

entities, which did not coincide. The divergence rather than convergence of place is what

I believe was too confusing for Kayla, which impacted my space with her at school as

teacher. The space for teaching, learning and ways of knowing then became contradictory

rather than complimentary. In this manner, there was no way I could fully take advantage

of the learning space in my classroom or the experiences lived because the space was not

my own.

  Schwab (1983) conceives the following definition of curriculum:

  Curriculum is what is successfully conveyed to differing degrees to different

    students, by committed teachers using appropriate materials and actions,

    of legitimated bodies of knowledge, skill, taste, and propensity to act and

    react, which are chosen for instruction after serious reflection and

    communal decision by representatives of those involved in the teaching of

    a specific group of students who are known to the decision makers

    (p.240).

Curriculum is therefore a changing agent in the presence of students, who according to

Schwab (1983) "will change from time to time and place to place (p.240)." The place of

learning this school-based curriculum was in a parallel location for Kayla in relation to

home. As her teacher, I was trying to invite Kayla into the learning. My own restorying

of this experience has made me realize that had I understood Kayla this way, rather than

just seeing Lilly through her daughter's actions, I could have individualized my instruction for Kayla differently and therefore connected better to her way of knowing. Schwab (1983) also notes that the principal is an effective member of the curriculum team. One reason he states this person is an important team member is because "the principal, if long in his post, will have fullest knowledge of the smallest but most potent social milieu which affects teaching and learning, that is, the milieu of the school itself (p.247)." Shirley's absence during this eruption with Lilly disrupted my space as teacher. I did not have the principal to participate in my curriculum choices or to support me with her knowledge, approval, and effective investiture of such curriculum (Schwab, 1983, p. 246). As a result, my space was overwhelmed with Lilly's insistence and Kayla's refusal to do work. My space as curriculum maker was correspondingly diminished.

The principal's presence would have built a bridge or space between me and Lilly. This space could have been a place where we conference through the principal's mediation to come to a common understanding. It was not Shirley's fault that she was away on vacation and therefore not able to physically be there during this incident. Due to her absence I was led to a place of isolation because my decision-making power was taken away from me in terms of my teaching toward Kayla. I was once again isolated as "teacher" from the other curriculum makers on campus, which meant there was no collaborative decision-making process to support my teaching. I was experiencing the opposite of what Clandinin and Connelly (1992) view as the teacher's role in relation to curriculum, "that the teacher is an integral part of the curriculum constructed and enacted in classrooms (p.363)." My space for this role had been taken away in a matter of a few days while my principal was gone on vacation.

Dimension 2: Time. While the temporality of this dimension seems to fit better as one in which time stopped for me as the teacher, I believe that time actually reached farther. If time is both temporal and on a continuum, then this event made time for me a blur of both the present and the future. Only I did not know it at the time. Time was moving as it should class by class, day by day. What I did not know was that the short time frame in which Shirley was in Italy and Lilly began undermining my teaching and authority was also cutting into my future. I could not foresee how these events would lead to my being fired, nor could I predict how being fired would impact the rest of my educational career, even though very few people have ever known I was fired. I did not understand then that every action, every conversation, every interaction would affect not only my long-term future but also my short-term future as teacher at this school.

If teachers are the curriculum makers à la Schwab (1983) and Clandinin and Connelly (1992), it takes time for teachers to learn and to fulfill this role. Part of the learning involves gathering data in order to make an informed decision appropriate to the context in which you are teaching. I did seek out advice from my partner teacher, last year's sixth grade teacher who was moved to fifth grade, and of course Irene. The data I gathered from my colleagues was to be careful when dealing with Lilly. The majority view was to give her what she wanted and not mess with the status quo. My rationale for not listening to this was my belief that I knew what was better instructionally for Kayla. What I did not know then but do now after re-storying is that my colleagues' advice was indeed valuable due to their time spent at the school and their better understanding of how the community ebbed, flowed, ticked, and breathed. I did not connect that part of my data for reaching Kayla was through understanding how to deal with her mother.

Shirley, on the other hand, did not investigate or support me through alternative methods after her return from Italy to my knowledge. Eisner (1997) states that "facts described literally are unlikely to have the power to evoke in the reader what the reader needs to experience to know the person someone portrays (p.8)." When Shirley did indeed fire me she stated the facts: I was at-will employee for the first 90 days of employment. She did not mention Lilly but I chose to believe that she took the facts described to her by both me in her office and, I am sure, by Lilly as well. Rather than delve into the situation she decided to stop time for me.

Dimension 3: Interactions. At the cross-section of time and interactions is what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) deem looking outward, at the experiential conditions of the environment. The culture-specific norms of the leadership at Muskerry-Burg, particularly the teacher leadership, could be characterized more as placating rather than subservient to the parent that complained the loudest, rather than teach to the individual child and differentiate based on the student's capabilities. Here, just as Karakoswky and Siegel (1999) endorse, the group majority was female and therefore their opinions and behavior were justified: Do not confront Lilly by any means. My leadership as a teacher was not influential because I did not participate in the group culture with the same amount of involvement (Carli & Eagly, 1999) as the other teachers. Specifically, I did not adhere to their code of conduct when dealing with disruptive students and parents. I involved myself not only more but differently because I would not ignore the problem. This was not a gender-difference but rather a leadership style distinction. What this difference along lines of leadership style rather than gender suggests is that even though we were all females, our leadership style was not gender-determined. Rather it was

based on our ways of problem-solving and interacting with the relationships within our school community. I was a connected knower, who as Belenky et al. (1997) explain, needed to collaborate with "like-minded knowers" in order to challenge and benefit from each other. I was not benefiting from this group of teachers but instead was impairing my abilities to make authentic decisions as the classroom teacher and further fracturing my status in both the Muskerry-Burg and larger Hayes communities.

It was not that what the other teachers on campus were advising me was wrong. It was just not in line with my way of knowing then and I could therefore not comprehend and accept what they were saying. After re-storying this I have come to know that at that time I would not open myself up in this particular situation to internalizing their knowledge of the community and the best approach to interactions with Lilly. This non-acceptance of outside information was perhaps too egocentric or in terms of ways of knowing was subjective knowing, which in turn stopped my efficacy as teacher to Kayla.

While female teachers may be more effective in terms of productivity for a leader of the same gender (Eskilson & Wiley, 1976), to what extent is that production successful? What then was considered successful productivity for me as a first year teacher? It seemed that the easier, more worksheet-based homework with a red checkmark or 100% on it was deemed more productive because the parents could plainly see success or failure on it. But what was truly productive with reference to learning for me as the teacher was not the outcome or product for me as a teacher, it was the process through which the students gained understanding, made connections, and learned about themselves as learners and knowers. This success was what I based my lesson planning, teaching, and re-teaching moments on in the classroom. Attention to these elements was

paramount, but was closely coupled with the required district curriculum and scope and sequence. However, I did not have support for this model of productivity, which in turn meant that I could not be successful.

For a new teacher, such help and support might come in the form of clear expectations bulleted out or in the form of rubric for what academic success looks like on that particular campus. Then, the new teacher would also need an explanation for how those expectations are executed through teaching and re-teaching experiences in the classroom. This kind of framework could seem stifling to an overly creative teacher, but on the other hand, it could also be used as a good guide for shaping common understandings. From such common understanding, a new teacher could begin grasp what she needs to do be successful under those conditions and within parameters. Productivity could still then be a process but with a shared vision for the outcome. In the end, the new teacher could also then re-evaluate if the school was a good fit for her.

Theme of the Episode: Teacher as Curriculum Maker

Teacher and curriculum maker should be synonymous. It is from the arts that education learns of (Eisner, 2004) enabling the teacher to exert her creativity and knowledge through the curriculum. It is this decision-making process that leads the teacher toward more effective student learning. This is due to collaborating with other teachers and understanding each student's learning needs and potential in order to execute lessons that match the process she went through to make the lessons and the desired outcomes as set forth by the district and/or state standards.

To be such a curriculum maker, the teacher needs to be a connected teacher (Belenky et al., 1997). In my experience with Lilly and Kayla, the issue was two-fold.

One, I was a connected knower while the other teachers were mainly procedural, separate knowers or received knowers. The difference between separate and connected knowers is the ability for empathy (Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et al., 1997), which helps connected knowers gain entry into other people's knowledge. The separate procedural knower makes meaning through objectivity and pragmatic strategies. By not including their own voice or perspectives these separate knowers gain adversaries' respect by adopting the adversarial views, meaning they approve and promote others' views (Belenky et al., 1997, p. 109).

This impacted my role as curriculum maker because these knowers accepted the district curriculum as is and excluded all feeling from judgments when dealing with parents. Suggestions or criticisms by parents to these teachers about how the curriculum was implemented in their classrooms was accepted and often put into practice in order to avoid confrontation. These knowers, these members of the faculty, "believe they can see more and see more clearly than they could when blinded by their own passions and opinions (Belenky et al., 1997, p.110)." However, through re-storying this experience I am not sure how much professional development was offered for teachers in this district in terms of curriculum making and collaborative decision-making process as I had in my collegiate student teaching training program. The isolation then for me as teacher came as a result of my connected knowing and curriculum making.

Both Lilly and Shirley were not interested in me adapting curriculum to Kayla's experience in my classroom in order to gain access to and influence her understanding of that curriculum. Rather, Lilly and Shirley wanted an outcome that was objective and grade-based with the least amount of relational contact. Grades were a piece of my

product but not the entirety because as a connected, constructed knower the process of gaining knowledge and growing as a learner was my focal point. But, I see now that my connection was more with the students and I needed to understand then that it was just as important for me to connect with my colleagues and their expertise and experiences, which would have added depth to my constructed knowing. Therefore, productivity for me as a first-time curriculum maker encompassed the process of lesson planning insomuch as my way of knowing and the product in terms of the official district policies on grading, which turned out to be an unsuccessful endeavor because I did not know how to combine these. This was what divided me from my class, my principal, my fellow teachers, and the parents.

Episode Four

Constructive or Critical?

The Thanksgiving holiday passed soon thereafter. I went home to Omaha and my whole family asked a million questions about my first year of teaching. They were so happy for me and so proud of me that I was accomplishing my dream. The week we got back to school, I was sitting at my desk eating my lunch during the kids' lunch period when Shirley came up and asked me to come to her office afterschool. I gaily and naively said, "Sure," as we had such a nice working relationship and since we talked often in her office, it was not a scary environment to be there. After dismissal, around 3:15 p.m., I walked into Shirley's office and sitting next to her was a middle-aged man, white of course, with his legged crossed sitting very officially. Shirley introduced him as the district assistant superintendent, someone whom I had never met nor knew existed until that very moment. I was very confused at this point. What was going on?

Then, my world came crashing down with three word she uttered next, "Lauren, you're fired." She continued "Today was your last day, you can come tomorrow if you want to get your things and say goodbye." I said I did not understand and he explained that they did not have to explain themselves to me since under the state's' law, new teachers are considered "at-will" for the first 90 days of employment. Apparently, I was just coming up on my 90 days within the following week or two. Done.

I ran down the hallways, up the stairs and to my classroom. I grabbed my bag and my purse, tried not to look anyone in the eye or talk to anyone and made it to my car. Then I called my NYU friend, Anne, in New York City who I spoke to weekly about teaching. I was practically on the floor of my car. Next, I called my sister hysterically crying from the car so much so she could barely understand me. I did not think I was going to be able to drive the 45-minute drive home. Somehow, I mustered the strength to start driving the car and I made it back to my apartment in the city.

The next few hours were a flurry of phone calls to my parents, my sister's now-husband-then-boyfriend who was in law school, and my friend Max in New York City, the gay Orthodox Jew going to medical school but whose true passion was music and being on Broadway. Max had just finished a class with his cadaver, got in his car, and drove for five hours to come to Boston so he could help us pack up my room the next day. I also called the Teacher's Union representative, of which I was not a part since no one solicited to me how important they were. It was she who told me about the state's law pertaining to first year teachers being at-will. She said she would get us a meeting with the Superintendent and she would be there, but that she really could not do anything

more to help since I was not a member. It was very late by the time I got in bed. I had a hard time falling asleep amidst the sobs.

We woke up very early the next morning, grabbed some boxes from our apartment and my sister, Max, and I set out to Muskerry-Burg. When I got there, I copied a letter I wrote to the faculty thanking them for being so nice to me, but that I was no longer going to be working there effective today. It was my only chance to say goodbye. News had already spread and teachers were coming up to me saying how sorry they were. Irene came to my room to say how sorry she was, but kept me at arm's length because by not getting involved her position was still secure. Pauline was a mess of tears and gave me a hug and told me she just could not believe it. When the kids came in the room, I had sat them in our circle and told them that today was going to be my last day; then I began crying. They asked why and I told them the truth that Shirley did not want me there any longer, that she did not think I was the best person to be teaching them and I did not know who their teacher was going to be. In order for us to have closure as a class, I assigned them one last writing assignment—and I told them they could write with anything they wished, pen, marker, crayon, etc. Oh, did they love that!

True Feelings and Sentiments Revealed

My kids wrote about something they felt they had accomplished in our short time together and what their goals would be for the rest of sixth grade. Alex wrote, quite honestly:

Dear Lauren,

At first when you became my teacher there were many things that I didn't like about your teaching styles, but just this week I stopped getting annoyed with your

teaching styles. Your teaching styles are different because people don't notice they are learning from you but they are learning a ton.

Ruth wrote me a succinct letter:

Dear Lauren,

I think you are a great teacher. I have learned many new and interesting things. I will miss you. It will not be the same without you. I am jealous of the next class that will be privileged to have you as there (sic) teacher. You have taught me so many things. I now know how to be a better person. I hope wherever you go next you have fun filled days, with excitement. I really enjoyed the Personal Narrative crafts. I have become a better writer because of you. I don't understand why you have to leave. I think it was unfair and not nice. You have been a great teacher and will continue to be. I will never forget the fun I had with you.

Lucy, my future could-be poet laureate, filled two pages:

Dear Lauren,

I will miss you. It seems like you had a lot of cool things planned for this year, and we will all miss it. Why do you have to leave? You are a really cool teacher who is different and special. You aren't afraid to do things differently, and the way you taught the class is a great way to teacher. You taught us all that there is more than one way to do things. I really liked writing in this class. Writing is one of my favorite subjects and it was challenging and fun to write my personal narrative and do all the writing crafts. I also thing that the way we did spelling was great, because we could choose words that we know we have trouble with…At the beginning of the year, I was really excited to get

you as a teacher. I am <u>not</u> excited to lose you as a teacher. I loved learning with you,

writing, math, Egypt, reading, everything. I will miss you.

Even Kaitlynn, who signed her letter "Love, Kayla," wrote, for the first time, her

twelve year-old feelings rather than her mother's:

Dear Laren (sic),

I am very sad that you are leaving. I wish you could have stayed. I really liked all

the things we did with writing (even though it's not possible to play rap music on the

piano!) I was very interested in the discussion we had about nigeria (sic) and the consept

(sic) of history. I loved how we had such a colorful room and all the art projects we did…

Three Dimensionalism

Dimension 1: Space. After taking a closer look at my first year teaching

experience, I am not sure there was a real space for me at Muskerry-Burg. There was a

physical location and an opening for a sixth grade teacher from Human Resources, but

there was no place for *me* as the teacher. I was trying to carve out a niche for myself both

personally and professionally within the walls of classroom and the school, but it could

be considered a unproductive attempt since I would never be able to fit in. The existential

space in which I apparently lived did not match up with the physical boundaries of this

location.

A good match for a first year teacher includes the right fit during hiring not just in

terms of working conditions but also with personnel. Susan Moore Johnson and Edward

Liu as part of The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers (2004) claim that

For new teachers, finding positions that closely fit their particular skills,

knowledge, and interests is important, because it influences their prospect

for achieving the success and the personal reward for which they entered

teaching. Unfortunately, the ways in which schools and districts hire new

teachers often make it unlikely that a good match will emerge. (p. 167)

For me, while I was not a late hire in August, I was mix between district-based and

school-based hiring, meaning that part of the hiring process was located at the central

office, the interview with the Superintendent, and part of it was at the school site, the

interview with Shirley. What I did not have is what Johnson and Liu (2004) call

"information-rich hiring," which incorporates such activities as "interviews with a wide

cross-section of the school community, teaching demonstrations, and observations of

classes or staff meetings" (p. 181). Through re-storying I realize that had those elements

been involved in my hiring process I may not have as eagerly signed a contract with that

school because they had the space and I needed a job.

Dimension 2: Time. The last morning I spent with my class dismantling

everything we had built up was a moment that stood still. It was a frozen moment where I

believe the students, for the first time, made their own decisions about me as their

teacher. It was during this moment in time, during the letter writing and question asking

that the students saw into their immediate future, which was now their current reality, i.e.

the rest of the sixth grade school year. As the teacher time stood still for me because I

was unsure what path to take next and how being fired would impact the rest of my

career. However awful the circumstances were those specific hours spent as a true class

community were the most well-spent we had the entire year.

A new teacher's sense of self takes time to evolve and for her to claim herself as

teacher changes as the year unfolds. At first she claims the title after licensure, whether it

is through a traditional university degree in teaching as I had or through alternative certification program. Then, as she is inducted into the school society over that year and is authenticated as one of the group her sense of self strengthens. New teachers are quite malleable because they do not have their own sense of self as teacher right away. Due to this they can easily be built up but just as easily destroyed as was I. The sense of self as teacher can oscillate between trying to fit in with colleagues and the school culture and finding confidence in exerting your own beliefs. This movement back and forth over time can result in building up or weakening the new teacher's confidence.

Schön (1987) discusses this teaching and learning process in relation to control between commitment and detachment. On a student's "ability to hold her ideas 'loosely [this] gives her the freedom to perceive, compare, and coordinate many different meanings and sets the stage for an eventual commitment based on richer understanding" (p.123). My commitment to my students was never in question. I recognize now through re-storying that I was detached from the school community, the parents and my fellow teachers. I was a connected knower insomuch as my teaching but my own learning was always relative to my students not to all stakeholders. Over time I have come to grasp this concept as pivotal in the success of a first-year teacher.

Dimension 3: Interactions. I can see now that which I could not back then. Back in 2001, I understood getting fired as not having support from anyone, any one leader whether teacher or administrator, in school. While that is true, it is only partially the reason why I did not succeed as full-time teacher in that particular context. Hargreaves and Fullan (2000) discuss a different mode of mentoring as we are now in the 21st century, one where mentor and mentee collaboratively problem solve rather than having

knowledge imparted to the newest member of the team, the mentee. I realize now that this was exactly the kind of mentoring I had at Muskerry-Berg, especially when it came to Lilly. The veteran teachers told me what to do, meaning giving me their knowledge, rather than guiding me through the process and helping me disentangle the web that Lilly had created between her daughter, myself, and the administration both internal, the principal, and external, the Superintendent, to the school. My teaching and leadership style was redefining the ways in which teachers taught and lead at that school and they were not prepared for such a drastic change.

I did not have that reciprocal and reflexive relationship with my boss that Schön (1987) describes as the kind that will deepen the student's (here me) learning. In fact, I was never officially assigned a mentor as a new teacher on that campus. My barriers for accessing that relationship (Ragins, 1999) were not because I was female, rather it was because I was not granted access to such a relationship as well as not I did not connect with any one person's style of learning that would relationally place me as mentee with a mentor. However, in conjunction with what Addi-Raccah (2006) reports, Shirley did not sponsor me as her protégée or mentee because of her status in the broader sociocultural environment of the Hayes school district, as a new female leader under the regime of a male led locale.

Theme of the Episode: New Teacher Mentoring and Induction

Johnson and Kardos (2004) explicate on a new mentoring style, which is not exclusively one-to-one mentoring. Their case studies show that exemplary mentoring programs for new teachers include several components. First, they are school-based on purpose so that the focus is on classroom teaching and student learning rather than

mentor teachers' knowledge and expertise. These kinds of programs "introduce new teachers to the mission and culture of the school, but also include explicit, guided opportunities to translate ideas into specific strategies and methods for classroom use" (p.221-222). At my school, there was no program such as this nor was I assigned a one-one mentor officially or unofficially. Second, mentoring programs should be "integrated into the professional life and practice of the school" (Johnson & Kardos, 2004, p. 222). This includes "purposefully engaging new teachers and veterans in reciprocal observations, reflective discussion about practice, and collaborative teaching, leaders in these schools implicitly endorse an interdependent school organization, which defies the limits of an egg-crate structure" (Johnson & Kardos, 2004, p. 222). Again, this did not exist on my campus or in the district. Not only were there no district trainings offered but because I there was also no school-based mentor or mentoring I never observed another teaching. I did ask Kay for advice a few times and she offered suggestions infrequently, but reflective, collaborative conversations about professional life and practice did not occur.

Thirdly, mentoring programs according to The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers (2004) are

> constantly changing and being refined both because the schools' circumstances
> and needs are in constant flux and because the coordinators are intent on
> improving them. In addition, the programs need to be flexible because the
> needs of incoming teachers are also, in some ways, unpredictable.
> (Johnson & Kardos, 2004, p. 223)

Important here is that Muskerry-Burg was changing but incrementally and not in a rapid fashion, meaning that they were not adjusting to these changes quick enough. They were still operating from a stance of the student population being white and affluent rather than like in my class having students qualifying for the federal Free and Reduced Priced Lunch and not being white. This change was small but noticeable. I was also the only new teacher at that time. So again because this school was not in constant instability it continued behaving as it always had. The administration and teachers needed to change insomuch as amending or even perhaps transforming how they operated because the existing conditions were not as that had always been.

Last, these programs succeed because of the "professional capacity" on campus, meaning they succeed and can sustain due to the "active support of many other expert staff members. Schools that have capacity can build capacity" (Johnson & Kardos, 2004, p. 224). Through the re-storying process I recognize that there was leadership capital at Muskerry-Burg. However, I am unsure how that capacity was built up and how the school advocated utilizing such human resources.

Lastly, these pieces are a smaller part to wondering how the district approached new teacher hiring, mentoring, and induction. I cannot fault the school completely if they were following what the district had always done, which was to not induce new teachers skillfully and fully. It does make me understand more wholly again how Shirley was fitting in to the district rather than leading her school, which affected my existence on campus and in the classroom.

Summary: Lessons Learned From Narrative Exemplars

In order to peer into these episodes deeper, let's understand them as narrative exemplars in Lyons' and LaBoskey's (2002) terms. The storying and restorying of my story is not only intentional and reflective, but it brings to light new questions from its original text. The new meaning constructed through the interrogation of aspects of my story and the restorying process has consequently then composed new knowledge about my first year of teaching, specifically of my teaching practice and my awareness or lack thereof about my place in the web of inclusion (Gilligan, 1982; Helgesen, 1985; Bateson, 1989).

Another quality of a narrative exemplar is its situatedness both socially and contextually, which has been dissected above as it is also one of the three dimensions declared by Clandinin and Connelly (2000). My professional identity as a first year teacher has been discovered or even more so redirected. From storying the memory I recall feeling slashed and burned down quite rapidly and yet when now restorying this I have come to understand that, while that may indeed have happened, two more pieces also existed: one being the lack of mentorship, and two my unawareness or even unconsciousness that I fit into and how I fit into a greater hierarchy of the school system. While teaching may be an "interpretive act" (Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002, p.22), I now realize that my interpretations were solely focused on the dealings of the classroom. I could not fathom then how to bring in the home-school connection into our web we created in our classroom in a way that was engaging and all-inclusive. Therefore, the happenings with Cody's mother and Shirley in regard to her observations of issues from parents, my parent-teacher conferences, and the incident with Lilly and Kayla were not at

all in the realm I was living in at that moment in time. To a certain extent they were peripheral to what I thought was the main goal: student learning. I knew then from being fired that they were pivotal to my actual failure, but did not know why. Restorying has helped me grasp why that awareness would have contributed to my success as well as how my experience has implications for how new teachers are inducted into the teaching profession. For these fundamental reasons these episodes would then fall under the category of narrative exemplar.

Additionally, while each episode presents a unique issue, some common themes emerged. A new teacher needs to understand the ways in which she learns and makes meaning in order to understand that her principal may not learn and thus communicate in the same manner. But in spite of this, this does not authorize principals from removing the new teacher as a part of the problem-solving and learning process. New teachers need coaching, mentoring, and practice at self-reflection that include their voices as valid and legitimate leaders. Transparent conceptualization of expectations for communication and student learning rather than just policies and procedures could support the new teacher's perseverance and productivity. Success that first year should not be solely determined on the grades the students make on their report cards, but rather inclusive of the processes that led them to their knowledge, which involves the new teacher's own learning, relationships, and school-based experiences.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

"Her joys, her woes,
Her highs, her lows,
Are second nature to me now;
Like breathing out and breathing in.
I'm very grateful she's a woman
And so easy to forget;
Rather like a habit
One can always break-
And yet,
I've grown accustomed to the trace
Of something in the air;
Accustomed to her face."
–My Fair Lady, "I've Grown Accustomed to Her Face"

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to gain a new understanding of my experiences through uncovering my cover story of my first year of teaching. My research focuses on support and development for new female teachers particularly by a female principal. The lessons learned from unpacking my authorized cover story directly relate to how voice, truth, and authority influence female teachers' professional development on a school campus. How the new teacher, specifically the new female teacher, is authenticated and legitimized as a leader from the principal, here a female principal, influences her investiture into the school's environment and community. The needs of a beginning female teacher and her leadership development are paramount to her success that first year. How the leadership supports that development is crucial to her understanding the ways in which the school culture operates and how she contributes to the accomplishments of the individuals and the group.

Discussion

In Chapter Four I analyzed four episodes from my cover story of my first year teaching and uncovered four lessons. The lesson of each episode will be discussed below in terms of my study and will focus on new teacher development and principal support.

Episode One

Theme of the episode: Meaning-making. My research contends with many researchers before me (Schwab, 1971; Eisner 1988; Dewey, 1938) that it is experience that creates and develops our understanding and it is our women's ways of knowing (Belenky et al., 1997) that construct and contextualize meaning for us (Gilligan, 1982; Bateson, 1989; Helgesen, 1995). Therefore, the significance of my research for new female teachers' support and development must stem from this central premise. From a feminist perspective, the theories about sex-stereotyping and assigning leader behavior to only male gender do not match how women operate, communicate, and come to know.

I was a connected knower connected with my students but not with the principal and my fellow colleagues as I had thought. I did not understand the school culture and community climate as one where the parents scrutinized every move made by the teacher and where the principal kept the peace by abiding by parents' wishes or demands. I was a leader among children but was questioned on it once they where no longer within the four walls of my classroom. I was not docile. Rather I was a thinker and a doer, but what I needed to know then that I know now is that I needed Shirley to be in my web of inclusion. I needed my principal to know her voice and support me as a new teacher in a constructive manner rather than micromanaging my teaching. When Shirley fired me it was not her voice. Rather, it was the voice of Jim Evans communicated through her.

These three experiential pieces can be triangulated in terms of connectedness. For a new female teacher, her successful development will come from either connecting with her situational awareness (T. Waters, public presentation, September 4, 2008) by recognizing the political culture and consciously choosing to accept it and abide by its rules or separating from her surroundings and resist with full knowledge of the possible implications and consequences. The next step is being able to qualify how and why each piece exists for the new female teacher. Once that occurs, she can move forward with learning to be a teacher in a specific school environment and culture. The challenge is doing all of that while maneuvering and managing within the hours of a school day with all of its intricacies. Had Shirley been able to lead and support me in a connected manner rather than separate (Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et al., 1997) in the way of helping me build relationships with those around me, i.e.: the parents and the faculty members, I do believe my path would have been very different that school year. Additionally, had I been situationally aware of the political climate and culture of the school and its community more of my choices and actions would have been more conscientious and deliberate.

For a new teacher reflective and reflexive practice is not something she would necessarily know how to process on her own. Initiation must come from the leader, the principal (Schön, 1987) in order for a convergence of meaning to be achieved. Otherwise, what Schön (1987) describes as a "learning bind" (p. 127) can occur where the teacher and student, here the new teacher and principal, fail to understand one another and a process of systemic misunderstanding perpetuates. First though, the new teacher must "be able to get in touch with and describe her own intuitive understandings" (Schön, 1987, p. 139) to then be able to connect with another's way of thinking and knowing. Schön

(1987) calls this "cognitive risktaking' (p. 139), which Belenky et al. (1997) would deem connected knowing. This directly connects with being situationally aware and being able to read the political culture.

What I thought was Shirley's initiation of me was her telling me I could come to her office any time and ask her questions. However, what should have occurred was Shirley setting our relationship up first with parameters and connecting me with a teacher mentor on campus. In other words, principals should help novices understand the culture of the school by being explicit about it. A better solution would have been to have system set up where we had scheduled times to discuss specific topics, such as homework or parent communication, I could have shared my understanding of a situation and then Shirley, now being aware of it, could have provided insight or feedback in a constructive, connected way. The first step then for the female principal is to identify her own way of knowing, as separate or connected, and then to realize her teachers' procedural knowledge.

It has now been established that for the new female teacher to be successful collaboration is needed between these two types of knowers as Belenky et al. (1997) recommended. For that reason the principal can better staff her grade levels with those she knows can and should collaborate well with each other. For teacher professional development this understanding of separate and connected knowing can aid a female principal in directing her influence in a more individualized approach with her teachers. Had I known my own way of knowing and how I connected with others I would have thought more about the consequences of my actions, such as how my homework would have been perceived or if Shirley should have been the person I needed to ask minute

questions just because she offered that opportunity to me. I do believe that I was

ignorant to this situational awareness or three dimensionalism (Clandinin & Connelly,

2000) and more so blind to its resounding impact on my year.

I believe that my demise during my first year teaching was partially due to my

principal speaking a foreign language to me. She was trying to speak in a male language

according to the district leadership, which then caused her to be excluded from my web

of inclusion. As Helgesen (1995) suggests Shirley may not have been leading with her

own voice, which stunted my growth and development as a teacher. The power of the

female principal's voice can be robust and prominent for a new female teacher either in a

positive and constructive manner or in a destructive and unsafe way, such as was my

experience. Thus, the influence of knowing your own way of making meaning and your

teachers' ways and subsequently using your authentic voice to lead should be adhered to

by female principals.

However, first year teachers must also be aware of all that surrounds them. I was

so solely focused on my students and their learning that I was ignorant to how the other

stakeholders fit in to the classroom. I knew parents were part of the puzzle but I did not

know how to include their voice in a productive manner in my classroom. I was savvy

with curriculum and instruction, but was not skilled in the art of professional relationship

building. It is at this point I believe it important to mention that this was a skill missing

from my university training. Part of new teacher professional development, whether pre-

service or first year, should include a piece on communication and relationship building

with fellow teachers, your principal, and the parents and understanding your situational

awareness in your district and how to navigate through it on your specific campus. Had I

known more how to do this and how to keenly maneuver between the instruction and the other factors I know I would have been a more successful teacher.

Episode Two

Theme of the episode: Silence and isolation versus legitimization. For a woman to be legitimized as "leader (Lucas, 2003)," whether as teacher or principal, and access leadership positions and the power that accompanies the title she must first be included in the web of relationships (Gilligan, 1982; Helgesen, 1995) that already exist on a campus and in a district. It is this inclusion that should then surround the new female teacher with the support and resources needed for success that first year. It is this enclosure that should position the new female teacher in such a state that she will not be at the bottom of the pyramid but rather should be closer to the top with support from a teacher mentor, her principal, the curriculum department and instructional specialists, the new teacher district coaching, and the PTO.

The only formal inclusion I had was a training done by the art teacher for our grade level before school started and sitting in the u-shape table formation at one faculty meeting. I did not have a mentor. I tried to solicit Kay's advice from next door, but even she was guarded with how much she would advise. Until I uncovered my cover story I did not realize how isolated I was and how much my voice was silenced as "teacher" (Elbaz, 1991; Hargreaves, 1996; Ellsworth, 1989). This silencing and isolation contributed to my demise and ultimate resignation.

In order for the new female teacher to be included though she must gain access to membership first. In order to do this she must seek out and connect with other colleagues and leaders on campus. She must find a confidant with whom she can confide and ask

even the simplest of questions. She needs to initiate this to make some of a connection in terms of being included in the web. Going rogue will not work even for the best of teachers. In order to be a successful member of the school community a new teacher cannot just be wonderful with the students. New teachers need to understand the ways in which the school lives and breathes, it situational awareness, in order to survive. It is this survival that will lead to legitimization. The tipping point for me would then lay between my creativity as the teacher and what the community could handle from that creativity, which as an unknown, versus the well-known instruction they were used to from the veteran teachers.

The new teacher cannot do this alone. She needs the assistance from the principal. The principal's role in fostering the new teacher's inclusion in the school community is one that is crucial. This means that the principal needs to be a transformational-charismatic leader (Yammarino et al., 1997) so that in her efforts to create community and foster relationships, she is including and enveloping the new teacher into such a society.

Episode Three

Theme of the episode: Teacher as curriculum maker. Tantamount to a new teacher's success is her professional development in the area of curriculum (Schwab, 1983). Curriculum is two-fold, the planned scope and sequence and the execution of it in the manner of instruction. New teachers often come out of university training with instructional methodology rather than curriculum expertise. It is this line that needs to be separated for new teachers so that they can understand while they may have innovative ways to teach children they should also come to know the district's curriculum

expectations. For me it was not a question of the content of the curriculum but rather the form of the instruction.

I do think that I was successful in understanding and executing the curriculum. I remember pouring over pages and pages of the district's sixth grade curriculum during the summer and planning my units according to the district curriculum. I made a rubric and binder for chapter books on grade level, developed my first social studies integrated unit on Ancient Egypt, and created science experiments. Part of the expectations for the district curriculum may have been unstated, meaning the content was to be taught the way it always had. After restorying my experience I have come to know this was not only not explicitly stated but was also misrepresented in my interview for hire. If I had known this early on I may not have accepted the job because I could have possibly realized the school was not a good match.

However, the support a new teacher needs is in understanding how to connect the pieces of herself as teacher and curriculum maker and herself as part of the district's curriculum executer. Part of her professional development and support needs to be carving the time and spaces to deconstruct her story as "teacher" to better equip her with an awareness of self as curriculum maker. This can only help her understand more how she fits in or connects with the school. Then, if she is aware of her situational awareness and of herself as teacher she should be able to make more informed decisions when it comes to curriculum. I knew myself as teacher in terms of a curriculum maker from my student teaching experiences. What I did not know was myself as the entire teacher. However, I do believe that comes with time and teaching experience, which a first year teacher does not have.

For me as a new teacher, I needed to first be legitimized as "teacher" and then allowed the space to become "curriculum maker". I have now come to understand through restorying that because of my background, training, and abilities, I decided to go straight to curriculum maker without knowing that I first had to be inducted into the school community. I thought being hired was legitimizing me as teacher.

The principal can support the teacher in this endeavor by beginning the induction process with successful teaching stories. Instead of just handing the curriculum documents to the new teacher, the principal could lay out a path with the scope and sequence such that for certain units or lessons she could advise or pre-set dates for the new teacher to observe and collaborate with the already established teacher. This was the new teacher can get a flavor of the teaching expectations while at the same time understand how the students and parents were used to receiving such instruction. Videotaping best practices deemed by the school or district is another option as well. Depending on the size of district the principal could also set up visitations from a member of the curriculum department's team to assist with lesson planning, model lessons, and support materials. In this manner the new teacher is included in the curriculum and instruction piece of the school as well as being invested in for legitimization.

Episode Four

Theme of the episode: New teacher mentoring and induction. A new teacher's professional development cannot be through assumptions and perceptions on both the teacher's and the principal's part. The teacher cannot become validated as leader until she has a mutual grasp on what the school via the principal's expectations deems successful,

productive, and achievement-oriented for students' learning. Here then, responsibility lies with the principal for guiding this process and the new teacher for being able to take in the information yet also produce according to this common understanding. If this process does not happen, then cover stories are created and experienced as the authentic version of the new teacher's experiences, rather than an understanding of the actual lived experiences, which creates true, rather than hidden or silenced meanings and connections.

Shirley's influence on me was not one where I gained strategies and language I could use to become a leader on campus. She was not a mentor who outwardly stated her purposes and goals and how she would assist me. The lessons I learned from her were the result of the consequences of being fired. Unfortunately, her actions should have been what I gained as a teacher through her support of me in becoming a campus leader. I learned that you need to be visible in teachers' rooms, ask for their opinions, support teacher-led decisions, encourage curriculum making, and trust in the competency and loyalty of your teachers' capabilities with students. It is why I was hired, but my voice was never heard. Hargreaves (1996) argues that the teacher's voice has been silenced by policy and research because the teacher's voice becomes *the* teacher's voice, meaning teachers are not heard as individuals. Consequently researchers and policy makers purport what they want teachers to be as a statement of what teachers are from not knowing individual teachers' strengths, differences and voices. Rather he suggests that "we do not merely present teachers' voices, but that we re-present them critically and contextually" (Hargreaves, 1996, p. 16). This means that if teachers are to have a voice researchers and policy makers must understand that teachers' work in varying situations and therefore their situational awareness and subsequent successes cannot be stated as

one but instead as more specific per context. If we do this then our research and understandings can be deeper and more targeted. If Shirley had critically and contextually listened to me as well as take orders from her superiors, it is possible that I would have learned how to better communicate with my parent constituents as well as how to develop a successful, working relationship with my principal, one in which my voice was heeded and partaken to be a part of the process, rather than the reason for what Schön (1987) describes as "a certain kind of communicative context which [the principal] perceives as reality. This is a win/lose world in which defensiveness and unilateral self-protection are the norm" (p. 135).

I take responsibility for my own behavior as well. I understand that I should have asked more concrete questions of and to Shirley about the nature of our relationship. I needed to set a boundary around our relationship in order to then contextualize it and our discussions. New teachers need to know their situational awareness and have a responsibility to pay attention to it. However, how they learn to be aware of it is the responsibility of the student teaching, pre-service institution and how they learn what it is context-specific and how to navigate through it is the responsibility of the school in which they are hired.

Restorying

The process of restorying my experience helped me gain new insight into that unforgettable first year of teaching. In my professional career as principal I still live with my cover story (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995), but in my personal life I feel relieved in many ways. I no longer view Shirley as the antagonist, rather I understand her as a leader who was also new and did not know her own ways of knowing and was trying to be

legitimized as leader not only in the school but also in the district. I understand my role and missteps in terms of three dimensionalism, space, time, and interactions, where I tended to focus mostly on two dimensions, space and time, at any given time rather than all three at once.

It seemed from an interview standpoint that I was ready for this teaching position, My student teaching experiences at a private school in Greenwich Village and a public school on the Upper East Side prepared me for the children and their backgrounds they brought to school like Muskerry-Burg. At the time I felt prepared; through restorying I have come to know I was only prepared for the students, the curriculum, and the instruction not with the situational awareness that accompanied it. I was unprepared for and have now come to know I was quite stunned with the adult involvement from the parents to the faculty and the administration.

This system of connectivity for teaching is complex; it is more than student teaching and taking methods courses; it needs to involve the pre-service teacher education piece in a different manner and on a deeper level. Restorying has opened my eyes to the kinds of professional development and support new teachers need today. It is no longer about the school calendar, location of the copier, and dismissal procedures. While that information is still valid and needs to be explained, new teachers need assistance in navigating all three dimensions space, time, and interactions, from a classroom level, school level, particularly in which community and part of the city a school is located, and district level and it is the principal's responsibility to facilitate when and how those pieces connect for her.

The principal can facilitate teacher learning in each of the three dimensions. In terms of space the principal can help the new teacher understand the space within the walls of her classroom as well as the school. She can also help the new teacher understand that space also includes the invisible boundaries outside the school that enclose the community in which the school resides. With the dimension of time the principal should assist in the progress of the new teacher's learning by being clear about what the expectations are for the current year as well as how the past years impact this year. Additionally, the principal should connect how the past and present directly to connect to the future's goals and objectives and how to achieve them. Lastly, the principal must explicitly explain the interactions within the school. These include all stakeholders, students, faculty, and parents and the expectations for each one need to be made clear to the new teacher. It is this facilitation that will improve the new teacher's chances of being successful.

Summary

Interpretation of my first year teaching experience and how teacher support from the leader can or cannot develop the new teacher into an emerging leader has helped me better understand that which I could not while in the midst of it. Specifically, I have come to better understand the role of the female leader and how her authentication of the new female teacher impacts the induction of the new teacher into the society of school and negotiates the beginning teacher's experiences as successes or failures. The process the new teacher undergoes to learn, understand, communicate, and authenticate her voice and ways of knowing have great significance on the outcomes of her leadership development and inauguration into being a female leader herself.

In Episode One, I uncovered a lesson about connected knowing (Belenky et al., 1997; Gilligan, 1982) and being a part of the web of inclusion (Helgesen, 1995) in a school. Based on my experiences I would recommend that new teachers do not just have district-led initiation training but in addition have campus-specific training. This would include time to professionally develop with her mentor, her principal, and any other new teachers to the campus in order to become acclimated to the culture and climate of the school and its community. This intimate time should focus on connected knowing and envelope the new teacher into the ways of knowing on this particular campus. It should become a mandatory part of the professional development week most schools have the week before school starts because of its necessity in the success or failure of the first year teacher.

This type of initiation can be compared to teaching the writing process to students. When teaching how to write a paper, I always found that there is a balance between form and content. The teaching of form would be done through the district-led professional development for new teachers in terms of the district testing calendar, how to access district curriculum documents, who to contact for technical difficulties, the literacy strategies used, etc. The content embedded in the form should be taught campus-based as it is becomes more individualized and unique to each setting. Here, we have connected the three dimensions (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) for new teacher: the time is the present from a district perspective yet incorporates the past from an on-campus view when learning about the school's history, the space for a teacher within the district and the school, and the interactions between the new teacher and district personnel as well as those on site.

In Episode Two, I further uncovered that in order for a new teacher to be included in the web of relationships she must first be legitimized (Lucas, 2003) as part of the group. I would recommend that for a new teacher to do this she needs to chose two to three elements she would like to work on to hone her craft as a teacher in that first year. At least one element for her should be something that the other teachers on campus do well already. For example, if "this is the way we do spelling tests every Friday," then she should learn this way for a more natural transition as part of the teaching team on campus. Then, after she is legitimized as teacher by the teachers, the students and by the parents she can adjust to incorporate her own strategies for spelling tests. This process should not be confused though with her innovative ways of teaching those spelling words. With the instructional execution she can authenticate her teaching practices but slide into being a legitimized member of the staff by keeping some of the same systems they use. If she is strategic in doing this, with guidance from the principal and teacher mentor (Schön, 1987) her voice and actions are still her own, yet now they have been accepted before enacting.

In Episode Three, I discussed the lesson learned as one in which teacher and curriculum maker are not synonymous. My understanding going into my first year teaching was that curriculum was the bulk of what it meant to be the teacher of record. I have come to know now that while it is a large portion of the actual teaching, being a teacher encompasses much more. It embraces situational awareness of each of the three dimensions, space, time, and interactions. I recommend that new teacher professional development should include a path for novices to learn their teaching strengths and leadership strengths. Teaching strengths can then fit with the curriculum making and

instructional implementation while leadership strengths can connect the managerial and relationship pieces together for the new teacher. These strengths then maximize a new teacher's abilities while also sharpening their skills' set. This interaction, in turn, shapes the new teacher's voice (Hargreaves, 1996) into a more polished one, which will be more likely to heard and not silenced.

In the last episode from my story the lesson uncovered discusses mentoring but within the context. My recommendation for new teacher professional development based on my experiences would be not only to assign a mentor to the new teacher but critically analyze who and why one becomes a mentor. It should not be based on the number of year teaching at the school but rather on who would be the best match for the new teacher and have a reciprocal relationship (Schön, 1987). It is the principal's role to select such mentors appropriately for the new teacher.

A requirement when entering a district could be that at some point you would be called upon to be a mentor to a new teacher. Knowing this may set a different tone and change the course of what teaching could look like. If being a mentor takes a coaching role then perhaps teachers will feel more accountable for their teaching practices. This could help create a more collaborative environment on campuses so that the explicit explanation to the new teacher becomes more rote by all rather than just one. Here, again, it is the principal's role to establish these expectations.

These recommendations are strategic and targeted. They focus on supporting the new teacher in a way that better reflects contemporary thinking about teacher induction and development, one in which the focus is both individualistic and collective. The objective is not to create robot teachers. Rather, it is first to find the right match of school

for each teacher and then willingly incorporate them into the school community both within and outside the walls of the building.

Epilogue

In my first year of being a principal, I was removed on Friday, February 17th, 2012, at 12:30 p.m. However, this time it was because the Chief of Elementary Schools said he wanted to "save my career" from the grapples of a few PTO mothers, the *Houston Press* writing any more scathing and untrue articles about me, and a board member not wanting to renew my contract in any capacity for next year. I was taken out not because they were questioning the integrity or quality of my work. I was moved in order to protect me. I am currently still a principal in title but not in duties. I was told that I am an asset to the district and a good principal. I was given a second chance, but with the caveat that my first mishaps will never happen again and that I learn from those mistakes.

My mentors are my web of connectedness, which include my two previous, female bosses, one a principal and one a School Improvement Officer. Both are different knowers, one a separate and one a connected knower, but I connected to both of them. They mentored in my time of despair and I believe it was their influence coupled with my voice that helped me survive this ordeal. My female boss at my school where I was principal was not included in my web of connectedness, even though I tried to loop her in to it. She would not align herself with my situation or help me in any way that was supportive. Rather, she would bring me to the Chief's office for a conference and it was there that I used my voice and my experiences at my school to advocate for the equitable rights and needs of all my children. It was this passion that the Chief recognized in me

that saved me and legitimized my first year principal experience. I can only wonder had my boss mentored me in what ways would my year had turned out differently?

While this most current episode of my first year being a principal mirrors my first year teaching in many ways it is different. The lessons I learned in from my first year teaching were to not trust my immediate boss and make connections with my colleagues. The take-aways were not adhered to this first year of my principalship, meaning that while I made connections with my fellow principals both within the community and across the district the relationship with my boss was not what it seemed. Just as in my first year teaching I trusted this woman to be the expert both in the operations of how a school works and the community in which the school was situated as she was there last year. This was a mistake.

I was trying to follow directives given to me and be a good soldier for my boss. However, what I have come to know is that she was not the right person to trust on sensitive issues. She had not had extensive experience with the community as she had in other areas of town. She had not built the trust with the faculty and parents enough to where her advice made sense for the intricacies of those relationships.

I should have moved slower in my decisions. They were the right ones for the children. However, I needed the more of the teachers with me rather than against me. I needed more of the parents who were silenced by the PTO to voice their feelings and opinions. I should have spent more time getting to know the teachers, community, and history of the school before taking action.

While I own my choices I know now that being data-driven in an age of high-stakes accountability is not the only way to make sound decisions. I have long reflected

about this year's sequence of events. I wish I had more coaching and mentoring on the decision-making process. So much of our training as first year principals is product-oriented: budget, purchasing, hiring, etc. But, if knowing and understanding are situational as well as the decision-making process that follows that knowing and understanding consequently I did not connect with my situation while I was living it. My decision-making process was based on my past experiences, previous knowing, and prior knowledge. I needed to build new knowledge and understanding in this location in the present time. I was residing in my new space, my new school as principal, but was not linking the dimensions of current time and interactions with it.

While this did happen in the end at the Town Hall meeting in front of the Chief, it was already too late for me. My career has suffered a setback and it will take me time to rebuild it. The difference this time is that the people in authority positions, such as the Chief, know my work and believe in it. The only issue is that to the outside community who do not know the intricacies of the school and its community, they only know me as a leader through the newspaper articles. I have to start anew and rebuild my story.

References

Action Research. [Special issue]. (September 1994). *The Elementary School Journal*, *95*(1).

Addi-Raccah, A. (2006, August). Accessing internal leadership positions at school: Testing the similarity-attraction approach regarding gender in three educational systems in Israel. *Education Administration Quarterly,* 42(3), 291-323.

Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., Waldman, D., DiMare, L., & Hayden, M. V. (2004, Februrary). Men's and women's perceptions of the gender typing of management subroles. *Sex Roles,* 50(3/4), 191-199.

Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life*. New York: Grove Press.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind* (10th anniversary ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Billing, Y. D., & Alvesson, M. (2000). Questioning the notion of feminine leadership: A critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership. *Gender, work, and organization,* 7(3), 144-157.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brooks, A. K. (2000). Transformation. In E. Hayes, & D. D. Flannery (Eds.), *Women as learners: The significance of gender in adult learning* (pp. 139-155). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, G., & Merchant, J. (1993). Women in leadership: A support system for success. In G. Brown, & B. J. Irby (Eds.), *Women as school executives: A powerful*

paradigm (pp. 87-92). Huntsville, TX: The Texas Council of Women School Executives.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brunner, C. C., & Grogan, M. (2007). *Women Leading School Systems: Uncommon Roads to* Fulfillment. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender effects on social influence and emergent leadership. In Powell, G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Gender and Work* (pp. 203-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Claes, M. (1999). Women, men, and management styles. *International Labour Review,* 138(4), 431-447.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 413-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' Professional Knowledge* Landscapes. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1996, April). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teacher stories. Stories of teacher. School stories. Stories of schools. *Educational Researcher,* 25(3), 24-30.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). <u>Teacher as curriculum maker</u>. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum.* (pp. 363-401). New York: Macmillan.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions . In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clinchy, B. M. (1996). Connected and separate knowing: Toward a marriage of two minds. In N. Goldberger, J. Tarule, B. Clinchy, & M. Belenky (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference, and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing* (pp. 205-247). New York: Basic Books.

Connelly, F. M., Clandinin, D. J., & He, M. F. (1997). Teachers' personal practical knowledge landscape on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(7), 665-674.

Craig, C. J. (Summer, 1995). Knowledge communities: A way of making sense of how beginning teachers come to know in their professional knowledge contexts. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *25*(2), 151-175.

Craig, C. J. (2000, January). Narrative inquiries of geographically close schools: Stories given, lived, and told. *Teacher College Record, 109*(1), 160-191.

Craig, C. J. (2007). Story constellations: A narrative approach to contextualizing teachers' knowledge of school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*, 173-188.

Craig, C. J., & Huber, J. (2007). Relational reverberations: Shaping and reshaping narrative inquiries in the midst of storied lives and contexts. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 251-279). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

De Beauvoir, S. (1989). *The second* sex. New York: Vintage Books.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and* education. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Egley, R. J., & Jones, B. D. (2005). Can accountability be inviting? An assessment of administrators' professionally and personally inviting behaviors. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice, 11,* 71-84.

Eisner, E. W. (1988, June - July). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. *Educational Researcher,* 17(5), 15-20.

Eisner, E. W. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher, 26*(6), 4-10.

Eisner, E. W. (2004). What can education learn from the arts about the practice of education? *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 5*(4).

Elbaz, F. (1991). Research on teacher's knowledge: The evolution of a discourse. *Curriculum Studies*, *22*(1), 1-19.

Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2007). Studying teachers' lives and experience: Narrative inquiry into K-12 teaching. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 357-382). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through repressive

    myths of critical pedagogy. In L. Stone (Ed.), *The education feminism reader* (pp.

    300-327). New York, NY: Routledge.

Eskilson, A., & Wiley, M. G. (1976, September). Sex composition and leadership in

    small groups. *Sociometry, 39*(3), 183-194.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in

    research on teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 20,* 3-56.

Fondas, N. (1997, January). Feminization unveiled: Management qualities in

    contemporary writings. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 257-282.

Friedan, B. (2001). *The feminine* mystique. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gardner, H. (1981). *The quest for mind: Piaget, Levi-Strauss, and the structuralist*

    movement. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's* development.

    Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grambs, J. D. (1976, October). Women and administration: confrontation or

    accomodation?. *Theory into practice, 15*(4), 293-300.

Hargreaves, A. (Jan-Feb. 1996). Revisiting voice. *Educational Researcher*, *25*(1), 12-19.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (Winter 2000). Mentoring in the new millennium. *Theory*

    into Practice, *39*, 50-56.

Helgesen, S. (1995). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York:

    Doubleday Currency.

Hooks, B. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA:

    South End Press.

Houston ISD (2007).. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from http://www.houstonisd.org

Ingersoll, R. M., Hoxby, C. M., & Scrupski, A. F. (2004). Why some schools have more underqualified teachers than others. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, *7*, 45-88.

Irby, B. J., & Brown, G. (2002). Women leaders: Creating inclusive school environments. In J. Koch, & B. J. Irby (Eds.), *Defining and redefining gender equity in education* (pp. 43-58). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Johnson, S.M. & Kardos, S.M. (2004). Supporting new teachers in school-based inductions. In S.M. Johnson, & the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers (Eds.), *Finders and keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools* (pp. 193-224). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jackson, P. W. (1990). *Life in* classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.

Karakowsky, L., & Siegel, J. (1999). The effects of proportional representation and gender orientation of the task on emergent leadership behavior in mixed-gender work group. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 84(4), 620-631.

Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2006). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education,* 126(1), 17-25.

Kelly, G. A. (1963). *The theory of personality: The psychology of personal* constructs. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

Lee, V. E., Smith, J. B., & Cioci, M. (1993, Summer). Teachers and principals: Gender-related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 15(2), 153-180.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers work and development. *Harvard Educational Review*, *60*(2), 159-180.

Lyons, N., & LaBoskey, V. K. (2002). Why narrative inquiry or exemplars for a scholarship of teaching?. In N. Lyons & V. K. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lucas, J. W. (2003, June). Status processes and the institutionalization of women as leaders. *American Sociological Review,* 68(3), 464-480.

Martin, P. Y. (1993). Feminist practice in organizations. In E. A. Fagenson (Ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in mangerial diversity* (pp. 274-296). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Miller, J. B. (1986). *Toward a new psychology of women* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Olson, M. (1995). Conceptualizing narrative authority: Implication for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 11(2), 119-135.

Olson, M. R., & Craig, C. J. (2001). Opportunities and challenges in the development of teachers' challenges:The development of narrative authority through knowledge communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 667-684.

Olson, M. R., & Craig, C. J. (2005). Uncovering cover stories: Tensions and entailments in the development of teacher knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 35(2), 161-182.

Ortner, S. B. (1974). Is female to male as nature is to culture?. In M. Rosaldo, & L. Lamphere (Eds.), *Women, culture, and society* (pp. 67-87). Stanford, CA: Stanford Univeristy Press.

Perry, W. G.Jr. (1998). *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships: A review and research agenda for the next decade. In G. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 347-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rust, F. O. (2002). Professional conversations: New teachers explore teaching through conversation, story, and narrative. In N. Lyons, & V. K. LaBoskey (Eds.), *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of* teaching (pp. 172-188). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practioner*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schwab, J. J. (1971, August). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *The School Review,* 79(4), 493-542.

Schwab, J. J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry. 13*(3), 239-265.

Stone, L. (1994). Introducing education feminism. In L. Stone (Ed.), *The education feminism reader* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tisdell, E. J. (2000). Feminist pedagogies. In E. Hayes, & D. D. Flannery (Eds.), *Women as learners: The significance of gender in adult learning* (pp. 155-185). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Van Engen, M. L., Van deer Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context, and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74,* 581-598.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wachterhauser, B. R. (1986). Introduction: History and language in understanding. In B. R. Wachterhauser (Ed.), *Hermeneutics and modern philosophy* (pp. 5–61). Albany (NY): State University of New York Press.

Waters, T. (2008, September 24). Balanced leadership: School leadership that works. Powerpoint presented at the Tennessee LEAD Conference. Nashville, TN.

Westbrook, L. (2005, January 31). The search for women's information: A research perspective. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies,* 11(1), 38 pages.

Yammarino, F. J., Dubinsky, A. J., Comer, L. B., & Jolson, M. A. (1997, February). Women and transformational and contingent reward leadership: A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal,* 40(1), 205-222.