

May I Have Your Attention Please
Morning Announcements: Using Discourse Analysis to
Investigate an Everyday School Experience

Rebecca Cunningham
Mount Saint Vincent University

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Education

© Rebecca Cunningham, February 2009

Dedication

For my friend and wordsmith Kyle Stone (1961-2008)

and

of course for my husband John, and my girls Stella and Sophie

My love and light...

Abstract

This thesis examines the discourse used during morning announcements by elementary principals at three separate schools in the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB). Using the theoretical frameworks of institutional ethnography and discourse analysis, this data is analyzed to examine whether principals use morning announcements primarily as an information sharing exercise or they use announcements to serve other purposes as well. My analysis of the data concludes that principals not only use morning announcements to share information and manage the day-to-day business of running a school. Principals also use morning announcements create for themselves (either consciously or unconsciously) what I call a “principal” identity.

Thematic and structural analysis is used to analyze the data in order to better understand a common structure of delivery evident in all three schools. This serves to underscore the concept of ruling relations; a notion used by institutional ethnographers to demonstrate how everyday experiences within institutions are mediated by an internally coordinated complex of administrative, managerial and discursive organization that often remain hidden. Thematic analysis is also used to highlight key themes within the content of the announcements. Three key themes of Safety/Rules, Personal Connections and Spiritual Education are examined. This study uses discourse analysis to reflect on how language does the work of several building tasks; those of identity, relationship and politics are the most relevant to this analysis. The findings are helpful in giving a better understanding of the often-overlooked everyday practice of delivering morning announcements in elementary schools. Principals are encouraged to consider how this practice offers them an important opportunity to connect with students and demonstrate positive models of leadership.

Acknowledgements

I will begin by thanking the members of the thesis review committee Drs. Andrew Manning, Jerome Harste and Michele Knobel. Thank you for encouraging my thesis work forward, for your enthusiasm for the topic, your attention to detail and your ongoing support. Thanks also to Ruth Ann Brown and Paula Mayich at MSVU for your often overlooked and unacknowledged administrative support. Distance education has its challenges and I am grateful for all the many tasks that you have undertaken to help keep this project on track. Thanks also goes to Brenda Gagné, who coordinated the ethics research review at MSVU and to Dr. Marina Vanayan for overseeing the ethical review at the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB).

Of course this project could not have possible without the participation of the three principals from the TCDSB who generously agreed to take part in this research. In order to ensure confidentiality I cannot name you. I hope, however, that you understand that my gratitude is anything but anonymous. You have showed nothing but positive support for which I am very grateful. I am also indebted to the original research team; Teresa Garritano, John Masciarelli, and Erika Power for collecting and transcribing the announcements, for sharing in conversations about the data and for the initial work on the early analysis; a deep thanks to all of you for your friendship, encouragement and for supporting my wish to broaden the research into a Masters thesis.

I am grateful for the friends and colleagues who have supported my work. Specifically I wish to thank Michele Kesten, a willing reader and wonderful neighbour who volunteered for the painstaking job of reading final drafts and copyediting. I am grateful for your remarkable attention to detail, for your questioning mind and for your friendship. Christine Borowski shares with me a grade school history that has brought us from the days of manually searching dog

eared card catalogues and rubber-stamping due dates on bright orange library cards to the remarkable world of on-line Boolean searches. Bless you for your patience with my lack of technical expertise – and thank you for helping me find my way into (and thankfully out again from) the electronic stacks. To my dear friend Susie Whelehan I am enormously grateful for your ongoing friendship and support especially throughout this research and writing marathon. A deep thank you for cheering me on during first steps, steering me around what seemed like insurmountable obstacles, pacing me through proof reading and finally striding along with me into the defense.

Finally to my husband John Mihevc and my girls Stella and Sophie this work wouldn't be possible without your support and understanding. You have accompanied me through the day-to-day tasks and I am indebted for your patience, grateful for your humour, and proud of your willingness to be flexible so that I could find the time and space to pursue this work. It is with deep gratitude that I close this acknowledgement with you in mind and in my heart.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
List of Tables	ix

Chapter 1 - Morning Announcements: Taking a Closer Listen

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Taking a Closer Listen.....	2
1.2 Research Questions.....	3
1.3 Chapter Outline.....	4

Chapter 2 - Theoretical Frameworks

2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Institutional Ethnography – Examining Everyday Experiences.....	7
2.2.1 Ruling Relations.....	10
2.2.2 Texts.....	11
2.3 Discourse Analysis - Examining Everyday Talk.....	13
2.3.1 Building Tasks.....	14
2.3.2 d/Discourse and Situated Meanings.....	15
2.3.3 Identity as Recognition Work.....	16
2.3.4 Which Comes First – Identity or the Discourse?.....	18
2.4 Literature Review.....	19

Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1 Introduction.....	23
3.2 Entering Into the Research of Everyday Experience - Smith.....	24
3.3 Validity.....	26
3.4 Data Collection.....	27
3.5 Transcribing the Data.....	28
3.6 Data Analysis.....	29
3.6.1 First Coding - Structure-Shared Content Elements.....	29
3.6.2 Second Coding - Themes.....	31

Table of Contents

3.7 Entering Into Discourse Analysis - Gee.....	32
3.7.1 Gee’s Warning About Methodology.....	33
3.7.2 Three Components of Discourse Systems	34
3.7.3 Building Tasks of Language	35
3.7.4 Building Identity	37
3.7.5 Building Relationships.....	39
3.7.6 Building Politics.....	40
3.8 Ethical Concerns	41
 Chapter Four - Structural and Thematic Analysis	
4.1 Introduction.....	44
4.2 Structural Analysis.....	44
4.3 Thematic Analysis Entering Into Discourse Analysis – Gee.....	47
4.3.1 Three Key Themes.....	50
 Chapter Five - Discourse Analysis – A Closer Look at Three Key Themes	
5.1 Introduction.....	53
5.2 Safety/Rules	55
5.3 Personal Connections.....	62
5.3.1 Happy Birthday.....	64
5.3.2 Congratulations to Teams	68
5.3.3 Welcome/Identification of Readers	70
5.4 Spiritual Education.....	75
5.5 Conclusion	86
 Chapter Six - Conclusion – Conversations with Colleagues and With the Data	
6.1 Introduction.....	88
6.2 Conversations with Colleagues - Confirming Theoretical Foundations.....	89
6.3 Primary Conclusions.....	92
6.4 Significance.....	92
6.5 Validity	95
6.6 Questions for Further Thought	98
 References	 100

Table of Contents

Appendix A First Draft of Data Transcripts	114
Appendix B Second Draft of Data Transcripts (Theme Markers).....	115
Appendix C Third Draft of Data Transcripts (Pronoun Markers).....	116
Appendix D American Sociological Association (ASA) Code of Ethics.....	117
Appendix E Free and Informed Consent Forms	120
Appendix F Toronto Catholic District School Board Confirmation of Ethical Approval.....	122
Appendix G Ontario Education Act (Opening and Closing Exercises).....	123
Appendix H Toronto Catholic District School Board Policy Register (Prayer in Schools).....	124

List of Tables

Table 1	Gee’s Components of Discourse Systems – Analysis Questions
Table 2	Gee’s Seven Building Tasks of Language - Analysis Questions
Table 3	Shared Content Elements - General Overview
Table 4	Shared Content Elements – Structure for All Principals
Table 5	Themes Identified in Morning Announcement Data
Table 6	Safety/Rules - Occurrences in Morning Announcement Data
Table 7	Personal Connection - Content Occurring in Morning Announcement Data
Table 8	Personal Connection - Samples of Happy Birthday Announcements
Table 9	Personal Connection - Congratulations to Teams Announcements
Table 10	Personal Connection - Announcements Welcoming/Identifying Student Readers
Table 11	Spiritual Education - Content Occurring in Morning Announcement Data
Table 12	Spiritual Education - Introductions Indicating Commencement of Prayer
Table 13	Spiritual Education - Delivery of Morning Prayers – Principal I
Table 14	Spiritual Education - Delivery of Morning Prayers – Principal II
Table 15	Spiritual Education - Introduction to Shared Prayer – Principal III

Chapter One: Morning Announcements - Taking a Closer Listen

1.1 Introduction

As children start their day at elementary school most visitors recognise a consistent pattern: students arrive, they head off to their classes and begin the task of settling into the day. Within minutes of arriving a common hush descends or is demanded within the school. The day officially begins as students listen to the principal's morning announcements delivered over the public address (PA) system. The principal's daily use of this technology to deliver morning announcements is a well-established phenomenon within most Ontario elementary schools. Indeed, the majority of students or teachers currently at school have rarely experienced any alternative way of beginning each school day. (Some elders from the teaching community remember other "morning exercises"— school assemblies that took place so that the principal could share information before beginning each day or the reading of "Announcements from the Principal" by teachers in each classroom.) Curiously, while school communities are encouraged to embrace new technologies, morning announcements continue to be delivered by principals using the PA system. The use of the PA to deliver morning announcements is a well-established and persistent school phenomenon.

While some complain that morning announcements interrupt the flow of the morning when students are too busy to listen to information from the office, others argue that morning announcements provide a structured starting point for the day; a time when the school community pauses to listen to important information. Whether morning announcements are welcomed or loathed by teachers (and students) one thing is certain: the phenomenon of morning announcements delivered by the principal over the PA system endures as part of the daily discourse at most elementary schools. Because morning announcements are a reoccurring

discourse in most schools they are easily overlooked. Indeed persistent and prevalent forms of discourse that occur in everyday practices are often disregarded and remain hidden from those who experience them (Smith, 2005). In this case very little research exists on this school practice. This thesis is my endeavour to take a closer look (and closer listen) to morning announcements.

1.2 Taking a Closer Listen

Essentially my closer examination of this everyday school phenomenon is what is at the heart of two distinct yet related forms of research; institutional ethnography and discourse analysis. In developing institutional ethnography, Canadian sociologist Dorothy Smith encourages researchers to examine the everyday practices that form the basis of our everyday experiences within institutions. Smith explains the task as follows: “Institutional ethnography is essentially a work of inquiry and discovery; it must move beyond what the ethnographer already knows or think she or he knows, and the ethnographer must be prepared for and open to finding out that matters are not as she or he may have envisaged them” (Smith, 2005, p. 208). What first appears as simply an information-sharing practice that occurs every morning at school offers an opportunity for inquiry, ultimately leading to a discovery of a new understanding about this everyday discourse at school.

In his preface to the second edition of his book on discourse analysis James Gee explains how a rigorous look at discourse is a valuable endeavour: “When we sit back and reflect on what people have said and written – a luxury we have too little in life, but the basis of discourse analysis – we often discover better deeper and more humane interpretations” (Gee, 2005, p. xi). As a busy elementary school teacher I have had little opportunity to enter into the luxury of doing this type of analysis of morning announcements. Yet I must admit, after 15 years of

teaching in elementary schools, I have a fondness for morning announcements. Perhaps this stems from a previous career as an intern for “As it Happens” on CBC radio. Working as a chase producer has given me a first hand opportunity to observe and participate in how radio is produced, edited and packaged. What appears as natural discourse on radio is the result of hard work on the part of many researchers, producers, editors and technicians. While delivering morning announcements on the PA is not as complex as producing a radio segment, I have often thought that there is more to morning announcements than first appears.

1.3 Research Questions

My study of morning announcements began with a casual reflection about my everyday experience that took place as part of a discussion during a course on research methodology. During a discussion about a study that examined how the foyers of several schools set the tone for these educational institutions I thought about how the phenomenon of foyers is an easily overlooked aspect of educational culture. Thinking about my own experience as a teacher, I began wondering about what everyday experiences I take for granted as “just the way things are” at school. One of the first things that came to mind was the persistent ritual of listening to morning announcements. I began to question: how is it that this is part of my everyday experience at school? Are there shared or common elements to the phenomenon of morning announcements that might serve a similar purpose in the way that foyers set the tone for a school? In short I began to wonder: is there more to morning announcements than meets the eye (or ear)?

Sharing my thoughts with my group members I suggested that we begin a preliminary research into an investigation of morning announcements. With this group of three other researchers I began listening to morning announcements with the key questions of qualitative

inquiry in mind: ‘What’s going on here?’; What does it all mean?’; and ‘What is to be made of it all?’” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 4). The research for my thesis is an extension of this preliminary research. It offers a more serious investigation and deeper insights into the spoken data gathered from morning announcements in three elementary schools. In particular three key research questions are the focus of my analysis:

- What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements?
- What elements are present in morning announcements?
- What purpose do they serve?

1.4 Chapter Outline

The following chapters approach these questions to consider the discourse of morning announcements in three separate elementary schools. The data I examine in this thesis suggest that principals not only use morning announcements to share information and manage the day-to-day business of running a school. Principals also use morning announcements to personally connect with students and, through this endeavor, create for themselves (either consciously or unconsciously) a specific identity.

Chapter Two outlines the theoretical pillars that form the foundation of my research. A brief consideration of institutional ethnography (specifically the work of sociologist Dorothy Smith) introduces this section. I use the main theories of institutional ethnography to validate an examination my everyday experience as the starting point for my research. This is followed by a discussion of how the theoretical framework of discourse analysis provides the bedrock for my research. I particularly focus on the contributions of James Paul Gee with specific reference to his work on discourse and identity. This chapter concludes with a literature review of the

pertinent research with regards to discourse within work and educational institutions and the construction of identity within these settings. I specifically look at research that examines the leadership role played by principals in setting the tone for school communities. I also consider material that specifically looks at the phenomenon of using the public address system in schools.

Chapter Three details my research methodology. I begin by outlining the elements of institutional ethnography, which I use as an entry point into my research. I continue with a look at James Paul Gee's methodology of discourse analysis. While Gee warns about using his work as a "how to methodology" to complete discourse analysis, I follow his suggestion to use some of the key points in his work as "thinking points" in order to inform my research methodology. I specifically refer to his approach to discourse analysis as d/Discourse analysis and his use of the components of discourse systems. Finally I outline the use of categorical theme analysis (coding) as introduced by Amanda Coffey and Paul Atkinson (1996) to investigate the shared themes present in the data gathered from the morning announcements.

Chapter Four begins the work of structural and thematic analysis to outline the common themes and patterns that are identified after the coding of the data. The first half of the chapter includes an explanation of how the data was initially and subsequently coded in order to clarify the overall structure of the delivery of morning announcements. Themes based on repetition of subject matter or key terms within the transcripts are outlined. A differentiation is made between those themes chosen by the principals and those that are mandated by School Board policy such as leading morning prayers (in the Catholic school system) and the provincial mandate of playing the national anthem. In this chapter I detail why I focus the data analysis on three key themes.

Chapter Five continues with the data analysis in more detail by tackling three key themes, Safety/Rules, Personal Connection and Spiritual Education. These themes are examined to reveal how principals use morning announcements to consciously or unconsciously create for

themselves a “principal” identity. I use quotes around the word “principal” to signify dual meanings inherent in this word; first the notion of the word principal meaning “primary” or “most important” and secondly giving a nod to the role of principal to signify the role of “top administrator” in the school. This chapter takes up an examination of how, in establishing a “principal” identity, principals also set the parameters for a specific relationship with their students (this includes the implicit valuing of particular social goods).

In Chapter Six, the conclusion of this thesis, I consider the quality of my data analysis and outline what I believe to be the significance of my observations. I examine my findings in terms of how these contribute to the theoretical perspectives of institutional ethnography and discourse analysis as informed by the work of Dorothy Smith and James Gee.

One might wonder whether morning announcements warrant such intense scrutiny. James Gee underlines the merit of such an endeavour:

In the end discourse analysis is one way to engage in a very important human task. The task is this: to think more deeply about the meanings we give people’s words so as to make ourselves better, more human people and the world a better, more humane place. (Gee, 2005, p. xii)

Applying this task to undertake a closer look at the everyday practice of delivering morning announcements is a worthwhile undertaking that demands a similar, serious consideration. It is my hope that my examination of the discourse used during morning announcements will provide an opportunity for the educational community to do the same.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Frameworks

2.1 Introduction

This chapter establishes the theoretical framework for my research. This framework draws on two distinct, yet theoretically consonant, fields: institutional ethnography and discourse analysis. I begin with an examination of how institutional ethnography (as developed by Dorothy Smith) provides me with an entry point into my thesis. I continue in this chapter to outline how discourse analysis (with a specific focus on the work of James Paul Gee) provides me with the main theoretical foundation from which I begin interrogating the data to answer my primary research question: What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements?

I conclude this chapter with a literature review to situate my thesis within the work that has been undertaken in terms of discourse analysis as it relates to institutional and work settings (with a specific focus on educational settings and the formation of identity within schools). I also consider the literature that examines how the principal is a key figure in shaping particular school cultures. A look at the existing research on the use of the public address system in schools concludes this section.

2.2 Institutional Ethnography – Examining Everyday Experiences

Research that takes its starting point from a close examination of everyday experiences within institutions is supported by the work of prominent Canadian Sociologist Dorothy Smith. Smith first developed a research method grounded in the everyday experience of women as part of her critique of the sociological tradition of inquiry in the feminist context. In her work “The Everyday World as Problematic” (Smith, 1987) Smith argued that because women had been

excluded from important and influential positions in the discipline of sociology, this prevented women from contributing to the themes and topics within the discourse of sociology. In essence women were left outside of the frame of sociological inquiry (Smith, 1987).

A Copernican shift for Smith occurred when she approached inquiry, not from the standpoint of established sociological theory and ideology, but from an examination of the real everyday relations between people. She describes this shift in the method of sociological inquiry:

Developing a sociology for women/people started with the idea of beginning in the standpoint of a housewife and mother in the actualities of her everyday world and anchoring an investigation of the social in the concrete actualities of the everyday and of everyday doings. Starting with experience was what we know how to do in the women's movement. Indeed we needed it because we came to see more and more clearly how the intellectual and cultural world we'd participated in had been put together from men's standpoint (it doesn't mean it was misogynist, just that we women weren't there as speakers and knowers.) Starting to build a sociology that started in the everyday experiences of our lives launched a work of discovering how to do it, a work that still occupies me though I am no longer alone in pursuing it.

(Smith, 2008, Institutional Ethnography: Online Resource)

While Smith's work finds its foundation in the feminist context its application is not always feminist in nature. Over the years Smith's work developed into institutional ethnography (Smith, 1987, 1999, 2005, 2006); what Smith now terms as a "sociology for people" (Smith, 2005). Institutional ethnography is a field of research that continues to evolve as researchers who implement institutional ethnography collaboratively continue to build on its application in many fields of study. Since its inception the application of its methodology and theory have been used to inform research in areas of study including sexuality (Khayatt, 1995; Kinsman, 1989), healthcare (Campbell 1988, 1995, 1992, 1995; Campbell and Gregor, 2002; Diamond 1992; Mykalovskiy, 2000; Mykalovskiy & Smith 1994; Smith 1995), education (Andre Bechely, 1999;

Griffith 1984, 1992; Stock, 2000), social work practice (deMontigny, 1995; Parada, 1998) and the specific experience of women (Ng, 1996; Taber, 2007).

Beginning with the everyday experiences of people's lives, institutional ethnography focuses its investigation on how people participate in or are "hooked up" (Smith, 2006, p. 60) to specific relations within particular institutions. Researchers use institutional ethnography to explore the social relations between people and institutions specifically examining how these social relations structure people's everyday lives. Through institutional ethnography researchers are called to examine topics that are meaningful to them, thus making the inquiry itself a process of discovery. Institutional ethnography researchers then are engaged in a process that leads them to understand "how it works" (Campbell & Gregor, 2002, p.11) so that important elements are recognized and mapped.

Institutional ethnography is suited to my research because this research begins from my experience of an overlooked everyday interaction and social practice (listening to morning announcements) within an institutional context (elementary school). Typical research using institutional ethnography explores the social relations and organization in which we participate daily but which remain hidden from us because they are easily overlooked. Because institutional ethnography focuses its investigation on how people participate in or are "hooked up to" specific relations within particular institutions (Smith, 2006) it is perfectly suited to provide me with an entry point into my research. In this endeavour I specifically examine how principals use the discourse of morning announcements to create a particular identity, relate (or "hook up") in a specific way to students and shape their experiences and activities at school. This helps place my research in the context of what Smith would call "ruling relations."

2.2.1 Ruling Relations

Central to institutional ethnography is the key theory that people's lives are mediated by what Smith calls institutional "ruling relations" (Smith 1999, p.45) and that in these everyday experiences we interact with texts. Smith (1999) describes her use of this term "ruling relations" as follows:

By 'ruling relations,' I mean that internally coordinated complex of administrative, managerial, professional and discursive organization that regulates, organizes, governs, and otherwise controls our societies. It is a mode of organizing society that is truly new for it is organised in abstraction from local settings, extra-locally, and its textually mediated character is essential. It couldn't operate without texts, whether written, printed, televised or computerized. (p. 49)

While institutions and the forms of social organization within those institutions are examined in institutional ethnography research, it is not primarily the institution that is under scrutiny but the social relations organizing these institutions as people participate in them from their own perspectives (Smith 2005, p. 225). Smith's theory around the concept of "ruling relations" is particularly helpful in that it helps this research to uncover what is going on in the daily practice of principals as they deliver morning announcements. The discourse of the announcements is the primary focus of my research. Essentially principals use the discourse of morning announcements to do the work of organizing, governing and mediating what goes on in their schools. I look at these announcements beyond how principals use them solely as a means to accomplish these tasks. My research looks deeper to consider what other elements are in play, specifically in terms of how principals give voice (whether consciously or unconsciously) to the identity and relationship they wish to establish between themselves and their students in order to "hook up" with their students, thus performing the work of ruling relations. The

interconnectedness between ruling relations and texts is the second significant element of Smith's work.

2.2.2 Texts

To describe the relationship between texts and ruling relations Smith (1987) writes:

The relations of ruling in our society are mediated by texts, by words, numbers and images on paper, in computers, on TV and movie screens. Texts are the primary medium (though not the substance) for power. The work of administration, of managements, of government is a communicative work. Organizational and political processes are forms of action coordinated textually and getting done in words, it is an ideologically structured mode of action – images, vocabularies, concepts, abstract terms of knowledge are integral to the practice of power, to getting things done. (p. 17)

My research uses Smith's theory of ruling relations to examine the discourse of morning announcements. My consideration of key terms, images, vocabularies and concepts present in morning announcements points to how principals create an identity for themselves which is an integral part of their practice of managing student behaviour in the school setting.

A brief consideration of what Smith means by "text" is important here for this is where my research differs from typical institutional ethnography research. Many researchers use the term "text" to refer to stretches of talk as well as to what is recorded in permanent form in transcripts from conversations or television programs (Fairclough, 2001, p. 240). For Smith, "text" refers to the association of words and images with some material that is easily capable of replication (Smith, 2005, p 166). The ability to coordinate people's activities within an institution, Smith contends, is a matter of being able to have a text turn up in identical form wherever the reader, hearer or watcher may be. Texts, then, are powerful because of their translocal nature. For Smith, being able to replicate texts in an institution is essential if people's activities are to be standardized at different times and places. An examination of these replicable

texts takes up much of the work of institutional ethnography. This, however, does not mean that the researchers who use institutional ethnography are only concerned with texts. They also use interviews, conversations with focus groups and participant observation to examine the details of what shapes the particular experiences of those informants (Diamond, 1992; Ng, 1995; Stock, 2000). Some researchers using institutional ethnography also observe and analyse naturally occurring language data to examine institutional work processes (DeVault and McCoy, 2002, p. 755).

The “text” I examine in this research is far from replicable. While the words of the announcements spoken by principals have been transcribed into a set of transcripts that can be replicated, these morning announcements, once spoken, are no longer retrievable and easily examined. This indeed is what makes analyzing morning announcements both rare and challenging. I consider the discourse captured in the transcripts of the morning announcements as “texts” in that morning announcements perform the activity of coordinating people’s activities within an institution; acting similar to a written text that would be analysed in a more traditional institutional ethnography research. Interestingly I learned from several veteran teachers that, before the use of public address systems, principals communicated information via a written page of “school announcements” that was distributed to teachers each morning. Teachers were expected to read these “school announcements” to students before beginning class instruction on behalf of their principal. If these documents still existed they would provide a fascinating “text” for institutional ethnographers to analyse. In the case of my research the transcripts for the morning announcements serve as the “texts” from which I have conducted my analysis. Since the discourse spoken by the principals during their delivery of morning announcements provides the data for my analysis this naturally links my work (in terms of its theoretical foundations in institutional ethnography) with that of discourse analysis.

2.3 Discourse Analysis – Examining Everyday Talk

This section takes the logical step of extending my research to include an examination of the theoretical underpinnings of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is used to describe a wide variety of research activities that have been applied to a broad range of fields including linguistics, critical theory, geography, philosophy, political science, psychology, anthropology, education and sociology (Brown & Yule, 1983; Coulthard, 1977; Schrifin, 1994; Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 2000; VanDijk, 1985). There are many approaches to discourse analysis and hence a wide variety of methods and approaches.

I have found the theories and contributions of James Gee in the field of discourse analysis are particularly suited to my research in that much of his work looks at language as it naturally occurs in everyday situations. Gee follows a tradition of those who agree that the work of discourse analysis begins at the starting point of looking at “language in use” (Gee, 2005; Georgakoupoulou, 1997; Halliday & Webster, 2003; Jarwoski & Coupland, 1999; Wetherell, 2001). Central to the work of discourse analysis is an understanding that the study of discourse calls for the analysis of real texts in actual environments (Georgakoupoulou, 1997, pg 22). Similar to Dorothy Smith’s notion of using everyday experience as a starting point for research, the main interest in discourse studies is not to make a point of theory; texts instead are the starting point of analysis (Georgakoupoulou, 1997,pg 22). In this thesis, then, I examine the words spoken by principals (which have been transcribed into text) at three elementary schools (actual environments).

2.3.1 Building Tasks

Central to the work of discourse analysis is the idea that language in use has a purpose beyond being a communicative phenomenon. In his primer on discourse analysis Gee (2005) cautions those who regard language use primarily as an information sharing activity:

Many people think that the primary purpose of language is to “communicate information.” However, language serves a great many functions, and giving and getting information, even in our new Information Age, is by no means the only one. (p. 1)

The “great many functions” of language in use is the focus of Gee’s work in discourse analysis. Gee underlines that we always actively use spoken and written language to perform what he calls “building tasks” (Gee, 2005, p. viii). He uses this term to illustrate how language is used to create or build the world of activities (e.g., committee meetings) identities (e.g., committee chairs, members, secretaries etc.) and institutions (e.g., committees) around us. These building tasks, he explains, are often done in routine and overlooked ways so that activities, identities and institutions appear to exist apart from the language and activities in the here and now (Gee 2005, p. 10). What is tricky in discourse analysis is uncovering the building tasks that are continually going on but seem to have naturally existed as an unchanging part of a historical discourse that has always been that way. In my research I examine the building tasks inherent in the language used by principals when delivering morning announcements. I examine a particular activity (delivering morning announcements), identity (principal as lead administrator) within an institution setting (elementary school).

Gee’s work identifies two closely related functions of human language: first in the way that it supports the performance of social activities (getting things done, sharing information etc.) and second, the way in which it is used to support how humans identify themselves as belonging to certain cultures social groups and institutions. Language then allows people to do the work of

identifying themselves as members of a specific group who act in a certain way in a particular setting and time (Gee 2005, p.1).

2.3.2 d/Discourse and Situated Meanings

To expand on this notion of these two functions of language in use, Gee differentiates between the use of “discourse” with a “little d” and “Discourse” with a “big D.” Gee uses “little d” discourse to refer to stretches of language as it is used to make sense in conversations or stories (Gee 2005, page 26). It is important to understand here that the language in use of “little d” discourse does not make sense on its own but only in its location in a larger context. For Gee, discourse analysis is a study of language in context and situated use. That is, stretches of language used in “little d” discourse on their own do not make sense out of context but have what Gee calls “situated meanings.”

To illustrate this concept of “situated meanings” Gee (2005) uses the example of how the simple word “coffee” can be fully understood only when it is situated in different contexts. He uses these utterances as an example: “The coffee spilled, go and get a mop” (liquid); “The coffee spilled, go and get a broom” (beans or grains); “The coffee spilled, stack it again” (cans or packages); “Coffee ice-cream is good” (a flavour). What is important here is that the situated meaning of the word coffee is assembled, as Gee puts it, “on the spot” as we speak, act and listen (Gee 2005, p. 64). He contends that, in the moment, we assemble the understanding that will constitute the situated meanings that the word will have in that context. Different contexts then invite different on the spot assemblies. To extend his example, if I am an interior designer and I say, “That coffee looks great in the tub,” I am inviting the listener to assemble the understanding of coffee as a paint colour for enamel rather than a steaming hot pool of brown liquid at a spa. Similarly when a principal announces over the PA: “Today at lunch we

will have Quince vs. Bok Choy. Yes indeed, good luck to the Bok Choy and the Quince,” listeners who understand the situated meaning of the “little d” discourse assemble the understanding that it is not that the cafeteria staff have arranged a test taste to decide which students prefer as the better tasting food item, nor will there be a wrestling match between a giant fruit and a vegetable! Listeners who belong to the school’s house league teams (one called the Quince and the other the Bok Choy) will understand that they need to report to the gym for a game of soccer during the lunch hour.

What Gee refers to as the “big D” Discourse comes into play when analysis of the discourse is extended to uncover the way people use particular ways of “talking, acting, thinking, believing, dressing, acting, to situate themselves with a particular identity in the world” (Gee, 2005, p. 27). Considering the “big D” Discourse allows us to understand how the principal uses “discourse” so that s/he can be recognized as a principal doing an activity that would be recognized as something that principals normally do; in this case share information about upcoming team sports in an enthusiastic way: (Yes indeed, good luck to the Bok Choy and the Quince!).

2.3.3 Identity as Recognition Work

Key to Gee’s use of big D” Discourses is the concept of “recognition.” Gee (2005) outlines this concept in the following way:

[M]aking visible and recognizable *who* we are and *what* we are doing always involves more than “just language.” It involves acting-interacting-thinking-valuing-talking (sometimes writing-reading) in the “appropriate way” with the “appropriate props” at the “appropriate” times in the “appropriate” places...If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, tools and places together in such a way that others *recognize* you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity), here and now, then you have pulled off a Discourse (and thereby continued it through history for a while longer). (pp. 26 - 27)

For Gee, then, recognition involves being identified by others as particular *who* (an identity: head administrator or principal) doing a particular *what* (activity: giving morning announcements) in a *where* (a certain here and now place: at school at 9:05 am). According to Gee, when people use language, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools and locations together in a particular way others will recognize them as a particular type of person who is engaged in a particular activity in a particular place. When all this comes together successfully they are using “big D” Discourse.

“Big D” Discourses, then, exist in the world because of the way humans constantly engage in recognition work. This thesis is concerned with how, through the discourse of morning announcements, principals participate in the recognition work of the “big D” Discourse. I use Gee’s understanding of recognition work and identity to examine how principals use morning announcements (either consciously or unconsciously) to create an identity for themselves – not only as a recognizable principal (in terms of the primary school administrator) but also as a certain *kind* of principal who sets up a specific relationship between him/herself and the students by using language during announcements in a certain way. Like Gee I consider how language is used “on site” (Gee, 2005, p.7) to create specific social activities and a particular identity.

2.3.4 Which Comes First - Identity or the Discourse?

Another key concept of Gee's work in discourse analysis is his understanding of how the recognition work of creating an identity and "big D" Discourses are inexorably connected (Gee, 2005, page 29). Central here is the idea that when people use language, the language they use reflects how individuals form their social, political¹ and cultural affiliations" (Gee, 2005, p. 2).

According to Gee, people's use of language not only reflects how individuals position themselves in the social order (by creating a certain identity) but their use of language also shapes how the social order and "big D" discourse is continuously transformed. Simply put, the way people use language, actions, beliefs, values, interactions objects, tools and technologies come to be known as the way Ms./Mr. X is recognized as a principal in Y School. Essentially when Ms./Mr. X acts and speaks as a principal s/he uses language in a way to transform the way the notion of principal (as "big D" discourse) is recognized. In turn the "big D" Discourse" shapes the way the "little d" discourse is used to perform the building task of recognition work.

What Gee is getting at here is that people use language in a way that not only reflects how individuals see themselves positioned within the "big D" Discourses existing in the social order, people use language in a way that also shapes how the social order is continuously transformed. Gee refers to this phenomenon as the chicken and the egg question: which comes first, identity recognition work or Discourses? (Gee, page 29) What is important for Gee is not so much an understanding of what comes first – the Discourse or the shaping of the social order – but that the two are inexorably linked. Because people are always creating new Discourses and changing old ones, the Discourse and recognition within that Discourse is constantly changing

¹ Gee does not use the term political to refer to political affiliation with elected parties or national policy concerns. He uses the word political in terms of how people position themselves around valuing certain social goods in society (social goods being anything that a group of people believes to be a source of power or status, value or worth like: money, literacy, age, wisdom, resourcefulness, health, etc.

(Gee, 2005). This thesis examines one particular phenomenon that exists within the changing phenomenon of school Discourse; the delivery of morning announcements in elementary school.

To place my work within the context of academic research what follows is a literature review examining the following: 1) discourse in institutional and work settings; 2) uses of language in educational settings; 3) discourse in relation to identity formation of teachers and principals within schools settings; 4) the work and role of principals in terms of leadership styles, managing schools and promoting positive school culture; 5) the phenomenon of using the public address (PA) system to deliver announcements within school settings.

2.4 Literature Review

While the practice of principals delivering announcements over the PA system persists as a daily ritual in most elementary schools, curiously, very little research has been conducted in this area. Attempts to unearth articles that specifically consider morning announcements as an educational phenomenon have produced remarkably few results. A search using the descriptors of “education” and “discourse” produces, of course, a plethora of writings. Literally hundreds of thousands of studies approach the issue of discourse and education, perhaps because there are so many ways in which discourse and education are interpreted and studied. Narrowing the search somewhat allows for a more focused understanding of what material exists that is pertinent to this study.

There is a solid body of research that examines discourse within institutional and work settings, (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Goffman, 1955, 1983; Goodwin, 1996; Heritage, 1997; Lakoff, 1990; Silverman, 1997) with some specifically looking at language used in work settings to touch on the issues of discourse and power relationships between subordinates and workers (Mayr, 2008; Morand, 2000; Tannen, 1987).

The use of language within educational institutions has been studied from a variety of perspectives. A close look at the discourse used in schools starting with the 1960s (Barnes, 1969; Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman & Smith 1966; Gallagher & Aschner 1963;) continuing into the 1970s (Barnes, Britton & Rosen, 1971; Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Coulthard, 1977; Edwards & Furlong, 1978; Flanders, 1970; Forsyth, 1974; Gumperz & Herasimchuk, 1973; Heath, 1978; McHoul, 1978; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Stubbs, 1976) and moving into the 1980s (Michaels, 1981; Giroux, 1984; Mehan, 1985) shows that these studies tend to examine classroom discourse in terms of teacher-student interaction, many focusing on the issues of turns at talk or how classroom discourse is structured with the teacher taking the leading role as initiator of classroom talk and following an initiate, respond and evaluate pattern. More recently many publications follow interpretive and discourse based approaches in researching education in general (Davies & Corson, 1997; Freebody, 2003; Gee & Green, 1998; Maclure, 2003; Rampton, Roberts, Leung & Harris 2002; Rogers 2004). Interestingly, none of these studies regarding discourse and education include any examination of the discourse of morning announcements.

There have been many studies that use the lens of discourse to examine the concept of identity. The research on identity constitutes a wide field of works with a variety of definitions about what the study of identity entails. For my research I have found sociocultural theories of identity to be most helpful in that they tend to focus on identity as being recognized as a certain kind of person in a given context (Thomas, 2007; Black, 2007). In my research I examine how the principal, through the practice of delivering morning announcements is recognized as acting in the role of principal in the school setting. Gee's (1997) work on identity picks up on this notion of how our everyday discourse is linked to what Gee calls "situated selves." In short, through our discourse we "do life" as individuals and as members of social and cultural groups

so that “we become recognizable to ourselves and to others and recognize ourselves, other people, and things as meaningful in distinctive ways” (Gee 1997, p. xiv).

Much of the research on identity focuses on the construction of teacher identity within school settings (Alsup, 2006; Brown & Mcnamara, 2005; Clarke, 2008; Miller Marsh, 2002a; Miller Marsh, 2002b; Miller Marsh, 2003; Philipps & Jorgensen, 2002; Santoro, 1997; Soreide, 2006) or student identity (Brown, Reveles & Kelly 2005; Eckhert, 1989; Peyton-Young, 2004). Studies that specifically focus on the identity and discourse of principals within school settings (Bogotch & Roy, 1997; Bredeson, 1987; Greenfield, 1988; Reitzug, 1989;) tend to focus on the nature of discourse that occurs between principals and teachers, often examining how interpersonal communication impacts upon how principals establish themselves as effective school leaders with their staff members.

While some of the literature examines the work of principals in terms of leadership styles and work behaviour (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Kmetz & Willower, 1982; Martin & Willower, 1981; Vann, 1994) a great amount of literature also deals with how principals can establish themselves as effective leaders by adopting specific leadership styles (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Starratt, 1995; Griffiths, Stout & Forsyth, 1988; Young & Connelly, 2007). Much research also examines how principals create collegial support or how they can maintain collaborative relationships with staff members that foster a positive team-like approach to running a school to promote a healthy school culture (Hancock & Lamendola, 2005; Letihwood & Jantzi, 1990; Pierson & Bredeson, 1993; Quinn, 2002). Recently a great deal of material has been written by principals, for principals, to reveal the most successful ways of managing a school and promoting positive change. These often offer tips on best practices and reflections on managerial mistakes (Barth, 2002; Grady, 2004; Parkay & Hall 1992; Spence, 2004; Whitaker, Whitaker & Lumpa, 2000; Young, 2004). In only some of these cases, morning

announcements are mentioned briefly, often with a succinct mention on how to make announcements more appealing to listeners or how principals can use them to set the tone for the day.

There is little research that focuses specifically on morning announcements. For the scant material that does exist, the approach towards morning announcements (and PA use in general) tends to fall into two camps: those that view announcements in a positive light and those that characterize the use of PA announcements as a detriment to learning. Those on the positive side tend to document how morning announcements can be used to support school initiatives and build school community (Chapman & Rosen, 2002; Everett, 1992; Folta, Goldberg, Economos, Bell, Landers & Hyatt, 2006; Preece, 2006; Hamilton, 1997; Hopkins, 2008). A small number examine how schools can invite students to produce morning announcements thus providing them with a valuable learning and community building opportunity (Braseli & Heints, 1997; Green & Brown, 2002; Flaherty, 1999).

The literature that documents the negative impact of PA use in schools examines announcements in terms of how they serve as a distracting factor, ultimately having a detrimental effect on the ability for teachers to teach without interruption thus negatively impacting student learning (Bushnell, 2003; Elovits, 2001; Harrison, 1983; Hassenpflug, 1984; Leonard, 1995; Leonard 2001; Leonard, 2003; Rousmaniere, 1997; Tripp, 1985, 1986).

I have found no published material that specifically investigates the discourse of morning announcements in a thorough and systematic way. This thesis seeks to fill that gap. The next chapter documents the research methodology I used to approach my analysis.

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines my research methodology. I begin by placing my research within the field of qualitative research by linking my research with the examination of everyday practices with the methodology used by institutional ethnographers (specifically outlined by Marjorie DeVault and Liza McCoy). I examine how their approach to institutional ethnography helps define the entry point I use for my research methodology. This is followed with a consideration of my use of the analytic tool of categorical theme analysis, or coding, as introduced by Lankshear & Knobel (2004) in their book on teacher research and Coffey & Atkinson (1996) in their research on ways of analyzing qualitative data. In this chapter I consider how the methodology of coding provides an opportunity to establish a framework from which the data can be analyzed at a deeper level. Establishing this framework enabled me to identify key elements and themes that I used as sign posts to move forward with my analysis.

Later in this chapter I document how the analysis moved ahead in terms of how I use discourse analysis to deepen my understanding of the data. I detail some of Gee's specific "thinking devices" (Gee, 2005, p.9) that I use to analyze the discourse present in the themes (those uncovered earlier through coding the data). In this section I outline the specific questions that I use to inform my discourse analysis; namely those regarding how language is used to build identity, relationship and politics (the valuing of social goods). This chapter closes with a consideration of some of the ethical issues arising from this research.

3.2 Entering Into the Research of Everyday Experience - Smith

Qualitative research is concerned with how people participate, experience, understand and interpret their social and cultural worlds (Lanshear and Knobel, 2004, p. 68). Much value, then, is placed on gathering data in real life or natural settings as the activities of everyday life unfold. Smith's notion of problematizing everyday experience (as a teacher experiencing morning announcements as a persistent school ritual) stands as the entry point into my research. Her notion of problematizing the everyday helped me to recognize the legitimacy of starting in-depth research on what, at first glance, seems a mundane, overlooked everyday experience. Indeed Dorothy Smith (and ethnographers in general) would concur that this stuff of everyday experience is a site where rich data exists. Smith (2006) is worth quoting here:

The project is to extend people's ordinary good knowledge of how things are put together in our everyday lives to dimensions of the social that transcend the local and are all the more powerful and significant in it for that reason. We participate in them without knowing what we are doing. (p. 3)

Because the emphasis in institutional ethnography is on research as *discovery* (Smith, 2005, p. 1), it explores the social relations and organization in which we participate daily but which remain hidden from us because they are easily overlooked. Because institutional ethnography focuses its investigation on how people participate in or are "hooked up" (Smith, 2006, p. 60) to specific relations within particular institutions it is perfectly suited to my research.

There are many ways that institutional ethnographers conduct their research to explore the social relations between people and institutions. Indeed Dorothy Smith concedes that this is an area of research that is evolving and is used differently by various scholars in a wide variety of fields (Smith, 2006, p. 2). She is cautious about using institutional ethnography as a

methodological dogma explaining that there are “examples, models, technical notions, and other sources based on the experience of institutional ethnography practitioners, none of these are intended to impose an orthodoxy (Smith, 2006, p. 2). Interestingly Coffey and Atkinson (who figure prominently later in this chapter) pick up on this same point regarding methodology. They encourage researchers to “ go beyond how previous scholars have used ideas...not to follow previous scholarship slavishly but to adapt and transform it in the interpretation of one’s own data (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p.158).

The work of DeVault and McCoy (2002) provided me with one approach to institutional ethnography that was particularly suited my research. They describe a research path of institutional ethnography as a methodology that follows this sequence:

- a) identify an experience,
- b) identify some of the institutional processes that are shaping that experience,
- c) investigate these processes in order to describe analytically how they operate as the grounds of experience.

(De Vault & McCoy, 2004, p. 755).

My entry into this research follows a similar path. I began by identifying one experience within my everyday experience as a teacher in an elementary school setting as the school day begins. I identified a key institutional process (the daily delivery of morning announcements) that shapes my daily morning routine (the ritual of stopping to listen to morning announcements even though this is a particularly busy time at school). This thesis is the result of my analysis aiming to understand more about the experience of morning announcements.

Before describing in more detail the methodology used to pursue my analysis, I wish to highlight one key difference between institutional ethnography research methodologies and my approach to this research. Central to institutional ethnography is the notion of auto-ethnography;

that is the inclusion of personal experience as a key element of institutional ethnography research. Auto-ethnography refers to research method that connects analysing and writing about the personal to an understanding of the cultural, social and political (Nagy and Leavy, 2006 p.183, Northey & Tepperman, 2002, p. 86). Many institutional ethnography researchers are called to examine topics that are meaningful to them and to make the inquiry itself a process of self-discovery. The auto ethnographical method used by many institutional ethnography researchers leads researchers to provide detailed accounts of how they experience the everyday phenomenon which they are researching and link this to the larger social and political landscape. This is where I differ substantially from the work undertaken by most institutional ethnography researchers.

My research does not document *my* experience of morning announcements to understand how they shape *my* activities at work or *my* understanding of power structures within the broader institution of educational settings or even within the specific culture of my school. It was not my intent to include in-depth analysis of my own experience as an integral part of this analysis. Having experience, however, as a teacher familiar with elementary school culture does provide me with a significant advantage for my analysis. Since I am familiar with the ways in which language is used during the discourse of morning announcements I am able to easily recognize patterns of delivery and make sense of these particular school discourses. As an insider to the elementary school culture I am familiar with routines and easily identify common groups and activities. This has provided me with a particular ease and advantage when unpacking the data.

3.3.Validity

A challenge for many researchers who are engaged in gathering spoken data lies in the issue of intruding into the data (possibly affecting its validity) through interaction between the

researcher and the subject (as in the case of interviews or questionnaires). In research settings unobtrusive ways of collecting data are ideal in that they do not intrude on anyone, they do not influence the functioning of the individual (or group) being studied and in this way they do not provoke a reaction or a change of behaviour (Northey & Tepperman, 2002, p. 80).

A benefit of examining the data produced by principals during morning announcements is that the data are not interactive; they exist independent of the research or the researcher (Nagy & Leavy, 2006, p. 286); because the data are not influenced by researcher interaction they are considered “naturalistic” (Nagy & Leavy, 2006, p 286). In this case, the data from morning announcements were gathered without any interaction between the initial researcher team (who gathered the data) and the principals.

3.4 Data Collection

Data was collected during the same one-week period from PA morning announcements recorded at three elementary schools in the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB). The three schools selected represent three distinct regions of the city. School I is based in the inner-city southwestern region with a population of 417 students (many coming from the Filipino community). This area is known for its transient housing and quickly growing community, with many family homes being replaced by large apartment buildings. School II is found in the mid-town region of the city with about 2/3 of the students coming to school by bus. A majority of students come from social housing apartments, with many student families immigrating from Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. Its student population is 298. School III is based in the northeastern region of the city with diverse student populations including many families from Filipino, Jamaican and East Indian heritage. The population of this school stands at 379, half of

the students being bussed from the surrounding suburban community. All three schools include programs from kindergarten through to grade eight.

3.5 Transcribing the Data

The recordings of each school were transcribed verbatim and were reviewed for accuracy. In order to reflect the content of the announcements and make this available for analysis, the transcripts included hesitations (e.g. uhm... ah...), pauses longer than two seconds (e.g. *pause 10 seconds*) emphasis (e.g. And in our **own** school yard...), drawing out of words (e.g. re:::joice) repetitions, and background noises (e.g. *As the speaker talks there is a radio playing over the P.A. system as well.*)

Standard forms for transcribing were applied: the date was included at the beginning of each transcript with start and end time, each school was identified with a roman numeral, and speakers were identified with the use of capital letters (P: Principal, S: Secretary, C: Child). Confidentiality was ensured by inserting (*student name, teacher name or school name*) when an individual or school identification was apparent (e.g. ...So, congratulations to (*student name*), a well-known well-loved figure here at (*school name*)). Utterance markers were employed when the speaker changed or when the same speaker (often the principal) changed subject. All three transcripts were merged into one document. This document was used for analysis (See Appendix A).

3.6 Data Analysis

3.6.1 First Coding - Structure - Shared Content Elements

To begin the data analysis I used the methodology of institutional ethnography (similar to the sequence outlined by DeVault & McCoy (2002) to engage in a process that led me into a greater understanding of how morning announcements “work” by using analysis to recognize and map important elements. I began to do this analysis by employing the methods of categorical analysis or “coding” as outlined by Coffey & Atkinson (1996). The following section outlines this methodology and the ways in which I used it to proceed further with my research.

To investigate the institutional process of using morning announcements to start each school day I employed the methodology of categorical analysis (which I will refer to as coding) as introduced by Coffey & Atkinson (1996) and reviewed by Lankshear & Knobel (2004). Coding is one way that researchers use to organize, manage and retrieve bits of data (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p. 26). Essentially this entails adding “tags” or labels to the data based on major concepts.

The transcripts of the data were read and re-read to determine what categories would “grow out of the data” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004, p. 272) without agreed upon or pre-conceived categories. During this initial analysis, themes were identified based on repetition of subject matter or key terms. This stage of coding allowed a large amount of data (in this case five days of morning announcements at three different schools) to be condensed into manageable categories for further analysis. Coffey & Atkinson warn that this process is not merely a mechanistic process but helps the researcher generate concepts from and with the data. (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 26). Coding, then, was a means of achieving a greater understanding of the data by first simplifying it so that it could be further scrutinized.

In considering what tags or categories might be attached to specific pieces of data during subsequent coding Lankshear & Knobel (2004) provide a clear understanding of how this comes about:

Categories and taxonomies are closely related and are indispensable within research. Categories pertain to similar and different sorts of things. Things that are the same belong to the same category; things that are different belong to different categories. When we do category analysis we look in the data to find ‘sameness’ and then think of labels under which to categorize the instances of each ‘sameness’ we have found. (p. 37)

As I began to examine two of the initial research questions (What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements? and more specifically, What elements are present in morning announcements?) this led me to consider what similar patterns and themes might emerge and if there was a common pattern of delivery among the three principals. These became evident after the first coding. A categorization of utterances under the heading Shared Content Elements resulted. The following Shared Content Elements emerged from this coding: Opening/Salutation, O Canada, Scripture Reading, Reflection (scripted), Prayer (scripted), General Announcements, Closing. (This is documented in more detail in the next chapter. See table 4.0). At this point the coding was used in a “quasi-quantitative way” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 28) by grouping instances, mapping when they occurred and measuring (by counting how often they occurred).

This process followed a procedure known as “coding and retrieving” (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, p. 28). It is a common analytic strategy that often undertakes three operations:

- a) noticing relevant phenomenon
- b) collecting examples of those phenomenon
- c) analyzing those phenomena in order to find commonalities, differences, patterns and structures

(Coffey & Atkinson 1996, p. 29)

Since I was interested in identifying shared themes in morning announcements, of particular interest was what patterns could be revealed in the shared themes that were *chosen* by each of the three principals. That is, what could be revealed by examining the non-mandated and specifically unscripted elements that each principal *chose* to include in morning announcements? (A consideration of what is mandated and scripted in morning announcements (as in reciting prayers) is included in Chapter Four.) This led to a closer consideration of the original research question (What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements?) to understand if the *chosen* themes from morning announcement discourse reveal a deeper understanding of how principals used announcements to do more than just share information? In order to explore this a more detailed run through of the data was required.

3.6.2 Second Coding – Themes

Coding was employed on a deeper level to systematically organize the utterances so that themes could be identified. (See Appendix B.) At this level of data analysis categorical analysis was used to proceed with what Coffey & Atkinson (1996) term the “data complication” (p. 30). Coding here served not to simplify the data into a bare bones set of categories that did not do justice to the rich qualities of the data. Rather, at this stage, coding was used to open the data up to more complex interrogation; a process which included creatively working with the data, “asking the data questions and generating theories and frameworks” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 30). The following themes emerged from this round of coding: Home/School Communication, Logistics, Spiritual Education, Clubs/Sports, Safety/Rules, Personal

Connections, Date, Cultural Connections. (These are documented in more detail in the following chapter. See Table 4.2)

Coding then can be seen as a process that both simplifies and expands the data at different points in the research process. That is, while the first run through of the data provided an overall structure to organize the data, subsequent readings with more coding allowed a richer analysis and understanding. It is at this point that a closer look at the content of the talk, paying particular attention to the use of language, word choice and descriptors, provided an opportunity to approach the data in a deeper way. What follows is an examination of how the work of James Paul Gee helped to facilitate the methodology used to proceed with this level of analysis.

3.7 Entering Into Discourse Analysis - Gee

Gee's approach to discourse analysis is essentially a task similar to the work of ethnographers who are involved in working with data "moving backwards and forwards between inside and outside, making the familiar strange and the strange familiar..." (Rampton, Roberts, Leung, & Harris, 2002, p. 375). Gee (2005) picks up on the notion of making the familiar strange in this way:

The goal of discourse analysis is to render even Discourses with which we are familiar "strange" so that even if we ourselves are members of these Discourses we can see consciously (maybe for the first time) how much efforts goes into making them work and, indeed, see normal, even right, to their members. (p. 102)

Also worth noting is that Gee's concept of the goal of discourse analysis is not unlike the notion Dorothy Smith uses to describe the work of institutional ethnography in its efforts to "extend people's ordinary good knowledge of how things are put together in our everyday lives

to dimensions of the social that transcend the local... We participate in them without knowing what we are doing” (Smith, 2006, p. 3).

The original aim of this research, as noted in the introduction, was to unpack the phenomenon of morning announcements by asking a primary research question: What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements? Gee’s methods of discourse analysis were used to get at this questions by undertaking the task of looking at language-in-use in everyday situations to allow for a deeper level of analysis.

3.7.1 Gee’s Warning About Methodology

Before outlining the key features of Gee’s methodology that I employed in my research, it is important to note Gee’s caveat about approaching his work as a ““step-by step” set of rules to follow” (Gee 2005, p. 9). Similar to Smith’s (2006) description of institutional ethnography research methodology, and Coffey & Atkinson’s (1996) overview of coding techniques, Gee warns researchers to avoid the temptation to simply follow his methodology in a mechanical and uncreative way. Instead he encourages researchers to use his methodology as a set of “thinking devices” which allows the researcher to uncover meaningful patterns and conclusions in the data (Gee, 2005, p. 9). Gee stresses adaptation, innovation and creativity when using his methodology for new research. On a general level Gee (2005) describes the work of discourse analysis as follows:

Essentially a discourse analysis involves asking questions about how language, at a given time and place, is used to construe the aspect of the situation network as realized at that time and place and how the aspects of the situation network simultaneously give meaning to that language. (p. 110)

The method of discourse analysis used in this paper aims to determine how language (in this case unscripted announcement utterances made by the principal during morning

announcements) at a given time and place (in this case in three separate elementary schools) is used to construct an aspect of the situation work (in this case the work of establishing the “big D” Discourse of being recognized as a principal). The next task, at this point in the research, was to determine what questions and framework would be used to analyze the data at a deeper level.

To engage in this level of data analysis two of Gee’s frameworks for analysis were used to generate the questions that would interrogate the data. First I employed Gee’s framework of the “Three Components of Discourse” (Gee, 1988). This was followed by a deeper level of analysis based on Gee’s understanding that all language in use performs seven “building tasks” (Gee, 2005). Both of these frameworks, and the methodology they imply, will be discussed in turn.

3.7.2 Three Components of Discourse Systems

Based on Gee’s (1988) work in discourse analysis, three categories of analysis were used to review the data. Making sense of the how the principals used language involved examining the language used in terms of three systems: 1) a referential system (where language is analyzed in terms of examining how information is conveyed literally); 2) a contextualization system (where language is analyzed in terms of how it establishes a context; in this case how the principal wished to establish a relationship with students and underline shared values and beliefs); and 3) an ideological system (where language is analyzed to specifically look at what deeper themes and images the principal wanted to communicate about his/her identity and worldviews).

In their book on teacher research, Lankshear and Knobel (2004) provide an excellent overview of the questions that Gee uses as a framework for analysis. The table below reveals what questions were used to examine the data.

Table 1: Gee’s Components of Discourse Systems – Analysis Questions

DISCOURSE SYSTEM	ANALYSIS QUESTIONS
Referential System (Literal meaning)	What does the speaker wish to say? What information is hoped to be conveyed? How does the speaker want the language to be?
Contextualization System (Social Relations)	In what context does the speaker want what is said to be placed in relation to the hearers and the speaker?
Ideological System (Values, Beliefs and Worldviews)	What deeper themes, ideas, images and views does the speaker want to communicate about him/herself, his/her social group, or the world? What ideology does the speaker wish to express?

(Adapted from Lankshear and Knobel, 2004, p. 292)

3.7.3 Building Tasks of Language

It was tempting, after the hard work of transcribing, coding and re-coding, to exclaim that the research work has been completed. Atkinson & Coffey (1996) remind researchers of the folly of this assumption. “Methods are not ends in themselves, and we should always remember that we are using analytic perspectives and techniques in order to make discoveries and generate interpretations of the social worlds we investigate” (p. 154). Indeed the difficult task of deeper analysis was just beginning. In order to get at the larger notion of how principals use morning announcements to do the work of forming an identity (and by extension establish a relationship with students and highlight valued social goods) Gee’s (2005) methodology embedded in his theory of the “building tasks” of language offered another opportunity to interrogate the data.

Gee suggests that those who are beginning to pursue their first discourse analysis, as I was, should look closely at the data and ask what linguistic details appear to be important for

how language is used to do the work of what he calls “building tasks.” Gee (2005) describes this notion as follows:

[L]anguage-in-use is a tool, used alongside other tools, to design or build things. Whenever we speak or write, we always and simultaneously construct or build seven things or seven areas of “reality.” Let’s call these seven things the “seven building tasks” of language. In turn, since we use language to build these seven things, a discourse analyst can ask seven different questions about any piece of language-in-use. (p. 11)

Essentially, then, language acts to perform seven tasks, which Gee (2005) outlines as follows: significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics (by which Gee means the distribution of social goods), connections and finally sign systems and knowledge. The table below outlines the questions that Gee suggests will examine how language in use employs these building tasks:

Table 2: Gee’s Seven Building Tasks of Language - Analysis Questions

BUILDING TASK	ANALYSIS QUESTIONS
Significance	How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways?
Activities	What activity or activities is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e. get others to recognize as going on)?
Identities	What identity or identities is this piece of language being used to enact (What does the speaker wish others to recognize as operative)?
Relationships	What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeing to enact with others (present or not)?
Politics (distribution of social goods)	What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating? (What is communicated to be normal, right, good, correct the way things ought to be...)
Connections	How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things – make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?
Sign Systems & Knowledge	How does this piece of language privilege or dis-privilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims of knowledge and belief?

(Adapted from Gee, 2005, pp.11-13)

My research is particularly interested in the third and fourth building tasks, those of constructing and identity and establishing a relationship. I also touch on the building task of politics (the social goods communicated as normal, right or correct) as my data analysis includes a discussion of how each principal shares what they value as part of the discourse they use to establish their “principal” identity and relationship with their students. What follows is a consideration of the questions used to inform my analysis in terms of these three building tasks.

3.7.4 Building Identity

In terms of identity, Gee ‘s (2005) theory of language in use declares that we use language to get recognized by others as taking on a certain identity or role. That is, as we use language in the here and now we are building an identity. He uses the example of how a speaker uses language differently when “acting as chair” of a committee, and then in another moment, how the same speaker talks in a different way when acting as a peer or colleague. Essentially, for Gee, we use language to do the work of enacting a certain identity at a specific time and place so that “any situation involves identities as a component, the identities that the people involved in the situation are enacting and recognizing as consequential” (Gee, 2005, p. 98). To get at this notion of identity I questioned the data with the following questions in mind:

- What identities (roles and positions) with their concomitant personal, social and cultural knowledge and beliefs (cognition), feelings, (affect), and values, seem to be relevant to, taken for granted in, or under construction in the situation?
- How are these identities stabilized or transformed in the situation?
- In terms of identities, activities and relationships, what Discourses are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant) and in what ways?

(Gee, 2005, p. 111)

Using Gee's methodology I began to consider how each principal created a "principal" identity, thus illustrating the specific relationship the principal aimed to establish with the students in their school. Quotes are used around the term "principal" to underline my intent to signal the dual meanings inherent in this term. First, I wish to highlight the notion of the word "principal" in terms of signifying the authority that one automatically takes on when becoming the leader, top administrator, or "principal" at the school. Secondly, I use the term "principal" to emphasize the concept of "principal" as in "most important" or "primary." That is, the term "principal" identity also refers to the most important or most recognizable identity that the principal constructs so that students will recognize him/her in a particular way. The data suggests that each principal (either consciously or unconsciously) uses language in such a way that ultimately does the work of constructing this "principal" identity.

It is important for a moment to pick up on Gee's notion that the identity that the speaker wishes to establish is constantly changing within context. While that may be the case, what is significant here is that the context in this research data remains the same; that is, this research looks at the identity being constructed as it is repeatedly established through the discourse of morning announcements that occur at the same time (in the morning) at the same place (in the given elementary school.) Since these announcements are often the first (if not only) contact that the principal makes with students during the day, this is a primary source of where the identity of each principal is constructed. This consideration of the key terms, images, vocabularies and concepts present in morning announcement discourse points to how principals create an identity for themselves which is an integral part of their practice of maintaining a specific relationship with students in order to manage student behaviour in the school setting.

3.7.5 Building Relationships

In order to explore the notion of building relationships Gee explains that we use language to signal what sort of relationship we have, or would like to have with our listeners. That is, as we use language in the here and now we are using language to build social relationships (Gee, 2005, p. 99). He uses the example of how the chair at a committee meeting could signal a deferential relationship (by saying “ Professor Smith I’m very sorry to have to move us on to the next agenda item.”) (Gee, 2005, p. 99) or a less deferential, relatively informal relationship with the same person (by saying “Ed it’s time to move on.”) (Gee, 2005, p. 99). A key element of language use is Gee’s understanding that we use language to do the work of establishing a relationship with specific individuals or groups of individuals so that “any situation involves relationships as a component, the relationships that the people involved enact and contract with each other and recognize as consequential” (Gee, 2005, p. 99). To better understand how principals used language to establish a relationship with their students I questioned the data with the following questions in mind:

- What sorts of social relationships seem to be relevant to, taken for granted in, or under construction in the situation?
- How are these social relationships stabilized or transformed in the situation?
- How are other oral or written texts quoted or alluded to so as to set up certain relationships to other texts, people, or Discourses?
- In terms of identities, activities, and relationships, what Discourses are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways?

(Gee, 2005, p. 111)

Key to Gee’s methodology is the task of looking closely at the data to examine a variety of linguistic details. This entailed a further consideration of the use of pronouns within the themes

of Safety and Personal Connections, with particular attention given to highlighting those pronouns that specifically link the speaker in relationship through the use of I/you, we/us (and by extension let's). A third draft of the transcripts was created to highlight the use of pronouns (see Appendix C).

3.7.6 Building Politics

My analysis will also touched upon Gee's (2005) notion of the task that language performs in building politics (how language works to reflect the social goods that one values; e.g. status, power, community, team work, authority etc.). (Gee, p. 12, 2005.) Underpinning the tasks of building identity and relationship is the simultaneous work we do to value certain social goods. That is, in making an effort to establish our identities as a certain kind of person, we also simultaneously communicate what particular social goods we value. In this research I examine how each principal uses language to signal what values he/she wishes to promote. To get at this concept of building politics, Gee suggests approaching the data with the following questions in mind:

- What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating?
- What is communicated to be normal, right, good, correct, the way things ought to be...
- How are social goods made relevant (or irrelevant) and in what ways?

(Gee, 2005, p. 112)

In order to fully interrogate the data Gee's questions (those from the building tasks of identity, relationship and politics) were used during my data analysis of the transcripts. This turned out to be a somewhat tricky endeavour as many of the building tasks happen simultaneously within one stretch of discourse. Added to this, there was a significant amount of

data to analyse. To apply and document the analysis stemming from these questions to all the data would prove to be overwhelming. In order to focus the research three key themes were chosen (Safety/Rules, Personal Connections and Spiritual Education) for further analysis. The reasons for choosing these themes are documented in the next chapter. Before moving to the chapters that document my data analysis a brief consideration of some of the ethical issues arising from how the data were gathered is in order.

3.8 Ethical Concerns

The data were originally collected as part of an in-class project supervised by professors from Mount Saint Vincent University where the information would not be used beyond the context of the course. The purpose of the course was to educate graduate students about research strategies. In order to ensure the validity of the data (to avoid the altering of the delivery of announcements if principals knew they were being recorded) the principals were not initially informed that they were being recorded.

Most professional organizations to which researchers belong (such as the American Sociological Association [ASA] and the American Psychological Association) have ethical codes that help researchers make ethical decisions (Esterberg, 2002, p. 94). ASA guidelines clearly outline that sociologists should obtain informed consent from research participants, students, employees, clients, or others prior to videotaping, filming, or recording them in any form, unless these activities involve simply naturalistic observations in public places and it is not anticipated that the recording will be used in a manner that could cause personal identification or harm. (See Appendix D.) Because the announcements took place in a location where they were easily heard by many listeners (anyone can enter and hear the morning announcements) and because the recordings would not be used in any way to identify or harm the participants (the principals,

students or staff at the schools) the initial recordings (without prior consent from the principals) took place in an ethical manner.

ASA guidelines go on to outline that researchers must make an attempt to correct any misconceptions with participants no later than at the conclusion of the research. Following recording, principals were immediately informed that the recording took place. They were asked to give their consent before data were used in the context of the in-class course on research. All principals gave their consent to use the recorded data from their morning announcements for the initial research project.

When this project evolved into research towards a Masters Thesis a more detailed process of ethical review took place. Principals were approached again and original transcripts were returned to them so that they became the sole holders of the transcripts. Subsequently they were asked if they would like to review these transcripts and release the data for analysis. This thesis, then, is an example of document analysis of the data handed over by the principals. That is, the documents (transcripts) released by the principals are the focus of the research. As part of the ethical review all three principals were given the opportunity to sign a free and informed consent form. (See Appendix E.) They were also given the opportunity to review their transcripts and remove anything they wished. The principals were informed that I would keep these transcripts in a secure location in my home for two years after the publication of the thesis at which point they would be shredded. The principals were also made aware and understood the potential for distribution among education researchers arising from the publication of the thesis. They were also informed that they would be given the opportunity to discuss the thesis upon completion with me. An ethical review also took place at the School Board level and permission to use the data and proceed with the research was granted. (See Appendix F.)

The following two chapters proceed with a documentation of my data analysis. Since there is a significant amount of data and analysis I have documented the data analysis into two separate chapters. My initial data analysis provided me with an opportunity to determine a framework or overall structure that ordered the data. Since there are many details within this structure that are worth noting I have outlined these in Chapter Four: Structural and Thematic Analysis. Subsequent analysis of the data led me to a closer examination of the specific building tasks of identity and relationship (and by extension politics). Again since a substantial amount of detail is worth noting I have separated this analysis and include it in Chapter 5: Discourse Analysis – A Closer Look at Three Key Themes.

Chapter Four: Structural and Thematic Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with an overview of the delivery of morning announcements, documenting the common features and structure that became apparent after analysing the data. In this section I revisit two of the three initial research questions: What elements are present in morning announcements? What purpose do they serve? The second half of this chapter considers the data more closely to explore the primary research question: What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements? In this section I illustrate how I decide to focus the data analysis to examine three key themes (Safety/ Rules, Personal Connections and Spiritual Education).

4.2 Structural Analysis

At the initial stage of analysis the data were reviewed and coded to determine whether there were shared content elements in terms of what principals include during morning announcements. After the first coding of the data the following shared content elements were identified:

Table 3: Shared Content Elements – General Overview

SHARED CONTENT ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION
OPENING/SALUTATION	Opening greeting signalling that announcements are beginning with a request for students attention
O CANADA	Playing of a recording of the national anthem
BIBLE READING OR PRAYER	Sharing of a reading from the Bible or scripted prayer
REFLECTION (SCRIPTED)	Sharing of a scripted reflection based on the reading or prayer
TRADITIONAL PRAYER (SCRIPTED)	Sharing of traditional prayer (Always the Hail Mary Or The Lord's Prayer)
GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS	Sharing information regarding school members or events taking place at the school
CLOSING	Closing remark thanking listeners for their attention and signalling the end of announcements

After coding the data it became clear that all principals include these elements in some way during their morning announcements.

By comparing the data from the three principals it also became evident that all three principals use remarkable consistency when delivering their morning announcements. Table 4 outlines how each principal includes these shared content elements in structuring their delivery of morning announcements throughout the week. A note is made beside each content element indicating whether they are scripted (that is, clearly read verbatim from a text), or unscripted (that is, spoken without following a written text).

Table 4: Shared Content Elements – Structure for All Principals

PRINCIPAL I	PRINCIPAL II	PRINCIPAL III
SALUTATION (unscripted)	SALUTATION (unscripted)	SALUTATION (unscripted)
O CANADA (recording)	O CANADA (recording)	O CANADA (recording)
BIBLE READING (scripted)	REPEAT SALUTATION (unscripted)	SPRINGBOARD INTO BIBLE READING (Unscripted introduction)
SCRIPTED REFLECTION	GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS (unscripted)	TRADITIONAL PRAYER (LORD’S PRAYER)
TRADITIONAL PRAYER (LORD’S PRAYER)		BIBLE READING (scripted)
GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS (unscripted)	VIRTUE EDUCATION (scripted)	EXPLANATION OF BIBLE READING (unscripted)
	TRADITIONAL PRAYER (HAIL MARY)	GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS (unscripted)
CLOSING (unscripted)	CLOSING (unscripted)	CLOSING (unscripted)

Of note here is that coding the data in this way provides a “data simplification” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 28) in order to achieve a greater understanding of shared patterns, elements and overall structure of delivery. Through this coding, the data suggest that each principal does not stray from including these content elements, often following the same order of presentation of these elements each day. Why would such a consistency occur? Was a handbook provided for principals to follow or were the principals mandated by the school board to include these elements? Research reveals that while there is no announcement handbook for principals there

is a directive regarding morning announcements contained in the Ontario Ministry of Education's Education Act. It clearly outlines that opening or closing exercises must be held in each school and that these must include the singing of O Canada (see Appendix G). In terms of the daily inclusion of public prayer, the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) Policy Register mandates that public prayer must begin with the Sign of the Cross and shall include either the Lord's Prayer (Our Father) or Hail Mary. (See Appendix H.)

Such a consistency in the delivery of morning announcements echoes Dorothy Smith's notion of an "internally coordinated complex of managerial, professional and discursive organization" that serves to regulate, organize, and govern the way in which things are done within these educational institutions (Smith 1987, p. 49). In this case the Ontario Education Act and the TCDSB Policy Register act as powerful texts that standardize the pattern of the announcements delivered by three principals at three separate locations at the same time. Of note is that these documents are seemingly invisible. The consistency in the delivery might appear to be "just the way things are" at school. We know now, that there are powerful mandates that direct this practice.

Such a consistency also underlines several of Gee's (2005) theories about the functions of human language that proceed in often overlooked ways so that activities are often done in routinized and consistent ways. The consistency supports two of Gee's central ideas about language. First it supports Gee's theory of how language acts in the performance of social activities of getting things done (in this case fulfilling the mandate of greeting students, leading prayers and O Canada). Second, it shows how language is used to support how individuals identify themselves as belonging to a certain group (in this case the principal is being identified as the leader of the school who routinely fulfills government and school board mandates) within a particular setting (the elementary school) and time (first thing in the morning).

The consistency also underlines Gee's notion of the "big D" of Discourse in action. That is, this routine pattern of discourse shared by the principals during morning announcements uncovers how particular ways of acting and talking work in order to situate the speakers with a particular identity. Clearly the principal is to be recognized as undertaking a particular activity that can be acknowledged as something that principals normally do (open each day with a consistent greeting and request for attention, include O Canada and prayers and share the announcements and information about the upcoming day.)

This simultaneously supports Gee's notion of how language is used to perform particular building tasks (Gee 2005). In this case a significant task of building activities is enacted. In short, the consistent way in which morning announcements are delivered points to a sequence of actions in which the participants are engaging. The repeated nature of this activity makes it easy for listeners to recognize what activity is being performed: the larger or main activity is the delivery of morning announcements by the principal; the sub-activities, of which the larger activity is composed, are the consistent presentations of the common elements. The actions that composed these sub-activities are the repeated daily communication of these announcements using the technology of the public address system to deliver information using these common elements. In this way the pattern of discourse used by the principals is being used to enact a particular activity; the principals are clearly seen (in fact heard) to be delivering morning announcements that others (students and staff) are able to be recognize as going on.

4.4 Thematic Analysis

Since the aim, at this initial point in my research, was to identify if there were any similarities between the morning announcement discourse of the three principals, of particular interest was what patterns could be revealed within the *chosen* themes that were shared among

the three principals in their general announcements. That is, what could be revealed by examining the non-mandated and specifically unscripted themes that each principal *chose* to include? To answer this question a second coding of the data was required. During this stage of the analysis themes were identified based on repetition of subject matter or key terms. The following themes emerged from the data:

Table 5: Themes Identified in Morning Announcement Data

THEMES	DESCRITPION	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES		
		Principal I (/5 days)	Principal II (/5 days)	Principal III (/4 days)
HOME SCHOOL COMMUNICATION	Requests for students to relay information home to parents regarding school events or school procedures	4	2	1
LOGSITICS	Information about lost items, teacher meetings, changes in school schedules, trips, and class movement	7	9	6
SPIRITUAL EDUCATION (Catechism) (Virtues)	Prayers, scripture readings, Reflection based on these prayers or readings Readings and reflections based on the TCDSB initiative to help students build virtue/character traits	11	10	17
CLUBS/SPORTS	Information about upcoming sporting events or reporting about team participation at tournaments	3	8	5
SAFETY/RULES	Reminders about school rules or information regarding the safety expectations for students including reminders about the weather	5	3	5
PERSONAL CONNECTIONS	Information about birthdays, condolences, expression of thanks, praise or evaluation of students with an indication of specific student names	11	8	11
DATE	Identification of date	1	5	4
CULTURAL CONNECTIONS	Information to educate students about shared cultural events (whether occurring at school or in the wider community)	1	3	3

The second coding of the data engendered what Coffey & Atkinson refer to as “data complication” (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p. 30). Essentially the second coding served to open up the data to more complex interrogation. What is striking is the remarkable consistency that exists among the three principals in their inclusion of these particular themes. The data shows that all principals touch on these themes in one way or another with some variations in the

number of occurrences. (Please note that data from Principal III consists of four days of morning announcements compared to five days of data for Principals I and II. This is because Principal III did not deliver the announcements one day; the secretary fulfilled this duty.) Essentially, however, the principals stick to these themes.

This consistency prompted a return to several of the questions that Gee (2005) employs as thinking devices when considering the building tasks that language fulfills in establishing the speaker's identity. I looked at the data to determine what identities seem to be relevant to, taken for granted, or under construction in the repetition of these themes during morning announcements. In this way I came to understand how these identities are stabilized (or transformed) in this situation and how certain discourses are made relevant.

The data suggests that the identity of the principal (as the one who leads the school) is stabilized by the work that is done through the consistent repetition of key themes during morning announcements. That is, as leader of the school, the principals show that things are done in a consistent and routine way and that students and teachers know they can count on the principal to take care of the daily routines and share important information. Principals, then, take on the identity of the leader who consistently looks out for everyone, manages the school and does his/her best to share relevant information so that things run smoothly.

Also evident in the consistent use of these particular themes during morning announcements is the positioning of the particular tasks that the principals value (and are consistently heard to value). Certain information is made relevant simply by the ongoing repetition of similar themes. The building task of Politics is enacted here in that the repeated nature of the delivery of announcements helps listeners recognize that the principals value acting in a routinized, predictable way; perhaps signalling to the students that work that is done in an

organized, dependable and predictable way is to be emulated. In reviewing these themes the data suggests that the principals also value:

- establishing ongoing links with home communities by asking students to share information with parents;
- overseeing the movement in the school by clearly sharing details about important meetings, trips, club activities;
- ensuring that the well being of all students in the school is honoured by reminding students about safety rules or providing information about inclement weather;
- providing leadership in the formation of the spiritual education of students by leading prayer and establishing a daily ritual for including prayer during morning announcements;
- creating a personal connection with students by mentioning birthdays, and giving praise for accomplishments;
- locating student rhythms within the daily calendar and making connections with shared cultural celebrations and practices.

Establishing the identity of the principal (as one who leads the school) is clearly enacted through this ritual of leading morning announcements. Note that, in all three cases, the principal is the only one who always leads the announcements (except on one occasion when the secretary fills this role for one morning and follows the same pattern of delivery). In all three schools the principals also direct the flow of the announcements. When students are invited to participate they always read from scripted texts. Clearly the principal is the one in charge of sharing information and setting the tone for the day.

4.3.1 Three Key Themes

Having established a general understanding of the overall structure of the delivery of the morning announcements and shared themes in the three schools, of interest, at this point in the research, was to take a closer look at the actual words and phrases used by the principals. This meant a return to the original research question: What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements? I was interested in determining

whether shared patterns of delivery would emerge and to understand the unique characteristics of each principal's discourse. What specifically interested me was what the transcripts would reveal in terms of how the discourse of each principal worked to perform the building tasks of identity, relationship and politics.

The scope of this thesis allows for an examination of only some of the themes that emerged after the second coding of the data. To determine how to focus the research, a review of the themes (those that emerged earlier through the second coding of the data) was conducted with the following question in mind: which of the themes might specifically reveal the work of constructing an identity and establishing a relationship between the principal and students? Three of the themes emerged: Safety/Rules, Personal Connections and Spiritual Education.

First, the principal's role has traditionally been defined by the Latin term *in loco parentis*, meaning "in place of a parent." This term refers to how the school institution has legally defined the responsibilities of teachers, and by extension the responsibilities of principals, who act as "head teacher." The school's boundaries were traditionally and commonly considered as the space that acted as a transition between the secure intimacy of the family and the public openness of life in the outside world (Van Manen, 1991, p.6). Originating in British common law, the concept of *in loco parentis* places teachers and principals in the position of acting in the best interests of the students: i.e. establishing rules and regulations that they feel ensure the students' safety. This led to an examination of what patterns of identity, relationship and politics emerge through the transcript sections that deal specifically with the Safety/Rules theme.

Second, in examining the relationship that principals create through establishing a specific identity, a close to look at Personal Connection themes was a logical choice. Considering how the principals use student names or include special events with names of school community members, this informed my analysis of how the principal connected personally with

students to establish a relationship. The question emerged: does the nature of this connection help the principal solidify their “principal” identity and simultaneously underline the building task of politics (the values or norms upheld by the speaker)?

Third, it is important to consider the work that principals in Catholic schools do to establish themselves as the spiritual leader within the school community. Even though daily public prayer is mandated in the Catholic system, of interest is the way in which each principal uniquely approaches the announcements that include a spiritual dimension. The following questions emerged: Does the discourse used by each principal during Spiritual Education announcements continue to do the work of establishing a consistent “principal” identity? Does the simultaneously work of maintaining a relationship with students also highlight the values that each principal upholds?

The next chapter documents the analysis springing from these questions with a consideration of the data found within these three key themes, (Safety/Rules, Personal Connection and Spiritual Education). In the upcoming chapter I examine how each principal specifically uses morning announcements to create and maintain a unique “principal” identity within the school setting: that of the director, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and the coach.

Chapter Five: Data Analysis - A Closer Look at Three Key Themes

5.1 Introduction

Since there was a significant amount of data to consider, a review of the data was conducted to focus the research. The three key themes Safety/Rules, Personal Connection and Spiritual Education were chosen because all three principals consistently include them in their morning announcements. Using each of these themes, I document, time and again, how each principal not only uses morning announcements to share logistical information necessary to maintain the many activities at the school; each principal, through using language in a certain way, also constructs what I call a “principal.” identity. This also enables principals to establish a relationship with their students and articulate certain values.

While there are many ways that I could have structured my analysis I consciously organized my analysis through an examination of the data using three themes. This allowed me to compare (and contrast) the language used by all three principals within themes. Finding common patterns and anomalies within the language used by principals has been most revealing. Documenting the data analysis using a thematic structure also follows the original approach through which I first approached the data. That is, the identification of themes was the first discovery after the coding of the data. It was not after the themes were identified that I began to employ discourse analysis to further understand how the building tasks of language were being realized through the discourse. This chapter, then, documents my analysis of the data by considering the three key themes of Safety/Rules, Personal Connection and Spiritual Education in sequence.

My analysis of these three themes is informed by Gee’s (2005) thinking devices for undertaking discourse analysis, in particular the questions: what identity or identities are being

enacted by the use of these pieces of language? (What does the speaker wish others to recognize as operative?) What relationship or relationships are being stabilized or transformed in the situation? What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating? In documenting how the data responds to these questions I get at Gee's notion of the "big D." Discourse I examine how each principal participates in the recognition work of the "big D" Discourse by "talking, acting, thinking, believing, dressing, acting, to situate themselves with a particular identity in the world" (Gee, 2005, p. 27). Essentially in this chapter I use Gee's understanding of recognition work and identity to examine how principals use morning announcements to create a unique "principal" identity for themselves. Each principal not only uses discourse to help listeners recognise that each principal is in fact acting as principal (in terms of the primary school administrator). The principals each use discourse in particular ways to help listeners identify them as a certain *kind* of principal who sets up a specific relationship between him/herself and the students.

I am aware of an understanding of identity that underlines how individuals often use language to create multiple identities for themselves. What I found most striking in this data was that each principal, again and again, constructs a particular "principal" identity across each of these themes. The reoccurrence of the construction of this "principal" identity is included in my data analysis. My analysis shows how the each principal constructs one of three unique identities: the director, the CEO and the coach.

5.2 Safety/Rules

In order to determine where Safety/Rules themes emerge, the data were reviewed to highlight where principals chose to specifically include reminders about staying safe and following rules. The Safety/Rules announcements in the data are summarized in the following table:

Table 6: Safety/Rules - Occurrences in Morning Announcement Data

PRINCIPAL I		
MARKER	THEME	CONTENT
(I)D1.014	Snow Ball throwing	Reminder about not throwing snowballs
(I)D2.013 -	Flood warning	Reminder to stay away from streams, rivers etc.
(I)D2.014 -	Wet weather	Warning about mushy yard and to be careful outside. Reminder not bring wet back inside.
(I)D5.009-	Snow Ball throwing	Reminder about not throwing snowballs
PRINCIPAL II		
MARKER	THEME	CONTENT
(II)D3.005	Bad weather Recess cancelled	In-door recess due to bad weather. Listen for further announcements.
(II)D4.006	Bad Weather Parent Reminders for for Cancelled Buses	Reminder to tell parents to check weather report for cancelled buses. Reminder that buses will not pick up students if bus is cancelled. Remind to tell parents of their responsibility to pick up students and phone school for busing updates.
(II)D5.003	Yard Rules Winter Safety	No going on the field or on mounds of snow. No throwing snowballs Reminder of serious consequences for infractions.
PRINCIPAL III		
MARKER	THEME	CONTENT
(III)D1.015	Inclement Weather	Reminder to dress warmly due to cool weather.
(III)D1.012	General Safety	Take your time out in the hallways
(III)D4.012	Bus Safety/ Thinking Ahead	Reminder of importance of bus safety rules. Accidents happen quickly. Thank you to those helping with the bus safety event.
(III)D5.002	General Safety	Few people are here so look after for each other. Pray for safety and remember to be careful on days like today.

Essentially, by consistently and repeatedly including information about safety, principals establish the general identity of the principal as the one who not only cares for the students but also takes seriously the responsibility for looking out for the well being of all students in ensuring that safety precautions are communicated, understood and followed.

The data suggest that the Gee's 2005 theory regarding the "big D" Discourse is at work in that the general identity of the principal (as the one who, among other duties, looks out for the well being of students at the school) is stabilized by the work that is done through the consistent repetition of safety announcements. Including safety announcements allows the principals to implicitly create the identity of a leader who will act in role of "*in loco parentis*" who is responsible for the well being of children in his/her care. That is, as leader of the school, the principals show that safety reminders are part of the work that principals do. They are seen to be doing the work of "big D" Discourse in establishing himself or herself as a principal who routinely does this work. Safety reminders are made in a consistent and routine way so that students know the principal is the one who will:

- establish and remind students of safety rules (no throwing snowballs);
- establish and remind students of safety procedures the need for parents to call the school for information about bus cancellations);
- share important safety information (inclement weather, flood warnings etc.);
- ensure that safety rules and procedures are followed (by making sure all students hear them and know that they are to be respected).

Principals, then, take on the identity of the leader who consistently manages the school safety and does his/her best to share relevant safety information so that things run smoothly. Implicit here, using contextual and ideological systems, the principals communicate:

- *I care about you and your family.*
- *My job is to keep you safe.*

A closer look at the differences between the language that each principal chooses when delivering safety messages reveals the specific “principal” identity which each principal constructs. Principal I delivers instructions regarding safety in a manner that is clear, concise, polite and direct. This is noted in the following utterance (typical of safety announcements delivered by this principal):

(I)D1.014-P: And, um, a little safety note. Boys and girls, a reminder, please, when you're out at recess today, ah, it's a great day. We'll have lots of fun out in the snow, but make sure that you are not throwing any snow. It's very, very dangerous, and we don't want anyone to be hurt. So please, ah, remember that.

Using a referential system of analysis, Principal I is simply communicating a safety reminder. Implicit here, using contextual and ideological systems, this principal also conveys the following information:

- *We all agree that you are meant to enjoy yourself during recess on snowy days.*
- *In order to enjoy yourselves we agree on these safety rules.*
- *You know these rules and only need a little reminder.*
- *Now it's time for you to follow these rules.*
- *This is how you should act.*
- *We all agree that we don't want any accidents.*
- *I want this to work.*

The word “dangerous” (with the emphasis of “very, very”) is the key phrase that is used to establish the overall importance of this safety message. Safety rules for Principal I, then, entail reminding students about what they can do generally (“have lots of fun out in the snow”) and what they can't do specifically (“make sure you are not throwing

any snow”) to avoid dangerous situations. (Indeed the majority of his safety reminders during the week are about how to act safely in snowy conditions.) Principal I puts the onus on the children to act according to safety reminders and make sure they are following the rules that he is reminding them about.

Through this discourse, this principal establishes the “principal” identity of one that acts as a director. He directs students with language that is clear and concise. Acceptable actions are made explicit, with the understanding that these actions will be followed. Notice that this principal also makes it clear that he trusts and expects that the students will follow through with these actions. Speaking in a polite and straightforward manner, the discourse acts to realize the task of building an identity. In this case Principal I reveals a “principal” identity similar to that of a director as if saying:

- *I am your director.*
- *I will tell you how to do it.*
- *These are the actions I expect.*
- *Please follow my directions.*

Principal II consistently delivers safety messages in a manner that is authoritative, detailed and clear. There is no misunderstanding about what is expected from the students when it comes to acting safely during the day. This is illustrated in the following utterance:

(II)D5.003-P: Boys and Girls because the snow plough has come through and created mounds of snow I am going to just say that for morning recess I don't want anyone out on the field. We will leave the field fresh for our winter activities for Carnival. I'd like you to remember that at no time is anyone to go on those mounds of snow. They are actually higher than they should be right now and they do pose a danger to any of our students who slide on them. Please make sure that you follow the uh no snowball throwing rules as well. I know that it's always uh uh it seems to be a tendency when we have snow that there has been so many reminders uh that we'll be moving quickly to consequences including no participation in carnival this afternoon for anyone who uh breaks those rules for this morning or any time during the week.

Notice the length of this message (indeed, while safety messages are only mentioned three times in one week at this school, all the safety announcements are of this longer length with explanations as to the need for the safety reminder and how it is to be followed). A referential system of analysis helps us understand how Principal II is simply communicating a safety reminder. Using contextual and ideological referential systems, this principal also implicitly conveys the following information:

- *There are no exceptions to these rules during recess.*
- *This is important information about a significant danger.*
- *I expect you to remember other related safety rules (no throwing snowballs).*
- *Children have a tendency to forget these rules.*
- *There have been sufficient reminders about these rules.*
- *Here's what I expect.*
- *Within the school there are consequences for not following safety rules.*
- *I will consistently enforce a consequence if rules are not followed.*
- *I am clearly stating the terms of how you should not act.*

While similar to Principal I, in that safety rules for Principal II are not integrated into other announcements, Principal II delivers these safety messages in a way that shows that safety is about what students are not to do ("at no time is anyone to go on those mounds of snow," "no throwing snowballs"). Unacceptable actions are made explicit, with the understanding that these actions should not be followed. All safety rules delivered by Principal II throughout the week are equally detailed yet politely delivered and to the point (albeit with a less strict emphasis on punitive consequences). She consistently uses language that is authoritative ("I am going to just say" "We will leave the field fresh for our winter activities...") informative ("because the snow plough has come through," "due to high winds today" "You do need to know one important thing...") and polite ("Just please remind your parents...")

"please be listening..." "I'd like you to remember..." "Please make sure you follow uh the no snowball throwing rule...").

Speaking in a clear and authoritative manner, the principal's discourse does the work of building a "principal" identity similar to messages delivered by a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) as if saying:

- *I'm your CEO.*
- *I will take leadership on these issues.*
- *My job is to keep you safe and I take this responsibility seriously.*
- *I expect that these rules will be followed.*
There are consequences for not following rules.

Principal III consistently delivers safety messages in a playful, encouraging manner, often weaving them within the body of other announcements. Safety messages from Principal III are always delivered as if encouraging a team. This team approach to keeping the school safe is evident in the following utterance (typical of the majority of his safety announcements):

(III)D5.002-P: So, I know we just got a few people in each of our classrooms, but remember together we're strong. So, let's pray that Our Father and pray that everyone will be safe today, ah to and from school and within the school, because it's days like today we have to be a little careful.

Again, using a referential system of analysis, Principal III is simply communicating a safely reminder. Implicit here, using contextual and ideological referential systems, this principal also conveys:

- *Everyone has a part to play in this school to ensure that we are all safe.*
- *We care about everyone here at the school.*
- *I'm watching you.*
- *We're a family and we need to watch out for each other.*
- *We all need reminders and can all use a little help to keep us safe.*
- *It is important to ask God for help to keep us all safe.*

Interestingly, Principal III integrates safety reminders into the other announcements of the day, often asking God to bless the students and staff during their day and to keep them safe.

Principal III also consistently shows an understanding of community and responsibility that goes beyond the walls of the school (even making the connection well beyond school walls to include the transcendent) with the implicit messages:

- *God is watching and will help keep us all safe.*
- *This is a team effort.*

Safety rules for Principal III, then, entail reminding students about how they generally need to look out for each other (like team members) in a proactive way. That is, safety is about what students need to remember (“be a little careful”) rather than what they can’t do. The majority of his safety announcements are woven into other announcements with general reminders to act in a way that proactively avoids getting into unsafe situations. These include remembering to “bundle up,” “take your time out in the hallways,” “think ahead,” and “take safety to heart.”

The data shows that Principal III consistently uses language (often active verbs) in a way that puts the onus on the children to work together like a team, thus revealing a “principal” identity similar to that of a coach. Through this consistent discourse, Principal III establishes the identity of a coach in that he directs students with language that is encouraging,

(“...remember, together we’re strong,” “So let’s pray that Our Father, and pray that everyone will be safe today”) **playful** (“...so as they say, have yourself a wonderful day,” “remember to work hard, an ah, of course shake your tail feathers”) **and positive** (“...remember together

we're strong..." "...and let's make sure you have a productive day God Bless and I'll see you out in the halls.").

While Principal III makes it clear that he knows that staying safe isn't always easy, he uses humour to talk about serious subjects and shows that he values each student as an important member of the school team community. Speaking in an enthusiastic, encouraging manner, the discourse of Principal III reveals the work of performing the building task of creating a "principal" identity similar to that of a coach as if saying:

- *I am your coach.*
- *We can all be safe if we work as a team.*
- *All of us have a job to do to take care of the team.*
- *Hold strong. We will all be okay if we look out for each other.*

Although safety messages are conveyed differently by each of the three principals, the principals all deliver these messages in a way that clearly illustrate that they are committed to ensuring that students are safe at their schools. While there are, of course, insurance and safety record issues that could also be in play, each principal does deliver these safety announcements in a particular way. Through this discourse the three principals not only show their commitment to overseeing safety concerns, they also use the discourse as an opportunity to construct for themselves one of three consistent, unique identities: the director, the CEO or the coach. By including safety messages the principals demonstrate that they fulfill their responsibility of attending to the safety of all the children at their school. This brings us to a consideration of the personal connections that are evident in the discourse of principals when delivering morning announcements.

5.3 Personal Connections

In order to determine where the Personal Connection theme was evident, the data were reviewed to highlight where principals chose to mention individual students by name.

Essentially, by using names, principals signal a personal relationship with students. This helps the principal create the impression that he or she personally knows the members of their community. Implicitly this creates the identity of a leader who is caring and knowledgeable about students. The following Personal Connection content emerges from the data analysis:

Table 7: Personal Connection - Content Occurring in Morning Announcement Data

PERSONAL CONNECTION CONTENT	OCCURENCES PRINCIPAL I	OCCURENCES PRINCIPAL II	OCCURENCES PRINCIPAL III
Welcome/ Identification of Reader(s)	2	2	3
Thanks/Evaluation of Reader(s)	4	0	2
Birthday Greetings	4	4	6
Congratulations to Teams	1	1	1
Condolences	0	0	1
Thanks to Teachers	0	0	2
General Complements	0	0	1
School Total	11	7	16

What follows is a consideration of Birthday Greetings, Congratulations to Teams and Welcome/Identification of Reader(s). These were chosen because all three principals include them among the Personal Connection contents of their morning announcements.

5.3.1 Happy Birthday

A cursory glance at the data shows that the most frequent utterances of names occur in the inclusion of birthday greetings. Interestingly, these names are usually student names. There is only one instance of the inclusion of a teacher birthday (in school II), perhaps signaling that the students are the most important members of the school to be celebrated. This could also be interpreted that adult birthdays are a private matter and not for public knowledge. Principal III playfully makes reference to this in the following utterance:

(III) D5.028-P: A::nd, apparently rumour has it (*teacher name*) is celebrating a birthday, but that's a big secret between you, me, and the walls.

Since all three principals include birthday greetings in their announcements, this again points to Gee's notion of the "big D" Discourse at work; that is, the identity of the principal includes being seen to be doing the work of acknowledging each student by celebrating their birthday in a public way. The data shows that each principal makes an effort to include birthday greetings, which suggests that this is an important ritual in all of the schools. In several cases the birthday of the student is mentioned if it occurs on a weekend. Similarly, a birthday greeting is repeated on a second day if a student is not in school when their birthday is originally announced signaling that they key person being addressed is the person having the birthday. The following data (see next page) illustrate this phenomenon:

Table 8: Personal Connection - Samples of Happy Birthday Announcements

PRINCIPAL I	PRINCIPAL II	PRINCIPAL III
<p>I)D5.010-P: And we'd like to wish (student name) - a very Happy Birthday today. And as well, on Sunday, (student name) - will also be celebrating his birthday. So Happy Birthday to you, (student name).</p>	<p>(II)D2.002-P: Good morning again everyone. Uh today is January 29th and we would like to wish a very Happy Birthday to (student name) and since (student name) was with the boys invitational tournament yesterday at (school name) a very happy birthday from Sunday.</p>	<p>(III)D2.007-P: Right, and it's the twenty-ninth and it's a wonderful day at (school name), because the twenty-ninth means it's (student's name) birthday, (student name) in (teacher name)'s class. So, congratulations to (student name) on her birthday, what a wonderful citizen of (school name) (student name) is. And yesterday, by the way, was (student name) birthday and she's in JK in (teacher name) bir -uh- class. So, congratulations to (student name) and (student name) on their birthdays. What a wonderful, wonderful treat.</p>

Using a referential system of analysis, the principals are simply conveying birthday information.

Implicit here, using contextual and ideological referential systems, the principals are conveying:

- *I know it is your special day.*
- *It is important that I acknowledge this because I value you as a member of our school.*
- *It is important that you know that I am acknowledging your birthday.*
- *It is also important that the rest of the school community knows that it is your birthday and wishes you well.*

Of particular interest are the different ways in which principals share birthday greetings and how this serves to create a specific identity for each principal. Principals I and II mentioned students in a brief, efficient manner, simply acknowledging the individual with a name and birthday wish.

The clear and concise nature of the discourse they use for conveying birthday greetings is also

consistent with the unique “principal” identity that has been documented for each principal: those of the director and CEO.

Examining which children the principals chose to include for birthday greetings reveals a deeper understanding of the data. Principals I and II consistently acknowledge the birthdays of those students who are currently registered in their school. Implicitly the principals are establishing a shared understanding of how community is valued, what community means and who is part of this community:

- *If you are registered in the school you are part of the school community.*
- *It is your registration in the school that makes you a valued member of our community.*

By extension, these principals are using language to do the work of the “big D ” Discourse. They use language to establish their identity as principal who is recognized as the administrator in charge, who keeps track of school members by public acknowledgement of birthdays. Implicitly the principals also communicate what they value:

- *I value each student.*
- *I show that I value each member of this community by remembering each student’s birthday.*

When we examine whom Principal III includes in birthday greetings we see that, like Principals I and II, he shares the identity of one who keeps track of birthdays (albeit with a little help from those in the office). He implicitly sends a similar message that birthdays are valued and that he wants students to know and hear that they are valued. What differentiates Principal III from the other principals is his understanding of community. Note the following utterance:

(III)D4.013-P: Alrightee, we’ll now turn to the ole’ birthday news, and let’s see if we have any birthdays here ... (talks to someone off microphone) ... today’s the 31st, right? ... yes, and today on the final day of, ah, of ah January, on ah, on ah this day, our good friend, (student name), back in (teacher name) class was born. So, congratulations to (student name) and (student name) and (student name) who are his brothers on that, on that historic event. So,

congratulations to them. And by the way, we can't help but notice that our good friend (*student name*) had his birthday yesterday. So, although he's left the school, we certainly have strong memories of (*student name*) and hopefully he'll be having a wonderful birthday as well.

Principal III makes an effort to place both students who are celebrating a birthday in the context of the larger community. In the first case the birthday child's siblings are also mentioned by name and are congratulated for being part of the "historic event." The implicit message here:

- *You are not only part of our school community because you go to school here; you are also part of a school community that includes and values your family.*
- *I not only know your name, I also know your family and I value that connection.*

In the utterance above, Principal III also includes a child who is no longer registered at the school but whom he considers worthy of mention. He states that the student has left the school with "strong memories." (There was no indication of whether these strong memories were positive or negative.) The implicit message here:

- *Even when you are not physically here you still matter to me and to our community.*
- *It is important that students know that even when they are not here they will be remembered.*

Principal III consistently mentions student names in relation to their connection with the wider school community (e.g. mentioning the teacher's room where the student belonged or the names of siblings.). This is consistent with language typically used by a coach. Like athletes who are identified according to their team affiliation, students are consistently identified via their connection with their classroom. He also refers to students by their nicknames, a practice commonly used by coaches. Principal III uses language in a consistent way to establish his "principal" identity as that of the coach. This will be demonstrated again in the data that include utterances that share information about student participation in a sports tournament.

5.3.1 Congratulations to Teams

As in the case of birthday announcements, all three principals choose to share information about how teams represented the school during recent athletic tournaments. On the referential level, all three are simply sharing information: students were away from the school at a tournament, this is how they fared and they are to be congratulated for their efforts. Since all three principals include information about these sports events in their announcements, all principals, then, value school participation in these events. Implicit here, using contextual and ideological referential systems, the principals convey:

- *I value that being on a team is important.*
- *I value the effort of those who participate in team sports.*
- *It is important that our school community congratulates team members and that those listening know how the team placed at a tournament.*

Once again, by making an effort to include announcements about team sports, the principals demonstrate Gee's "big D" Discourse as active. Principals are seen to be actively doing what principals usually do: support the efforts of school athletes. In terms of establishing an identity the principals also implicitly convey:

- *It is important that I acknowledge athletes as part of a team*
- *It is important that students hear that I am acknowledging athletes in a public way.*

Throughout the week of announcements, all three principals include one occurrence of mentioning school participation at a tournament. This data is captured in Table 9. (See next page.)

Table 9: Personal Connection - Congratulations to Teams Announcements

PRINCIPAL I	PRINCIPAL II	PRINCIPAL III
<p>(I)D5.008-P: And we'd like to congratulate our boys' basketball team. They were in a tournament at (<i>school name</i>) yesterday and they did very, very well. They made it to the finals, and lost by one point. So congratulations to them. They did well and the coaches were quite proud of their team. So way to go!</p>	<p>(II)D2.003-P: We want to congratulate our boys. They made it to the finals and just lost by a couple of points in their very very last game. They did exceptionally well and they brought back a beautiful plaque for our hallway so congratulations to those boys on the team as well as to their coach (<i>teacher name</i>).</p>	<p>(III)D4.014-P: Congratulations to the boys' basketball team who placed 2nd in a tournament at (<i>school name</i>). Yes indeed folks, they placed se::cond. Big-ups to cousin (<i>student name</i>), (<i>student name</i>) the terror, slash (<i>student name</i>), (<i>student name</i>), (<i>student name</i>), (<i>student name</i>), the traveller (<i>student name</i>, and the rest of the team. Yes, indeed, congratulations to all those, ah all those fine people and also to their coaches for the good work and preparation they've done so they could earn that 2nd place finish. Excellent.</p>

Principal III chooses words that help listeners identify him as someone who knows and uses language that students use and understand: the use of the term “big -ups” in the place of “congratulations” along with a double naming of some students on the team, using their official first and last name as well as a nickname name: “cousin” (part of the family) “the terror” (perhaps noting ability or attitude on the basketball court) etc. Not only does this principal share information about the team, we can infer that, by using a contextualization system, he is establishing a “principal” identity as one who knows the students well (much like a coach). The implicit message here:

- *I know you well and show this by using the same language you do.*
- *Because I know you well I even know your special nickname.*
- *I use this nickname easily.*

On the ideological level, it can be inferred that Principal III is communicating the worldview that all school members, no matter who they are, are part of a team.

- *It is important that students know that I am like them.*
- *We are really part of one big team.*

While Principals I and II also clearly value team efforts, by including information about the tournament in the announcements, neither of these principals uses individual names to identify team members to the school community. Rather, the team remains as a single unit – a team without individuals. A contextualization system establishes their “principal” identity as one who is not part of the team but who congratulates the team and praises the team for their efforts.

The implicit message here:

- *On behalf of the school community I value and applaud your efforts as a group.*
- *No one individual team member is more important than the rest.*

On the ideological level it can be inferred that these principals are communicating the worldview that, while school team members are special members of the community, they represent the school as part of a team. The implicit message here:

- *It is important that students know that being part of a team is a collective effort.*
- *When I praise the team all members receive praise together.*

5.3.3 Welcome/Identification of Readers

A deeper analysis of the transcripts shows that even utterances that are easily overlooked often reveal deeper meaning. In the Personal Connection theme (when the principals simply welcome or identify student readers by using their names) the data analysis reveals that in all three schools students are invited to speak on the PA system using scripted material only. All student voices read prayers, share biblical readings or introduce intramural events. There is no

data that records unscripted student voices or opinion. (While only five days of data were recorded this suggests that spaces for unscripted student voices may be rare.) On a referential level, children are simply sharing information about upcoming events and are sharing religious heritage through scripture and prayer. This overall structuring of student voices holds the implicit value: *Children participate only if they speak within controlled parameters.*

Examining how the principals welcome or introduce these children serves to uncover what relationship is established between the principal and the children who read during morning announcements. The following table captures all data with regard to welcoming or identifying student readers using their names:

(See next page.)

Table 10: Personal Connection - Announcements Welcoming/Identifying Student Readers

DAY	PRINCIPAL I	PRINCIPAL II	PRINCIPAL III
1	<p>(I)D2.008 - P: I would like to welcome (student name) (student name) and (student name) who are leading us in prayer today.</p> <p><i>(After the reading)</i> (I)D1.009-P: Thank you girls. Please be seated for our morning announcements.</p>	<p>(II)D1.007-P: And we have one announcement from our athletic rep. Uh (student name), around uh some games today.</p> <p><i>(After the reading)</i> (II)D1.009-P: Okay, So that's team E and C for house leagues today.</p>	<p>(III)D1.004-P: Let's sit down now boys and girls ... (3 second pause) And we've got a couple of announcements. We don't have any scripture reading for today, uhm, but hopefully we'll get somebody in tomorrow to do that.</p>
2	<p><i>(Students read the prayer with no introduction right after the national anthem. After students finish reading, the principal comments.)</i></p> <p>(I)D2.008 - P: Thank you, (student name) and (student name). That was very well done. Could you please be seated for our morning announcements?</p>	<p><i>(No student readers.)</i></p>	<p>(III)D2.004-P: A::nd, let's now ah listen to, oh actually we, yes, we don't have a reader today either, so hopefully ah, yeah, so folks can figure out who the readers are for the scripture tomorrow. And let's just go straight to a couple of important announcements.</p>
3	<p><i>(No scripture reading due to mass.)</i></p>	<p><i>(No student readers.)</i></p>	<p><i>(Secretary introduces this day.)</i></p>
4	<p>(I)D4.003-P: I'd like to welcome (student name), and ah, (student name) who are doing our readings today.</p> <p><i>(After the reading)</i> (I)D4.009 - P: Thank you, (student name) and (student name). That was very well done. Could you please be seated for our morning announcements?</p>	<p>(II)D4.007-P: And (student name) would just like to give us just one brief announcement here for the house leagues.</p> <p><i>(After the reading)</i> (II)D4.009-P: Okay, so junior boys this morning uh junior teams, rather, at B and C.</p>	<p>(III)D4.004-P: Please sit down now, boys and girls. A::nd, now we have a beautiful psalm from (student name), right? Our good friend (student name) from (teacher name)'s class. Let's listen carefully to (student name) reading that he brings to us from the Holy Bible.</p> <p><i>(After the reading)</i> (III)D4.006-P: Thanks be to God. Yes, thanks be to God and thank you (student name) for that. That's a beautiful reading from St. Paul...</p>
5	<p><i>(After the reading)</i> (I)D5.006 - P: Thank you, (student name), (Student name), and (student name). That was very well done. Could you please be seated for our morning announcements.</p>	<p><i>(No student readers.)</i></p>	<p><i>(Students read a short play but the principal does not identify them by name..)</i></p>

After considering this data some interesting patterns are identified. The principal at School I specifically models the ritual of welcoming students (2 out of 4 occurrences). He uses the pronoun “I” similarly to offering a personal invitation. On the referential level Principal I is identifying students and welcoming them to address the school. By personally inviting the student readers Principal I implicitly conveys:

- *I am polite.*
- *I welcome you to read to the community.*
- *It is important that I show hospitality and welcome student readers.*

Note that this was not a welcome that extends to every reader. On days 2 and 4 students read with no introduction. Principal I, however, identifies the readers after they complete the reading by modeling the ritual of thanking them. This modeling of manners is demonstrated by thanking readers each time they read. In the majority of cases (3 out of 4 instances) a consistent comment to praise or evaluate their efforts follows the reading: (Thank you, (student name) and (student name). That was very well done.) On the surface, students are being identified and thanked. On a relational level, Principal I implies:

- *Thanking people in a straightforward and consistent way is important.*
- *Giving simple words of encouragement is also important.*

Gee’s notion of “big D” Discourse is also at work here in that Principal I is using language to position himself so that others recognize that role of principal entails the modeling of polite forms of greeting and thanking students in an appropriate manner.

Principal II uses a similarly efficient way to introduce student readers – using their name (and in one case their title: athletic rep.) to signal to students what the upcoming information is about (upcoming house-league sports events.) Of interest, here, is the use of the pronouns “we” and “us.” While Principal II does not personally invite the student to begin the announcements, she signals to the listeners that the child has information for the whole community – thus

positioning the principal as part of the “we/us” of school/community. By extension the principal assumes that all listeners will find this information important. The implicit message here is that the principal and the students are all part of a community together:

- *This information is for all of us.*
- *I am listening just as you are.*

It is interesting to note that that there was no “thank you” given to student readers by Principal II. On the surface this principal is simply introducing the student. The perfunctory nature of the introduction without thanks could imply:

- *It is important to introduce student speakers on the PA.*
- *They have a job to do and are expected to give information to the community.*

After the students have shared information at this school, Principal II consistently acknowledges the reading with “Okay” and then goes on to repeat this information (the names of teams playing for house-league sports). On the surface information is being clarified. By repeating it Principal II is implicitly valuing the information and establishes the principal’s role as the one in charge who clarifies important information. Implicitly the message is:

- *We have all heard this information.*
- *I will support this student by repeating what this student has said.*
- *Important information should be repeated.*
- *It is my job, as your principal, to make sure that this information is communicated effectively.*

Conversely, one could argue that this repetition of the information can make the child invisible.

Implicitly, then, the message could be:

- *Information that is important should be repeated by an adult.*
- *When I share this information more people will pay attention because what I say is important.*

As was outlined earlier in this analysis, Principal I and Principal II differ from Principal III in terms of how student names are identified in the context of the school community. Both

Principals I and II identify student names without indicating homeroom or any other school/community affiliation. The data shows that Principal III consistently introduces students in connection to those in the school community and this also occurs when student readers are welcomed or identified. Here, Principal III consistently uses the names of students in relation to the name of their teachers or by explicitly referring to students as “our good friend” or “my good friend.” Beyond literally identifying students and valuing them by using their name, this principal communicates that students in this school belong to a larger community (like a coach acknowledging team members). This includes a personal connection that the principal values by calling students “friend.”

At the same time, Principal III implies that students are expected to respect each other and work together as a team. Notice his use of the pronouns “us,” “we,” and “let’s,” in this Welcoming and Identification discourse, thus positioning himself as part of the community who is ready to listen to the reading from scripture. This brings us to a consideration of how the principals approach announcements that include a spiritual dimension.

5.4 Spiritual Education

Though my original intent was to examine only the non-mandated elements of the morning announcement data, upon reflection it became clear that it would be an oversight to omit any mention of the work that these principals do in positioning themselves as the spiritual leader within their schools. An initial review of the data, which simply counts the occurrences of spiritual education within the morning announcements, reveals that the principals devote a significant time to deliver announcements that include prayer and spiritual education. Since daily public prayer during morning announcements is mandated in Catholic schools, prayers and spiritual reflection are consistently delivered. Indeed, an examination of common themes shows that spiritual education

occurs the most number of times. (See Table 5.) Clearly this is an important part of the work that principals do at Catholic schools. All three principals demonstrate their participation in “big D” Discourse in that by making an effort to lead students in prayer every day they signal that the principal is to be recognized as one who consistently leads the school in spiritual development.

In order to document when Spiritual Education themes emerge, the data were reviewed to highlight where principals introduce or lead prayers, reflect upon prayers (in either a scripted or unscripted manner), include readings that illustrate the “virtue of the month” (a School Board initiative that introduces a particular virtue throughout the school system each month with scripted quotes and reflections), or include any mention of prayer as practice or God in general (as in “God Bless”). Announcements which include Prayer/Spiritual Education are documented in the following table: (See next page.)

Table 11: Spiritual Education – Content Occurring in Morning Announcement Data

ELEMENT	PRINCIPAL I (/5 days)	PRINCIPAL II (/5 days)	PRINCIPAL III (/4 days)
Indication to all students To stand for prayers	5	5	4
Welcome/ Identification of Scripture Reader(s)	2	NA (no student readers)	4
Scripted Reflection/Response to Scripture/Virtue Quote	3	1	0
Unscripted Reflection/Response to Scripture/Virtue Quote	0	0	6
Modeling response to scripture reading	3 (out of four readings)	NA (no scripture reading)	2 (only two readings)
Invitation/Signal to all students to join in prayer	1	5	5
Modeling of sign of cross at beginning of prayer	3	5	4
Principal leading of Our Father/Hail Mary	1 (students lead 4/5)	5	4
Request for prayers for particular purposes/people	0	5	5
General Blessing	0	0	4
Sharing logistical information about liturgical/events (mass, choir practice, celebrations)	1	4	0

What becomes evident is the complexity of events that is entailed in the principal’s fulfillment of the role as spiritual leader within the school. The variety of the sub tasks involved in leading the school in a spiritual education demonstrates that this work is a demanding and multi-faceted activity. Gee’s (2005) notion of activity building is at play here. When we consider what activity or activities these pieces of language are being used to enact (i.e. get others to recognize as going on) we can see that the principals consistently use language to signal that the work of prayer is going on and is to be recognized by the students as operative.

This is particularly evident in the phenomenon of each principal’s consistent introduction to prayer time each morning at all three schools. All three principals signal the appropriate

response for engaging in prayer by including a phrase that prompts the students to respond in a physical way:

Table 12: Spiritual Education – Introduction Indicating Commencement of Prayer

PRINCIPAL	DATA	OCCRENCES
I	Good morning, staff and students. Could you please stand and join in the singing of O Canada and remain standing for the prayer after.	5/5days
II	Good morning everyone. Today is (date). Please stand and join in the singing of O Canada and remain standing for our morning prayers and announcements.	4/5days
III	And if you could please remain standing for the saying of the Lord’s Prayer.	4/4days

This language does the work of demonstrating the “big D” Discourse of what it means to be recognized as doing the activity of prayer. Principals signal this work by the physical act of standing and making the sign of the cross (consistently modeling the words “In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit” before beginning of prayer). Interestingly this is not unlike what the priest does when leading a Catholic mass: using phrases that never change so that the congregation responds in specific ways at specific times during the mass when it is appropriate to sit or stand. (Standing is used at times during the mass to signal respect and attention towards particularly significant moments of prayer.) We find that a similar phenomenon occurs in the two schools that include scripture readings. After students have read a scripture passage both principals consistently respond with the phrase “The word of the Lord.” or “Thanks be to God.” which is a direct modelling of the responses that are expected from the congregation after hearing scripture at mass. Principals I and II also

consistently model the appropriate response that occurs during mass asking the student to sit down after the readings for the rest of the announcements.

Essentially, by repeatedly using language in this way, principals establish the “big D” Discourse as operative: principals are to be recognized as the one who understands and models the correct rituals in order to lead prayer. Each principal, then, takes seriously the responsibility for leading the students in spiritual development and ensuring that the rituals around praying or listening to scripture are modeled and followed.

By consistently including prayer and reflection in daily morning announcements, and by devoting a significant amount of time to this each day, this would suggest that the principals value the work of showing that praying publicly and leading spiritual education are part of what Catholic principals do. Prayer is done in a consistent and routine way so that students know the principal is the one who will:

- establish the importance of daily prayer by making time for it each day;
- model appropriate routines, responses and procedures (the need to stand and remain standing during prayers, make the sign of the cross or respond with the appropriate phrases);
- ensure all students hear these routines, responses and procedures;
- help students understand that appropriate routines, responses and procedures are expected to be followed;
- share important religious, cultural information (scripture readings, information about saints, liturgical celebrations etc.).

Principals, then, take on the identity of the leader who consistently calls the school together for prayer, manages the procedures for prayer and shares relevant information for the

spiritual development of the children. Using contextual and ideological systems, by including these announcements the principals implicitly communicate:

- *I care about your spiritual development.*
- *My job is to lead and model prayerful activities.*
- *Making time for prayer is important*

Given the ritualized nature of how prayer is conducted one might think that there would be very little room for principals to do the work of establishing a “principal” identity within the delivery of these announcements. A closer look at the patterns of delivery and language used by the principals suggests that each principal uniquely approaches these announcements. A consideration of this aspect of how each principal maintains his/her distinctive “principal” identity during prayers or spiritual reflection concludes this chapter.

The data that captures utterances dealing with spiritual education are quite extensive. I have chosen to focus my attention on whether principals include prayer and spiritual education using only a scripted approach (with rote recitations or reflections), or whether they include non-scripted responses. Interestingly we find that Principals I and III share a similar approach: at no time during their announcements do they reflect on prayers or readings in a non-scripted way. Principal I shows a remarkable consistency in that the delivery of prayers is delivered with the same pattern every day. The following table documents this phenomenon: (See next page.)

Table 13: Spiritual Education - Delivery of Morning Prayers – Principal I

MARKER	DATA
(I)D2.001-P:	Could you please STAND and join in the singing of O Canada and remain standing for our morning reading and prayer after.
(I)D2.002-C1:	<i>First child reads scripted introduction and introduces prayer with sign of the cross.</i>
(I)D2.003-C2:	<i>Second child reads scripture reading ending with phrase: The word of the Lord.</i>
P, C1 & C2:	Thanks be to God. <i>(Principal and children say this in unison.)</i>
(I)D2.004-P:	Do we boast about our good qualities? Where do they come from and what are they for?
(I)D2.005-C1:	<i>First child reads petition and introduces praying of Our Father with the sign of the cross.</i>
(I)D2.006 - C2:	<i>Second child refers back to ideas in the introduction with a scripted reflection and final prayer finishing with phrase:</i> We ask this through Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with you, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, forever and ever.
(I)D2.006b P, C1 & C2:	Amen. <i>(Principal and children say this in unison.)</i>
(I)D2.007-P:	Thank you, <i>(student name)</i> and <i>(student name)</i> . That was very well done. Could you please be seated for our morning announcements?

The same pattern of student/principal interaction for the delivery of prayers during morning announcements is followed each day with key phrases that echo part of the mass which are embedded in the announcements. Throughout the week there is no variation in this pattern of delivery. This principal, once again consistent with the role of the director, oversees the action and interplay among readers; each individual has a role to play in the delivery of these announcements. Neither the students nor the principal give any unscripted reflection on the meaning or significance of the readings. The script is followed in a predictable and patterned way, implying that the principal views the activity of prayer as one that is done in a ritualized, consistent way: leading public prayer involves following written texts without interpretation.

Principal II also follows a pattern of consistent delivery, reading prayers or quotes without unscripted reflection (except with a linking of virtue quotes to the formal praying of the Hail Mary). This is evident in the following utterance, typical of all five days of morning prayer lead by Principal II.

Table 14: Spiritual Education - Delivery of Morning Prayers – Principal II

MARKER	DATA
(II) D2.008-P:	Um, let us begin our day in prayer and sign ourselves in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Our quote for courage today: Courageous people take action to deal with difficulties rather than avoiding them. Think about the times that you needed to be courageous.
(II) D2.09-P:	And let us ask Mary to bring us some assistance with this: Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou amongst women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb Jesus. Holy Mary Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen. Our Lady of the Assumption Pray for us. In the name of the father, and of the son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Like Principal I, it is evident that Principal II does not include unscripted reflection or interpretation of these readings, though she does signal that prayer can be used as a way to ask for help in living out the virtues that are emulated in the readings. Consistent with the leadership style of the CEO, prayers are delivered in a concise, patterned and efficient way. Students are not expected to take part in this ritual other than to join in prayer that is predictable and recognized as part of praying within the Catholic tradition of faith.

It is clear that, for both these principals, leading schools in prayer is about offering students an opportunity to hear established texts, recite familiar prayers and respond using formulas established in rituals already established within the faith tradition. This is consistent with both their “principal” identities, whether this is the director (who clearly outlines what is to be done and expects student to follow through) or the CEO (who politely and concisely shares information and models appropriate behaviour with expected responses).

In considering Principal III, a use of language, consistent with his work of establishing his “principal” identity of the coach (who encourages students on and outlines the game plan) is evident. This includes playful, encouraging and positive messages even during his delivery of prayers and spiritual reflection. While he makes sure to include the praying of the Our Father (Lord’s Prayer) every day, this is not done with a routine introduction. Interestingly, he introduces this same prayer each day with a different reflection on the significance of this prayer – explaining a particular word or helping the students understand the significance of the prayer and the action of praying so that these are linked to what the students are doing within the school community. This is illustrated in the following examples that capture the several introductions used by Principal III when inviting students to join in morning prayer: (See next page.)

Table 15: Spiritual Education – Introduction to Shared Prayer – Principal III

DAY	MARKER	DATA
1	(III)D1. 002-P:	So, please now remain and now we'll say the Lord's prayer, a beautiful prayer to begin our week. And let's make this a prayer, or we can try to remember that we must always remain in communion with God and with one another. And that means we must always be helpful, to turn the other cheek, and say to ourselves 'what can I do to help?' So, let's say the Our Father together now...
2	(III)D2. 002-P:	And let's all please now continue standing for the saying of the Lord's Prayer. Remember, the Lord's Prayer we say, 'hallowed be thy name' and hallowed is a good word, it's a word it means blessed, special. So, let's try to remember to keep everybody hallowed and special today as we say the Our Father.
3	(III)D3. 002-P:	And if you could please remain standing for the saying of the Lord's Prayer - a prayer, as they say, that Jesus taught us and one that, as they say, if we live it in our hearts every day of our lives, would be better and so would every (school name)ers. So, let's begin now and carefully say the Our Father, with all my friends down here.
5	(III)D5. 002-P:	Alright now, boys and girls, if we could please remain standing now for the saying of the Lord's Prayer. And we're going to say this prayer together, ah just where Jesus taught us whenever two or more are gathered in my name we are together. So, I know we just got a few people in each of our classrooms, but remember together we're strong. So, let's pray that Our Father and pray that everyone will be safe today, ah to and from school and within the school, because it's days like today we have to be a little careful. So...

There are several observations worth noting here. First, the remarkable variety of examples which this principal uses to educate the students about the significance of this prayer; modeling that prayer is not something that is said in a rote, automatic way but in a way that is thoughtful and meaningful. It is the intent and thoughtfulness behind praying that make the act of praying significant. Principal III clearly shows that as a Catholic principal his job is not only to

give the opportunity to say prayers, it also entails modeling thoughtful interpretation and a linking of prayer to the daily action of the students in the school.

Second, a closer look at the language used by this principal shows that he picks up on the ongoing work he does to establish his “principal” identity of coach. His introduction to praying the Our Father uses language that includes team building themes especially suggested in the following utterances:

- So, let's try to remember to keep everybody hallowed and special today as we say the Our Father...
- ...if we live it in our hearts every day of our lives, would be better and so would every (school name)ers...
- So, I know we just got a few people in each of our classrooms, but remember together we're strong. So, let's pray that Our Father and pray that everyone will be safe today...

Significant also is that Principal III includes connections to prayer or spiritual reflection by embedding spiritual messages throughout his announcements. He does not limit inclusion of spiritual education to mandated prayers but often includes spiritual reflection in other announcements, (...let's begin our week uhm in a prayerful way and as they say, let's ask ourselves 'What we can do to help others. God bless, have a beautiful day a:nd take your time out in the hallways.')

or reminding students of significant spiritual concepts that students can refer to during the day (Let's, as they say, try to remember to keep everyone hallowed today and remember that we live on hallowed grounds.).

Significant also is that every day he closes his remarks with the phrase “God Bless” leaving the impression of a caring leader who asks for God’s blessing and protection over students:

(III)D5.015-P: So, as they say, have yourselves a wonderful day boys and girls. Uhm, it's going to be an unusual day, because we're down a few ah, students, ah, please be careful wherever you are and if you venture outside. And let's make sure you have a good day and a productive day. God bless and I'll see you out in the halls and in the classrooms.

Evident in the data capturing the spiritual education announcements is the consistent way that principals position themselves with a particular identity. As in other announcements, each principal uses language in Spiritual Education messages consistent with the construction of their “principal” identity: that of the director, the CEO or the coach.

5.5 Conclusion

My aim in this chapter has been to illustrate how principals use language not only to do successfully engage in using “big D” Discourse so that they easily can be identified as taking on the role of principal. I have also documented a variety of examples to show how principals specifically use language during morning announcements to create their unique “principal” identity. In doing this the principals implicitly establish the type of relationship they wish to have with their students. By sending certain messages to the school via these roles the principals help students recognize what relationship he/she wishes to have with their students. The roles of the director, the CEO and the coach are easily recognizable within our collective culture so that student will understand how to approach each principal. For example, most students would recognize that the director, CEO and coach have a clear plan of action and that this authority is rarely to be questioned. While there may be many different types of directors, CEOs and coaches (authorative, inclusive, competitive, enthusiastic, manipulative, open...) one thing is certain: the principal is expected to lead and students are expected to be lead. The ramifications of establishing this type of relationship will be considered in the conclusion of the thesis.

This chapter has also provided the reader with an overview of the data included in morning announcements using Gee's (2005) methodology of discourse analysis, specifically considering what identity or identities are being enacted by the particular tasks, topics and uses of language that the principals choose to use during their morning announcements. Coding and analysing the data has helped me understand that principals not only undertake a great number of tasks in delivering morning announcements. They also consistently perform these tasks so that they are able to successfully engage in working with a "big D" Discourse. In this way they will be recognized as actively participating in the role of principal. My analysis has also led me to conclude that, within these tasks, principals use language in a way that consistently maintains a particular "principal" identity. The data suggest that each principal uses the morning announcement discourse as an opportunity to construct for themselves one of three consistent, unique identities: the director, the CEO or the coach.

In the conclusion of this thesis I will consider the implications of my findings in relation to the theoretical foundations that have informed my thesis. I will also determine the validity of my research and reflect on the significance of my analysis (specifically the work of the identity construction that principals undertake in their delivery of morning announcements). I will close with some questions that principals might use to inform their practice of delivering morning announcements.

Chapter Six: Conclusion - Conversations with Colleagues and with the Data

6.1 Introduction

Many researchers question the notion that analysis, if it is to be considered valid, must reflect reality in a simple objective way so that it settles a research question (or questions) “once and for all” (Gee, 2005, p. 113). Rather than providing definitive answers to my initial research questions about morning announcements my primary aim in undertaking this thesis was to open up a conversation about morning announcements. The conclusion, then, provides an opportunity for me to look at the quality of my conversation with the data and to consider the significance of my observations.

I will begin with a reflection about how my conversations with colleagues (which occurred during the writing of this thesis) confirm the theoretical foundations I used to frame my thesis. This is followed by a consideration of the quality (or validity) of my conversation with the data. I approach the question of validity by using the four elements that Gee (2005) applies when reviewing research that includes discourse analysis: convergence, linguistic details, coverage, and agreement. A brief review of the primary conclusions that have emerged from my analysis will close this section. I reflect on the significance of these conclusions and consider three key questions that could inform future conversations on this topic.

6.2 Conversations with Colleagues - Confirming Theoretical Foundations

My research has taken place among a community of teaching colleagues who have entered (some with more enthusiasm than others) into a conversation about the focus of my thesis. Within moments of revealing my research topic I have found that the expressions of my colleagues shift into revealing one of two dispositions. Most often their faces fall (quite literally - eyebrows furrowing) into expressions of puzzled, if not baffled, disbelief; some even voicing, *“Why on earth would you want to look at something like that!? Most people don’t even listen to morning announcements!”* Less often their faces lift (literally - eyebrows rising) into expressions of inquisitive wonderment; a handful exclaiming something like, *“How fascinating – I’ve never really thought about that before! I’ll have to pay more attention to morning announcements!”* Reflecting on these responses has led me to validate the work of the two scholars that frame my research: Dorothy Smith’s theories regarding institutional ethnography (particularly her work on ruling relations and the everyday as problematic) and James Gee’s theories about how discourse analysis reveals the way language works beyond simply sharing information.

The first of these responses from my colleagues confirms the notion that lies at the heart of institutional ethnography: most of us participate in the ruling relations within institutional organizations without understanding the significance of this participation. The scepticism about whether my research topic provides enough material for a serious academic study points to a tendency to overlook the ongoing practices (and our participation within these practices) that are part of our everyday activities within institutions. While the ritual of delivering morning announcements in elementary schools occurs everyday, the puzzled response of most of my colleagues signals that the significance of this practice ultimately remains hidden. The general lack of attention paid to this daily phenomenon within schools betrays a gap in our

understanding of how we are hooked up to specific relations within particular institutions; illuminating Smith's (1999) idea of how an internally coordinated complex of administrative, managerial and discursive organization ultimately organizes, governs and regulates our experiences within institutions. Her point about how everyday phenomena and practices within institutions are taken for granted also manifests itself in the lack of research that undertakes a serious documentation of this everyday school discourse.

Smith's notion of ruling relations is also evident in the common structure of delivery evident in the discourse of all three principals. The common pattern that provides the structure of delivery found in all three schools points to the hidden ruling relations that direct this practice. It may seem that beginning the day with O Canada and the inclusion of daily prayer is simply the way announcements naturally proceed. My analysis has shown that these practices occur because the Ministry of Education and School Board mandate them. A significant part of the work that the principals do in delivering announcements is to fulfill these mandates.

Those who have responded more openly to my research topic support Gee's theory that discourse analysis provides us with an opportunity to understand how language works in serving many functions beyond simply communicating information (Gee, 2005). Like Gee, they are willing to consider the validity of undertaking a careful analysis of everyday discourse, especially as it occurs in common and often overlooked contexts.

Since there are many ways to approach discourse analysis there is no one correct way to undertake this type of data analysis. Ultimately I must be content to live with the limits of choosing one particular framework to inform my interpretation of the data. Using Gee's (2005) theories about how discourse (specifically as in terms of how it is linked with recognition work) has provided me with a greater understanding of how the discourse of morning announcements works in several ways. Essentially principals use this discourse to position themselves as a

particular *who* (the head administrator) doing a particular *what* (delivering morning announcements) in a particular *where* (at school first thing in the morning). When principals use language, and a particular structure of delivery for morning announcements their listeners recognize them as a particular type of person who is actively engaged in a recognizable activity. When all this comes together, so that students recognize the principal at work, the principals have been successful at using the “big D” Discourse of principals doing the work of morning announcements. What is impossible to determine is what comes first – the discourse or the recognition work. Their use of language in morning announcements not only positions each principal in the social order (so they can be identified as the principal) their use of language also shapes how the “big D” discourse of morning announcements is being continuously transformed. That is, as principals continue to deliver morning announcements over a long period of time, the discourse considered appropriate to this practice continuously evolves.

Gee’s (2005) framework of discourse analysis has also been particularly illuminating in that it has helped me to understand more about how the discourse of each principal works to construct a unique “principal” identity. His theories about discourse and his methodology of discourse analysis have provided me with a thought provoking framework so that the building tasks of identity and relationship are the primary focus for my analysis of the data. I found it remarkable how across a wide variety of themes the principals use language to construct a consistent and unique identity; either that of the director, CEO or coach. (It is important to note that another researcher may have used other roles to describe these identities. My use of the identities of director, CEO and coach are constructed as a result of my own history and experiences within school and work settings.)

6.3 Primary Conclusions

In examining my primary research questions (What might be revealed by a closer look at the discourse used by principals during morning announcements? What elements are present in morning announcements? What purpose do they serve?) I have found the data to be surprisingly rich in examples that suggest that the discourse of morning announcements does more than just share information. Essentially my analysis has led to the following primary conclusions:

- 1) As a persistent practice within elementary schools, the delivery of morning announcements is a significant yet overlooked practice.
- 2) Principals use a common structure when delivering morning announcements, underlining the concept of ruling relations at work.
- 3) Principals not only use discourse in morning announcements to share information. They simultaneously use this discourse to construct and maintain (either consciously or unconsciously) a “principal” identity.
- 4) The data suggest that each principal constructs a unique “principal” identity (the director, the CEO and the coach) to signal the nature of the relationship each principal wishes to create with their students.
- 5) Through the discourse of morning announcements students are exposed to significant models of leadership. For this reason it is an important discourse that demands careful consideration.

6.4 Significance

These conclusions essentially underscore the need for principals to pay closer attention to how they participate in the everyday school practice of delivering morning announcements. Those who overlook this practice and limit their understandings of it (to chiefly an information-sharing exercise) miss an important opportunity to create an identity that shows listeners (particularly students) that they genuinely wish to connect with students. Currently the administrative workload of most principals has increased to such an extent that it is rare to see

the principals interacting with students in a prolonged and meaningful way. In some cases hearing the voice of the principal during morning announcements is the only time during the day when an individual student might be directly addressed by the principal. If principals are interested in connecting with students in a significant way, they would be wise to consider how this can be accomplished through the discourse they use during morning announcements.

The principals who overlook the significance of this practice also miss an opportunity to understand how they can use the discourse of morning announcements to provide a positive leadership model for students. The role of the principal was traditionally considered that of head or lead teacher (Quinn, 2002). Indeed, in order to be considered for the position, principals were (and still are) required to hold a teaching degree to demonstrate that they have significant teaching experience and an understanding of the particular challenges that face both students and teachers in the divisions where they hope to work. To honour this tradition, and the significant work that principals do beyond administrative tasks, principals need to consider how morning announcements offer an important opportunity to model leadership and teach significant leadership values.

Principals at elementary schools provide children with a significant (often their first) model of leadership within institutional settings. Essentially, through their exposure to principals, students learn how leadership works; they come to understand how leadership is constructed and exercised. What are students learning about leadership and their own potential as leaders through the principal's discourse during morning announcements? A principal's discourse might exemplify communicative and compassionate forms of stewardship, or it might illustrate dictatorial, despotic modes of leadership. Each discourse has a great impact on what students learn about leadership and how they choose to lead. Simply providing strong leadership is not necessarily the goal. After all, strong leadership takes many forms. (Think for a moment the

different values that come to mind for recognizable leaders like: Ghandi, Stalin, Mandela, Bin laden, Thatcher, Elizabeth I, Pearson...)

Principals would be wise to consider how they might engage their students (and, indeed, all staff in their schools) in dialogue so that all members of the school are encouraged to participate and model diverse forms of positive leadership. Just as the notion of the teacher as the “sage on the stage” has long been rejected in favour of the teacher as the “guide on the side” (Hadden, 2007, ¶ 6), principals need to explore new ways of providing meaningful leadership within schools.

I believe an examination of the discourse used in morning announcements offers an opportunity for principals to reflect on how they choose to lead. In using morning announcements to model leadership, principals would be prudent to pay attention to what unique identity they adopt. Does the identity they construct promote a relationship of mutual respect, openness and trust among themselves and students or does it generate fear, blind obedience and mistrust towards authority? Does this identity encourage students to approach principals with their problems and challenges as well as share their successes and solutions?

Finally, by considering the significant work that morning announcements can accomplish, principals would better grasp what values they model and emulate. In becoming more aware of the discourse they use during morning announcements principals may discover that the values they wish to encourage are not necessarily reflected in their discourse. A brief return to the three themes investigated in the data (Safety/Rules, Personal Connection and Spiritual Education) helps to illustrate this point.

If principals believe that schools are places where students learn through discovery (much of which occurs when learners take risks) how is this manifested in the safety messages that are a routine part of their morning announcements? Is the underlying message about safety one that

discourages (indeed forbids) students from discovering their limits and taking reasonable risks? Does using an authoritative tone for safety messages imply that any risk taking leads to danger? Does it also imply that students cannot be trusted to judge what risks may or may not be reasonable? If a principal wishes to promote inclusiveness by encouraging all members of the community through personal connections, how is this supported if sports teams are the only groups that are consistently singled out for praise? Does this create an elite community of athletes and ignore the attempts of those who are not as skilled? Finally, significant in Catholic schools is the value placed on the need to grow into a deeper understanding of faith in an authentic way through spiritual education. How does the discourse used by principals model authentic approaches to this growth beyond scripted recitation or responses? What models of significant spiritual approaches to prayer might be missing (questioning, silent reflection, humour)? What images of God are encouraged, discouraged or forbidden?

6.5 Validity

As a researcher, I am, of course, ultimately concerned with establishing my analysis as accurate and truthful (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004) so that the validity of my research is confirmed. Gee contends that a study that includes discourse analysis is determined more (or less) valid in terms of how the researcher includes analysis that incorporates the following four elements: convergence, linguistic details, coverage, and agreement (Gee, 2005, p. 113). In undertaking this discourse analysis, I have argued that certain data (in this case the words spoken by principals during morning announcements that are documented in the transcripts) support a given theme or point (principals use morning announcements to do more than share information; they specifically use them to create a unique “principal” identity and maintain a relationship with their students).

For Gee, the concepts of convergence and linguistic details are the most important aspects to consider when determining validity. The concept of convergence refers to how thoroughly the analysis considers the questions around how language performs building tasks and how often the answers converge in a way that is “compatible or convincing” (Gee, 2005, p. 113). In short, determining convergence demands that the researcher demonstrate that the analysis points to consistent conclusions about the data and that these conclusions are based on a consideration of several building tasks. My analysis of the data supports, time and again, the conclusion that principals use language to build a unique “principal” identity. In considering Gee’s thinking points and related questions regarding several building tasks (including Activities, Identity, Relationship and Politics or the valuing of social goods) I was struck by how the data repeatedly suggests that each principal uses language that points toward the creation of a unique and recognizable identity. This manifests itself not only in terms of how principals use language in order to be recognized as acting in the role of principal (as in head leader or administrator), it is also evident in how the principals use language to establish a unique “principal” identity, in this data manifested by the roles of the director, CEO or coach.

While Gee admits that no work in discourse analysis can or should ask all possible questions or seek all possible sources of agreement (Gee, 2005, p. 114), he believes that it is important that the data is covered in a thorough manner. Endeavouring to document a significant number of linguistic details is important. While the scope of this study does not allow an exhaustive coverage of all linguistic elements (indeed Gee concedes that no analysis should do this) I have provided a detailed examination of linguistic elements to underscore my conclusions about the construction of three consistent “principal” identities. My research details a variety of linguistic elements, including an examination of the overall structure of this discourse as it is revealed through the repetition of themes and elements. I have included an examination of

language choice, pronoun use, and the repetition of key phrases and motifs within several themes.

This brings me to a consideration of coverage; Gee's notion that an analysis is more valid the more it can be applied to related sorts of data. This includes being able to place the data analysis in the wider context of what has come before and after the situation being analysed. The initial coding of the data provided me with an opportunity to examine where themes occurred and re-occurred within the data so that concepts could be examined in a variety of instances. The consideration of Personal Connection themes provided a particularly solid opportunity for coverage in that the data with Personal Connection themes occurred in several places throughout the transcripts. This provided an opportunity to review this theme in several instances including Birthday Greetings, Team Sports, and the Welcoming/Identification of Readers. When themes occurred in only a few instances (as in Safety or Spiritual Education) the strength of my analysis rests on my efforts to examine these themes in terms of the commonalities and differences occurring among the data from all three principals. That is, by comparing the data from three schools I was able to document common themes and unique elements to underscore my conclusion about how principals use language to construct a "principal" identity.

Before turning to Gee's concept of agreement, it is important to note that a challenge inherently lies in the fact that my consideration of validity, at this point in my research, is an individual and isolated endeavour. That is, my consideration of validity is somewhat limited in that I have not yet shared my thesis with the research and education communities. Gee (2005) points out that validity is social not individual; that is, other researchers must be called into the conversation with the data to revise, support or challenge conclusions. For this reason responding to Gee's notion of agreement is difficult. For Gee, agreement refers to the extent to which "native speakers" of the social languages in the data or "members" of the Discourse

community agree that the data reflects how the discourses actually occur and function within the context of where they take place (Gee, 2005, p. 113). Since this is the first instance where the discourse of morning announcements has been thoroughly analysed in a research project, the notion of agreement is yet to be tested.

It is important, however, to acknowledge that initial analysis and conversations about this data took place within a research community whose members were familiar with the context and culture of the discourse. I am indebted to the original research team that helped to gather the data. This research team (consisting of members of the teaching community where the morning announcements took place) reviewed the data for accuracy and discussed initial ideas and concepts. In proceeding towards a Master's thesis the data transcripts were also reviewed for accuracy by the participating principals. I look forward to including them and others in the research community, in further conversation about the conclusions that I have reached in this thesis.

6.6 Questions for Further Thought

Principals demonstrate that they value the practice of using the PA system to deliver morning announcements through their consistent commitment to participating in it; most principals choose to participate in this activity everyday. This practice is also significant in that it provides principals with their first opportunity to communicate with their students each day. In encouraging a closer look at morning announcements, my point is not to overwhelm principals into a paralysing state of second guessing themselves each morning when they approach the PA system. My primary intent is to encourage principals to consider three key questions:

- What identity (ies) am I adopting through my discourse during morning announcements? What other building tasks are at work in the construction of this identity?
- What kind of relationship do I wish to establish with my students through my discourse during morning announcements?
- What are the key values that my discourse during morning announcements promotes?

While there are many ways that principals might construct their identity as school leaders throughout the school day (from the way they dress to their visible interactions with members of the school community) my analysis of morning announcement data concludes that using the PA system is a significant practice that helps principals do the work of establishing a unique “principal” identity. I believe principals would be wise to consider this, whether or not they choose to begin morning announcements with that familiar phrase: “May I have your attention please?”

References

- Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Inc.
- Andre Becheley, L. N. (1999). To know otherwise: A study of the social organization of parents work for public school choice. (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles).
- Barnes, D. (1969). Language in the secondary classroom. In D. Barnes, J. Britton & H. Rosen (Eds.), *Language the learner and the school* (2nd Ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Barnes, D., Britton, J., & Rosen, H. (Eds.). (1971). *Language, the learner and the school* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Barth, R. (2002). The culture builder. *Educational leadership*, 59 (8) 6-11.
- Bazeli, M., J., & Heints, J., L. (1997). *Technology across the curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Libraries Unlimited.
- Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, H. M., Hyman, R. T., & Smith, F. L. (Eds.). (1966). *The language of the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Black, R. (2007). Digital design: English language learners and reader reviews in online fiction. In M. Knobel & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *A new literacies sampler* (pp. 115-136). New York: Peter Lang.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986, January 1). *The effective school principal: Perspectives of school leadership*. Second Edition. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED283274) Retrieved October 18, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Bogotch, I. E., & Roy, C. B. (1994). Communicative interaction: a discourse analysis of school leadership in practice. *Journal of Management Systems*, 6 (4) 45-60.
- Bogotch, I. E., & Roy, C. B. (1997). The contexts of partial truths: An analysis of principals' discourse. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35, 234-52. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ552034&site=ehost-live>

- Bredeson, P. (1987, January 1). Principally speaking: An analysis of interpersonal communications of school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 25(1), 55-71. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ367323) Retrieved October 18, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Brown, B., Reveles, J. & Kelly, G. (2005, September 1) Scientific literacy and discursive identity: A theoretical framework for understanding science learning. *Science Education*, 89(5), 779-802. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ759940) retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, T., & McNamara, O. (2005). *New teacher identity and regulative governments: The discursive formation of primary mathematics*. New York: Springer.
- Browne-Ferringno, T. (2003, January 1). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 468-503. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ674610) Retrieved October 18, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Bushnell, M. (2003). Teachers in the schoolhouse panoptic. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(3), 251-272. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <https://eus.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/3/251>
- Campbell, M. (1988). Management as ruling: A class phenomenon of nursing. *Studies in Political Economy*, 27, 29-51.
- Campbell, M. (1992). Nurses' professionalism: A labour process analysis. *International Journal of Health Services*, 22, 751-65.
- Campbell, M. (1995). Teaching accountability: What counts in nursing education. In M. Campbell, & A. Manicom (Eds.), (pp. 221-33). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Campbell, M., & Gregor, F. (2002). *Mapping social relations: A primer in doing institutional ethnography*. Aurora, ON: Garamond Press.

- Cazden, C., John, V., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Chimobo, M., & Roseberry, R. (1998). *The power of discourse an introduction to discourse analysis*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clarke, M. (2008). *Language teacher identities: Co-constructing discourse and community*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). Classroom interaction. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *An introduction to discourse analysis* (pp. 93-115). London: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Davies, B., & Corson, D. (1997). *Oral discourse and education*. Encyclopedia of language and education, v. 3. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- De Vault, M., & McCoy, L. (2002). Institutional ethnography: Using interviews to investigate ruling relations. In J. A. Gubrium, & J. A. Holsein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 751-776). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- deMontigny, G. (1995). *Social working: ethnography of front-line practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Diamond, T. (1992). *Making gray gold: Narratives of nursing home care*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analysing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3 - 65). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in high school*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

- Edwards, A., & Furlong, V. (1978). *The language of teaching: Meaning in classroom interaction*. London: Heinemann.
- Elovitz, L. (2001, February). The sanctity of the classroom. *Principal Leadership*, 1(6), 5-7. Retrieved November 10, 2008, from Research Library database. (Document ID: 69698789).
- Elovitz, L. (2002, January 1). Let's cut out all those classroom interruptions. *Principal*, 81(5), 57-58. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ642997) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Everett, P., National Association of Secondary School Principals, R., & Others, A. (1992, January 1). Middle Level Spirit/Service Projects. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED354099) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC data base.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). The discourse of new labour: Critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 229 - 267). London: Sage.
- Flaherty, K., (1999, November). Local school set to hit the airwaves [Seaway District High School, Iroquois}. *Update*, 27(5), 4. Retrieved November 27, 2008, from CBCA Education Database.(Document ID:413743101).
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analysing teacher behaviour*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Folta, S., Goldberg, J., Economos, C., Bell, R., Landers, S., & Hyatt, R. (2006, November 1). Assessing the use of public address systems to deliver nutrition messages to children: Shape up somerville - audio adventures. *Journal of School Health*, 76(9), 459-464. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ744610) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Forsyth, I.J. (1974). Patterns in the discourse of pupils and teachers in The Space Between *CLIT Reports and Papers* 10, 77-79.
- Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: Interaction as practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Gallagher, J. & Aschner M. (1963) A preliminary report on analyses of classroom interaction. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 9, 183-194.
- Gee, J. P. (1988). Discourse systems and aspirin bottles: On literacy. *Journal of Education*, 170(1), 27-40.
- Gee, J. P. (1997). Foreword: A discourse approach to language and literacy. In C. Lankshear (Ed.), *Changing literacies*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P. & Green, J.L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 119-169. Retrieved October 3, 2008 from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0091-732X%281998%2923%3C119%3ADALASP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4>
- Georgakoulou, A. (1997). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1984, January 1). Rethinking the language of schooling. *Language Arts* 81 (1), 33-40.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ291278) Retrieved November 15, 2008 from ERIC database.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face work. *Psychiatry*, 18, 213-31.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 1-17.
- Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S., F. (1993, January 1). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363917) Retrieved November 15, 2008 from ERIC database.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1996). Informings and announcements in their environment: Prosody within multi-activity work settings. In Couper-Kuhlen E., & Selting M. (Eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies* (pp. 436-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Government of Ontario. (1990). Opening and Closing Exercises at Schools, Education Act U.S.C. 304 (1990). Retrieved from http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90e02_e.htm#BK539
- Grady, M., & Nebraska Univ., L. (2004, January 8). *20 Biggest Mistakes Principals Make and How to Avoid Them*. Corwin Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED495517) Retrieved February 6, 2009, from ERIC database.
- Green, T., D., & Brown, A. (2002). *Multimedia projects in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Greenfield, W. (1988). Moral imagination, interpersonal competencies and the work of school administrators. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools* (pp. 207-32). Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Griffith, A. I. (1984). Ideology, education and single parent families: The normative ordering of families through schooling. (PhD, University of Toronto).
- Griffith, A. I. (1992). Educational policy as text and action. *Educational Policy*, 6, 415-28.
- Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (1988). *Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Pub.
- Gronn, P. C. (1983). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(1), 1-21. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ276384&site=ehost-live>
- Gumpertz, J. J., & Herasimchuk, E. (1972). The conversational analysis of social meaning: A study of classroom interaction. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Current trends and prospects* (). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Haas, J. (1983). Developing a businesslike school environment-A key to success. *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(459), 16-20. doi:10.1177/019263658306745904.

- Hadden, K. (2007 December). How principals build capacity. *ATA Magazine*, 88(2), 12-15. Retrieved November 10, 2008, from CBCA Education Data base. (Document ID1413191491).
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. (2003). *The collected works 3 On language and linguistics*. London [u.a.]: Continuum.
- Hamilton, P. (1997, January 1). The morning announcements. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 24(7), 20-21. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. EJ544734) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Hancock, M., & Lamendola, B. (2005, March). A leadership journey. *Educational Leadership*, 62(6), 74-78. Retrieved October 18, 2008, from Education Research Complete database.
- Harrison, R. (1983 April 1). A descriptive study of the perceived influence of institutional interruptions on the morale and work of teachers and pupils in elementary schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231041) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Hassenpflug, A. (1985, January 1). Is anyone out there listening? *C.S.P.A.A. Bulletin*, 42(3), 1-4. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ313466) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Heath, S. B. (1978). *Teacher talk: Language in the classroom*. Washington: Center For Applied Linguistics.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hopkins, G. (2008). Good morning! A.M. announcements build school community. *Education World*, Retrieved Oct 10, 2008 from http://www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin/admin351.shtml.
- Hutto, J. R., & Criss, G. D. (1993). Principal, finesse your way to instructional leadership. *Nassp Bulletin*, 77(553), 8-11. doi:10.1177/019263659307755303

- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Khayatt, D. (1995). Compulsory heterosexuality: Schools and lesbian students. In M. Campbell, & A. Manicom (Eds.), *Knowledge, experience and ruling relations* (pp. 149-63). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kinsman, G. (1989). Official discourse as sexual regulation: The social organization of the sexual policing of gay men. (PhD, University of Toronto).
- Kmetz, J., & Willower, D. (1982, January 1). Elementary school principals work behaviour. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 62-78. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ272626) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: The politics of language in our lives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research: From design to implementation*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Letihwood K., & Jantuzi C. (1990). Transformational leadership: how principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. 1 (4), 249-280.
- Leonard, L. (1995, January 1). Towards maximising instructional time: The nature and extent of externally imposed classroom interruptions. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(5), 454-74. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED460119) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Leonard, L. (2001, November 1). Erosion of instructional time: Teacher concerns. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED460119) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Leonard, L. (2003). Optimising by minimising: Interruptions and the erosion of teaching time. *Journal of Educational Inquiry*, 4(2), 15-29. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <http://www.literacy.unisa.edu.au/jee/papers/JEEVol1No2?paper.pdf>.

- Martin, W., & Willower, D. (1981, January 1). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 69-90. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ243926) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Conducting educational research. Buckingham: Open University.
- Mayr, A. (2008). *Language and power: An introduction to institutional discourse*. London: Continuum.
- McHoul, A. (1978) The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7, 182-213.
- Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Volume 3 ed., pp. 120 - 131). New York: Academic Press.
- Michaels S. (1981). Sharing time children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10, 423-43.
- Miller Marsh, M. (2002a). Examining the discourses that shape our teacher identities. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32(4), 453-469.
- Miller Marsh, M. (2002b). The shaping of ms. nicholi: The discursive fashioning of teacher identities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(3), 333-347. Retrieved January 29, 2009, doi:10.1080/09518390210122809
- Miller Marsh, M. (2003). *The social fashioning of teacher identities*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Morand D. (2000) Language and power: An empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used in superior-subordinate communication. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(3), 235. Retrieved November 17,2008 from SocINDEX database.
- Mykhalovskiy, E. (2000). Knowing health care/ governing health care: Exploring health services research as social practice. (PhD, York University).

- Mykhalovskiy, E., & Smith, G. W. (1994). *Getting hooked up: A report on the barriers people living with HIV/AIDS face assessing social services*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nagy Hesse Birber, Sharlene, & Leavy, P. (2006). *The practice of quantitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ng, R. (1996). *The politics of community services: Immigrant women, class and state*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.
- Northey, M., Tepperman, L., & Russell, J. (2002). *Making sense: A student's guide to research and writing*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Parada, H. (1998). Restructuring families and children in the child welfare bureaucracy. Presented at the conference exploring the restructuring and transformation of Institutional processes: Applications of Institutional Ethnography, October, York University, Toronto.
- Parkay, F., & Hall, G. (1992). *Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Peyton-Young, J. (2004). Cultural models and discourse of masculinity: Being a boy in a literacy classroom. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 173-206). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Inc.
- Phillips, L., & Jorgensen, M., W. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pierson P., & Bredeson P. (1993, January 1). It's not just a laughing matter: School principals' use of humour in interpersonal communications with teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3(5), 522-33. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ466909) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Preece, C. (2006). Stomping out bullying through a health promoting schools approach: A success story. *Physical and Health Education Journal*. 72(1), 24-25. (Document ID: 1474657431) Retrieved November 10, 2008 from CBCA Education database.

- Quinn, D. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 447-467. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/09578230210440294>
- Rampton, B., Roberts, C., Leung, C., & Harris, R. (2002). Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(3), 373-92. Retrieved from <http://appliedjournals.org/cgi/reprint/23/3/373>
- Reitzug U. (1999, January 1). Principal teacher interactions in instructionally effective and ordinary elementary schools. *Urban Education*, 24 (1), 38-58. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. EJ390051) Retrieved November 10, 2008 from ERIC database.
- Reitzug, U., & Burrello, L. (1995, January 1). How principals can build self-renewing schools. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 48-50. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. EJ502911) Retrieved November 10, 2008 from ERIC database.
- Roffey, S. (2007) Transformation and emotional literacy, the role of school leaders in developing a caring community. *Leading Managing*, 13(1), 16-30. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <file://library.acer.edu.au/document/?document> id=160926
- Rogers, R. (Ed.). (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Inc.
- Rousmaniere, K. (1997, January 1). City teachers: Teaching and school reform in historical perspective. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420559) Retrieved November 10, 2008, from ERIC database.
- Santoro, N. (1997). The construction of teacher identity: An analysis of school practicum discourse. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Mar97, 25(1), 91. Retrieved from <http://msvu-resolver.asin-risa.ca/?genre=article&volume=25&issue=1&spage=91&aulast=Santoro&aufirst=Ninetta&title=Asia-Pacific+Journal+of+Teacher+Education,+Mar97&atitle=The+construction+of+teacher+identity%3A+An+analysis+of+school+practicum+discourse>.

- Schriffin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Schwandt, T. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The english used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, D. (1995). Assessing treatments: Managing the AIDS epidemic in ontario. In M. Campbell, & A. Manicom (Eds.), *Knowledge, experience and ruling relations* (pp. 18-34). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. (1999). *Writing the social: Theory, critique, investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Oxford: Altimira Press.
- Smith, D. (2006). *Institutional ethnography as practice*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Smith D. (2008). Institutional Ethnography: Online Resource and Discussion. url: <http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/mdevault> , accessed 10/13/08).
- Soreside, G. E. (2006). Narrative construction of teacher identity: Positioning and negotiation. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(5), 527-547.
- Spence, C., M. (2004). *On task! on time! on a mission! A year in the life of a middle school principal*. Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Starratt, R., J. (1995). *Leaders with vision: The quest for social renewal*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Stock, A. (2000). An ethnography of assessment in elementary schools. (PhD, University of Toronto).

- Stubbs, M. (1976). *Language schools and classrooms*. London: Methuen.
- Taber, N. (2007). *Ruling relations, warring and mothering: Writing the social from the everyday life of a military mother*. Unpublished PhD, University of South Australia, Adelaide.
- Tannen, D. (1987). Remarks on discourse and power. In L. Keder (Ed.), *Power through discourse* (pp. 3-10). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Thomas, A. (2007). Blurring and breaking through the boundaries of narrative, literacy, and identity in adolescent fan fiction. In M. Knobel, & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *A new literacies sampler* (pp. 137-165). New York: Peter Lang.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Toronto Catholic District School Board Policy Register. (1992). Public Prayer, S.23 (1992).
Retrieved from <http://www.tcdsb.org/policyregister/S23.html>
- Tripp, R. L. (1985). Take a look at public address systems. *Nassp Bulletin*, 69(485), 121-122.
doi:10.1177/019263658506948528
- Tripp, R. L. (1986). Public address systems--can schools function without them? *NASSP Bulletin*, 70(488), 105-07. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ334246&site=ehost-live>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. New York: Academic press.
- Van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching*. London (Ontario): Althouse Press.
- Vann, A. S. (1994). That vision thing. *Principal*, 74(2), 25-26. Retrieved from
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ492877&site=ehost-live>

- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. London: Sage.
- Whitaker, T., Whittaker, B., & Lumpa, B. (2000). *Motivating and inspiring teachers; the educational leader's guide for building staff morale*. Larchmount, NY: Eye on Education.
- Young, P. (2004). *You have to go to school –You're the principal! 101 tips to make it better for your students, your staff and yourself*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Young, P. & Connelley, G. (2007). *Promoting positive behaviours*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

APPENDIX A - FIRST DRAFT OF DATA TRANSCRIPTS

III/2008/01/31

START TIME: 9:09.00 A.M

END TIME: 9:15.07 A.M.

- (III)D4.001-P: Good morning (*name of school*)ers. It is a coolish day for sure. Let's all stand up, shake our tail-feathers and sing O Canada. (6 second delay)
(O Canada plays: English lyrics)
- (III)D4.002-P: And if you could please remain standing for the saying of the Lord's Prayer - a prayer, as they say, that Jesus taught us and one that, as they say, if we live it in our hearts every day of our lives, would be better and so would every (*school name*)ers. So, let's begin now and carefully say the Our Father, with all my friends down here.
- (III)D4.003-P: In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day, our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. Amen. In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.
- (III)D4.004-P: Please sit down now, boys and girls. A::nd, now we have a beautiful psalm from (*student name*), right? Our good friend (*student name*) from (*teacher name*)'s class. Let's listen carefully to (*student name*) reading that he brings to us from the Holy Bible.
- (III) D4.005-C: A reading from the Philippians Chapter 4 verses 4 to 7. A reading of the letter of St. Paul to the Philippians; Brothers and sisters rejoice in the Lord always. Again, I will say rejoice. By your gentleness, let it be known to everyone. The Lord is near. Do not worry about anything, but everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your request be made known to God. And the peace of God which surpasses all understandings will guide your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus. The word of the Lord.

APPENDIX B - SECOND DRAFT OF DATA TRANSCRIPTS (THEME MARKERS)

III/2008/01/31

START TIME: 9:09.00 A.M

END TIME: 9:15.07 A.M.



(III)D4.001-P:

Good morning (*name of school*)ers. It is a coolish day for sure. Let's all stand up, shake our tail-feathers and sing O Canada.

(6 second delay)

(O Canada plays: English lyrics)



(III)D4.002-P:

And if you could please remain standing for the saying of the Lord's Prayer - a prayer, as they say, that Jesus taught us and one that, as they say, if we live it in our hearts every day of our lives, would be better and so would every (*school name*)ers. So, let's begin now and carefully say the Our Father, with all my friends down here.



(III)D4.003-P:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day, our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. Amen. In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.



(III)D4.004-P:

Please sit down now, boys and girls. A::nd, now we have a beautiful psalm from (*student name*), right? Our good friend (*student name*) from (*teacher name*)'s class. Let's listen carefully to (*student name*) reading that he brings to us from the Holy Bible.

(III) D4.005-C:

A reading from the Philippians Chapter 4 verses 4 to 7. A reading of the letter of St. Paul to the Philippians; Brothers and sisters rejoice in the Lord always. Again, I will say rejoice. By your gentleness, let it be known to everyone. The Lord is near. Do not worry about anything, but everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your request be made known to God. And the peace of God which surpasses all understandings will guide your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus. The word of the Lord.

APPENDIX C - THIRD DRAFT OF DATA TRANSCRIPTS (PRONOUN MARKERS)

III/2008/01/31

START TIME: 9:09.00 A.M

END TIME: 9:15.07 A.M.



(III)D4.001-P:

Good morning (*name of school*)ers. It is a coolish day for sure. **Let's** all stand up, shake our tail-feathers and sing O Canada.
(6 second delay)
(O Canada plays: English lyrics)



(III)D4.002-P:

And if **you** could please remain standing for the saying of the Lord's Prayer - a prayer, as they say, that Jesus taught **us** and one that, as they say, if **we** live it in our hearts every day of our lives, would be better and so would every (*school name*)ers. So, **let's** begin now and carefully say the Our Father, with all my friends down here.



(III)D4.003-P:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day, our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. Amen. In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.



(III)D4.004-P:

Please sit down now, boys and girls. A::nd, now **we** have a beautiful psalm from (*student name*), right? Our good friend (*student name*) from (*teacher name*)'s class. **Let's** listen carefully to (*student name*) reading that he brings to **us** from the Holy Bible.

(III) D4.005-C:

A reading from the Philippians Chapter 4 verses 4 to 7. A reading of the letter of St. Paul to the Philippians; Brothers and sisters rejoice in the Lord always. Again, I will say rejoice. By your gentleness, let it be known to everyone. The Lord is near. Do not worry about anything, but everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your request be made known to God. And the peace of God which surpasses all understandings will guide your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus. The word of the Lord.

APPENDIX D - AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (ASA) CODE OF ETHICS
(from, Esterberg, 2002.pp-228 – 231)

12. Informed Consent

Informed consent is a basic ethical tenet of scientific research on human populations. Sociologists do not involve a human being as a subject in research without the informed consent of the subject or the subject's legally authorized representative, except as otherwise specified in this Code. Sociologists recognize the possibility of undue influence or subtle pressures on subjects that may derive from researchers' expertise or authority, and they take this into account in designing informed consent procedures.

12.01 Scope of Informed Consent

(a) Sociologists conducting research obtain consent from research participants or their legally authorized representatives (1) when data are collected from research participants through any form of communication, interaction, or intervention; or (2) when behavior of research participants occurs in a private context where an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or reporting is taking place.

(b) Despite the paramount importance of consent, sociologists may seek waivers of this standard when (1) the research involves no more than minimal risk for research participants, and (2) the research could not practicably be carried out were informed consent to be required. Sociologists recognize that waivers of consent require approval from institutional review boards or, in the absence of such boards, from another authoritative body with expertise on the ethics of research. Under such circumstances, the confidentiality of any personally identifiable information must be maintained unless otherwise set forth in 11.02(b).

(c) Sociologists may conduct research in public places or use publicly-available information about individuals (e.g., naturalistic observations in public places, analysis of public records, or archival research) without obtaining consent. If, under such circumstances, sociologists have any doubt whatsoever about the need for informed consent, they consult with institutional review boards or, in the absence of such boards, with another authoritative body with expertise on the ethics of research before proceeding with such research.

(d) In undertaking research with vulnerable populations (e.g., youth, recent immigrant populations, the mentally ill), sociologists take special care to ensure that the voluntary nature of the research is understood and that consent is not coerced. In all other respects, sociologists adhere to the principles set forth in 12.01(a)-(c).

(e) Sociologists are familiar with and conform to applicable state and federal regulations and, where applicable, institutional review board requirements for obtaining informed consent for research.

APPENDIX D (CONT.) – ASA CODE OF ETHICS

12.02 Informed Consent Process

(a) When informed consent is required, sociologists enter into an agreement with research participants or their legal representatives that clarifies the nature of the research and the responsibilities of the investigator prior to conducting the research.

(b) When informed consent is required, sociologists use language that is understandable to and respectful of research participants or their legal representatives.

(c) When informed consent is required, sociologists provide research participants or their legal representatives with the opportunity to ask questions about any aspect of the research, at any time during or after their participation in the research.

(d) When informed consent is required, sociologists inform research participants or their legal representatives of the nature of the research; they indicate to participants that their participation or continued participation is voluntary; they inform participants of significant factors that may be expected to influence their willingness to participate (e.g., possible risks and benefits of their participation); and they explain other aspects of the research and respond to questions from prospective participants. Also, if relevant, sociologists explain that refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation in the research involves no penalty, and they explain any foreseeable consequences of declining or withdrawing. Sociologists explicitly discuss confidentiality and, if applicable, the extent to which confidentiality may be limited as set forth in 11.02(b).

(e) When informed consent is required, sociologists keep records regarding said consent. They recognize that consent is a process that involves oral and/or written consent.

(f) Sociologists honor all commitments they have made to research participants as part of the informed consent process except where unanticipated circumstances demand otherwise as set forth in 11.02(b).

12.03 Informed Consent of Students and Subordinates

When undertaking research at their own institutions or organizations with research participants who are students or subordinates, sociologists take special care to protect the prospective subjects from adverse consequences of declining or withdrawing from participation.

APPENDIX D (CONT.) – ASA CODE OF ETHICS

12.04 Informed Consent with Children

(a) In undertaking research with children, sociologists obtain the consent of children to participate, to the extent that they are capable of providing such consent, except under circumstances where consent may not be required as set forth in 12.01(b).

(b) In undertaking research with children, sociologists obtain the consent of a parent or a legally authorized guardian. Sociologists may seek waivers of parental or guardian consent when (1) the research involves no more than minimal risk for the research participants, and (2) the research could not practicably be carried out were consent to be required, or (3) the consent of a parent or guardian is not a reasonable requirement to protect the child (e.g., neglected or abused children).

(c) Sociologists recognize that waivers of consent from a child and a parent or guardian require approval from institutional review boards or, in the absence of such boards, from another authoritative body with expertise on the ethics of research. Under such circumstances, the confidentiality of any personally identifiable information must be maintained unless otherwise set forth in 11.02(b).

12.05 Use of Deception in Research

(a) Sociologists do not use deceptive techniques (1) unless they have determined that their use will not be harmful to research participants; is justified by the study's prospective scientific, educational, or applied value; and that equally effective alternative procedures that do not use deception are not feasible; and (2) unless they have obtained the approval of institutional review boards or, in the absence of such boards, with another authoritative body with expertise on the ethics of research.

(b) Sociologists never deceive research participants about significant aspects of the research that would affect their willingness to participate, such as physical risks, discomfort, or unpleasant emotional experiences.

(c) When deception is an integral feature of the design and conduct of research, sociologists attempt to correct any misconception that research participants may have no later than at the conclusion of the research.

(d) On rare occasions, sociologists may need to conceal their identities in order to undertake research that could not practicably be carried out were they to be known as researchers. Under such circumstances, sociologists undertake the research if it involves no more than minimal risk for the research participants and if they have obtained approval to proceed in this manner from an institutional review board or, in the absence of such boards, from another authoritative body with expertise on the ethics of research. Under such circumstances, confidentiality must be maintained unless otherwise set forth in 11.02(b).

12.06 Use of Recording Technology

Sociologists obtain informed consent from research participants, students, employees, clients, or others prior to videotaping, filming, or recording them in any form, unless these activities involve simply naturalistic observations in public places and it is not anticipated that the recording will be used in a manner that could cause personal identification or harm.

APPENDIX E - FREE AND INFORMED CONSENT FORMS



Free and Informed Consent Form (for Student Researchers) Faculty of Education

Title of Study: May I Have Your Attention Please: Morning Announcements - Using Discourse Analysis to Examine an Everyday School Experience

Name of Researcher: Rebecca Cunningham

I am a graduate student currently pursuing a Masters Degree in Literacy in the Faculty of Education of Mount Saint Vincent University. As part of my Masters Thesis I am conducting research under the supervision of Dr. Andrew Manning and I am inviting you to participate in my study May I Have Your Attention Please - Examining Morning Announcements: Shaping Principal Identities in Elementary School. The purpose of this study is to investigate the shared themes present in morning announcements to examine how principals use these announcements to connect with students. More specifically I will examine how principals create for themselves (either consciously or unconsciously) a principal identity.

I am contacting you now to inquire if you will allow me to use the transcripts, which are in your possession of the audio recordings of five consecutive days of morning announcements at your school in February of 2008 for document analysis. If you agree to this you may remove anything that you wish from the data you own and forward me a copy. Confidentiality in the data transcripts has been insured by inserting the terms "student name," staff name," or "school name" where applicable so that no student, staff member or school will be identified in this research. Only the data, which you release to me, will be used for this research. You may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty and the data will be returned to you. By agreeing to hand over the data I will be able to use your data as part of document analysis for my reach towards a Master's thesis. I will keep a copy of the data that you send to me for two years after the completion of the thesis. After two years these copies will be shredded.

Upon completion, this thesis will be made available for reading by the education and research community. A copy of the final thesis will be made available to you with an opportunity to discuss the findings. Your participation is completely voluntary.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact:

Rebecca Cunningham: (██████████) - ██████████

Andrew Manning: (902) 457-6148 - andrew.manning@msvu.ca

I would like to assure you that this study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University Research Ethics Board at Mount Saint Vincent University. If you wish to speak with someone not directly involved in the study, you may contact the Chair of the University Research Ethics Board (UREB) c/o MSVU Research and International Office at (902) 457 6350 or via email at www.research@msvu.ca.

APPENDIX E (CONT.) – FREE AND INFORMED CONSENT FORMS



Free and Informed Consent Form (for Student Researchers) Faculty of Education

Title of Study: May I Have Your Attention Please: Morning Announcements - Using Discourse Analysis to Examine an Everyday School Experience

Name of Researcher: Rebecca Cunningham

By signing this consent from you are indicating that you fully understand the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Participant's Signature

Date:

Researcher's Signature

Date:

One signed copy to be kept by the researcher, one signed copy to the participant.

**APPENDIX F – TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD (TCDSB)
CONFIRMATION OF ETHICAL APPROVAL (COPY OF E-MAIL)**

Dear Rebecca,

Thank you for providing the revised consent letter for your study entitled, *May I Have Your Attention Please: Morning Announcements - Using Discourse Analysis to Examine an Everyday School Experience*

It is my understanding that this project is being completed as a requirement for your Master's degree and that it has been approved by your Supervisor and the Ethics Review Board of Mount Saint Vincent University.

As the data have already been collected and you are a teacher within TCDSB, please continue to complete your study as required by your university.

Following standard research practices, it is understood that you will obtain 'informed consent' of the Principal prior to using the transcripts, participation is voluntary, and that anonymity of individuals, schools and school board will be maintained when reporting publicly.

Best wishes for success in your study.

Marina

Dr. Marina Vanayan
Senior Coordinator, Educational Research
Toronto Catholic District School Board
80 Sheppard Avenue East
Toronto, Ontario M2N 6E8



APPENDIX G - ONTARIO EDUCATION ACT - OPENING AND CLOSING EXERCISES

(Taken from Part XIII of the Ontario Education Act - Behaviour, Discipline and Safety)

Opening and closing exercises at schools

304. (1) Every board shall ensure that opening or closing exercises are held in each school under the board's jurisdiction, in accordance with the requirements set out in the regulations. 2000, c. 12, s. 3.

Same

(2) The opening or closing exercises must include the singing of *O Canada* and may include the recitation of a pledge of citizenship in the form set out in the regulations. 2000, c. 12, s. 3.

Exceptions

(3) A pupil is not required to participate in the opening or closing exercises in such circumstances as are prescribed by regulation. 2000, c. 12, s. 3.

**APPENDIX H - TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD (TCDSB)
POLICY REGISTER (PRAYER IN SCHOOLS - S.23)**

TCDSB Policy Register

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS S.23

Date Approved: 17 Dec 92	Date of Review: 12 Sep 06	Dates of Amendment: Sep 98; 18 Feb 93
Cross Reference:		

Policy:

It is the policy of the Toronto Catholic District School Board that public prayer, involving students and staff, shall take place on a daily basis in all TCDSB schools.

Regulations:

1. The opening exercises of each school day (and closing exercises, where these are held) shall include public prayer which begins with the Sign of the Cross and shall include either the Lord's Prayer or the Hail Mary.
2. Both staff and students shall be encouraged and invited to take part in each school's daily public prayer, by
 - (a) reading/proclaiming the prayer or sections of it;
 - (b) helping compose the prayer or sections of it;
 - (c) providing musical accompaniment and/or singing, when appropriate.
3. Public prayer in TCDSB schools may be taken from either published formulas and formats or original compositions produced by staff and/or students. Prayers taken from published formulas will usually incorporate the Our Father and Hail Mary; however, other traditional common prayers of the church such as the Creeds, Glory Be, Memorare, et cetera, may be used as appropriate. All public prayer shall begin with the Sign of the Cross and conclude with a blessing appropriate to the theme, occasion or season.
4. School Principals shall also encourage classroom teachers to pray publicly with their students at times such as after recess or a period change, or at other appropriate times during the school day.