Abstract

A Grounded Theory Case Study Examining the Impact on Policy Actors of their Engagement and Interactions with Educational Policy Implementation Processes.

by Irfan Z. H. Sheikh

In the field of Education there appears to be a gap in the literature examining policy implementation process from the viewpoint of educational stakeholders. This thesis attempts to address that gap by examining the impact on site based policy actors of the implementation of a policy in the form of a new mathematics curriculum.

This dissertation endeavours to answer the question of how the interactions and engagement of policy actors with policy implementation processes are impacted by and impact such processes.

The research approach adopted is that of a case study using a Classic Grounded Theory Methodology. This approach permits the data to be approached from a conceptually neutral position, allowing theoretical understanding to be built from the concepts that emerge from the analysis. The theoretical model developed from this grounded theory analysis is then filtered through two conceptual lenses, social cognition and affect/emotion, to determine an understanding of their theoretical relevance to the interactions and engagement of policy actors with policy processes.

This study adds to the understanding of how policy processes unfold in a site based setting. In particular, it gives recognition to the affective responses of policy actors as they engage and interact with policy processes and how those responses may impinge on those processes.
A Grounded Theory Case Study Examining the Impact on Policy Actors of their Engagement and Interactions with Educational Policy Implementation Processes.

Submitted by

Irfan Zafrul Husain Sheikh

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

School of Education, Durham University, UK, March 2014
# Table of Contents

ABSTRACT 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES 7

LIST OF APPENDICES 8

DECLARATION 9

STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT 10

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 11

DEDICATION 12

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 13

1.1 Overview 13

1.2 Purpose of the Study 14

1.3 Background to the Research Question 14

1.4 The Research Question 15

1.5 Significance of the Research Study 16

1.6 Thesis Structure
   1.6.1 Literature Review 16
   1.6.2 Research Methodology 17
   1.6.3 Data Analysis and Research Findings 17
   1.6.4 Discussion 18

1.7 Summary to the Introduction 18

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW 20

2.1 Policy Implementation 20
   2.1.1 Introduction 20
   2.1.2 Implementation dynamics 20
   2.1.3 Sensemaking and Policy Implementation 31
## CHAPTER 3  RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Methodology Overview</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Research Context</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Locating the Case Study in Curriculum Policy</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Case Study Site</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Framing the Research Approach</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Research Paradigm</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Classic Grounded Theory</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>Methodological reflexivity: critiques and limitations</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Methodological Considerations and Research Procedures</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Ethical Issues</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Research Design Considerations</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.4</td>
<td>Interview Sampling</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Data Management &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.6</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.7</td>
<td>Theoretical Sampling</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.8</td>
<td>Theoretical Sensitivity</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.9</td>
<td>Procedural Challenges</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.10</td>
<td>Locating My Role Within The Research</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Methodological Tools</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Procedural Considerations</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>Coding &amp; Memo Writing as Methodological Tools</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2.1</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2.2</td>
<td>Memo Writing</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2.3</td>
<td>Memo Analysis and Category Formation</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Emergent Stakeholder Themes</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER 4  DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Analytical Foundations of Categories</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Professionally and Vocationally Vested</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Emotional Investment</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>System Integrity and Viability</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5</td>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.6</td>
<td>Retrenchment</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.7</td>
<td>Policy Legitimacy</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.8</td>
<td>Colleagially Connected</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.9</td>
<td>Ideological Repurposing</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.10</td>
<td>Social Inequity</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.11</td>
<td>Ethical Trust</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction
   5.1.1 Professional and Emotional Investment (PEI)
   5.1.2 Decisional Legitimacy (DL)
   5.1.3 Hierarchical Trust (HT)
   5.1.4 System Integrity and Viability (SIV)
   5.1.5 De-professionalization (DP)
   5.1.6 Identity Safeguarding (IS)

5.2 Core Concept – Affective Disruption

5.3 Core Concept – Theoretical Underpinnings to Policy Processes

5.4 Theoretical Foundations Locating the Core Concept

5.5 Study Limitations

5.6 Methodological Observations

5.7 Implications for Practice

5.8 Implications for Research

5.9 Study Significance

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Interview Questions

Appendix 2 – Sample Line by Line Coding of Transcripts

Appendix 3 a – Sample Codes Derived From Transcripts

Appendix 3 b – Sample Grouping of Codes

Appendix 4 a – Raw Memos from Transcripts

Appendix 4 b – Raw Memos Grouped by Category

Appendix 4 c – Analytical Memos Grouped by Concept

Appendix 4 d – Reflective Memos Grouped by Concept

Appendix 5 – Sample of Field Notes

Appendix 6 – Sample of Codes Grouped to Categories

Appendix 7 – Sample of Analytical Notes

Appendix 8 a – Code of Practice and Research Ethics

Appendix 8 b – Ethics and Data Protection Monitoring Form
List of Figures and Tables

List of Figures

1. Figure 2.1 page 42 – Core Affect (Russell 2003)
2. Figure 2.2 page 44 – Mediating Variables to Behavioural Responses (Bartunek et al. 2006)
3. Figure 2.3 page 49 – Emotions & Psychological Capital (Avey et al. 2008)
4. Figure 3.1 page 121 – Category Emergence: A Diagrammatic Heuristic
5. Figure 4.1 page 163 – Conceptual Map of Emergent Categories
6. Figure 5.1 page 177 – Model Developing the Core Concept

List of Figures

1. Table 3.1 page 119 – Validity Procedures (Creswell & Miller 2000)
2. Table 3.2 page 122 – Linking Codes & Themes to Category Identification
3. Table 3.3 page 124 – Emergent Properties of Categories
4. Table 4.1 page 138 – Positional Role (Ball et al. 2011b)
List of Appendices

1. Interview Questions p.195
2. Sample Line by Line Coding of Transcripts p.196
3. Codes
   a. Sample Codes Derived from Transcripts p.198
   b. Sample Grouping of Codes p.202
4. Analytical & Reflective memos
   a. Raw Memos from Transcripts p.204
   b. Raw Memos Grouped by Category p.215
   c. Analytical Memos Grouped by Concept p.226
   d. Reflective Memos Grouped by Concept p.233
5. Sample of Field Notes p.238
6. Sample of Codes Grouped to Categories p.242
7. Sample of Analytical Notes p.243
8. Durham Ethics Forms
   a. Code of Practice and Research Ethics p.247
   b. Ethics and Data Protection Monitoring Form p.250
   c. Ethical Approval Letter p.253
9. VSB Approval Process
   a. VSB Research Guidelines p.254
   b. VSB Checklist for Conducting Research p.256
   c. Informed Consent Letter p.258
   d. VSB Permission Letter p.260
Declaration

This thesis is the result of my own original research under the supervision of Professor Carl Bagley. This study and the work presented in it have not been published or offered previously in candidature at any other university. To the best of my knowledge, this thesis contains no material previously produced by another author, except where due reference is made.
Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and on the Internet, without prior written consent of the author.

Any and all information derived and/or cited from this thesis must be appropriately acknowledged.
Acknowledgements

The road to the completion of this thesis represents a marathon journey that has been marked with interesting challenges, that has precipitated considerable internal reflection and that has reached its final culmination with a sense of personal satisfaction. The completion of this journey would not have been made possible without the mentorship, encouragement and ongoing support of a number of individuals who kept me focussed on the grand scheme.

Prof. Carl Bagley, my thesis supervisor, whose wise words and thoughtful dissection of my work forced me to explore avenues that opened my intellectual thinking.

Ms. Anji Rae, my adjunct supervisor, whose perceptive critique of my writing permitted me to express and present my ideas and thoughts with greater clarity.

Dr. Faisal Ali, my fellow Doctoral companion and good friend, whose completion of his parallel journey encouraged me to stay the course and see it though to the end.

My SLT colleagues at two school sites, Mr. Gino Bondi, Mr. Thomas Harapnuick, Ms. Darlene Hughes and Mr. Greg Mar, for their understanding.

My father, Dr. Shakir Sheikh, whose faith in my successful completion of this venture was unshakeable.

And my wife Nina, whose steadfast patience and support throughout this lengthy journey was unconditional.

Thank you seems to be too little to say, yet it is said with great import and much sincerity.
Dedication

The work represented in this thesis is dedicated to my parents who have shaped who I am today and continue to influence who I may become tomorrow.

To my father Dr. Shakir Sheikh whose unending quest for knowledge is a constant source of inspiration and to my mother Mrs. Hazra Sheikh whose example taught me independence and self-reliance.
Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 Overview

Early manifestations of policy implementation research were primarily focused on understanding the "macro-implementation issues" (Odden 1991 p.3) of large scale system wide policy initiatives. Researchers operating within these parameters engaged the topic at a macro level (Berman and McLaughlin 1976, 1978, Berman 1978, Sabatier and Mazmanian 1979, 1980, Sabatier 1986, Laroque 1986, McLaughlin 1987) examining policy enactment processes from either top-down or bottom-up perspectives, where successful implementation was contingent upon the structural efficacy of such processes. As Odden (1991) observes understanding policy implementation cannot be limited to the simple notion of a “lack of capacity and will” (p.3) to comply with system wide mandated change, but needs to consider the multiplicity of factors impinging upon the implementation process. In this light over the past twenty years greater research attention has been focused on understanding policy processes in terms of the relationship to and impact on policy actors (Darling-Hammond 1990, McLaughlin 1990, 2006, Ball 1993, Spillane 2002, Honig 2004, 2006, Braun et al 2010, Ball et al 2011a, 2011b). This thesis attempts build on such approaches, in seeking to understand if, and how, the interactions, perceptions, attitudes and behaviours of individuals with policy processes in a school setting shape its implementation.

The theoretical framework for this study will draw on relevant understandings gained within the fields of management and behavioural psychology, along with emergent ideas from educational research, to elaborate an analytical understanding of the research question.

The remaining sections of this introductory chapter lay out the purpose, background and research question, followed by thoughts regarding the significance of the study. The final section of this chapter details the structure of the thesis.
1.2 Purpose of the Study

This study is of interest to me in my role as a member of a school leadership team with responsibilities for overseeing site based policy implementation. In my role I am aware that the policy environment within schools is characterized by complex relationships between the multiple actors that engage with policy processes. Within this context, teachers are charged with the primary responsibilities for site based policy implementation. Thus the ongoing interaction and engagement of teachers with policy processes bears critical examination in order to gain an understanding of how policy processes unfold. This study sets out to unpack this interaction and engagement in terms of its relationship to and impact on policy processes, by examining the implementation of a new mathematics curriculum at a secondary school in the province of British Columbia, Canada.

1.3 Background to the Research Question

In 2001 in British Columbia, Canada, the Liberal party espousing a right of centre political philosophy assumed power after ten years of left of centre governance by the New Democratic Party (NDP). As Chan et al (2007) contend in referring to BC educational policy, the Liberals undertook a transformation of the apparatus of government guided by the forces of neo-liberal thinking.

Political ideology is central to our interpretation of education and educational policies. In the case of British Columbia, we see a trend towards conservatism since 1988 and neoliberalism since 2000. As governments have limited the size of the public space in Canadian society, so too have the ideals of professionalism come under attack. (Chan et al 2007, p.11).

Chan et al (2007) further suggest that these ideologically based policy initiatives cast a large shadow in shaping new directions in educational policy.

The New Right ideology of the government since 2001 is having a substantial impact on school agents. The ideological perspective uses the language of flexibility, choice and accountability. We are observing a clear allocation and imposition of values on the system at every level. Reforms from 2001 to 2003 have seriously undermined the morale of teachers in the province. (Chan et al 2007, p.26).
Subsequent to consultation with educational stakeholders and in collaboration with other provincial governments, the BC Ministry of Education redeveloped the mathematics curriculum for the entire K-12 system, with implementation beginning for the junior grade levels in 2007.

The implementation for grades 10 to 12 commenced in 2010 with completion of the process to place over three years through to 2012. This study examines the implementation process for the new mathematics curriculum at a secondary school in Vancouver, British Columbia.

1.4 The Research Question

As noted earlier, teachers are the primary policy actors responsible for the enactment of or implementation of policy at a school level. As such, understanding the role of teacher in and their reaction to policy processes is critical to building an understanding how implementation plays out at the site level. This consideration leads me to an investigation of the following research question regarding the site based implementation of a new curriculum.

*How do the primary partners in mathematics education at Southside Secondary School perceive, understand and engage with the new Provincial Mathematics Curriculum and what does this perception, understanding and engagement bring to bear on the implementation process?*

In examining this research question, acknowledgement needs to be made that in their role as policy actors, teachers may be impinged upon by a host of factors shaping their perceptions and engagement that may not be overtly identifiable or immediately apparent. The investigative approach to this research question needs to afford me as the researcher the means to uncover such hidden factors and elaborate an understanding of their relationship to teachers’ responses to policy processes. To this end the adoption of a classic grounded theory (CGT, Glaser and Strauss 1967) methodology is presented as a useful approach for this research investigation. The inductive approach of CGT provides an analytical tool that identifies emergent concepts from the data, which
act as the structural foundations in building a theoretical explanation that addresses the research question.

1.5 Significance of the Research Study

This study purports to add to the understanding of the factors that influence and shape how policy is enacted and implemented in a school setting. Through consideration of the critical realist notion of mechanisms (Bhaskar 1975, 2008) this study endeavours to elaborate how the forces at play during policy processes impact and influence policy actors. Attention is focussed on building an understanding of emergent affective mechanisms arising from their interactions and engagement and how in turn these mechanisms reciprocally influence such interaction and engagement. This study thus builds on and adds to the research examining the affective and emotional dimensions influencing policy processes. By way of divergence however, this study departs from a focus on identification of the affective and emotional landscape within which policy actors operate, shifting instead towards locating and understanding the impact of the forces within that affective and emotional landscape.

1.6 Thesis Structure

The written structure of this thesis consists of five chapters, including this introductory chapter. Chapter 2 examines literature relevant to the scope of this study, chapter 3 elaborates the research methodology, chapter 4 unpacks the data analysis and lays out the research findings and finally chapter 5 presents a discussion of my findings.

1.6.1 Literature Review

The initial part of this chapter explores research in relation to the dynamics of policy implementation. The literature is examined in terms of its progression from structural considerations of policy implementation processes, towards research seeking to understand the contextual factors impinging upon policy actors during implementation.
The focus of the chapter then drills down into this latter notion of context, in considering the cognitive and affective/emotional factors that may influence and shape meaning and understanding for policy actors in their engagement with policy processes.

1.6.2 Research Methodology

The research methodology chapter elaborates the details of the research process.

The chapter begins by looking at contextual considerations framing the research study. Focus then shifts to locating the research paradigm that informs my ontological and epistemological approach to this study. Specifics regarding the use of the case study utilizing a classic grounded theory approach are subsequently examined, followed by consideration of the importance of methodological reflexivity to the research process.

Consideration then turns to a detailed account of the research methods employed, that includes an examination of all aspects of the research design for consistency with the case study and classic grounded theory approaches. Careful attention is then given to elaborating the process of coding and memo writing as important aspects of the classic grounded theory methodology.

The final part of the chapter presents the categories that emerged from the concurrent process of data collection and analysis associated with a classic grounded theory approach. While these categories are presented at the end of the chapter, they provided the foundation for ongoing additional data collection through the process of theoretical sampling.

1.6.3 Data Analysis and Research Findings

This chapter provides a detailed exposition of the analytical foundations of each of the eleven emergent categories presented at the conclusion of the methodology chapter. Samples of written memos are embedded within the text of the chapter, illustrating their contribution to the data analysis in terms of their analytical or reflective properties.
The chapter concludes with the presentation of a conceptual map of the eleven categories, leading to the articulation of six emergent concepts developed from the classic grounded theory analysis.

1.6.4 Discussion

The final chapter of this thesis draws together the analysis and research findings.

In considering the six emergent concepts, ideas examined in the literature review are folded into the discussion in terms of adding to the understanding of the development of each of these concepts. With the unfolding of this discussion, attention is turned to the theoretical relationships between the six concepts and a conceptual model built articulating those relationships in the form of a theoretical core concept framing an understanding of the impact of the interaction and engagement of policy actors with policy processes. Discussion of the core concept draws on theoretical support from conceptual formations examined in the literature review.

Discussion of the research findings then incorporates an examination of the limitations of the study and aspects of the methodology that bear re-examination or additional consideration.

The discussion then turns to a consideration of the implications of this study in terms of further research and in terms of implications for practice.

Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the significance of this thesis in terms of its contribution to adding to the understanding of how policy actors are impacted and influenced by their interactions and engagement with policy processes.

1.7 Summary to the Introduction

This introductory chapter has set out a roadmap for this thesis in providing an overview to the study and articulating its purpose. In
presenting the research question, this introduction has also elaborated the significance of the study and detailed the structure in which the thesis is presented.

Consideration in the following chapter now turns to a review of the literature pertinent to this study.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Policy Implementation

2.1.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss research literature examining the engagement by policy actors with policy processes and the possible impact of that engagement on policy implementation.

The research question under consideration seeks to understand how policy actors perceive, engage and interact with the process of implementation of a new mathematics curriculum at Southside Secondary in Vancouver, British Columbia and the implications of that perception, engagement and interaction.

The first part of the chapter lays out research examining the interactive nature of policy processes and how those interactions frame the dynamics of policy engagement and implementation. The latter part of the chapter focuses on the agency of policy actors, situating the theoretical lens of sensemaking as a heuristic to build an understanding of how policy actors react to and cope with those policy processes. Consideration is also given to the role of the affective aspects presented by emotions and their relationship to and impact on the cognitive process of sensemaking.

2.1.2 Implementation dynamics

Policy implementation processes at the local or school level are in essence processes of change management. Matland (1995) suggests that policy implementation occurs as either ‘top-down or bottom-up’ processes.

…top-down theorists see policy designers as the central actors and concentrate their attention on factors that can be manipulated at the central level. Bottom-up theorists emphasize target groups and service deliverers, arguing policy really is made at the local level. (Matland 1995 p.146).
Matland (1995) further argues that the adoption of either top-down or bottom up policy processes that create ambiguity and/or conflict influences how those policy processes are perceived by policy actors and how they evolve within the policy setting.

Earlier work (Larocque 1986, McLaughlin 1987) supports Matland’s (1995) argument for the need to consider the beliefs and assumptions held by policy actors, framing their engagement with policy processes.

Larocque (1986) argues that diverse groups of policy actors hold conflicting viewpoints, characterized as “technological”, “political” or “cultural” (p.497), shaped by their perspectives as to how policy processes should be conducted.

Larocque (1986) suggests that the technological viewpoint is framed by those groups holding hierarchical perspectives where policy actors are seen as “passive consumers” (p.497) who will conform to prescriptive processes framed by “rational and technical” arguments that “attempt to justify the proposed change” (p.498). Larocque (1986) frames the political viewpoint as the perspective held by policy actors whose engagement with policy processes is framed by groups. Larocque (1986) suggests that these policy actors work as a collective “in engaging in a power struggle” to advance the policy goals and interests of the group and redress the “balance of power” through bargaining and negotiation (p.498). Finally, Larocque’s (1986) cultural viewpoint suggests that diverse groups of policy actors demonstrate “beliefs, values, interest, norms and traditions may be so different” that policy processes must involve “mutual adaptation and clarification” (p.502) for the policy to be contextually meaningful for such groups. In essence, policy processes become negotiated spaces. Larocque’s (1986) argument underscores the idea that policy processes that do not account for a range of viewpoints encounter inherent tensions and challenges.
Consideration of these multiple dimensions is further advanced by McLaughlin (1987) in framing the integration of the opposing paradigms of macro-analytic and micro-analytic approaches as necessary to better understand policy processes. For McLaughlin (1987)

“Macro analyses operate at the level of the system. They stress regularities of process and organizational structures as stable outlines of the policy process and frame individual action in terms of position in a relational network. Microanalyses, conversely, operate at the individual level. They interpret organizational action as the problematic and often unpredictable outcome of autonomous actors, motivated by self-interest (p.177).

McLaughlin (1987) brings recognition to the dilemma of framing policy processes within one or other of these opposing paradigms, wherein macro analyses do not acknowledge localized policy contexts and micro analyses fail to incorporate system wide perspectives. The polarity of these positions leads McLaughlin (1987) to suggest that “The conceptual and instrumental challenge … lies in integrating these two communities of discourse in models that accommodate these multi-level multi-actor complexities” (p.177). This argument recognizes that policy implementation processes occur in a complex environment, in which a broad spectrum of policy actors determine the outcome contingent on their varying needs and interests. The underlying premise of individual self-interest creates a dynamic tension between compliance with and resistance to change, that requires mitigation through policy processes that create clarity and understanding for policy actors.

This analytic approach, accounting for the range of policy actors’ perspectives, is further refined by Darling-Hammond (1990), who contends that an understanding of the variation in engagement with policy processes at the local level is critical to its framing successful implementation. Darling-Hammond (1990) suggests that the prior knowledge and experience of policy actors frames their understanding of new policy and thus subsequently their interaction with implementation processes. In addition, it is noted that there exists a requirement for trusting, professional relationships between policy actors in order to create the credibility required for policy adoption.
It was not until researchers began to try to understand the local meanings of policy that they were able to begin to explain the phenomenon that Richard Elmore has called "the power of the bottom over the top" (Elmore, 1983). Those explanations ... have helped us to understand that top-down policies can "constrain but not construct" practice; that local leadership and motivations for change are critical to policy success; that local ideas and circumstances always vary (therefore local agencies must adapt policies rather than adopting them); and that teachers' and administrators' opportunities for continual learning, experimentation, and decision making during implementation determine whether policies will come alive in schools or fade away when the money or enforcement pressures end. (Darling-Hammond 1990 p.341).

For Darling-Hammond (1990), the acknowledgement and incorporation of prior knowledge of policy actors is essential for policy to be adopted in the intended manner and for this to occur, meaningful interaction and communication amongst policy actors are critical elements in establishing the required relationships for successful policy processes. How this interaction and communication takes place and the outcome of its occurrence is the factor that requires further elaboration.

The notion of the interconnected nature of policy implementation has become foundational to the examination of policy processes through the early work of Bowe et al (1992) and Ball (1993), who examined the interplay of policy processes using the concept of the policy cycle as a lens through which to examine such processes.

For Bowe et al (1992) the policy cycle operates within a triumvirate of contexts – the context of influence, representing the discourses advanced by various groups and stakeholders intent on inserting specific priorities into policy formation; the context of text production, where complex written texts of policy documents may be subject to interpretation and re-configuration in order to negotiate textual understanding; and the context of practice, where the prior knowledge, understanding, beliefs and experience of educational practitioners may frame and shape their interaction with the intended policy.
Ball (1993) suggests that policy processes cannot be understood through simple examination of policy text, but must be looked at in terms of the existing relationships between policy actors that govern and direct the interpretation and enactment of policy as it plays out institutionally. Ball (1993) adds that those relationships expand or constrict the interpretation of policy text, privileging some or disadvantaging others.

Ball (1993) furthers suggests that policy actors do not only interact with the text of policy, but also with the policy process through their own agency through "making meaning, being influential, contesting, constructing responses dealing with contradictions, attempting reconstructions of policy" (Ball 1993, p.14) and it is this agency in the context of practice that reframes the policy effects.

Finally, Ball (1993) advances the notion that policy actors “take up the positions constructed for us within polices” (Ball 1993, p14) through the dominant discourses embedded within policy which inherently act to direct agency. This notion of discourse as a driver of agency is particularly powerful, in that the attitudes, perceptions and behaviours of policy actors may be framed and influenced writ large by the dominant ideas of those discourses embedded within policy text formation, regardless of whether those ideas are immediately evident or apparent. In Ball’s terms “we take up the positions constructed for us within policies’ (p.14). Ball (1993) further suggests that those embedded discourses serve to limit the responses available to policy actors in that it “limits our responses to change and leads us to misunderstand what policy is by misunderstanding what it does” (Ball 1993, p.15).

It is evident that the conceptualization of policy processes by Bowe et al (1992) and Ball (1993) encompasses a holistic view, presenting a dynamic interplay of forces internal and external to the policy actors, of whom key players are those individuals directly involved with policy processes at the ground level. This suggests that building an understanding of the nature of the
interactions between policy actors, in order to develop insight into how individuals interpret those interactions, bears careful consideration in order to understand policy processes within the contexts of practice.

The critical importance of this idea was recognized by Case (1994) in terms of the practical application of policy changes insofar as they provide meaning and purpose to those for whom the change is intended.

The underappreciated challenge facing educational reform is to improve our collective ability to conceptualize and operationalize change initiatives. In other words, we must learn to explicate the meaning and purpose of initiatives with adequate clarity and to translate them into sufficiently refined practical strategies so that they are commensurate with the intricately balanced matrix of countervailing factors operating within any education system.

(Case 1994 p. 81).

The preceding lines of inquiry elaborate a position that advances the importance of context in framing individual and collective engagement of policy actors with policy processes.

In later research extending the foregoing ideas (Bowe et al 1992, Bowe et al 1992), Braun et al (2010) elaborate the importance of the interactive nature of policy actors’ influence in framing the outcome of policy processes. Braun et al (2010) underscore the idea that policy processes are decidedly interconnected at a human level. They argue further that the outcomes of policy processes are contingent on intangible factors embedded within the personal interactions and relationships of policy actors and on contextual factors that shape understanding of those processes for the various policy actors.

…an examination of policy enactment at a school level is about examining connections and inter-dependencies. It is important to consider, firstly, that policies are processes, even when mandated, and policy texts can be differently worked on and with. Secondly, policy practices are specific and contextualised. They are framed by the ethos and history of each school and by the positioning and personalities of the key policy actors involved. And thirdly, and related to the contextualised aspect of practice, policies are mediated by positioned relationships: between government and each local
authority, the local authority and each of its schools, and within, as well as between schools. (Braun et al 2010 p.558).

Braun et al’s (2010) position bears careful consideration as being foundational to developing a clearer understanding of the interpersonal dynamics of policy processes at a local level, where site based policy actors negotiate the constant stream of policy initiatives requiring their attention. Braun et al (2010) frame this interpersonal and social nature of policy processes as a “creative process of interpretation and recontextualisation – that is the translation through reading, writing and talking of text into action and the abstractions of policy ideas into contextualised practice” (Braun et al 2010, p.549). An important idea emergent from Braun et al (2010) is the notion that relationship dynamics between policy actors engaging with policy processes at the site level create shared understandings that act as lenses through which new policies are screened, filtered and dissected for meaning, resonance and relevance. Furthermore Braun et al (2010) note that the implementation of the same policy in sites exhibiting different relationship dynamics may give rise to different perceptions, attitudes and degree of commitment to the policy, contextually bound to variations in factors such as clientele, staff and resources.

These site based implementation dynamics are further addressed in subsequent research presented by Braun et al (2011), Maguire et al (2011) and Ball et al (2011) extending the above line of inquiry and further conceptualizing frameworks that influence site based policy engagement and enactment.

Braun et al (2011) build on the notion of policy contexts advanced by Bowe et al (1992) and elaborate the idea of situated, professional, material and external contextual dimensions impinging on policy processes.

Situated contexts are “historically and locationally linked to the school, such as a school’s setting its history and intake” (p.588). Implementation of
policies within individual sites may become defined by the tangible situational elements specific to a site. Variations in policy engagement and enactment thus may arise as these situated contexts act to re-frame how the policy is received, developed and tailored to meet the conditions present within that particular site’s environment.

Policy actors are positioned in a professional context framed by their "values, commitments and experiences" (p.591) that may determine the degree of individual and or group engagement and interaction with policy enactment. Braun et al (2011) suggest that “dissonances between embedded institutional values and national policy trends” (p.591) may give rise to site based tensions when policy processes are in conflict with the professional context of policy actors, thereby reframing the process of engagement and subsequent policy enactment.

Material contexts reference the range of funding, resources, physical space and supporting infrastructure present and available across different institutional sites. Variations and discrepancies in these materials create impediments and inequity for policy actors to support policy processes. Braun et al (2011) cite the example of poorly resourced sites being challenged to attract and hold new staff, which in turn impacts the morale and degree of professional commitment of current staff to policy initiatives. The positive or negative impact of material contexts on policy processes in essence become self-sustaining.

The external contexts of Braun et al (2011) align with the notion of context of influence described earlier. Distinct groups external to the site hold a range of “expectations” (p.594) aligned to their policy interests and preferences. The degree to which these expectations dominate an institutional setting frames the degree to which compliance with policies reflecting those expectations will occur.
This notion of compliance is further developed by Maguire et al (2011) in examining the notion of discourse driving policy processes. Discourse is represented by the language, beliefs and values that are overtly or covertly embedded within policy language and frame the practices to which policy speaks. As Ball (1993) contends “we are spoken by policies, we take up the position constructed for us within policies” (p.14). Maguire et al (2011) suggest that policy discourse embedded with institutional texts and artifacts serve to advance a preferred vision of reality, privileging that vision to the detriment of others. In essence, discourse becomes the tool that conserves power and authority within policy processes. As policy actors are subjected to those discourses in their engagement with policy processes, it follows that the influence of those discourses may impact how they receive, construct and perceive policies in the course of their interactions.

Ball et al (2011a) address this notion of discursive reflection in suggesting that “teachers make meaning with the discursive possibilities available to them” (p.612). As discussed above, policy compliance may be linked to external contexts, however Ball et al (2011a) make the point that “different … kinds of policies, position and produce teachers as different kinds of policy subjects” (p.612). Ball et al (2011a) differentiates between “imperative” and “exhortative” (p.612) policies; wherein the former constrains and narrowly defines policy manoeuvrability and the latter delivers a degree of creative freedom for policy actors to “bring judgement, originality and ‘passion’ … to bear upon the policy process” (p.615). This suggests that the type of policy drives the manner in which engagement takes place and the concomitant reactions within policy actors arising out of this engagement. The manner of engagement is taken up by Ball et al (2011b) in framing a typology of policy actors.

Ball et al (2011b) suggest that “Actors in schools are positioned differently and take up different positions in relation to policy” (p.625). The typology advanced by Ball et al (2011b) classifies policy actors in terms of the
approach they adopt with respect to policy engagement, their situated career stage and the role they assume or are invested in within the policy process. What becomes evident from the analysis is that policy actors are not uniform in their thinking, approach, motivation and attachment to policy processes. Furthermore this differentiation in perception amongst the different types of policy actors gives rise to different reasons for, methods of and reactions to engagement with policy processes. This suggests a complexity to implementation, which cannot be assumed to have an identical impact and affect across the board with all policy actors.

The above lines of research support a developing argument suggesting that policy processes should carefully gauge the understanding of policy actors regarding the purpose and intent of policies, prior to their incorporation into practice within a complex system that contains checks and balances that purposefully act to mediate their implementation.

It is further evident from the preceding lines of inquiry that policy processes cannot and should not be considered as a top down process. Rather, recognition and acknowledgement should be given to the importance of policy actors, as individuals and groups, at all levels working through the process of de-constructing policy as text and re-constituting it as policy as practice in a manner that gives meaning and structure to those for whom it is intended.

Honig (2006) advances a case for a deeper examination of interpersonal aspects framing meaning and structure, arguing that “implementation research generally revealed that policy, people and places affected implementation, contemporary implementation research specifically aims to uncover their various dimensions and how and why interactions among these dimensions shape implementation in particular ways” (Honig 2006 p.14). In this vein, Honig (2006) recognizes the epistemological expansion of policy implementation research to include theoretical constructs from “disciplines not
traditionally applied to implementation” (Honig 2006 p.21) that explore notions of how human agency impacts, and is impacted by, interactions within the policy environment. Honig (2006) further suggests the variation in policy enactment is “part and parcel of the basic operation of complex systems” (p.21) and that exploring this variation through alternate theoretical lenses builds an understanding of “how individual, group and cognitive processes contribute to implementers’ variable policy responses” and “to illuminate how particular dimensions of policies, people and places come together to shape how implementation unfolds” (p.21). Alternate theoretical lenses suggested for consideration by Honig (2006) include “constructs from disciplines not traditionally applied to implementation such as those form anthropology, cognitive science, psychology and learning theory” (p. 21). The argument advanced by Honig (2006) suggests the enlisting of an inter-disciplinary approach towards building a clearer understanding of Ball’s (1993) notion of “the changing relationships between constraint and agency” (p.13/14) within the context of practice (Bowe et al 1992), where agency may be construed as representing distinct activities designed to construct meaning and shape personal understanding,

Attention is now turned to this latter point of meaning and understanding for policy actors in terms of their engagement with policy processes. As cited above, Ball et al (2011a, 2011b) elaborate how the type of policy drives the manner of engagement and the ways in which policy actors engage. However, Ball et al (2011a, 2011b) do not consider the internalized reactions to policy processes that take place within policy actors that act shape and frame the manner of engagement. In keeping with Honig’s previously cited position (2006) calling for an expansion of the epistemological framework of policy implementation research, an understanding of this notion may be built by considering research from the field of social cognition, with specific attention to the construct of sensemaking. Sensemaking is a notion which purports to explain how individuals unpack external sources of information into meaningful
frameworks to enhance understanding. This construct will be examined in terms of its relationship to how policy actors may deconstruct meaning during the process of policy implementation.

2.1.3 Sensemaking and Policy Implementation

Sensemaking is the process whereby individuals take note of external signals and decode them for understanding based on their existing cognitive apparatus established through prior experience and learning. Earlier work (Louis 1980, Weick 1995) investigating the cognitive processes employed by individuals in coping with organizational change shaped the development of sensemaking as a theoretical construct to explain mechanisms of adaptation to new situations.

Sensemaking is viewed by Louis (1980) as a recurrent, cyclical process of cognitive engagement with stimuli, designed to stimulate reflective processes in order to challenge accepted beliefs and practices, so as to incorporate new information in a meaningful way. For Louis (1980) the process is iterative; as additional information is continually presented, the process is self repeating.

A model framing sensemaking as a conscious, cognitive process was advanced by Weick (1995), with distinguishing characteristics which, when activated, act in a complementary manner to provide individuals with a scaffold around which to incorporate new information. For Weick (1995) sensemaking is an organic process, in which self concept, prior history, social relationships and expected realities interplay with environmental cues and stimuli to create a re-conceptualized plausible reality, consistent with the individual’s constructed understanding of their environment. This conceptualization by Weick (1995) suggests that when faced with conditions that challenge established understanding, individuals enlist an internal cognitive mechanism to calibrate, sort, screen and select information to reframe that understanding under the new conditions.
Later research by Spillane et al (2002) examining sensemaking in relation to policy processes supports Weick’s (1995) contention, arguing that the social, environmental and contextual dimensions of human cognition mediate the interpretation and understanding of policy intent.

Policy messages are not inert, static ideas that are transmitted unaltered into local actors’ minds to be accepted, rejected or modified to fit local needs and conditions. Rather, the agents must first notice, then frame, interpret, and construct meaning from policy messages. (Spillane et al 2002, p.392)

This reconstruction of policy by site based policy actors aligns with the notion of the context of practice (Bowe et al 1992) with respect to policy trajectories (Ball 1993). Spillane et al’s (2002) argument seeks to build an understanding of how the cognitive agency of those policy actors works to facilitate and make sense of policy in relation to their every day practice. In advancing their position, Spillane et al (2002) argue that affective traits such as values, emotions and motivations, are also important aspects contributing to the sensemaking process. According to Spillane et al (2002) the degree to which these aspects mediate and impact sensemaking influences the manner in which policy processes unfold. Spillane et al (2002) articulate a position that calls for a move away from a purely behavioural focus in framing the actions of policy actors, towards developing an appreciation for how they “construct understandings of the policy message, construct an interpretation of their own practice in light of the message and draw conclusions about potential changes in their practice as a result” (p.392). This argument thus locates sensemaking by policy actors as central to policy engagement. Spillane et al (2002) further suggest that in addition to the implementing agency of policy actors framing the sensemaking process, it is also impacted by the “situation in which sensemaking occurs, and the policy signals” (p.392) within the policy arena. Based on these notions, Spillane et al (2002) advance an integrated sensemaking framework that considers individual cognition, situated cognition.
and policy representation as key components of the process. Consideration of this framework warrants consideration.

As implementing agents, policy actors individually possess prior knowledge, experience, values and beliefs which are brought to bear in analyzing and evaluating new information with which they may be presented. Spillane et al (2002) advance the argument that previously established cognitive schemas within individuals may act as filters through which new information must be screened, which may lead to acceptance, rejection or modification of the new information prior to incorporation. Thus, the strength of these schemas in acting as filters for the sensemaking process depends on the degree to which new information aligns with or presents challenges to the previously embedded knowledge, beliefs and practices that guide behavioural actions. A reasoned conclusion from the foregoing suggests that ongoing engagement with policy processes may be contingent upon the manner in which previous policy interactions were shaped and influenced by an individual’s sensemaking framework. This notion of prior cognitive schema framing individual action is elaborated by Spillane et al (2006), in advancing the idea that individual differences frame individual understanding, regardless of whether the information being received by all policy actors is identical. In effect, individual policy players see and interpret information based on what they expect to see, and on what they expect the outcome to be based on prior knowledge and personal experience. This is a particularly powerful notion, since it portends the notion of multiple interpretations of a policy text, an idea that resonates with earlier research (Ball 1993). The interesting question this poses is whether the sensemaking that occurs at an individual level may be mediated by sensemaking that may occur at a group or collective level, and if so what are the conditions for this to occur? A further question posed is an understanding of the influence of this collective sensemaking on individual policy actors within the social context of the local policy arena.
Another aspect of individual cognition impacting sensemaking resides in affective responses to policy processes based on embedded values, beliefs and/or biases. Spillane (2002) suggests that “Emotional associations are an integral part of knowledge structures used to reason about the world” (p.402) and that any changes initiated through policy processes potentially impacting values or beliefs may elicit negative affective responses. This notion resonates with the concept of core affect advanced (Russell 2003) to describe the activation of an emotional state in response to positive or negative responses to environmental stimuli and its impact on motivation (Seo 2004). These ideas will be further explored later in the chapter.

The notion of situated context for Spillane et al (2002) engenders the multiple environments in which policy processes occur. Spillane argues that the “situation or context is not simply a back drop for the implementing agent’s sensemaking but a constituting element” (p.389). Policy processes unfold within diverse environmental contexts, each framing different interpretive perspectives for policy actors. Thus the idea of sensemaking being contextual is reinforced by Spillane et al (2002, 2006), who posit that accepted practices and beliefs within a specific environment may shape the sensemaking process by promoting conformity to the social norms of behaviour of that environment thereby mitigating individual action against those norms. This line of reasoning suggests that if indeed actions and behaviour are socially contextual, the formal and informal environments in which policy actors operate may create internal conflict within individuals arising from affiliations and allegiances to diverse social and professional groups. This conflict may in turn mediate individual sensemaking, subjugating personal interpretation and understanding through the group lens, thereby marginalizing individuality in favour of conformity. Spillane (2002) advances the notion of multiple “thought communities” and “worldviews” that contextually shape collective understanding and interpretation, which in turn shape individual sensemaking processes. An interesting parallel that helps to explain this phenomenon is the
notion of ‘groupthink’, coined by Irving Janis (1972), which attempts to explain the effect of the desire for conformity to a group taking precedence over the need to rationally analyze and weigh alternative courses of action.

Policy representation (Spillane 2002) pertains to the lack of interpretive clarity regarding policy processes required by policy actors to facilitate their sensemaking with respect to that policy. This arises from incoherent communication attached to and articulating the policy as implementation unfolds. This notion resonates with earlier research (Bowe et al 1992, Ball 1993) examining policy as text, where the interpretation of the text is contingent on the frame of reference brought to the text by the reader. Policy processes that fail to “unpack the key change ideas and justify the changes” create “a very real tension between communicating abstract principles and being concrete enough to provide adequate constraints on the understanding process” (Spillane et al 2002, p. 416). Thus, when policy language lacks clarity, policy actors synthesize their own meaning, falling back on established cognitive schema and practice to shape sensemaking.
In examining the role of sensemaking in mediating policy processes, Coburn (2001, 2005, 2006) extended the argument regarding the influence of thought communities and worldviews. Coburn (2001) found three elements at play in collective sensemaking in the enactment of reading policy; interpersonal interaction between individuals, gatekeeping, and technical and practical considerations of practice. Coburn (2001) argues that the nature of the collective engagement and interpersonal interactions during policy implementation framed each individual's understanding of the new policy. In essence, individual actions, thoughts and beliefs may be shaped by the dynamics of collaborative processes and by the dominant discourse driving the group's deliberations. The development of shared understandings of the policy intent thus becomes dependent upon the diversity or conformity of individuals to the group's values and beliefs, which in turn is dependent on the degree of alignment with individual values and beliefs. This latter point is a critical element in sensemaking, since for alignment of group and individual values and beliefs to occur, the latter may be required to frame and re-frame their prior conceptual understanding in order for the new idea to resonate. In later studies Coburn (2005, 2006) extended the concept of group processes and interpersonal interactions in relation to sensemaking, by examining the role of leaders in policy implementation processes. Coburn (2005) concluded that the mediating role of leaders in framing a policy problem acted in a similar, but sharply heightened manner, to the group dynamics during interactions between peers. The inference is that leaders may influence group sensemaking through controlling access to information, thereby privileging or devaluing certain policy directions. However, this also suggests that the degree to which the leader's values and beliefs influence the dynamics of group sensemaking is contingent upon the leader's ability to set the limiting parameters and discussion guidelines for unpacking policy details that frame policy processes. A critical question posed by Coburn's conclusions relates to the perceived relevance and importance for policy actors of positional authority and leadership in their sensemaking towards policy processes. If policies are indeed framed by "ethos
and history of each school" and the “positioning and personalities of the key policy actors” as Braun et al (2010, p.558) suggest, this may indicate that policy processes may be more highly attenuated to the sensemaking of policy actors who are directly engaged with those processes as opposed to being contingent on leadership that is detached and disengaged from the immediate policy arena. Coburn (2005) suggests that the relevance of such leadership to policy processes is further called into question through sensemaking, when policy processes are shaped by leaders’ knowledge, values and beliefs that are incongruous with those of the primary policy actors. Under these conditions, policy actors used sensemaking as a process to negotiate policy meaning through personal and professional filters, thereby mediating the incongruity presented by leaders’ positions. This suggests a need to reframe the lenses examining policy processes away from approaches which focus on external factors that may act to impose policy, to those that pay increased attention to the interactive processes between policy, people and places in shaping implementation processes, where “the benefits or limitations of one dimension cannot be adequately understood separate from the other” (Honig 2006, p19).

As previously elaborated (Spillane 2002) policy actors face many diverse worldviews and beliefs arising from the diverse thought communities with which they interact. Coburn (2001) observed that policy actors took on a gatekeeping role that filtered out information deemed not relevant to the sensemaking process. In essence, policy actors try to sort policy information in order to understand the intent. Once sorted, information is categorized into that which is relevant to the group, and that which is not, with the latter being rejected in terms of influencing group sensemaking. Coburn’s (2001) findings regarding policy actors rejecting information they deemed irrelevant may be couched in a range of factors, including, the degree of confidence they posses in engaging with the ‘unfamiliar’; the belief in their own competency with respect to the ‘new’ policy approach and the challenge it may represent to that competency; the applicability to their current practice and the degree of
philosophical resonance they encounter with the new policy. This latter point may be particularly important in group sensemaking, where it may be employed to advance a specific agenda and invalidate philosophically competing positions. For this to occur, the gatekeeping role becomes one of sustaining a specific discourse and reinforcing its cognitive validity, through leveraging the relationships within the group structure. These relationships may arise out of alignment with individuals or sub-groups who have a vested interest in sustaining or advancing a particular policy track based on the philosophical discourse being advanced. In this instance gatekeeping serves the purpose of promoting and sustaining a dominant perspective within the group’s deliberations designed to drive forward the specific position.

Technical considerations of practice were deemed to be limiting conditions (Coburn 2001) framing the sensemaking process, based on the adherence of policy actors to “Pre-existing practice and structural constraints” (p.155). Based on this notion, Coburn (2001, 2005, 2006) suggests that policy actors had difficulty disengaging from old habits of practice and rather than examining how structures need to be adapted to accommodate the introduction of the new policy, used sensemaking as a process to determine how new policy would fit into existing structures of practice. Coburn (2001) found that during group sensemaking, different affiliations to a technical aspect of instruction created points of disagreement that acted to compartmentalize the group process into pedagogical camps, thereby disrupting the collective sensemaking effort towards building consensus and agreement with respect to implementation of the new policy. Concomitantly, the group dynamics at play seemed to privilege a particular sensemaking viewpoint depending on the positional influence of those advancing that viewpoint or a tacit recognition of the expertise framing that viewpoint, necessitating a compromise position to accommodate competing views. Under these conditions, sensemaking reinforced established beliefs and practice to the detriment of the new policy. This highlights the organic nature of policy processes as suggested by Weick
requiring individuals to adapt to environmental conditions through an iterative process as proposed by Louis (1980), framing and re-framing mental schema, until acceptable conditions are created that cognitively resonate with the sensemaker. In this situation, (Coburn 2001) the collective sensemaking process leveraged pre-existing mental schema by groups advancing the viewpoint maintaining current structures of practice. An interesting point arising from Coburn (2001) is the potential for internal dissonance when individual sensemaking is in conflict with collective group sensemaking with respect to policy processes (Coburn 2001), thereby creating an affective impact on the individual as sensemaker.

Revisiting Weick’s (1995) notion of sensemaking as a structured, process involving social cognition with a theoretically discernable framework of calibrating, sorting, screening and selecting information, an examination of factors that may impact these components bears consideration. Since policy actors operate in multiple environments, there are potentially multiple points of influence on these components that may act to frame and re-frame the sensemaking process. Several lines of investigation examining policy processes (Coburn et al 2001, 2005, 2006, Bartunek 2006, Stensaker 2008, Avey 2008) highlight the emergence of these potential influences on sensemaking for policy actors.

In investigating the implementation of reading policy, Coburn (2001, 2005, 2006) found that patterns of interaction and dialogue between policy actors impacted sensemaking. The nature of this impact was framed by the type of the relationships between the participants during their interactions. In interactions of a formal nature, where the relationships were framed by pedagogical approaches to practice, participants with similar worldviews or philosophies aligned themselves in terms of their interpretation of the proposed policy. During informal interactions, participants aligned to specific social networks used the influence and tacit authority imparted by ‘membership’ in those networks to advance the policy interpretation advocated by these groups.
Thus, the patterns of interaction acted to promote a discourse influencing the sensemaking process in a specific direction.

Additional lines of policy implementation research suggest that the sensemaking of policy actors may be impacted by the degree and type of involvement of leaders with the implementation process. Leaders at different levels of an organization bring differing perspectives to bear on the implementation of policy, which in turn impacts policy actors’ sensemaking and engagement in differing ways.

Earlier work by Spillane (2000), suggests that the lens through which policy actors in a leadership role filter information and frame the dialogue driving the policy forward may impact engagement at the local level. While Spillane (2000) contends that the perspective of these policy actors may be directed towards framing the discourse through which implementing policy actors actively engage with the policy, the prior discussion of Coburn (2001) relating to technical considerations of practice suggests that these policy actors may be more focused on activating their sensemaking apparatus. This focus may be driven by a desire to pay greater attention to the practical considerations of policy processes, thereby negating or nullifying the leadership perspective, deeming it to be inconsequential to everyday practice.

Coburn’s (2005) investigation into the shaping of teacher sensemaking by leaders, suggests that when the latter adopt clear and specific positions with respect to a policy, a critical mass of policy actors need to subscribe to that position in order for it to be considered. This suggests the necessity of creating the conditions, opportunities and willingness for policy actors to validate the leaders’ conceptualization through their sensemaking lens. Where this sensemaking leads to alignment of the implementing policy actors’ vision with that of the leader, policy implementation may be successful; where the sensemaking process leads to a conflicted understanding, implementation aligned to that vision may be problematic.
Whilst sensemaking is framed as a cognitive process with recognizable structural elements (Weick 1995), later research (Weick 2005, Bartunek 2006, Avey 2008) suggests that it does not occur in isolation as a structured process, but operates in concert with, and is impacted by, affective emotional components. In Weick’s (2005) conceptual construction the “interplay of action and interpretation rather than the influence of evaluation on choice” (p.409), shifts the sensemaking construct away from a purely rational, cognitive process towards one that considers affect and emotions as dimensions of sensemaking that may act interpretively in framing a particular course of action. This notion was previously recognized by Nias (1996) in suggesting that as “emotions are rooted in cognition” individuals cannot “separate feelings from perception, affectivity from judgement” and further that “neither cognition nor feeling can be separated from the social and cultural forces which help to form them and which are in turn shaped by them” (p.294). Nias (1996) thus recognizes that emotional responses are structurally embedded processes within policy actors that operate parallel to, and are reciprocally activated through, interactions with their cognitive apparatus. In essence, emotion and cognition, whilst being separate constructs, are inexorably linked.

Research examining the formation of these notions of affect and emotion (Russell 2003, Seo et al 2004, 2010) and their impact now bears consideration.

Russell (2003) advances the notion of core affect, which is located as an emotional/affective state of individuals in terms of physiological activation and emotional response to environmental stimuli along a pleasure/displeasure continuum. Russell (2003) graphically illustrates this notion of core affect along two axes (fig 2.1). The bottom hemisphere of figure 2.1 denotes physiological deactivation and the top hemisphere activation. Another way to frame this notion of activation/deactivation represented by the north-south axis of the
the model is as a manifested state of physical alertness and readiness to cope with environmental conditions. The right and left hemispheres denote the emotional state emanating from elicited pleasure or displeasure reactions in the face of environmental conditions. This east-west axis thus serves to position an individual's emotional state of being in relation to their pleasure valence when presented with external stimuli. In essence core affect for Russell (2003) represents “that neurophysiological state consciously accessible as the simplest raw (nonreflective) feelings evident in moods and emotions” (p.148). This notion thus embeds core affect within an emotional framework independent of cognitive processes, which may be seen to “affect other psychological processes accordingly” and “guides cognitive processing according to the principle of mood congruency” (p.149).

Seo et al (2004, 2010) further explore this idea of core affect in terms of its relationship to work related emotional behaviour. Seo et al (2004) argue that core affect “is the appropriate place to start thinking scientifically about emotion related phenomena” in that “core affective feelings influence work motivation via their influence on judgement … involved in conscious
behavioural choices” (p.424). For Seo et al (2004) this judgement is impacted by the emotional frame of mind established by different states of core affect in which the individual is located arising out of their interactions with the forces shaping the environmental conditions in which they are operating. This latter point is underscored by the further argument that “people often experience affective reactions that are divergent from or in conflict with their conscious assessments, and when such divergence occurs, affective reactions often exert a dominating influence on behaviour” (p.432). Later work by Seo et al (2010) extending their initial consideration concluded that the positive or negative dimensions of core affect “systematically predicts behavioural choice, intensity and persistence” (p.964). This leads to the suggestion that if core affect is integral to shaping behaviour in terms of the framing of an emotional/activation response, it thus is also integral to the sensemaking process, extending it beyond simply being a cognitive process, to one that incorporates an emotional/affective component. This suggests that affect and emotion must be accounted for in any conceptual framework that purports to advance an understanding of how policy actors negotiate engagement with policy processes.

One such conceptual framework situating the mediating roles of *sensemaking and affect* in understanding change processes has been proposed by Bartunek et al (2006) (Fig. 2.2). This framework suggests that the degree to which individuals actively participate in the process may positively or negatively impact both the sensemaking process and the emotions activated in response to the proposed change. This further suggests that the arousal of positive or negative emotions in policy actors, related to their participation, may be contingent on the ‘locus of control’ framing their participation. Positive emotional responses may be encountered where this is within their domain; negative responses where it is not, thereby creating an emotional mindset complimentary or antagonistic to the cognitive framework governing sensemaking.
The model proposed by Bartunek et al (2006) allows for the conceptualization of a boundary between the activation of the conscious, cognitive process of sensemaking and the arousal of unconscious feelings, attitudes and emotions driving the affective responses of human behaviour to external cues and stimuli, driven by change. This finding is particularly interesting since it suggests that whilst sensemaking may be an independent cognitive process, the outcome of its activation may be dependent on emotions and feelings that may be aroused by intangible factors not accounted for as part of the sensemaking process. A further implication is that while sensemaking in of itself is an important process allowing individuals to adapt to change in a meaningful way, there is need to understand the role of emotional disposition and affect in mediating effective adaptation to change as represented by new policy initiatives.

Dimensions of this notion of emotional disposition and the role it inhabits in mediating change are elaborated by a number of researchers (Hargreaves 2001, 2004, 2005, van Veen et al 2005, Schmidt and Datnow 2005, Kelchtermans 2005), and more recently Gorozidis (2014).
Hargreaves (2001) advances the conceptual framework of “emotional geographies” in response to the lack of a “systematic understanding of how teacher's emotions are shaped by the changing and variable conditions of their work” and the impact of these emotions in terms of how they become “embedded in the conditions and interactions of their work” (p.1058). Hargreaves (2001) argues that threats to emotional stability are locationally situated in terms of the socio-cultural, moral, professional, physical and political distance between the policy actor and other elements embedded within the policy environment. The greater the separation, the greater the potential for emotional mis-alignment, resulting in a greater threat to emotional stability. An important consideration from Hargreaves’ (2001) framework is the identification of multiple dimensions to the emotional geography facing policy actors, each of which has the potential to shape and influence affective emotional responses.

Hargreaves (2004, 2005) unpacks this notion further in examining the responses of policy actors to two such dimensions of emotional geography, externally imposed versus self initiated change (2004) and career path and life stage (2005). With respect to the former, Hargreaves (2004) looked at “teachers’ differing emotional experiences of educational change in terms of whether the change is mandated or self-initiated” (p.291). A difference emerged in the emotional responses to each. Negative emotions were associated with mandated changes arising out of factors associated with “being forced to change without consultation” … “poor design of the changes” … “too much pressure and insufficient support” … “poor implementation” and “weak leadership” (p.295). Further to this, these externally imposed changes are perceived as contradicting the self identified moral purpose of teaching, thereby further exacerbating affective negativity. Self-initiated change on the other hand elicited positive emotional responses due to their engagement with and sense of control over the process and the potential outcomes. Hargreaves (2004) concludes that negative emotions derive from the mis-alignment of mandated changes with the values and purposes of policy actors, whereas the
emergence of positive emotions from self-initiated change is linked to feelings of personal control and fulfillment. Hargreaves (2004) further emphasizes that regardless of the initiating source of the change, the type of emotional response that will be elicited is also contingent on two overarching features associated with the change. These identified features are open and inclusive implementation processes and the realization for students of real benefits arising out of any proposed change.

In examining the relationship of career path and life stage (Huberman 1989) as aspects of emotional geography, Hargreaves (2005) suggests a differentiation in emotional responses is demonstrable contingent on the career stage at which policy actors are located. Of interest from Hargreaves (2005) is the idea that as policy actors at different stages of their careers exhibit different priorities, they also adopt different methods of coping with change that are specific to the pressures associated with their career stage. An implication arising from this suggestion is that differentiated affective responses to similar aspects of emotional geography may be exhibited by policy actors who are at different stages of their career life cycle. In this vein, Hargreaves (2005) suggests that negative emotional affective responses are intensified for policy actors in their late career and less evident for those at the early stages of their career cycle whose priorities were more focused on survival. Mid-career individuals on the other hand maintained an even emotional keel in the face of change and were “typically more relaxed, experienced and comfortable about their job and themselves than they had once been” (p.979).

In an exploration of identity as an aspect of emotional geography, van Veen (2005) builds on the notions advanced by Hargreaves (2001, 2004, 2005). van Veen (2005) suggests that when alignment of change processes to an individual’s core purpose is evident, positive emotional disposition emerges. When this core purpose is challenged by change, negative emotions emerge that threaten self esteem, motivation and individual moral purpose, all important factors in maintaining professional identity. Van Veen (2005)
identifies that “different aspects in the environment” … “play a role in how the teacher experiences a reform” wherein such experiences produce emotionally based responses that act to reposition “perceptions of personal and professional identity” (p.931). Van Veen (2005) thus concludes that this “interplay of situational demands and the cognitive-affective processes … shape different emotions” (p.931).

Schmidt & Datnow (2005) in recognizing that “emotion and cognition are tightly interwoven” (p.952) examine sensemaking in terms of its contextual relationship to the landscape of emotional geography Hargreaves (2001, 2004, 2005). Schmidt and Datnow (2005, p.950) suggests that “human beings act towards things on the basis of the meaning and emotion they have for them”. In these terms Schmidt and Datnow (2005) argue for an examination of the relationship between “how teachers make sense of reform and the emotions that might result from the sensemaking process” (p.950). This question is explored by Smith and Datnow (2005) in comparing emergent collective and individual sensemaking and emotions in the face of structured and unstructured change processes.

At the collective level Smith and Datnow (2005) noted a “consistency” of “understanding” and a “uniformity of meaning” with respect to structured change, however a consistent emotional response could not be identified wherein “teachers were always comfortable and enthusiastic” (p. 955) about those changes. On the other hand, unstructured change produced a range of cognitive and emotional responses, due to “ambiguous or vague understandings of the reforms they were implementing” (p.957) giving rise to conflicting positions on the efficacy and relevance of the change.

At the individual level, change was viewed in terms of its impact at the classroom level, and took on a more personal meaning for teachers with respect to their professional practice. Structured change was critically examined for alignment to personal values and beliefs and for beneficial impact
on learners. When cognitive processing did not align with these lenses, emotional responses were predominantly negative. Unstructured change was filtered through the lens of current classroom practice and cognitively screened for alignment to those practices, which teachers deemed as being in the best interest of learners. If alignment to current practice was not evident, and there was cognitive ambiguity in individual understanding of the intent and purpose of the change, higher incidences of negative emotions were precipitated.

Kelchtermans (2005) unpacks another layer of the emotional responses of teachers in elaborating their feeling “powerless, threatened” (p.997) in the face of being “questioned by others” (p.997) with respect to their practice. This challenge to their “professional identity and moral integrity” (p.997) precipitates feelings of vulnerability that require mediation through personal and/or collective agency in order to reclaim professional identity. For Kelchtermans (2005) vulnerability is not in of itself an emotional response; rather it is an internal structural condition arising from specific contexts and conditions within the teaching environment that threaten teacher identity and self image. Vulnerability thus acts as an instigator of actions and behaviours to counteract the negative emotional responses precipitated by such threats.

More recent research (Gorozidis 2014) enlists the notions of autonomous and controlled motivation from Self Determination Theory (SDT) in building an understanding of how implementation of change is taken up by policy actors. While motivation is not an emotional response, it is situated within the affective dimension governing agency and action. The essence of this approach suggests that autonomous control over individual action is deemed to have greater motivational impact than externally imposed control. Furthermore, with autonomous action, the motivation is based on self determined outcomes through choice, as opposed to prescriptive outcomes with no choice. The issue thus becomes one of control over choice and outcome. This notion links well with aspects of emotional geographies
(Hargreaves 2001) wherein distance and control may be presented as a parallel constructs influencing agency and action.

The above discussion supports Bartunek’s (2006) understanding of the relationship between the cognitive and emotional dimensions mediating policy actors’ responses to change processes. Further clarity is brought to bear by the work of Avey et al (2008).

The mediating effect of attitudes and behaviours on emotional states and their impact on the psychological capital required for meaningful information processing was further explored by Avey et al (2008). The research focussed on how the notion of psychological capital (defined as hope, efficacy, optimism and resilience) which, along with mindfulness (heightened awareness), act in concert to develop positive sensemaking with respect to the implementation of change processes. Figure 2.3 is a representation of Avey et al’s (2008) model.

Essentially Avey et al (2008) concluded that the creation of positive psychological capital through emotions may be requisite factors in mitigating attitudes and behaviours that constrict successful policy implementation and change processes. Additionally, Avey et al (2008) suggest that change recipients’ heightened awareness of their thoughts and feelings contributes to
building positive psychological capital, which better equips them to cope with the negative stresses associated with change. This coping ability thus contributes to a positive sensemaking experience with respect to change. Avey et al (2008) build on the work of Bartunek (2006) by further elaborating the complimentary role of affect and emotional responses to the cognitive process of sensemaking. This construct lends support to the position of this thesis in examining policy processes through a lens of social cognition, which is framed by the myriad interactions between policy actors at different levels of the policy processes. The relevance of this approach is enhanced and supported by Ball’s (1993) earlier identification and consideration of the internal and external interactive forces at play on policy actors and further extended by the research previously cited in this chapter (Braun et al 2010, Braun et al 2011, Maguire et al 2011, Ball et al 2011a and Ball et al 2011b) on the contextual nature of those interactions and their potential influence on policy processes. Within this framework of interactive policy processes and social cognition an important question that needs elaboration is how these interactions frame the emotional mindset of policy actors, thereby impacting their existing beliefs, practices and predispositions towards change. It is evident the preceding line of inquiry makes strong arguments that an understanding of the emotional mindset of policy actors, who are the critical players in the enactment and implementation of policy processes, becomes a key component of understanding the unfolding sensemaking with respect to those policy processes, thereby reinforcing the notion advanced by Spillane et al (2002) of the need to reconstruct policy contextually through an active process of building personal understanding and meaning of any proposed policy process.

In a study that builds additional insight into an understanding of this question, Stensaker et al (2008) looked at policy processes being framed at the mid and lower levels of organizations and the contrast between planning for change and actually engaging with change. Stensaker et al (2008) found that
at these levels there was a bias towards action in the operationalization of change, rather than a focus on the planning and communication aspects.

... we have argued that action may be a viable alternative to a focus on planning and cognitive understanding prior to action. One might ask if it is possible to understand everything up front and prior to any action and whether action prior to a cognitive understanding might induce speedier and more lasting understandings of the reasons for and effects of change. Managers should therefore aim to introduce more implementation activities that focus on trial and error ... (Stensaker et al 2008 p.183).

It may be argued that this orientation towards action, at these levels of the organization, arises out of the prior experiences of policy actors with change, wherein an overdependence on the planning process in previous policy processes resulted in little attention being paid to the practical aspects of the proposed change. This consideration is particularly important where planned changes may disrupt established operational processes and patterns of work that ground level policy actors deem to be established and working, thereby eliciting dissonance in the emotional security offered by the status quo. This may suggest that policy actors are motivated to engage in an action orientation, in order to redress the emotional imbalance created by the proposed change, by comparing it against the established procedures with which they are familiar. In essence, Stensaker’s (2008) contention suggests that the cognitive aspect of the sensemaking process, through pragmatic evaluation of the new policy in an operational setting, may impact the emotional processing of a change process. This implication is notable, since it suggests that for policy actors at the ground level, policy processes may be emotionally attenuated by actual observable policy outcomes, based on their direct, day-to-day interactions with the policy, as opposed to conceptual outcomes as intended by the policy. This line of thinking suggests that the emotional states aligned with sensemaking may be rationally mediated by interactive processes that allow individuals to weigh the advantages and disadvantages prior to policy implementation. In essence, the “trial and error” manipulation of the policy by policy actors advanced by
Stensaker et al (2008, p.183), provides them with the “feel” for the policy process, thereby creating a positive emotional capital (hope, efficacy, optimism, resilience) and a heightened degree of mindfulness (awareness) (Avey et al 2008) with respect to implementation outcomes.

The notions advanced by Bartunek et al (2006), Stensaker et al (2008) and Avey et al (2008) integrating cognitive and emotional constructs into the sensemaking framework are strengthened by consideration of lines of research in social and organizational psychology extending the linkages between sensemaking and emotional constructs. Seo et al (2004, 2010), as previously cited, explored the linkages between affect and motivation, Meyer (1999) and Meyer et al (2004) looked at commitment in relation to affect, Sonenshein (2012) examined meaning making in engaging with change and Maitlis (2013) explored emotions and sensemaking in relation to change processes. The common thread to each of these lines of investigation is that affective, emotionally driven responses internal to individuals shape the manner in which they interact with their environments. These interactions in turn act to reinforce the affective foundation framing the original response.

This lens of sensemaking and affect lends support to the social constructivist view of how understanding is advanced and underscores the importance of the interactive, organic nature of policy processes, albeit circumscribed within a structural framework of policy ‘texts and trajectories’ (Ball 1993). However, it is the foundation of this structural framework that sensemaking actually addresses, for as Ball (1993) reminds us, ‘agency’ and ‘discourse’ are the critical elements framing the interplay of the contexts of influence, of text production and of practice, with respect to policy implementation processes. In this instance, sensemaking may be viewed as the ‘cognitive discourse’, operating on an individual and group level and affect may be considered as the ‘emotional agency’, operating primarily on an individual level, but mediated by group interactions and processes. This notion of agency, or human action, is crucial to policy processes and building an
improved understanding of how this agency, or engagement, is impacted as policy is implemented is the aim of this thesis.

This literature review has endeavoured to examine the engagement with policy implementation from the viewpoint of policy actors. It has located policy implementation as being complex and interconnected, with multiple contexts and discourses shaping the engagement of policy actors during policy enactment processes. While the lines of investigation examined shed light on the structural elements of how and why such contexts and discourses impact policy processes, further clarity is needed with respect to the internal responses of policy actors arising from their agency and engagement with such processes. This proposition has led me to consider lines of inquiry from outside of the dominant approaches examining educational policy research, towards those that explore sensemaking and affective/emotional responses as constructs in building an understanding of the internal responses of policy actors. Since there appears to be a research gap in utilizing such an approach, this thesis will attempt address this gap by linking multidisciplinary theoretical lenses from the fields of educational policy, social psychology and organizational management in order to expand the understanding of the impact on policy actors of their engagement and agency with policy processes.

However, in utilizing a grounded theory case study approach examining curriculum implementation, this study will set aside pre-established theoretical explanations of agency and behaviour, permitting explanatory constructs to be developed through unfiltered analysis of the data. The multidisciplinary constructs examined in this literature review will thus only be referenced as and when they become relevant to enhancing the theoretical understanding unfolding through the grounded theory analysis.

From the foregoing discussion locating sensemaking and affect as constructs processes mediating the engagement of policy actors with policy
processes and with due consideration for the contexts and discourses framing those processes, this thesis will address the following research question:

*How do the primary partners in mathematics education at Southside Secondary School perceive, understand and engage with the new Provincial Mathematics Curriculum and what does this perception, understanding and engagement bring to bear on the implementation process?*

This research will examine the policy processes related to the implementation of a new Mathematics curriculum at Southside Secondary School that is taking place over a three year period from September 2009 to September 2012. During the course of those three years eight new Mathematics courses, representing three new curriculum strands, are replacing four existing curricula. The four existing curricula cover a broad range of student achievement in Mathematics: from a low level of competency represented by Essentials of Mathematics, to Applications of Mathematics for non-technical oriented learners and finally to two courses for advanced learners Principles of Mathematics and Calculus. With the new curricula the Essentials curriculum level targetting low Mathematics achievers is eliminated and each of the four new strands, Application and Workplace Mathematics, Foundations of Mathematics, Pre-Calculus and Calculus, all demand of learners higher levels of Mathematics competency.

This research thesis will adopt the case study methodology of Yin (1984), employing the classic Grounded Theory approach of Glaser & Strauss (1967) to investigate the engagement and interactions of policy actors at Southside Secondary with the policy processes related to this curriculum change and how they are impacted by such engagement and interactions.

The following chapter will lay out the methodological approach to be followed in the course of the research.
Chapter 3  Research Methodology

3.1 Methodology Overview

As the literature review chapter has laid out, the environments within which policy processes take place are shaped by a variety of contexts and factors. This suggests that the engagement of policy actors within these environments is in itself fraught with complexity in terms of how such engagement plays out in terms of shaping, influencing or reacting to those policy processes. Unpacking the complexity of this engagement thus becomes essential in order to build an understanding of its significance to policy processes. This research study attempts to add to this understanding.

The research question I am addressing in this thesis examines how the primary partners in mathematics education at Southside Secondary School perceive, understand and engage with a new Provincial Mathematics Curriculum and what this perception, understanding and engagement brings to bear on the implementation process.

As a member of Southside’s School Leadership Team (SLT), taking on the role of an embedded researcher, my purpose in exploring this case study is to develop insight into stakeholder interaction and engagement with policy implementation at the school level, in order to understand how those interactions influence site based policy processes. Teaching staff and the SLT form the primary policy actors engaged in curriculum implementation at the school level and my research approach will focus on the interactions of these two groups with policy processes at Southside Secondary.

Southside Secondary as a case study site provides a vehicle for examining the research question employing the Classic Grounded Theory approach (CGT) of Glaser and Strauss (1967) as the analytic methodology. This approach allows me to develop a theoretical framework inductively from the data (Glaser and Strauss 1967) that offers insight into how stakeholders
impact, or are impacted by, engagement and interaction with policy processes during implementation. The juxtaposition of the case study approach with that of classic grounded theory fits within the research design parameters suggested by Miles & Huberman (1994) where a case is deemed to be “a phenomenon of some sort occurring within a bounded context” (Miles & Huberman 1994, p. 25). This is supported by Stake (1994, 2005) who suggests that the “case study is defined by interests in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used” (1994, p. 236) and further that a “case is not a methodological choice, but a choice of what is to be studied” (2005 p. 443). In this instance, Southside Secondary is interesting to me as a case study site in that it represents a school setting that operates with a culturally dominant Indo-Canadian student population and is consistently positioned at the lower end of publicly published school performance rankings, factors which may have potential impact in shaping the perceptions of educational stakeholders regarding the school. As a member of the Southside SLT operating within this contextual environment, I have observed that regardless of the these factors potentially shaping perceptions, the teachers and staff as key stakeholders at Southside are fully engaged professionally, show a passion for teaching and demonstrate a high degree of care and compassion for the students under their tutelage. I have also observed that the staff take ownership to initiatives and establish strong working relationships within a collaborative and collegial framework. These aspects present Southside as an interesting case study site within the Vancouver School District, providing me as the researcher with an opportunity to examine stakeholder engagement and interaction with policy processes framed by a range of contexts, such as notions of student needs, beliefs regarding curriculum, prior experiences with policy processes or any other perspectives that may arise from the ensuing analysis. This wide range of contexts speak powerfully to the use of grounded theory as the methodological framework, which articulates a central tenet that theoretical frameworks must emerge from the data without any preconceived notions on the part of the researcher as to how those frameworks are structured. This
approach forces me as the researcher to consider all contexts and all explanations in arriving at any theoretical explanation suggested by analysis of the data.

The foregoing literature review located theoretical constructs for framing an understanding of the engagement and interaction of policy actors with implementation processes. While the literature review provides a theoretical framework within which to situate current knowledge for this particular inquiry, for the purposes of this thesis I will adopt a neutral position with respect to any elaborated theoretical positions, in order to allow authentic utilization of the inductive processes explicit to the Classic Grounded Theory methodology in considering the research question.

It is worth noting at this juncture that my use of a Classic Grounded Theory as the analytical tool permits me to approach the data free of theoretical encumbrances that may influence me conceptually with respect to the research problem. Ensuring that I remain true to this neutrality of approach will be crucial in preserving the inductive nature of the grounded theory approach, avoiding the referencing of established theoretical frames that may lead to deductive interpretations that are not authentically grounded in the data. I will further address this notion at a later point in the chapter.

This chapter details the methodological approach used to examine the research question. The initial part of the chapter locates policy and site considerations framing the research inquiry, in order to understand the contextual factors encountered by policy actors framing their engagement with policy processes,

The middle section of the chapter articulates my research paradigm in terms of my ontological and epistemological worldview. Consideration is then turned to the adoption of a case study approach utilizing grounded theory as
the investigative lens, along with methodological considerations faced by the researcher in adopting such an approach.

The final section of the chapter provides a detailed elaboration of the procedures employed in applying the classic grounded theory methodology to this research study.

3.2 Research Context

3.2.1 Locating the Case Study in Curriculum Policy

Since 1993 in Western Canada a ‘collaborative policy space’ has been occupied by the Western Canadian Protocol (WCP), which was established to foster inter-provincial collaboration in the formulation of educational policy. The protocol framed its terms of reference in a discourse of ‘educational improvement’, through the establishment of a Common Curriculum Framework (CCF) across key subject areas, including mathematics. (In 2000 the Canadian territory of Nunavut joined the group, which was renamed the Western & Northern Canadian Protocol - WNCP). Arising out of the WCP, a CCF for mathematics from K-12 was developed in 1996, governed by the following beliefs framing the discourse of the document.

Mathematics is a common human activity, increasing in importance in a rapidly advancing, technological society. …
It is important for students to develop a positive attitude toward mathematics so that they can become confident in their ability to undertake the problems of a changing world, …
All students should receive a level of mathematics education appropriate to their needs and abilities.
(WCP 1996 p. 3).

In 2004 the WNCP engaged in consultations with groups invested in the outcomes of educational practice – business leaders, industry and post-secondary institutions – to determine their degree of satisfaction with the preparation provided by the original CCF for mathematics and to address whether changes were needed in order to better prepare students for the
life after secondary school and the world of work. The following quote encapsulates the discourse driving the move for change.

As the world of today’s student rapidly changes more and more they find themselves affected by things involving technology and mathematics. In order for today’s students to be prepared and succeed as productive members of society it is essential that they become knowledgeable in the many areas of mathematics. … (p 57)
The curriculum must extend beyond the realm of the school and the classroom to focus on the role of mathematics in employment… (WNCP Mathematics Final Report 2004 p. 63).

As a result of these consultations, recommendations for a restructuring of mathematics courses from grades 8-12 was deemed necessary, in order meet the perceived needs of students in regards to their post-secondary career and education requirements. However, underpinning these recommendations was a general degree of dissatisfaction by industry with the mathematics preparation afforded students for entry-level work and by post-secondary institutions offering applied/consumer courses, where advanced mathematics skills were not requirements (WNCP 2004). The recommendations called for three strands of mathematics within the CCF from grades 10-12.

3. In order for the CCF to effectively meet the needs of our secondary students, it includes three distinct programs for Grades 10 to 12. Specifically, it is recommended that the secondary programs be developed to meet the needs of students who are:
3.1. Entering post-secondary programs that require calculus (e.g., Mathematics, Sciences, Engineering, Commerce, etc.).
3.2. Entering post-secondary programs that do not require calculus (e.g. Humanities, Fine Arts, some Trades and Technical programs, etc.); and,
3.3 Entering the workforce, Trades or Technical programs that do not require advanced mathematics.

The recommendations were adopted in British Columbia (BC), leading to the 2007 revision of the entire K-12 Mathematics curriculum aligned with WNCP principles, with the three curricular strands being: Foundations of Math 10, 11, 12; Pre-Calculus 11, 12 and Apprenticeship & Workplace Math 10, 11, 12, which were perfectly aligned with the CCF directions.
Subsequent to these revisions, an implementation schedule was adopted for the three mathematics pathways, beginning with grade 10 courses in 2010, with full implementation of the grade 12 courses to be completed by September 2012. Whilst curriculum implementation is mandated for BC school districts by the provincial Ministry of Education, each school district in turn assigns the operational responsibility for implementation to individual school sites. Southside Secondary School is one of the 18 secondary schools in the Vancouver School District that is engaged in implementing the new curriculum.

3.2.2 Case Study Site

Southside Secondary School is located in a well established, ethnically diverse, urban neighbourhood in British Columbia within the Vancouver School District. It is a school of 1300 students, 80 teachers and support staff, with a School Leadership Team (SLT) of three administrators. For this study, I am embedded in the field as the primary researcher, being a vice principal within that three person leadership team with a range of responsibilities including program and policy implementation. My status as an “insider” within the school structure may have methodological implications, highlighting the need for personal awareness and reflexivity (Creswell 2000, Hammersley 2007a) regarding the perceptions of stakeholders towards my role in policy implementation and the potential impact of that role on aspects of the research process. This notion reinforces the need for me to consider that my site based history as a member of the SLT acting in the role of researcher bears important consideration during the research process, for as Hammersley (2007a) suggests, “the orientations of researchers will be shaped by their socio-historical locations, including the values and interest that these locations confer upon them (p. 15). This gives rise to the implication that, “people … will often be more concerned with what type of person the researcher is than with the research itself” (Hammersley 2007a p. 65), with a further
suggestion that “the researcher must reflect on how he or she has influenced the situation and the people being studied in order to monitor reactivity, so as to minimize any distorting effect on the research findings” (Hammersley 2007b, p.2).

These considerations necessitated that I pay close attention to any vested policy positions embedded within my leadership role of being charged with the responsibility of curriculum implementation at the case study site. Recognizing these positions, how they played out during policy processes and their possible influence on the research process were all elements that had to be reflexively considered in terms of my dual role as policy actor and researcher. This forced me to carefully consider whether these positions shaped policy actors responses to me as a researcher, as well as whether they framed my own engagement with the research protocol and interpretation of the data. Exemplifying this notion of researcher reflexivity is my recognition and negotiation of the tension between my professional responsibility for establishing compliance to the new curriculum and my need to maintain an open stance as a researcher during data collection in order to capture the positions of policy actors with respect to curriculum implementation. This led me to pay careful attention to the manner in which interviews were conducted, forcing me to refrain from any personal observations on the policy processes during the interviews in order to mediate this tension.

Richardson (1994) earlier advanced a process for classifying field notes and memo writing which I find useful in terms of assisting the process of researcher reflexivity. Richardson (1994) frames field notes and memos as being observational, methodological, theoretical or personal (p. 526) vehicles for recording researcher reflexivity. From an analytical perspective, this categorization permits the researcher to differentiate between reflexive and analytical field notes and memos and appropriately locate their significance during the ensuing data analysis. I will elaborate on
these issues of field relations and reflexivity (Hammersley 2007a) later in this chapter.

The school population is made up of two dominant ethnic groups, one well established in the community, the other consisting of relatively recent immigrants to the geographic area. I have observed that these groups of students appear to have strong connections to family and community and that they are highly respectful of the school, of the teaching staff and of the SLT. These observations are borne out by the plethora of positive student-adult relationships that I have witnessed between a wide cross section of the student body and members of the teaching staff and SLT.

Southside Secondary has an enriched educational program that provides enhanced educational programs to thirteen percent of its population, who gain entry to the program through a selection process. In addition, Southside has seven special education programs delivering specialized services to seven percent of its population, half of whom attend regular classes to varying degrees depending on the student’s learning profile. An additional thirteen percent of the students are also designated as special needs and are fully integrated into mainstream classes, making the special needs students twenty percent of the total student population. Another significant group of learners are represented by new arrived students studying English as a Second Language who constitute thirteen percent of the population (Fraser Institute 2010). In my observations both of these groups of students appear to be well integrated socially within the fabric of the school, however in many cases I have seen that students from these two groups are streamed into upper and lower levels of Mathematics and Science classes based on perceived needs suggested by their learning profiles.
The majority of Southside students perform reasonably well on standardized government exams. However, the school has historically ranked in the lower echelons of the publicly published school performance league tables. Evidence from previous lines of research examining school performance rankings suggests this discrepancy may be due to factors characterizing the makeup of the student population including: (1) the wide variation in language abilities of new immigrant families, (2) the integration of a large number of students with special needs and (3) the wide variation in family socioeconomic status. These educational contexts are reflective of and relevant to the Southside student population, where many of the second language learners and students with special needs do not participate in government examinable courses and/or meet graduation requirements by the end of their grade 12 year. These factors serve to skew the two key measures that frame the ranking of the school within the published league tables; the percentage of students writing government exams and the percentage of grade 12 students fulfilling graduation requirements.

Despite the school’s profile as reflected by external perceptions embedded within the performance rankings I am aware of a strong sense of school community and a strong culture of caring and connectedness within the school. These attributes are nurtured and sustained by a teaching staff that consists of a core group of experienced veterans and a cohort of dynamic, highly engaged, younger teachers. The demonstrated enthusiasm and passion for teaching by this group of teaching staff seems to have a positive and motivating effect on the student body, negating any perceived limitations framed by externally imposed representations of the school. It is evident to me from the perspective of being a site based policy actor and researcher in a leadership role that the teaching staff are highly invested in the school, work diligently towards developing strong
connections with students and focuses on building a school culture based on a climate of care.

In supporting this approach, the SLT nurtures the establishment of ethical, collaborative and collegial decision making processes in order to build trust and credibility in their relationships with staff. As a fully engaged member of the SLT, this approach has allowed me to establish high credibility and trust with those engaged in a variety of policy processes and other initiatives at Southside Secondary. In this respect, my opinion has been sought out and my input valued regarding policy processes that are not under my direct purview. This latter point is particularly significant for me as an embedded researcher, since policy actors may be conflicted by their professional experience of an open and candid dialogue in my SLT role as a policy actor, in contrast to their perceptions of me in the role of researcher, where I am forced to disengage from two way dialogue in order to elicit perceptions at arms’ length regarding policy processes. It thus becomes critical for me to clearly articulate my role as researcher, from both an external and an internal perspective. In essence, policy actors need to understand that (i) I have no vested interest in their advancing a particular viewpoint regarding the policy processes under consideration and (ii) I need to remain fully aware of the need to conduct the research process in a manner that does not consciously or unconsciously inflict, impose or otherwise frame the viewpoints of respondents. An additional level of awareness also requires me to recognize, and analytically account for, the occasions where respondent viewpoints are impacted by my dual role. This recognition is accomplished through analytical auditing by careful attention to the utilization of reflexive procedures that permit me as the researcher to consider how my role within the research site setting plays out during the course of data collection and other research procedures. This latter point is methodologically critical in order for me to be confident that the generated data are authentic and not influenced by my site based position as a policy
actor. Examples of this reflexive approach will be presented throughout this chapter as the methodological procedures are elaborated.

This diverse student population exhibits a wide range of mathematical abilities and competencies, to the degree that the teaching staff recognize the need to maintain mathematics course offerings at both the higher and lower ends of the achievement spectrum, in order to provide students with the utmost opportunities to achieve success and meet BC graduation requirements. These course offerings included three strands: Essential Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Foundations of Mathematics, in order of increasing rigour. However, as previously described, the new curriculum is replacing these three strands. As the member of the SLT liaising with the Mathematics department in the implementation of the new courses, it is evident to me through informal conversations with teaching staff that these proposed changes to the curriculum are being met with a heightened degree of concern for the students who will be faced with the new courses.

Within this context I will undertake this case study, using a grounded theory methodology, examining the perceptions, understanding and engagement of the staff with the implementation of the mathematics curriculum at Southside Secondary, in order to gain an understanding of what these factors bring to bear on the implementation process.

3.3 Framing the Research Approach

3.3.1 Research Paradigm

Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggest that the research paradigm “represents a worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the ‘world’, the individual’s place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts” (p. 107). Miles and Huberman (1994) further advance that knowing “how a researcher construes the shape of the social world”
allows us to understand the “conversation” (p. 4) being advanced by the researcher. In these terms the adoption of a research paradigm “sets down the intent, motivations and expectations for the research” (MacKenzie and Knipe 2006, p. 2) shaping the “subsequent choices regarding methodology, methods, literature or research design” (p. 2).

In adopting a research paradigm a researcher thus puts forth a statement of position in terms of a worldview that advances a personal conceptualization of the nature of reality (ontology) and the nature of knowledge construction (epistemology). This worldview becomes the researcher’s touchstone with respect to making “knowledge claims”, to enlisting a “strategy of inquiry” and to adopting “methods of data collection and analysis” (Creswell 2003, p. 5)

Research paradigms are classified by several authors (Guba and Lincoln 1994, Huberman and Miles 1994, Creswell, 2003) as being linked to the quantitative or qualitative nature of the research study. In these terms, quantitative studies are more readily associated with positivist ontology and an objectivist epistemology, whereas the paradigms for qualitative studies are more readily located along the interpretivist/subjectivist framework.

The positivist/objectivist paradigm relates to the historical “received view of science” (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p. 106) where the focus is on the verification and quantification of an objective reality. Critiques of this approach suggest that the positivist focus on quantification and verification fails to account for factors such as context, human agency, embedded perceptions of reality and the recognition of individuality. Furthermore, it is suggested that this paradigm fails to consider or account for ideas outside of those being verified in terms of their relevance to the research inquiry. In Guba and Lincoln’s (1994) terms “Quantitative normative methodology is thus privileged over the insights of creative and divergent thinkers” (p. 106) under this received view of science. Guba and Lincoln suggest that this
imbalance may be redressed by the “greater use of qualitative data” (p. 107).

Additional criticisms relate to the absence within the positivist paradigm in addressing (1) the inter-dependent relationship between fact and theory, (2) the divergence between deductive verification and inductive reasoning in building theoretical understanding and (3) the relationship of the researcher to those being researched and the resulting impact on the research study. Such criticism lead Guba and Lincoln (1994) to suggest that “fundamental adjustments in the assumptions” (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p. 107) guiding the inquiry are required to counteract structural concerns associated with the positivist paradigm.

The interpretivist/subjectivist paradigm seeks to address the above criticisms by taking the view that reality is socially constructed and relies on the “participants’ views of the situation being studied” (Creswell 2003, p. 8). These views are subjective in nature and through their “interactions with others” (p. 8), act to coalesce meaning and understanding for participants of processes within the environment in which they operate. The interpretivist researcher thus focusses on the interactions of individuals with these processes in order to build an understanding of their impact. In addition to focussing on interactions, the interpretivist paradigm also addresses the “contexts in which people live and work” as well as assessing their insertion into the research context by asking how “their own background shapes their interpretation” (p. 8) in terms of impacting the research situation. The goal of the researcher in adopting an interpretivist paradigm is to “make sense of (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world” through developing a “theory or pattern of meaning” (p. 9) by way of explanation of those meanings.

While both of these approaches represent paradigmatic opposites, I accept that each has something to offer to my worldview as a researcher. I
concur with the position held by Miles and Huberman (1994) that “Human relationships and societies have peculiarities that make a realist approach to understanding them more complex – but not impossible (p. 4). As Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest human activity takes place within social structures that are “invisible, but nonetheless real” (p. 4) and it is recognition of the real impact and influence of these structures that leave them open to inquiry and investigation. I also accept the premise of a socially constructed reality that is contextual and shaped by interactive forces that are inadequately interrogated within the positivist paradigm. I further concur with Miles and Huberman (1994) in positioning the aim of research as transcending subjective experience through “building theories to account for a real world”, not from a positivist paradigm, but from a perspective of how “a social process, a mechanism, a structure at the core of events” may be viewed as providing a causal description of the forces at work” (p. 4). In essence, my worldview aligns with a post-positivist paradigm represented by transcendental or critical realism, which “calls for both causal explanation and for the evidence to show that each entity or event is an instance of that explanation” (p. 4). Further elaboration of this research approach now bears consideration.

Critical realism lies within the boundaries of a post-positivist paradigm that is positioned between positivist and interpretivist conceptualizations. Critical realism argues that while “reality is assumed to exist”, it is “imperfectly apprehendable” due to “flawed human intellectual mechanisms” (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p. 10). Critical realism overcomes these arguments in establishing research approach that “offers an ontology that can conceptualize reality, support theorizing, and guide empirical work”, while concurrently addressing “the role of both agency and structural factors in influencing human behaviour” (Clark 2008, p. 168).

Critical realism, located as a middle ground between positivist and interpretivist research paradigms, originates with the 1975 publication by
Roy Bhaskar of *A Realist Theory of Science* (e-book later republished in 2008 by Taylor & Francis). The central tenet of Bhaskar’s proposition is the “existence of three realms of reality: the actual, the real and the empirical” (Clark 2008, p169). For Bhaskar (2008) each realm or domain represents a stratification of reality, where “causal structures and generative mechanisms of nature must exist and act independently of the conditions that allow men to access them” (p. 46). The empirical domain is characterized by “that which we can observe – things that happen and exist according to our immediate experience” (Alvesson 2009, p. 40). The actual domain encompasses “that which transpires independently” and the domain of the real “includes those mechanisms that are productive of different events” (p.40). Critical realism as a paradigm concentrates its focus on investigating the domain of the real, focussing on those mechanisms and events in terms of their impact on shaping reality.

This notion of mechanism is central to the construction of critical realism. Mechanisms may be defined as inherent structures or processes that are “capable of making things happen in the world.” (Alvesson, p. 42) and “are taken to exist, even when they are not triggered or their effect impossible to trace” (p.42). Essentially, Bhaskar (2008) advances an argument for the intransitive nature of such mechanisms and events in the natural world, where their existence is independent of whether they are observed or not.

For Bhaskar (2008) these mechanisms and events are embedded within the domain of the real. Bhaskar (2008) further argues that empirical paradigms fail to differentiate these three levels of reality and fall into the anthropocentric trap of merging them into one, wherein the merged reality can only be uncovered via experiences, thereby committing the “epistemic fallacy” where “statements about being can always be transposed into statements about our knowledge of being” (p. 5). Alvesson (2009) suggests that “it is the interest in mechanisms of a ‘deeper dimension’, which
distinguishes critical realism from other traditions” (p. 40). While critical realism shares positivism’s focus on objectivity, pattern recognition and causality, it also distances itself from the avoiding consideration of the unobservable that characterizes positivism. In these terms, critical realism embraces the duality of a qualitative focus on “synthesis and context”, while simultaneously emphasizing the “objective nature of reality” (Alvesson p.40).

The conceptualization of a stratified reality characterized by the existence of real mechanisms and events as proffered by critical realism is open to contestation and criticism. First, the notion of an intransitive objective reality is contested. The idea that structures and mechanisms exist regardless of their recognition is problematic in that such recognition is attributed to elements that are unknowable outside of a philosophically constructed paradigm. This places the integrity of the research process in question if the researcher presupposes the presence of an existent structure or mechanism, and then proceeds to investigate that it indeed does exist. Second, the notion of structure and mechanism are themselves called into question as constructs. In framing structures and mechanism as causation of events or action, can we be sure that the observed events or actions are indeed the only outcomes of causation? Are there other explanations and have they thoroughly considered? Finally, does critical realism as a paradigm pay adequate attention to researcher reflexivity and attendant issues arising from such consideration?

Despite the critiques, critical realism offers a research approach that serves to address and integrate the divergent positions represented by positivist and interpretivist paradigms. Pring (2005) offers support for the adoption such a paradigm that seeks to reconcile the dichotomy presented by positivism and interpretivism. Pring (2005) suggests there is an “untenability” (p.258) to the either/or of both paradigms. Pring (2005) further acknowledges that a balance between the two paradigms bears
consideration wherein qualitative work “simply sets limits and gives greater refinement to the more general verifiable and (where possible) quantifiable claims which research should constantly be seeking” (p.259). Critical realism as a paradigm permits this reconciliation in that it allows the researcher to set aside concerns that may arise from employing a purely interpretivist paradigm, while preserving access to its analytic techniques to deepen meaning and understanding beyond the empirical.

Clark (2008) suggests that the strengths of critical realism relate to its ability to “render complexity intelligible, its explanatory focus, its reconciliation of agency and structural factors, and its ability to recognize … the importance of social meaning to humans” (p.168). Furthermore, for Clark (2008) the approach is “well suited to approaches that seek to explain outcomes”, where the “overriding importance is on understanding reality” (p.168). In this context qualitative or quantitative considerations of methodology are secondary to research outcome. In terms of this latter point Alvesson (2009) suggests that critical realism “is more and more often suggested as a counterweight to and alternative to social constructionist ideas” and as a “ground for critique of social constructionism, in a time when positivism has lost its appeal” (p.39). Alvesson reinforces this position by suggesting that critical realism as an approach “shares the interest of positivism in the objective world, patterns, generalizations” but negotiates an understanding that the “study of the observable is too superficial” in that it “disregards the unobservable mechanisms that produce the phenomena that positivists seek to measure and explain” (p.40). It is in seeking to address this latter point that the position of critical realism as a research paradigm is strengthened. In Alvesson’s (2009) view critical realism thus offers a “relevant critique against research that refrains from leaving the surface level; approaches that never go outside or beyond the empirical, to analyse other aspects that affect this level” (p.49).
From the foregoing it is evident that critical realism presents a research paradigm advancing a worldview wherein meaning and understanding should not be dependent on strict adherence to a rigid research paradigm. Furthermore, its recognition of both positivist and interpretivist constructs in elaborating an understanding of a complex reality, lends strength to its adoption for the purpose of this research study aimed at unpacking and understanding the nature of the interactions and engagement of policy actors with policy processes. It is within this premise that critical realism is adopted as the theoretical lens for this study.

Attention is now turned to case study and grounded theory as methods of inquiry.

3.3.2 Case Study

In the seminal work outlining the case study, Yin (1984) identifies three conditions for its use as a research approach: when the research question is framed by how or why, when there is little or no control over behavioural elements and when the phenomenon under investigation is contemporary, rather than of a historical nature, allowing the researcher to engage in direct observation and systematic interviewing as data collection techniques. Yin (1984) further elaborates three types of case study: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory, the latter of which specifically focus on answering the *why & how* aspects of a research inquiry. This approach is understood as being an empirical research strategy that examines a phenomenon within its real life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. Yin (1984) also suggests that when the context in which a phenomenon occurs potentially impacts the phenomenon itself, there is a need to consider the interdependence of both dimensions in order to develop an understanding of the phenomenon. The case study approach thus permits an examination of the phenomenon *in situ*, while enabling the researcher to investigate the case *in toto*, when the researcher believes that political, social and other
contexts need to be considered in terms of their potential influence on the phenomenon under examination. Consideration of these multiple contexts in terms of the case study becomes part and parcel of the overall process of “analytic generalization” (Yin 1994, p. 31) that locates case study as a vehicle for theory generation or refinement. This approach permits the analysis gained by examining events from a case, or series of cases, to infer a theoretical understanding of the phenomenon. In essence, the generalization is arrived at inductively, based on an analysis of observed phenomenon, rather than deductively, based on a statistical analysis of empirical data.

Yin’s (1984) formulation is supported by Stake (1994) who argues that case study is not a methodology; rather it is a means of framing the focus of an inquiry.

Case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of object to be studied. … As a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used. (Stake 1994 p. 236).

This notion permits the inquiry to focus on the issue (phenomenon) and the multiple contexts within which it is located, as opposed to strict adherence to canons of methodology, thereby providing the researcher with an opportunity to focus on the complexity of the interactions within the specific case setting. In essence, it gives the researcher the intellectual space to consider multiple perspectives in relation to the phenomenon under consideration.

In framing both Yin and Stake’s characterization of the case study as an observational vehicle, a key question arises in terms of what is being observed and why. The foundation for the case study an observational tool is supported by Gerring (2007) in laying out the idea that “for a case study to provide insight in to a broader phenomenon, it must be representative of a broader set of cases” (Gerring 2007, p. 91). In this sense, the chosen site
for the study should be recognizable as a typical case, where “The typical case exemplifies what is considered to be a typical set of values, given some general understanding of a phenomena” (Gerring 2007, p. 91). Within this context, I have chosen Southside Secondary as the case study site in that it is a school within the Vancouver School District that demonstrates average achievement amongst the student body in most curriculum areas, but struggles with Mathematics and Sciences. This profile is typical of the majority of the eighteen secondary schools located within the South, North and East sides of the Vancouver School District, whose demographic makeup draws largely from those families in the middle to lower income levels in terms of socio-economic standing and levels of higher educational attainment.

Selection of the case study as an inquiry method brings the framing of the 'research focus' into a critical perspective. Gerring's position is supported by Eisenhardt's (1989) argument suggesting that in a case study without a clear research focus it is easy to become “overwhelmed by the volume of data” (Eisenhardt 1989, p. 536). For the researcher, this necessitates clear understanding of the purpose of the inquiry, of the research question being addressed and of the limitations of the study's focus. Whereas the need for a clear research focus is central to Eisenhardt's (1989) approach, it should be noted that Eisenhardt in a departure from Yin (1984) suggests that a priori theoretical constructs be utilized in order to frame the research design. Whereas Eisenhardt's (1989) position suggests that this conceptual framing lends empirical power to emergent theoretical considerations, for this study I will not adopt this stance. Rather, the approach I take will employ the case study as an observational process (Yin 1984, Stake 2005 and Gerring 2007) requiring me to pay close attention to remaining open and inductive in terms of my analytical approach, unencumbered by a priori theoretical assumptions. These conditions framing this observational approach are in alignment with
the canons of classic grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Glaser 2005, Holton 2007), which I will now examine in greater detail.

3.3.3 Classic Grounded Theory

Classic Grounded Theory (CGT) research, as initially elaborated by Glaser & Strauss (1967), is positioned as being devoid of ontological or epistemological predispositions. CGT represents a systematic approach to qualitative research, whereby ‘data’ are analyzed through a constant comparative method, allowing thematic concepts to emerge, which form the basis for framing a theoretical explanation of the phenomenon under consideration. The theory is said to be grounded in and emerge inductively from analysis of the data. The data for a Grounded Theory analysis arise from qualitative interviews; researcher interactions with research subjects and personal reflections of the researcher in the course of the inquiry…in essence, anything that relates contextually to the inquiry is deemed worthy of consideration and analysis. Glaser’s (2001) dictum “all is data” underscores the idea that all aspects of a phenomenon in a CGT inquiry bear examination in terms of their potential impact and contribution to the process of concept development.

For the GT researcher the world is totally empirical. As he collects data his job is to deal with exactly what is happening, not what he would want to happen, not what his interest would wish the data to be. The data is not “truth” it is not “reality”. It is exactly what is happening. (Glaser 2001 pp.145-146).

Following the Discovery of Grounded Theory, Glaser and Strauss diverged in their approach. Strauss proceeded in a direction related to strategies aligned with Qualitative Data Analysis techniques that allow coding techniques and analysis to be informed by theoretical consideration, whereas Glaser maintained the conception of Classic Grounded Theory (CGT) as an interpretive, contextual means of inquiry as opposed to a theoretically informed methodology. For Glaser the advancement and application of Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) techniques and principles to
Grounded Theory analysis represents an encroachment that challenges the integrity of the approach, which is designed to permit theory to emerge from the data through conceptual analysis. This latter notion is highlighted by Glaser’s (2005) argument refuting the application of restrictive theoretical considerations as being foundational to CGT.

GT is just a relatively simple inductive model that can be used on any data type and with any theoretical perspective. It is just a general inductive model, or paradigm, if you will, that is sufficiently general to be used at will by any researchers in any field, any department and any data type. No one theoretical perspective can possess it. (Glaser 2005 p 4). … The quest for an ontology and epistemology for justifying GT is not necessary. It will take these on from the type of data it uses for a particular research FOR THAT RESEARCH ONLY. GT is simply an inductive model for research. It is a paradigm for discovery of what is going on in any particular arena. Whether GT takes on the mantle for the moment of prepositivist, positivist, postpositivist, postmodernism, naturalism, realism etc, will be dependent on its application to the type of data in a specific research. (Glaser 2005 p. 5-6).

Thus, in Glaser’s view, a research inquiry based on Classic Grounded Theory analysis permits an examination of data devoid of any theoretical constructs through treating the data ‘impartially’ and employing a constant comparison of events in order to frame conceptual emergence. These concepts are then further examined for consistency, discrepancy, alignment or dissonance, thereby enabling the researcher to consider multiple propositions prior to framing a substantive theoretical claim that may have emerged from the data.

Support to Glaser’s argument is offered by Holton (2007) who locates CGT as a construct-free means of inquiry.

While articulating one’s stance on the nature of knowledge and knowing is a prerequisite of any qualitative research design … classic grounded theory methodology transcends this concern. …classic grounded theory methodology uses data of all types and media and accommodates a range of epistemological and ontological perspectives without having to espouse any one perspective; in essence, the methodology is epistemologically and ontologically neutral. (Holton 2007 p. 268).
Further support is advanced by Holton’s (2007) argument that whereas most qualitative research requires the “declaration” of a philosophical stance premised on a theoretical construct through which a phenomenon is viewed, grounded theory uncovers concepts embedded within the data that inform and frame theoretical explanations of the issue under study. A grounded theory approach thus forces the researcher to think beyond established theoretical constructs, forcing him or her to engage in abstract conceptualization during the analysis and develop theoretical frames from those emergent concepts as possible explanations for the observed phenomenon. Furthermore, Glaser’s classic grounded theory approach requires the researcher not only to conceptualize alternate explanations, but also to demonstrate theoretical sensitivity in triangulating these explanations through a method of constant data comparison and theoretical sampling, in order to reinforce the viability of the explanatory theoretical frames. Classic grounded theory thus appears to be a self regulating mode of inquiry that stakes its research claims on the application of an internal analytic consistency towards the data, free of restrictive theoretical constructs, thereby allowing the data to speak for itself in terms of framing an understanding of the processes at play in the observed phenomenon.

This argument (Glaser 2001, 2005, Holton 2007) situating CGT as an analytic tool unencumbered by theoretical propositions or a priori assumptions defining the nature of reality or the nature of knowledge held particular appeal for me as the researcher. Adopting this research stance permitted me to examine the data through a conceptually blank lens, affording me theoretical freedom to consider broad based conceptual linkages of emergent themes, devoid of pre-defined theoretical limitations. As a novice researcher this approach was particularly useful in that it gave me license to look beyond pre-established constructs that may have acted as limiting parameters framing the subsequent and ongoing analysis.
This latter notion is illustrated by the following reflexive examples regarding my interaction as an embedded researcher with the CGT methodology. The first involves whether I paid close attention to any assumptions or dispositions I may have brought to the research process framed by my role as a site based policy actor that might have the potential to predefine and shape analysis of the data. Examples of such assumptions include: was I hearing and validating all viewpoints equally during interviews; was I giving analytical preference to internally resonant statements advanced during interviews? The second related to whether I was aware of how other policy actors perceived my role in terms of policy processes and how those perceptions framed their interview responses. In this respect the critical question became one of whether was I aware of and did I account for the perceptions of my positional authority on policy actors during the interview process in terms of how those perceptions may have impacted their responses? These considerations of researcher reflexivity regarding the use of CGT as a methodology of inquiry suggests that there is an acute need for personal awareness of any potential impact that may impinge upon the process of data collection and analysis. This awareness becomes critical in order to mediate any potential issues relating to researcher impartiality, the ethical comfort of research participants and an open and transparent research process. Once these factors are recognized and mediated the CGT approach becomes a powerful tool to build understanding of a case study phenomenon.

From the foregoing discussion it is evident that a case study approach examining a phenomenon in its natural setting, utilizing the analytically inductive approach of classic grounded theory, is well suited to the line of inquiry posed by the proposed research question which seeks to understand how the perceptions, understanding and engagement of stakeholders with a particular policy relates to the implementation of that policy in a school setting.
3.3.4 Methodological reflexivity: critiques and limitations

Yin (1984) in establishing the conceptual framework for the use of the case study as a research tool identifies four areas of critique (originating out of the positivist, empiricist research tradition) that must be met by qualitative researchers using this approach. These are critiques of research construct, validity (internal & external) and reliability.

Construct threats relate to the use of operational methods in case studies that do not appropriately capture the topical focus of the research. This concern is addressed by Yin (1984) through researchers clearly specifying the processes or changes under investigation and ensuring that the research tools designed to gauge these processes are indeed doing so. In addressing this concern, I paid close attention to the structure of the interview as the primary research tool, in order to mediate potential threats related to respondent authenticity. Careful consideration was given to factors such as types of questions and the manner in which they were posed, along with the time of day, location and length of the interview, in order to mediate fatigue and potential disengagement of respondents, leading to the accumulation of poor data. These considerations were critical since interview subjects were mostly full time classroom teachers, whose instructional day typically ran full on for four classes from 8:30am to 3:15pm with a lunch-break in the middle of the day. For most teachers this lunch break however did not offer a full respite from their duties, which were filled with supplementary teaching tasks such as supervision of make up tests, committee meetings and sponsoring student extra-curricular activities.

Threats to internal validity in case research arise from an interpretive and social–constructionist perspective. For Yin (1984) these threats are embedded in the manner in which data analysis drives interpretive inferences. Some of the questions posed to test the internal validity construct include...are there multiple strands of evidence supporting these inferences...have all avenues of analysis been considered...are there
alternative explanations? While consideration of these questions may be relevant to a case study research approach that adheres strictly to the canons of qualitative data analysis, my use of CGT as the analytical tool in this study provides a countervailing argument to these concerns by virtue of its iteratively inductive nature as an analytical methodology. This iteratively inductive analysis parallels Huberman & Miles (1994) approach to qualitative research in terms of posing a “succession of question and answer cycles” (p. 431) wherein the “resulting inferences” from such cycles may be deemed to be valid by virtue of their constant modification and refinement. This is akin to the CGT notion of theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Holton 2007), which defines the point at which additional cycles of data analysis neither yield additional information nor add to the emergent conceptual framework. In essence, it may be argued that this CGT notion of theoretical saturation is a self checking process framing internal validity, in that it cannot be claimed to have been arrived at unless all avenues of analysis have been fully explored.

External validity threats present a particular issue for case studies, in that this research approach may not contribute in an empirical way to generalizable theory. External validity tests have traditionally been associated with the positivist, structuralist paradigm of inquiry, whose analytical frame for generalizability resides in a statistical sampling framework. This critique is addressed by the argument (Yin 1984) that theory arising out of case studies is contingent upon generalization to a socially constructed analytical framework, rather than a statistically driven empirical model. The discussion framed earlier in the chapter advancing the argument for naturalistic (Stake 1967) and analytic (Yin 1984) generalization is supportive of this position, where a general understanding of a phenomenon may be socially constructed from case to case by those observing the phenomenon within a range of settings. Reflecting upon this idea, while I understand that undertaking this case study may not yield
results that are readily generalizable on an empirical basis, I argue that case specific insights may emerge that can be applied in a general sense to case study sites of a similar nature (albeit within different contexts) along the lines of as suggested by Stake (1967) and Yin (1984). This argument is reinforced with the addition of the methodological layer of classic grounded theory as an analytical tool that inductively draws out theory from the case data.

The final critique associated with the positivist paradigm is that of reliability, wherein results are to be deemed reproducible, given the same research conditions and circumstances. A critique of qualitative research in general is that it fails the test of reliability, in that the research is mostly conducted within a constructivist, interpretive paradigm, which by the very nature of its paradigmatic construction limits reproducibility. Yin (1984) acknowledges this limitation and advances the notion of routinized documentation of research processes and procedures, thereby providing the opportunity for transparent observation of the research protocol by arm’s length observers. The impact of this approach would be to allow faithful reproduction of the research process, albeit with an understanding that reproduction of the research environment may present a more challenging proposition.

The above critiques may be addressed by the qualitative case study researcher through (a) the use of multiple sources of evidence, (b) establishing a chain of evidence and (c) research review by ‘embedded key informants’ to inform construct validity. The ‘triangulation’ of data through additional evidence sources and accessing key informants inside the organization who possess insight and understanding of the processes under investigation, (Mathison 1988, Krefting 1991, Creswell 2000, Cho 2006) are avenues used to mediate the concerns raised regarding issues of validity. As Krefting (1991) suggests when the researcher is faced with multiple realities of informants regarding a phenomenon they then need to
“focus on testing their findings against various groups from which the data was drawn” (Krefting 1991, p. 215-216). This point is borne out by Stevenson’s (2004) argument that construct validity is strengthened for readers of the research, through creation of meaningful analytical, experiential and/or personal connections with the case phenomenon under study. A vehicle that mediates this connection is the triangulation of data (Creswell 2000) through key informants, or member checking, which provides the reader with multiple contextual lenses through which to locate the analysis, which will bear further elaboration below.

An approach addressing the above limitations of qualitative research is offered by Lincoln & Guba (1985), who reframe the criteria for what counts as ‘good research’ within the constructivist-interpretive paradigm. Lincoln & Guba (1985) advance the notion of ‘trustworthiness’ of the research in re-tooling the validity-reliability construct to the qualitative research model. Elements of the trustworthiness model proposed by Lincoln & Guba (1985) parallel the constructs of validity and reliability, but from a constructivist frame. These elements include credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility refers to the accuracy in identifying and describing the research focus. Checking for credibility involves (i) the use of third party vetting of analytic processes to verify representational authenticity and (ii) comparative triangulation of results from multiple data sources to comparatively validate evidence for internal consistency. In addressing this issue, I need to ensure that the process through which the analytic conclusions are arrived at are cross-checked for accuracy and transparency in terms of being drawn out from the research data. In essence, I need to consider whether I as a researcher have paid attention to ensuring that data analysis and interpretation reflect the phenomenon through the lens of the study participants.
Transferability is embedded in the ability of a case reader to make positive comparisons and determine similarities between the case study population and a population of their own choosing. The inference is that the case study must contain enough information about its population for the reader to gain an appreciation of the nuances of similarity/difference between the two groups. Lincoln & Guba (1985) support the contention that this is accomplished through engaging in thick, rich and comprehensive description of the study, leaving aside the need for assumptions as compensation for missing information. Transferability is seen as the qualitative equivalent to external validity. As a means of addressing this issue I have striven for depth of descriptive accuracy in locating the context for the case study and engaged in nuanced reflections to explicate my interpretations regarding the interactions of study participants with policy processes. This latter notion of reflection is essential to the analytic process of CGT and allows me to mediate the process of reader transferability by providing an insight into how I as a researcher arrived at certain interpretations.

Dependability is identified by Lincoln & Guba (1985) as a qualitative mirror to the notion of reliability in quantitative studies. As noted previously, the dominant research paradigms associated with case study preclude the notion of reliability. Lincoln & Guba (1985) support Yin (1984) that engaging in strategies similar to those designed to enhance credibility may minimize the criticisms associated with the need for reliability.

Finally, confirmability according to Lincoln & Guba (1985) is linked to the notion of objectivity of the research process. This is framed in terms of whether appropriate techniques are employed, the analysis meets rigorous standards and there is documentary transparency providing the means for evaluating these processes. Two critical pieces I need to address to build confirmability are clear documentation and open reflexivity. It is critical that I engage in careful documentation of the research process in order to give
the reader clear understanding of what was done, how it was done and when. In essence, I need to ensure that the methodological canons of the CGT process are clearly articulated in order for the reader to follow how the concurrent processes of data collection and analysis are tied together in arriving at the analytical conclusions of the study. It is also important that I am visibly transparent in locating myself reflexively within the research process in order for the readers to be able to assess for themselves the degree of trustworthiness they can place upon the research process.

Notwithstanding the prevalent criticisms regarding Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) methodologies as described above, it should be noted that the adoption of a grounded theory approach to a case study as proposed for this research inquiry is centred on the earlier argument laid out by Glaser (2001, 2003) and Holton (2007) countering the necessity of incorporating QDA approaches into grounded theory inquiries. This argument contends that the grounded theory approach is not concerned with a positivist verification of facts or creating reproducible results via statistical verification, rather, it is more concerned with the inductive generation of concepts that arise from within the data itself and creating an analytical framework for developing theoretical frames linked by these concepts that offer an explanation of the phenomenon under study. A supporting argument for Glaser’s (2001, 2003) and Holton’s (2007) conceptualization of remaining true to the inductive approach of grounded theory is embedded in the approach to triangulation by Mathison (1998), who suggests its use as an avenue for the researcher to “make sense of some social phenomena” (Mathison 1988, p. 15), as opposed to being used as means to delivering that outcome. Mathison (1988) further conceptualizes triangulation as an inductive process by recognizing it “as a technique which provides more and better evidence from which the researcher can construct meaningful propositions about the social world”, whose value “lies in providing evidence such that the researcher can
construct explanations of the social phenomena from which they arise” (Mathison 1988, p. 15). Applied in this sense, triangulation in the form of member checking may be seen to be compatible with a Classic Grounded Theory methodology that bypasses the ontological and epistemological frameworks necessary to alternate methods of qualitative inquiry. As Holton (2009) states,

The decision to use classic grounded theory methodology is a ‘full package’ decision. It requires the adoption of a systematic set of precise procedures for collection, analysis and articulation of conceptually abstract theory. On the menu of research methodology, classic grounded theory is ‘table d’hoře’, not ‘à la carte’.
(Holton 2009 p. 45).

Another area of critique relates to the lack of an ontological and epistemological foundation embedded within the grounded theory methodology.

The inductive approach advanced by the classic grounded theory requires me as the researcher to remain open into reaching analytic conclusions and developing theoretical propositions unencumbered by predetermined ontological and epistemological foundations; rather these conclusions and propositions must be derived directly from the data without any theoretical preconceptions. While there are variations to the grounded theory approach (Corbin & Strauss 1990, Strauss & Corbin 1994, Charmaz 2000) each of these approaches “differ sufficiently from the original methodology that they serve a different purpose” (Breckenridge et al 2012). Breckenridge (2012) makes the case that the CGT approach attempts to frame a conceptual understanding of observed behaviours, rather than explain research participants’ perspectives of those behaviours. In essence CGT attempts to theoretically explicate what is going on at a larger conceptual level. It may be argued that if an epistemological framework is applied to a grounded theory analysis, then the understanding gained by the analysis is clouded by the conceptual framework of that epistemological lens and does not lead to accurate theoretical interpretations of the
observed behaviours. Holton (2007) further elaborates this notion of CGT existing outside of the limiting boundaries of an epistemological divide in suggesting that “classic grounded theory can adopt any epistemological perspective appropriate to the data and the ontological stance of the researcher” (p.269). In this sense, a CGT approach permits the researcher to adopt “multiple perspectives” (Breckenridge et al 2012) in arriving at conceptual understanding of the phenomenon under study. This suggests that the grounded theory approach may be combined with any epistemological lens and does not preclude the application of a paradigmatic framework to the ensuing discussion arising from the findings.

This approach thus lends itself to being combined with a single site case study, which examines a specific phenomenon in a specific setting to determine what can be learned about the phenomenon in the context of that setting.

A key epistemological foundation in utilizing the case study approach is the idea of what can be learned from the single case, as opposed to what may be generalized from it in positivist terms. Stake (1982) contends that case study provides a lens through which a researcher’s knowledge may be augmented by ‘vicarious experiences’, thereby allowing the formulation of ‘naturalistic generalization’ based upon those experiences that in turn may frame expectations for future experiences. For Stake (1978) naturalistic generalization derives from the “tacit knowledge of how things are, why they are, how people feel about them and how these things are likely to be later or in other places with which this person is familiar” (Stake 1978, p. 6), as opposed to the notion of formal generalization that arises out of empirical, positivist forms of inquiry, supported by quantitative analytical techniques.

In light of the prior analysis, my use of the case study as a methodology is well suited as an observational vehicle for me as an embedded researcher to study policy implementation as a phenomenon in
its natural setting at Southside Secondary School. This approach, in combination with Classic Grounded Theory (CGT) allows me the use of a theoretically neutral approach, affording me the opportunity to remain open into developing insights into a “phenomenon in its context” (Rowley 2002, p. 18) and to provide analysis of the phenomenon in a manner that develops “a heuristic in the form of analytical constructs or categories that readers can use to reflect on their practice” (Stevenson 2004, p. 46). A critical reflective thought that I must keep at the forefront of my analysis is that that any understanding of phenomenon I develop from this case study only relates to that particular phenomenon in that particular case setting, as highlighted by Stevenson (2004) who suggests that “case researchers recognize that these constructs are based solely on data derived from the case(s) they studied” (Stevenson 2004, p. 46). This latter position suggests a good fit in utilizing a grounded theory case study approach, in that any findings arising from a grounded theory study are specific to the phenomenon uncovered within that grounded theory study and are not generalizable beyond the limits of that case. However, a concomitant strength of this approach is that it permits me as the researcher to intellectually venture beyond the limits of the specific case, by providing a means of developing a theoretical foundation for broader understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

Since the adoption of a case study using classic grounded theory methodology appears to be an ‘all or nothing ‘proposition as exemplified above by Holton (2005), specific methodological considerations now bear further examination.

3.4 Methodological Considerations and Research Procedures

3.4.1 Ethical Issues

Ethical considerations for researchers are highlighted by Punch (1994) who identifies that research fieldwork operates within an
environment where “acute moral and ethical dilemmas may be encountered” that have to be “politically and ethically” resolved by the researcher (p.84). Punch (1994) takes the perspective that “everything from the personal relations to the culture and resources” (p. 84) within the institutional setting being studied, have a contextual influence on the research, forcing the researcher to be aware and cognizant of these influences from an ethical perspective. This latter point of consideration was particularly important for me as an embedded researcher, with a primary professional responsibility as a member of the SLT for shepherding through the implementation of the new mathematics curriculum. I had to recognize and pay attention to the potential influence of my positional status, of emergent role conflicts and of perceptions of my personality, in terms of the potential of each of these factors to shape and influence interactions during the research process. Recognition of these concerns thus forced me to continually vet my personal actions through a lens of critical reflexivity, in order to ethically locate my position within the research process.

Specific ethical issues within the context of the relationship between the researcher and research subject are further elaborated by Punch (1994), in identifying the primary concerns of “harm, consent, deception, privacy and confidentiality of data” (p. 89) with respect to research procedures. Creswell (1998) further addresses these concerns by reminding the researcher to pay attention to preserving the anonymity of research subjects, creating clear participant understanding of the purpose and nature of the research, developing information sensitivity and disclosure parameters and clarifying to research subjects the embedded role of the researcher as ‘participant’ in the processes under study. Each of these concerns was addressed by my careful adherence to the ethically acceptable research protocols put forward by the university and the school board.
I initially vetted this project through the university’s ethics committee to determine conformity to the ethics standards. Upon approval the project was subsequently presented to the Vancouver School Board research approval committee (Appendix 09) to ensure adherence to their established ethical protocols for research in school settings. An important element of both of these vetting processes was the notion of informed consent which Punch (1994) identifies as the right of research subjects “to be informed that they are being researched and also about the nature of the research” (p. 90). I delivered to each interview subject a letter of introduction outlining the research parameters and the requirement for each interviewee to sign off a letter of consent to participate in the study. I reviewed these letters of consent with each subject prior their interview and addressed any issues or concerns that were raised, apprising the participants of the process of anonymous masking of names, places and of the data arising from the research process. I gave reassurance to the study participants that the data and findings were strictly for research purposes and would not be accessible to individuals or groups for any other purposes. Finally, I gave assurances to the research subjects that my role as a researcher was bounded by ethical research practices, which prevented me from acting in any manner that would jeopardize the authenticity of the research process. In that sense, I reassured them that any knowledge, insights or understandings gained from this project were purely for the purposes of my thesis, with no consideration of the finding being used in decision making in my role as a member of the school leadership team.

In terms of this latter point, an ancillary ethical issue is raised by Fontana and Frey (1994) in questioning the “veracity of reports made by researchers” (p. 373), in terms of the analysis truly reflecting the thoughts and viewpoints of the research subjects, without being shaded by researcher opinion or preference. In this sense, I had to carefully analyze my interpretations of the reactions of research subjects during interviews, in
terms of whether these interpretations may have been influenced by personal bias, prior history or ongoing interactions with each individual being interviewed. In essence, I had to critically reflect on whether my interpretations were at arm’s length in terms of their analysis, or not. This required continual attention on my part to ensuring that I engaged reflexive processes to examine my dual role at the research site as a policy leader and as an embedded researcher. Field notes served as a useful recordkeeping device in documenting my interactions with other policy actors, to which I could subsequently return to and critically reflect upon in terms of analyzing such interactions. Examples of this reflexive role of field notes are presented in the next section.

3.4.2 Research Design Considerations

Case study design is differentiated as being intrinsic or instrumental by Stake (1994), who argues that the former focusses on understanding a particular phenomenon as represented by the case, whereas the latter is related to the refinement of a theory for which the case may offer additional insight. In essence the “case is of secondary interest: it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else (p. 237).

For the purposes of this inquiry I have adopted Stake’s (1994) instrumental approach in order to focus on the processes at play in the implementation of new curriculum policy at a school site within a large urban school district in British Columbia. As argued previously this approach allows me as the researcher to utilize a grounded theory methodology as the lens though which these processes may be analyzed and interpreted, in order to develop new theoretical insights into the interactive and interdependent nature of policy implementation. This approach is validated by Miles & Huberman’s (1994) contention that when the research goal is (a) to identify elements of a research inquiry and explore their connectedness, or (b) to understand and interpret the meaning of behaviours and actions, that grounded theory and case study
respectively may serve as suitable vehicles of investigation. Since the research question I am addressing fits the criteria as suggested by Miles & Huberman (1994), an amalgam of both of these lines of inquiry is appropriate, in that it permits me theoretical freedom by removing constraining epistemological constructs, thus presenting me with the opportunity to: focus on data collection in a natural case setting, elaborate new theory, and/or re-interpret existing theory based on the emergent concepts arising from subsequent data analysis.

In applying the principles of grounded theory to data collection the Glaserian tenet of ‘All is Data’ (Glaser 2001) bears brief examination. For Glaser (2001) whatever the researcher encounters in the research site related to the inquiry must be considered in the analysis that frames the emergent concepts. Data collection thus is not restricted to the transcripts of interviews, but encompasses the recording of all observations and reflections that are encountered that may be analyzed for relevancy to the inquiry. While Corbin & Strauss (1990) may diverge in their analytical method, they parallel Glaserian thought in terms of their approach to data collection, allowing that it is not limited to interviews and observations, but should encompass “anything that may shed light on questions under study” (Corbin & Strauss 1990 p. 5). However, whereas Corbin & Strauss advance the notion that these avenues of data collection should be subject to the same principles governing qualitative data collection as used in other research paradigms, Glaser (2001) contends that the process is completely open ended, resulting in the provision an unfettered depiction of the phenomenon, requiring deep researcher engagement in order to elaborate conceptual understanding during analysis. To this end it is essential that I as the researcher remained open to analyzing all sources of information I encountered in the field and determine any bearing on the research question.
The notion of ‘all is data’ is subject to critique within the conventional frames of qualitative data collection and analysis, (Bryant & Charmaz 2007), on the grounds that the absence of a guiding theoretical point of reference in terms of the quantity, quality, relevancy or accuracy of the collected data may simply result in meaningless conclusions arising out of the very nature of the data itself. Glaser counters this, arguing that the nature of the data is irrelevant. More critical is the idea that all data sources are considered and analyzed through constant comparison, until no new concepts are seen to emerge. Quantity, quality, relevancy or accuracy do not enter the realm of consideration, since the grounded theorist is not concerned with representativeness, reliability or the other tenets pertaining to data sampling, rather he or she is more concerned with examining multiple data sources, through theoretical sampling, to enhance the process of conceptual triangulation leading to theory generation.

The above considerations served to heighten awareness of my role as a member of the SLT in policy processes and led me to keep field notes of my interactions with staff as those processes unfolded. It was important for me to document, reflect on and analyze my leadership role and to recognize where, how and when my actions may have had an impact. These reflective notes provided me with the lens through which to view these actions at a distance and identify occasions where policy processes may have been shaped by those actions. The following examples of field notes illustrate instances of my engagement with the curriculum process that required me to step back during data analysis and reflexively consider where, when and how my interactions may or may not have shaped the curriculum engagement process.

Example 1.

2010/01/04: Conversation with Math DH re curriculum implementation. Main concerns heard are resources support needs and the piecemeal approach and the poorly planned way this is being rolled out.
Reflection: This is going to be a challenge if the Math department isn’t on board, especially the DH. Need a meeting to air the concerns!

The above example illustrates my relationship with the Math department head. On the one hand the individual in question exhibits a high degree of trust in our relationship to the point that there is no reticence in sharing concerns about the unfolding policy process. On the other hand, my internal response recognizes the challenge to the policy process if the policy actors are not in alignment. This precipitates recognition on my part of the need to elicit policy actors’ perspectives in order to have any chance of moving the process moving forward.

Example 2.

2010/01/11: Math department meeting to discuss who can attend MoE info session tomorrow at VSB. NO takers! Notice too short. Might be able to view the webcast if VP can arrange it at the school.

Reflection: Need to make this happen to at least get the staff to hear the MoE reps lay out their views of the curriculum change. Might not change staff perceptions, but at least we will as a group all be aware of the messaging from the MoE and know what leeway we have at school sites with respect to the new curriculum.

This second example illustrates recognition of my professional role in mediating policy processes in the face of encountered obstacles. In this instance this type of interaction repositioned my leadership role to one of lessening any inherent tension in order to negotiate the emergence of a meaningful context for policy actors with respect to the unfolding policy process.

Field notes such as those illustrated above helped me to maintain a reflexive stance as data analysis unfolded, forcing me to recognize where any sense of personal empathy with and/or antipathy towards the interview subjects may have coloured my analytic interpretations.

3.4.3 Data Collection

The primary data collection technique I utilized for this grounded theory inquiry was the unstructured interview (Fontana & Frey 1994, p. 365-
368), using open ended questioning techniques allowing an uninterrupted flow of conversation related to the inquiry’s focus. During unstructured interviewing a critical reflexive position I had to adopt was that of maintaining an awareness of my responses to questions from the subjects that required the insertion of my personal thoughts and feelings into the dialogue. This point is emphasized by Fontana & Frey (1994) in suggesting that “the researcher should avoid … getting involved in ‘real’ conversation in which he or she answers questions asked by the respondent or provides personal opinions on the matter discussed” (p. 371) As Fontana & Frey (1994) further elaborate, a key focus for me during the interviews was to “attempt to understand the complex behaviour … without imposing any a priori categorization that may limit the field of inquiry” (Fontana & Frey 1994 p366). This point is further emphasized by Goulding (1999) who suggests a need to skillfully strike a balance between being totally unstructured avoiding "confusion, incoherence and … meaningless data" (p. 8) and having some degree of organization to the questions, to create the conditions for the subject to feel comfortable enough to fully participate and meaningfully engage in the proceedings. I addressed this issue by having a guiding set of questions (Appendix 01) to allow me to stay on track if I found that the conversation was going away from the focus of the research question.

Data collection was not limited to the interview process. In keeping with the previously elaborated Glaserian dictum of “all is data” (Glaser 2001) ongoing interactions between myself as both an embedded researcher and lead member of the SLT for implementation of the new curriculum required me to have ongoing conversations and interactions with policy actors who had involvement with the implementation of the mathematics curriculum at the case study site. Such conversations and interactions were noted in terms of their relevancy to the research question and recorded in field notes for further consideration during data analysis.
3.4.4 Interview Sampling

Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that sampling in qualitative research is “purposive rather than random” (p.27) in order to gain in depth understanding of the contexts in which such subjects operate and of their roles within those contexts. In essence, qualitative sampling is theoretically driven where “Choices of informants, episodes, and interactions are being driven by a conceptual question” where the focus is on “the conditions under which the construct or theory operates” (p.29). Morse (1994) elaborates further in suggesting that “A good informant is one who has the knowledge and experience the researcher requires, has the ability to reflect, is articulate, has the time to be interviewed and is willing to participate in the study” (p.228) and is “information rich” (p.229) in terms of the processes under consideration. These arguments reinforce the theoretical sampling approach of CGT (Glaser and Strauss 1967) where informants are initially chosen in relation to their relevant knowledge of the processes being investigated and subsequently chosen in terms of providing additional insight into to the emergent conceptual framework by virtue of their knowledge and experience.

Twenty interviews in total were conducted with a sample of thirteen interview subjects from Southside Secondary. Each of the thirteen individuals selected for in initial interviews fit the criteria (Morse 1994) as qualified informants by virtue of their range of experience with policy processes at Southside Secondary. Seven of these thirteen were theoretically sampled for an additional series of interviews following the initial round of data analysis. While the notion of sample size is contested (Morse 1994, p.224-225) in terms of appropriateness to qualitative research, this sample of twenty interviews is consistent with the findings of Guest et al (2006) examining non-probabilistic sample size in relation to developing theoretical saturation. With this latter notion being integral to CGT, Guest et al’s (2006) position warrants elaboration. Key findings
framing Guest et al’s (2006) argument suggests that code generation reached saturation point early in the coding process (p.67 fig.1) and that “data saturation had for the most part occurred after we had analyzed twelve interviews” (p.74). A point that Guest et al (2006) note in advancing this position is the requirement for a clear understanding on the part of the researcher of the purpose of the study. Guest et al (2006) suggest that “If the goal is to describe a shared perception, belief or behaviour among a relatively homogeneous group, then a sample of twelve will likely be sufficient” … “but if one wishes to determine how two or more groups differ along a given dimension, then you would like use a stratified sample of some sort” (p.76). In this case the sample from Southside Secondary is relatively homogeneous and is appropriate to the stated purpose of the study, which seeks to understand how the interactions and engagement with policy processes of this particular group of policy actors shape their perceptions of those processes.

3.4.5 Data Management & Analysis

Two crucial factors in facilitating the completion of qualitative research are data management and data analysis. Creswell’s (1998) model conceptualizes data management and analysis as interlocking coils of a spiral. This spiral begins with creating indexed storage systems for the ‘voluminous’ data generated by the case study approach. Huberman & Miles (1994) note that

...how data are stored and retrieved are at the heart of data management. Without a clear working scheme, data can easily be "miscoded, mislabelled, mislinked and mislaid" (Wolfe, 1992, p.293). A good storage and retrieval system is critical for keeping track of what data is available; for performing easy, flexible, reliable use of data ... and for documenting the analyses made so that the study can, in principle, be verified or replicated. (Huberman & Miles 1994 p. 430).

For Huberman & Miles (1994) data analysis consists of
three linked subprocesses: data reduction; data display and conclusion drawing/verification. These processes occur before data collection, during study design and planning; during data collection as interim and early analyses are carried out; and after data collection as final products are approached and completed. (Huberman & Miles 1994 pp. 428-429).

The data storage and retrieval elements suggested by Huberman & Miles (1994) have some application in Classic Grounded Theory, in that the compilation of interviews, memos and documents represents a large array of data for analysis through the lens of CGT. However, whereas Huberman & Miles (1994) model may have import towards established qualitative data analysis approaches, its application to CGT is contested (Glaser 2001, 2003), in that data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification are deductive processes, whereas CGT builds theory building based upon inductive analysis. This suggests that the analysis in a CGT inquiry aims at building theory through observation of the phenomenon in its natural setting and drawing conclusions through analytical deconstruction of those observations on a broader conceptual scale that encompasses the multiple inter-related aspects of the phenomenon. Thus, the qualitative data analysis model suggested by Huberman & Miles (1994) bears limited, if any, relevance to the analytical processes of the classic grounded theory methodology. Hence, while I will employ the principles of data storage and retrieval suggested by Huberman & Miles (1994) in this study, I will not be utilizing their analytical procedures, choosing rather to remain true to the classic grounded theory methodology.

As suggested by Huberman & Miles (1994) I adopted a systematic approach to the storage and retrieval of collected data involving the sub-processes of data reduction, data display and drawing and verifying conclusions.

The primary vehicle for the collection of data was through the interview process. Interviews were electronically recorded through a digital recording device, with subsequent manual transcription of the recordings.
into word processing files. This permitted electronic storage of the interview transcripts, which would subsequently prove to be useful in facilitating the search and referencing of passages from specific transcripts during subsequent data analysis.

Data reduction was accomplished through a multi-phase iterative examination of codes consistent with the CGT model of Glaser & Strauss (1967), with the Carney (1990) model of stepwise progression of analytical abstraction (cited in Miles & Huberman 1994, p. 92) and with the Huberman & Miles (1994) model framing the cyclical process of comparing displayed and analyzed data text. Each and every code derived from the line by line coding process was examined, reflected on for interpretive meaning and recorded into groups based on those interpretations. The following codes illustrate this methodological approach to the interpretive grouping of codes along lines of conceptual similarity: Invested; Engaged; Motivated; Committed; Receptive. These five codes are a sample of twenty-five distinct codes that were grouped together conceptually. Finally, each group was culled for repetition of codes and examined for consistency of thematic inclusion. This led to consolidation of the codes into groups reflecting internal interpretive consistency. Ensuing analysis of these groups at higher levels of theoretical abstraction supported further data reduction in terms of developing categories and concepts consistent with the analytical processes of the CGT methodology. The resulting concepts formed the foundational framework for a diagrammatic representation of a model framing the theoretical propositions drawn from the analysis.

Data and storage and retrieval considerations would be incomplete without reference to these processes in relation to field notes and memos. In terms of field notes the protocol followed was two fold: (1) recording field notes after formal interviews of things that struck me during the interview as requiring follow up and (2) recording field notes related to my professional interactions with policy processes as they unfolded and the potential impact
of those interactions on policy actors. These field notes were handwritten and anecdotal. The data management of written memos was more structured and process oriented. Raw handwritten memos were directly linked to their originating page from interview transcripts. Memos were subsequently transcribed into a spreadsheet, classified in terms of their transcript origin, their relationship to categories and concepts and whether they were analytical or reflective in nature. The use of the spreadsheet as a means of sorting and filtering the memos by both category and concept in relation to either their analytical or reflective nature proved to be highly productive in terms of facilitating the analytical process.

3.4.6 Interviews

I initially conducted thirteen formal interviews with eleven teachers and two administrators at Southside Secondary from September 2010 to May 2012, during which time the new mathematics curriculum was being implemented. I scheduled the interviews at the end of the school day, giving teachers the opportunity to choose a mutually convenient time through an online scheduling vehicle. In March 2011, in the midst of my field studies, I was transferred to a new school site forcing me to be more efficient with time management when returning to the case study site for field work. To this end I arranged back-to-back interviews with different interview subjects, minimizing the need for multiple site visits to complete the initial interviewing process. Interviews ranged from 45 to 55 minutes in length, with a series of guiding questions for researcher reference in order to keep the conversation flowing. Interviews were conducted as open ended in depth conversations, focusing on the subject’s engagement with and perceptions of curriculum implementation processes at the school level. When avenues of discussion were deemed to be of particular interest or required further clarification, I asked probing questions to explore in greater depth the strand of conversation that was taking place at the time. I electronically recorded the interviews, which were then manually
Each interview transcript was subsequently subjected to the line-by-line coding process consistent with the CGT approach.

Three of the interview subjects were seasoned and experienced mathematics teachers and the remaining eight were from other subject areas with varying degrees of exposure to curriculum implementation within their departments. Six of the eight teachers from other subject areas were department heads and had prior experience with curriculum implementation within their departments as part of their professional duties and leadership responsibilities. Two of the eight teachers had non-instructional roles as guidance counsellors, providing academic planning and social-emotional support services to students as they progressed through their high school career. One teacher was involved in the school as a senior union representative and brought those perspectives with policy implementation into the interview process.

The two members of the SLT team who were interviewed had extensive experience with a wide range of policy processes at Southside Secondary and over the course of their professional practice.

I found initial stages of the interviewing process to be uneven, in that the research subjects demonstrated a wide range of familiarity with the specifics of the current curriculum implementation. However, as the process unfolded I was able to create comfortable conditions for the interviews to unfold in an open ended conversational style. Guiding questions facilitated the flow of the interview (Appendix 01) and through the use of probing questions subjects were given freedom to elaborate on ideas and thoughts that arose during the course of the interview. The following excerpt from an interview highlights my use of probing questions to engage subjects and elicit further reflections on ideas of interest that arose during the course of the conversations.
SH: I’m interested in this notion of circle of doom that you just mentioned? Can you expand on that?
SW: Well they were a group of older teachers who have all retired now. They were just the most negative people.
SH: In what sense?
SW: Well because our school is on the bottom, so we would be constantly trying new ideas to see if we could improve learning and improve success rate. And they would say ‘Oh well we did that in 1975, and you know it’s just more of the same I’m not going to be doing this etc’ and it was just so negative.
SH: How did that play out with the rest of the staff?
SW: It had a negative effect on the staff morale for sure. But now they have retired, and a lot of young people are here and we’re all more open to new ideas.
SH: So you’re saying the younger staff came in, when did those changes occur?
SW: The last 3 or 4 years it began.
SH: And is the old attitude still manifesting itself?
SW: No I think it’s been totally abandoned. They’re looking at this assessment and looking at no-fails like the U.S. saying ‘no child left behind’ type stuff. And you just buy into one and you try, and I hope this new one that I am buying into will be around for a while.

The foregoing excerpt clearly demonstrates how the use of an open ended dialogue employing the use of probing questions permitted me to drill down on ideas as they arose during interviews, thus providing greater clarity of understanding as the ensuing analytical process unfolded.

Another key consideration during the research process was that of field relations. I had to pay careful attention during interviews not to interject my thoughts and/or opinions even if requested to do so. This was particularly important in light of my relationships and professional positioning with each of the interview subjects. This point is reflected in the reality that as a trusted site based policy actor my opinion was valued and sought after on a variety of issues not solely related to policy processes, but also concerning overall school operations and working conditions. I had to keep in mind at all times that my insertion as a researcher within the school site, while at the same time continuing to function as a member of the SLT charged with responsibilities for policy processes may have created the perception of role confusion, eliciting possible reticence and/or anxiety in the interview subjects towards full disclosure of their opinions and feelings.
regarding policy processes. To that end I worked carefully during each interview to ensure that subjects felt at ease and comfortable, reassuring them of the ethical framework binding me to confidentiality and preservation of their anonymity as part of the research process. Furthermore, I emphasized that because this study was designed to gauge their perceptions and reactions towards policy enactment processes arising from their engagement with such processes, it was critical for me to operate from a position of neutrality in order to avoid inserting any personal or professional positions on the ideas presented during our conversations, that might taint or otherwise influence the analysis.

Another area of concern related to the duality of my role was regarding my possible reactions during interviews to union issues that might be in conflict with my SLT role and perspectives on policy processes. I had to be self-aware in order to filter any biases or predispositions towards comments or positions advanced by both of these groups. This was particularly important when constructing an understanding of the comments made by the union rep in terms of separating those that were positional in terms of the union stance versus those that were personal opinion. I was fortunate in this case that the relationship between me and the union rep was one that was respectfully cordial and any thoughts or positions advanced from a union perspective were usually prefaced by a comment indicating that this was the union stance.

I also had to filter the comments and thoughts from the SLT, given that the principal was my immediate supervisor, whereas the vice principal and I were at the same level in terms of organizational hierarchy. This was particularly relevant, since the principal who was appointed at the same time as I assumed my leadership position, possessed an entrepreneurial outlook and had very clear ideas about the relevance of policy processes and how they should play out at a school site. The vice principal on the other hand was a veteran of the school, understood its inner workings and
was recognized for being highly collaborative and collegial in his leadership approach, with a reputation for taking care of the details and getting things done. It became evident to me that I had to pay careful attention to how these members of the SLT framed their responses and understand where and how the perspectives they advanced were located in terms of their management authority.

The importance of paying attention to the above points during the interview process is succinctly highlighted by Hammersley (2005) who suggests that for researchers who operate in familiar settings “it can be much more difficult to suspend one’s preconceptions, whether these derive from social science or from everyday knowledge” (p. 81). This caution by Hammersley (2005) alerted me to the need to remain open, reflexive and aware of my impact within the case study site and conversely its impact upon me while conducting interviews and throughout the entire research process. Keeping these ideas at the forefront, key considerations for me during interviews were keeping the conversation flowing, continually asking redirect questions to probe for understanding and seeking clarification and elaboration of ideas as they unfolded, without editorial insertions on my part.

3.4.7 Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling within CGT is the process through which the researcher looks to collect additional data that offers conceptual strength to the emerging theory. Data collection is informed by examining ‘data gaps’ in the analysis and identifying groups and individuals that may lend support to the theory development. It may be argued, as elaborated earlier in this chapter that within CGT this process is parallel to the QDA notions of triangulation through member checking articulated by Creswell (2000), as a means of establishing the credibility claims (Lincoln & Guba 1985) of the research inquiry. The difference however from member checking is that theoretical sampling arises out of the ongoing and concurrent process of
data collection and analysis endemic to CGT, serving as a vehicle to inform additional data collection sources in order to confirm or disconfirm the analysis to date. Glaser & Holton (2004) emphasize this point as being critical to the methodology.

By identifying emerging gaps in the theory, the analyst will be guided as to next sources of data collection and interview style. The basic question in theoretical sampling is to what groups or subgroups does one turn to next in data collection—and for what theoretical purpose? (Glaser & Holton 2004 paragraph 51).

Given this consideration, it becomes evident that the process of theoretical sampling draws on the knowledge, understanding and insight of key informants, whose connection to the phenomenon under study provides additional perspectives to the conceptual richness of the grounded theory, thus lending weight to its foundation. Thus, theoretical sampling occurs as a parallel and adjunct process to data analysis, whereby the researcher closes the gaps in the grounded theory through additional data collection from sources that the researcher identifies as being relevant to the emerging theoretical framework.

Following the coding and analysis of the initial thirteen transcripts and staying true to the CGT perspective I theoretically sampled seven of the original thirteen interviewees. These additional interviews consisted of “taking data and interpretations back to the participants in the study so that they can confirm the credibility of the information and the narrative account.” (Creswell 2000, p.127). This process presented an avenue for me to re-engage with research subjects to determine their degree of resonance with my interpretations prior to proceeding with the next stages of the analysis. This process also afforded me an opportunity to probe for the emergence of any additional information that may have arisen from shifts in the perceptions of the research subjects subsequent to their original engagement with the interview process (Angen 2000).
I provided the interviewees with a one sheet outline of the analysis to date showing the categories and concepts that I had uncovered, giving them an opportunity to reflect on the content without any input from me, in order to determine whether the emergent categories and concepts resonated with them and represented an accurate reflection of their thoughts arising from the initial interviews. This second round of interviews initially presented a particular challenge. In the first follow up interview, the subject was unclear in their understanding of categories and concepts due to their lack of familiarity with CGT methods and associated terminology. This forced me to draw back from gauging reaction to the analysis, to having to explain the analytic process, the meaning of the labels and how the labels were developed. Once this was clear in the mind of the interviewee then re-introduced the one sheet summary and proceeded with the interview. This served me well in terms of how I would proceed in structuring the remaining six interviews.

I engaged the subjects in a thirty to forty minute open ended conversation on the content of the document, exploring their perceptions of the categories and concepts. Handwritten field notes during the interview permitted me to record the reflections of the interview subjects with respect to the conceptual framework being discussed. The field notes were analyzed after each interview and reflective memos were written to frame and confirm my understanding of the interviewees’ perceptions, a process supported by Carlson (2010), who recommends that “Data should be continuously scrutinized for accuracy of interpretation and for meaningful, coherent conveyance of the participant’s narrative contributions” (Carlson 2010, p. 1105), to avoid traps in member checking.

3.4.8 Theoretical Sensitivity

A key condition in developing a soundly structured grounded theory is the ability of the researcher to maintain theoretical sensitivity (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Glaser & Holton 2004, Holton 2007). This notion refers to the
requirement of the researcher to examine the phenomenon under study devoid of preconceived theoretical constructs that may frame and influence his or her interpretation of events and allowing the conceptual frames to arise naturally from the data. Holton (2007) refers to this as “the required analytic temperament” … that will … “allow the researcher to maintain analytic distance from the data, tolerate regression and confusion and facilitate a trust in the power of preconscious processing for conceptual emergence” … in order … “to develop theoretical insights and abstract conceptual ideas from various sources and types of data” (p. 275). In essence, the researcher must maintain an ‘arm’s length’ relationship with the data and the analytical process, whilst demonstrating an acute ability to frame ideas suggested by the emergent codes, concepts and themes arising from the data. A lack of theoretical sensitivity on the part of the researcher runs the risk of the data analysis falling into a descriptive mode as opposed to that of conceptualization (Glaser 2001, 2004). Theoretical sensitivity thus allows the researcher to rise above and beyond the descriptive process, in utilizing his or her skills at analytic induction in order to draw out the key concepts and themes that will serve as the foundations for developing alternative ‘substantive grounded theories’, which offer alternative conceptual interpretations of the data. These substantive theories are further tested through the constant comparative method until theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Holton 2007, Breckenridge 2009) leads to the ultimate identification of a formal grounded theory. The point of theoretical saturation is arrived at when no new information can be gleaned from additional constant comparison of the themes and concepts to add theoretical substance to the main categories of the proposed substantive theories. In essence, the grounded theory comprehensively incorporates each category and its boundaries. A formal grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) emerges when each substantive theory is cross compared to identify an emergent core category that maintains its conceptual clarity as the driving force behind the formal grounded theory.
3.4.9 Procedural Challenges

A critical challenge for me as a novice researcher in employing the classic grounded theory methodology was coming to the recognition that data collection and data analysis were concurrent processes, requiring the initial analysis to point me in the direction of where to go next with respect to data collection. A further challenge lay in arriving at the understanding that this process was ongoing and continuous until I arrived at a point of saturation (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and no new information emerged from additional cycles of analysis. As my familiarity with the process developed I endeavoured to stay true to this method, assiduously employing the constant comparative process, checking and rechecking codes and categories for overlap or duplication, sorting memos by code and category in relation to their descriptive or reflective nature and acting as a reflective researcher in order to recognize personal preferences that might influence the collection data and its concurrent analysis.

As previously stated, the classic grounded theory offered a true departure from the canons of traditional qualitative data analysis, as it required of me as the researcher an understanding of when this point of saturation was reached and the iterative process of data collection and data analysis were no longer necessary. Recognition of this point presented an interesting challenge to me in being able to intellectually identify that analytical saturation had indeed been reached. The critique could be presented that my judgment as a researcher in determining the point of saturation is itself part of the research process, i.e. at what point do I as the researcher feel confident that the methodology has been validated, that the analysis is complete and that the research question has been adequately addressed.
3.4.10 Locating My Role Within The Research

A key aspect of qualitative research methodology designed to address the above noted concerns is the requirement for my continual vigilance to the notion of researcher reflexivity (Creswell 2000, Hammersley 2007a) in examining any “assumptions, beliefs and biases” (Creswell 2000 p.127) that might predispose me to incomplete analysis and drawing premature conclusions. This required me to consider three key questions based on my position as a site based policy actor: did I react in the same manner to all research subjects, did I have beliefs that would frame my analysis and did I have expectations of what the research would tell me?

With respect to the first question, while careful attention was paid to the structural elements of the interview process, reflections on my interactions with the research subjects bears scrutiny, since each of them presented a different relational paradigm within the interview situation. Awareness and recognition of these differences was thus important, in order to account for and critically reflect on any relational preferences that may have predisposed me to analytically favouring or discounting a viewpoint advanced during the course of an interview. Two examples of this awareness highlight the importance of this notion. The first involves how I reacted during an interview to a subject who had specific needs for validation, as evidenced by the interviewee constantly asking whether these were the answers what I was looking for. I had to avoid falling into this relational trap and reframe each time that situation presented itself. Another interviewee presented strong opinions during regarding the involvement of the SLT with policy processes. I had to emotionally filter out these opinions in order to avoid engagement in a dialogue that would have sidetracked the interview away from the primary investigative purpose, remembering to record these views reflectively through memoing in order to consider their analytical meaning regarding policy processes.
In reflecting on my professional role as a member of the SLT I had to be acutely aware of my personal philosophical and/or ideological predispositions that might conflict with that role and be brought to the fore in influencing my analytical thinking. Such a position is exemplified by possible discrepancies between my views and those of the interviewees on the role of public education in the context of government policy and how I might unconsciously preference the views latent to my position during the course of data analysis.

Finally, with respect to the idea of safeguarding against preconceptions related to research findings, was I sufficiently aware of the notion of allowing the data to tell its own story, rather than imposing my story on the data. This point is particularly significant to me as a practitioner acting in the role of researcher, where in acting as the former I might rely on anecdotal information in framing explanations of a phenomenon, as opposed to the requirement for the researcher to develop evidence based explanations based on sound research procedure.

This key notion of researcher reflexivity thus was critically important to maintaining the integrity of the research process, forcing me to pay close attention to its application at each and every level of the methodology, from coding, to category formation to concept development and ultimately derivation of the core concept. As Hammersley (2005) suggests this reflexivity acts as a means for the researcher “to minimize any distortion of their findings by their political convictions or practical interests” (p. 18). Clear application of the processes of journal entries and memo writing proved to be ideal vehicles to frame and record such thoughts and later distill them in terms of their analytical or reflective relevance in terms of their impact on the research process. Further consideration of the notion of memo writing is laid out in the next section.
3.5 Methodological Tools

3.5.1 Procedural Considerations

As outlined previously, I utilized the Classic Grounded Theory (CGT) methodology of Glaser & Strauss (1967) as the analytical methodology for this case study. This commenced with my application of the process of open coding to the interview transcripts, which resulted in the identification of 324 (Appendix 3 a) separate codes. Applying the CGT analytic notion of constant comparison to these individual codes for similarity and/or difference gave rise to the assigning of these codes into discrete groups (Appendix 3 b) based on their being conceptually aligned with respect to thematic meaning. Subsequent to the emergence of these thematic groups I applied a more rigorous analytical scrutiny to each group of codes. This scrutiny, in combination with careful consideration of the reflective and analytical themes identified during the memo writing process, permitted me to sharpen the conceptual strength of each group of codes. With this process I was able to solidify the overarching conceptual linkages between the individual thematic group and the codes from which the group emerged. Deeper analysis through ongoing constant comparison of codes within and across thematic groups for resonance and alignment to the conceptual linkages identified eleven clearly distinct categories (Appendices 6 & 7) which captured the essential conceptual elements deemed to be reflective of stakeholder engagement in, interactions with and responses to the curriculum implementation processes at Southside Secondary.

3.5.2 Coding & Memo Writing as Methodological Tools

3.5.2.1 Coding

Coding is the essential tool driving data analysis in both classic grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and the variant advanced by Corbin & Strauss (1990). Coding practice for classic grounded theory calls for the researcher to examine interview transcripts through line-by-line
‘open coding’, a process whereby the researcher creates “tags or labels for assigning units of meaning … to information compiled during a study” (Miles & Huberman 1994 p 55). The text to be coded is underlined and the open codes are written directly on the transcripts as margin notes. The focus is not on the words themselves, rather it is on the meaning ascribed to the words and/or phrases by the codes that is a crucial element of the open coding process. The researcher’s ability to conceptualize ideas from these codes will be dependent on the interpretive robustness of the codes in framing an understanding of the text being analyzed. The grouping of conceptually related codes into categories follows the open coding process (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Glaser & Holton 2004, Holton 2007). As new incidents are uncovered during ongoing coding, a constant comparison of the text and newly emergent codes against the categories is employed, as a means of triangulation of the analysis. Following the emergence of a core set of categories, the constant comparative process is further utilized to examine categories for emerging themes and the assigning of ‘theoretical codes’ (Glaser & Holton 2004, Holton 2007, Hernandez 2009) to groups of categories that are thematically related. These theoretical codes are a key process in the development of a grounded theory, in that their identification requires the researcher to look beyond the emergence of categories and concepts, towards linking them into a framework that offers theoretical insight into the observed phenomenon.

After completing the interviews I commenced the coding process. I subjected the transcripts to the open coding process in keeping with qualitative data management techniques (Huberman & Miles 1994) and the coding, category development and concept building strategies consistent with the classic grounded theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss 1967).

I manually coded each interview transcript, using a line-by-line open-coding technique, with key words recorded in the transcript margins representing ideas that resonated with me in terms of providing clarity of
meaning. The coding technique was challenging, since it required of me an ability to frame the research subjects’ words into a meaningful word or phrase that captured the essence of the ideas being expressed in the interviews. The difficulty of the open-coding process is confirmed by Holton’s thoughts regarding the challenges faced by an inexperienced grounded theorist in coming to terms with the “iterative nature of the overall process resulting in coding confusion” (Holton 2007, p. 276). Nevertheless, as the coding process unfolded with the remaining transcripts and through rigid application of the constant-comparison process (Glaser & Strauss 1967) to compare incidents and emergent codes, I developed a fluency in applying the technique. An ongoing process of constant-comparison of codes across transcripts during the line-by-line coding allowed me to see connections and linkages in the emergent expressions and ideas from each interview, which in turn provided clarity and consistency to the coding process. As these expressions and ideas emerged from each transcript, I was able to determine whether they were unique ideas worthy of their own code, or whether they were reflected in a previously emergent idea and therefore embedded within an existing code. Whenever there was a clear differentiation in terms of a new idea, I assigned a new code. Following this iterative nature of the coding process forced me to actively engage the constant-comparison process, checking and rechecking against existing codes and reflecting on their application to new ideas as they emerged from the transcripts. I then manually transcribed codes from each transcript into tabular form and cross-referenced on a page by page basis against the original transcripts. This resulted in 46 pages of codes from the thirteen interview transcripts (Appendix 3 a & 3 b).

Staying true to the classic grounded theory method, I scrutinized the tabulated codes on a page-by-page basis, distilling the 46 pages of raw codes into individually identified codes, which I then grouped along lines of similarity of meaning. I attached labels to each of these groups, designating
them as categories. This process required me to stay open conceptually and “strive for a higher level of abstraction in the naming of codes” (Holton 2007, p. 276) and look beyond cursory relationships between codes to determine a conceptual fit warranting inclusion of a particular code within a given category.

Following the development of categories, I then moved to a higher level of abstraction by looking for conceptual relationships between categories, informed by inclusion of an examination of the reflective and analytical memos linked to each category. As previously stated, this required me to pay continual attention to staying open and consciously engaging “theoretical sensitivity” (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Glaser & Holton 2004, Holton 2007) in examining the categories for conceptual relationships and theoretical linkages. This process of concept development forced me to distill the ideas from category formulation and key memos into cogent concepts that accurately reflected the essential ideas embedded within the categories. Concept formation was challenging, in that it forced me to step outside of the descriptive arena into a higher level of abstract thinking in engaging with the data and staying true to the inductive processes of the classic grounded theory methodology.

Utilizing the Glaserian approach of line-by-line manual coding and employing the constant comparative method, I assigned 324 codes to the raw interview transcripts (Appendix 2 & 3 a) that conceptually captured and labelled the range of interactions, reactions, responses of policy actors during their engagement with the processes of implementing the new curriculum. This line-by-line manual coding allowed me to systematically and independently engage with each interview transcript, remaining true to the open coding methodology of Glaser & Strauss (1967) that “forces the researcher to verify and saturate categories, minimizes missing an important category, and ensures relevance by generating codes with emergent fit”. (Holton 2010 p. 24). Through employing the process of
constant comparison advanced by Glaser & Strauss (1967) during the coding process, the identification of an idea that did not align with any previously defined idea was assigned a new code. This analytic technique thus minimized the risk of omission of any latent ideas interpretively embedded within the transcripts that might have been brought about through over-generalization of ideas during the coding process. This wide array of identified codes thus presented me with “efficient data-labeling and data retrieval devices” (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p.65) that serve as analytically robust and conceptually meaningful data markers and foundational reference points for the ensuing data analysis.

3.5.2.2 Memo Writing

Memo writing is the reflective and analytical process during which the researcher records written insights about the coded data and emerging concepts; recording those insights for future consideration during theoretical coding. As Lempert (2007), suggests memo-writing is the start of the process through which “the researcher analytically interprets data.” (p. 245). Corbin & Strauss (1990) describe the act of memo writing as a system whereby the researcher “keeps track of all the categories, properties, hypotheses, and generative questions that evolve from the analytical process” (p. 10) and acts as a conceptual bank leading up to the process of theory generation. As concepts are developed and memos written, the researcher begins to formulate alternate theoretical frames that offer substantive theories (Glaser & Strauss 1967) suggested by the developing theoretical codes. However, these theoretical frames may be incomplete in terms of offering a concise and comprehensive explanation and may require supplementary conceptual support. This is accomplished by collecting additional data via theoretical sampling.

I carried out memo-writing concurrently with the coding process, (Corbin & Strauss 1990, Miles & Huberman 1994), allowing me to immediately record reflections and insights that struck me during coding.
Engaging in the process of memo writing process provided me with a means to identify and record conceptual thoughts and reflections that emerged during open-coding, with a view to later linking them together at higher levels of abstraction as ongoing analysis of the data unfolded. As ideas began to take form through the coding process, I employed the process of memo-writing as both a reflective process and an analytic tool.

Reflective memos served the purpose of permitting me as the researcher to "engage in and record intellectual conversations ... about the data" (Lempert, 2007 p. 249), providing a platform for further reflection at a conceptual level with the ideas regarding stakeholder engagement that emerged during the coding process. This process of intellectual reflection gave me an opportunity to engage with the data in an unencumbered manner, recording thoughts and ideas as they presented themselves from the data.

The process of analytical memo writing provided me with a tool to record “ideas and reactions to the meaning of what you are seeing ... (that) ... suggest new interpretations, leads, connections with other parts of the data” (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p.67). Memo writing as an analytical tool further gave me the intellectual space to conceptually frame the emergent codes and “tie together different pieces of data into a recognizable cluster” (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p. 72), thereby informing subsequent phases of data analysis leading to the development of conceptual categories.

During the memo-writing I generated 139 reflective and analytical memos (Appendix 4 a), each serving as a means for me to develop thinking and record insights into the ideas that presented themselves during the coding process. I scrutinized each memo for their relationship to the emergent categories/concepts and then grouped them by category and/or concept (Appendix 4 b). Memos of an analytical or theoretically reflective nature were further differentiated and separately grouped (Appendices 4 c
The memo writing process permitted me to interact with emergent ideas at a theoretical level, allowing me to develop conceptual frames in relation to the ideas emergent from the data, informing concurrent and ongoing data analysis consistent with the classic grounded theory methodology.

By its very nature memo writing was challenging, requiring me to step outside the data and reflect on the interview transcripts on an interpretive level. Initially, my memos were quite descriptive in nature, wherein I was reframing interviewee’s ideas through my own lens, a hazard endemic to an embedded researcher as pointed out by Lempert (2007) “novice grounded theory researchers … become frustrated with the uncertainty of sorting, coding and memo writing. They produce a few memos that don’t seem to be going anywhere, or at least anywhere with an immediately recognizable theory. When that happens, novice researchers sometimes latch on to an early descriptive pattern” (p. 249). As coding proceeded I became more adept at looking beyond cursory interpretations framed by my own thinking, towards a more nuanced approach to memo writing that more deftly linked and interpreted the perceptions of the research subjects at higher levels of abstraction. As I progressed to categorization and subsequently to the linking of categories to concepts, memo writing took on added importance as a tool for me to make interpretive linkages across layers of data and between levels of conceptualization, a notion reinforced by Lempert 2007 who argued that “As incipient ideas are recorded and explored through the memoing process, they grow in complexity and association” (p. 249). In essence, my reflective memos acted as the conceptual glue holistically binding the elements of the emergent ideas into a conceptual framework.

This use of memos in terms of informing the analytical processes of category development is further elaborated below.
3.5.2.3 Memo Analysis and Category Formation

Memos written during the initial coding process were considered in terms of their relationship to the emergent categories and each memo was coded in alignment with the relevant category in (Appendix 4 b) terms of content resonance with that particular category. This analysis produced a series of memos within each category that were either of a reflective or analytical nature. Memos within each series were then evaluated to determine the analytic or reflective nature of their content, allowing me to clearly differentiate between memos that informed the analytic process of category formation, in contrast with those memos that served as placeholders for further engagement with and reflections on the emergent categories (Appendices 4 c & 4 d).

Reflective memos (Appendix 4 d) also provided an avenue for me to pose questions of the coded data with respect to the thoughts of individual interview subjects and to speculate on how these thoughts might be interconnected and related to each other in terms of overarching perceptions regarding their interactions with policy processes. The following example relating to interview SW6 illustrates my use of the memo as a reflective tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Teacher Memo</th>
<th>Transcript Page</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Analytical or Reflective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy shift seems to be challenging the professional knowledge of teachers with no valid explanation regarding the purpose of the change. Leads to questioning the relevance and validity. Evidence required to mediate the negativity of change.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical memos (Appendix 04 c) provided a degree of robustness to the process of category formation, by allowing me to sharpen conceptual linkages between parallel ideas that emerged from the analysis of individual transcripts in terms of their resonance, alignment and meaning in relation to building a broader spectrum of understanding of stakeholder engagement.
with policy processes. The example below of an analytical memo highlights this notion.

A critical challenge I faced in incorporating the ideas from memo analysis into categories and subsequent core concept development was that of remaining critical and open in ensuring that those ideas authentically emerged from conceptual analysis and avoiding the trap of being simply descriptive observational reflections on my part. This latter requirement forced me to critically and clearly demarcate a boundary between the analytical and reflective nature of the memos, in order for the analysis to stay true to the grounded theory approach of permitting categories and concepts to emerge from the data through theoretical conceptualization.

### 3.6 Emergent Stakeholder Themes

I analyzed the 324 codes that were identified during the coding process differentiating them for conceptual discreteness and interpretative consistency. This analysis entailed a re-consideration of codes that appeared to have a nuanced difference in meaning in order to confirm that they accurately represented the idea they were coded to convey. Each individual code was then examined and placed into groups (Appendix 6) according to their broad conceptual alignment and interpretive resonance. I paid careful attention to codes that seemed to be conceptually versatile for possible inclusion across more than one group and re-examined the transcripts to determine the soundness of the initial coding process. Whenever the initial code was found to lack conceptual clarity, the transcript was re-read and re-coded. If the original

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Teacher Memo</th>
<th>Transcript Page</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Analytical or Reflective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>EE3a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication vehicles are inefficient; they don’t distill what teachers need to make the policy work for them in an instructional setting... Teachers are forced to access it themselves... but time constraints/workload relegate to low priority... so... practice happens devoid of valid information needed to make policy changes work... which causes teacher resentment, retrenchment and withdrawal.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
code was deemed appropriate, it was re-examined for conceptual resonance when compared across groups and a 'best-fit' determination was made with respect to final group inclusion. This analytical process resulted in broad emergent themes (Appendix 7) that I interpreted as being reflective of stakeholder engagement with the curriculum implementation process. Further analysis crystallized these broad themes into discrete conceptually linked groups of codes. Table 3.1 below shows the related number of codes underpinning the formation of each of the eleven emergent groups. From table 3.1 it is evident each thematic code group encompassed a wide range of codes, from as many as fifty nine to as few as fourteen. Despite this variance in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code Groups</th>
<th>Number of Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 – Thematic Emergence and Coding Analysis

the degree of code inclusion within a particular thematic group, the key analytical consideration was that of developing conceptual strength, rather than a quantitative reliance on the inclusion of a large number of codes to authenticate a particular thematic grouping. This conceptual strength was reinforced by my
careful application of the constant comparative analytic process advanced by Glaser & Strauss (1967), giving me confidence in the soundness of the conceptual foundation to the thematic groupings, allowing me to move to the process forward.

My next level of analysis involved a more in depth consideration of the thematic groups of codes looking for conceptual alignment and interpretative resonance at a higher level of theoretical abstraction. An integral and important part of this process was consideration of the reflective and analytical memos as the theoretical lenses through which to filter and consolidate these themes into discrete categories that conceptually captured the emergent elements framing stakeholder engagement with policy processes. This deeper analysis provided confirmation of the identification of these eleven thematic groups as distinct theoretical categories (Appendix 7), permitting me to label them as such. In ascribing a label to each category, I endeavoured to identify a central organizing construct that captured the conceptual linkage between codes and themes and categories at a higher level of theoretical abstraction. This process required me to broaden my conceptual thinking beyond descriptive codes and organizing themes to a degree of abstraction that permitted me to draw out theoretical meaning throughout the analytical process. Figure 3.1 below illustrates this process of analytically narrowing codes to themes along conceptual lines, through the iterative and ongoing process of constant data comparison, with the resultant development of individual categories. A key idea captured by figure 3.1 is that of the analytical progression from descriptive narrowness represented by codes, to conceptual broadness represented by themes, to a still higher level of theoretical abstraction embedded within the emergent category. As previously elaborated, codes represent data labels and serve as a point of departure for building conceptual understanding. The examination of codes for interpretive resonance resulted in the grouping of conceptually similar codes. As conceptual thickness began to take shape within each group of codes, I re-examined the groups for consistency and resonance with respect to code inclusion and identified relevant themes that appeared to link the codes together within each
group. This process reinforced the CGT notion of arriving at analytic saturation through the constant comparison of the data, and proved to be useful in informing the subsequent labelling of the emergent categories.

Table 3.2 below illustrates the analytical process represented by Fig 3.1 denoting progressive conceptual thickening. Table 3.2 exemplifies how codes derived from the coding process were grouped and conceptually narrowed into themes, leading to identification of the thematic groups and subsequently to the emergence of the theoretical categories. The codes shown in column 1 representing data labels were conceptually thickened into the themes represented in column 2. Deeper conceptualization incorporating the ideas from the analytical and reflective memos generated the categories represented in column 3. Thus, the category labels in column 3 of table 3.2 represent the analytical consideration of the data to a greater degree of theoretical abstraction, fully incorporating the emergent constructs that were initially identified as being embedded within the codes and themes.
A key CGT construct I needed to stay true to throughout this process of category identification was the requirement to remain analytically robust and consistent in applying the process of constant comparison, while concurrently demonstrating “theoretical sensitivity” (Glaser & Strauss 1967, Glaser & Holton 2004, Holton 2007) when examining differences between codes for their inclusion within specific themes. This need for heightened theoretical sensitivity was further sharpened during subsequent category identification, which required higher level of conceptual abstraction in order to name the categories in a way that captured and conveyed their defining characteristics. In essence the process of naming the categories forced me to attach word labels that best captured the imagery contained within the thematic representations derived from coding. An example illustrating this category labelling process may serve to
clarify this analytical process. The label for category 3, 'locus of control', conceptually links the ideas embedded within the codes in column 1. The sample codes anxiety, disequilibrium, challenge, overload and unease are identified as being conceptually linked by the theme 'forced adaptation'. The same notion applies to the codes associated with the themes 'subordinated autonomy' and 'powerlessness'. Finally, 'locus of control' represents a construct at a greater level of theoretical abstraction that links the three themes and forms them into the category. Table 3.3 below further elaborates the emergent conceptual properties of each category theoretically derived from the analysis. These properties reflect thematic frameworks that were analytically drawn out and conceptually developed from the coding and thematic analysis consistent with the process as described above. The statements attached to each category in table 3.3 thus reflect my capacity and insight as a researcher in making conceptual linkages amongst codes that are theoretically robust in terms of being solidly embedded within the conceptual foundations consistent with a grounded theory approach.

The eleven categories arising out of this grounded theory approach are presented in the following analysis and research findings chapter, which examines the analytical foundations theoretically defining each category. Examples of analytical and reflective memos that informed the process of building and developing each distinct category are also presented in support of the analytical foundations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Emergent Properties of Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionally &amp; Vocationally Vested</td>
<td>Reflects professional competence, commitment to sound educational practice and degree of career continuity of those engaging in policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional Investment</td>
<td>Reflects degree of dedicated commitment, recognition of personal responsibilities and passionate engagement with learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of Control</td>
<td>Reflects feelings of powerlessness resulting from external impositions, creating an internal disequilibrium and imbalance in the ability to shape their own environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. System Integrity &amp; Viability</td>
<td>Reflects perceptions of inefficiencies and inadequacies in resource allocation to support sound educational structures, threatening system sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alienation</td>
<td>Reflects levels of detachment, disconnectedness and marginalization of those engaged in policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Retrenchment</td>
<td>Reflects strategic coping mechanisms engaged to manoeuvre through contested policy processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Policy Legitimacy</td>
<td>Reflects perceptions of authenticity, coherence and relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collegially Connected</td>
<td>Reflects formation of supportive and interdependent professional networks to sustain professional capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ideological Repurposing</td>
<td>Reflects external drivers framing and delivering policy processes to fulfill discrete and purposeful intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Inequity</td>
<td>Reflects capacity to leverage cultural capital in shaping preferred educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethical Trust</td>
<td>Reflects level of confidence in leadership based on credibility of purpose, ethical history and personal qualities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 – Emergent Properties of Categories
Chapter 4  Data Analysis and Research Findings

4.1 Introduction

The data analysis chapter begins with consideration of the analytical identification of themes and elaborates the emergent properties of the eleven categories. These conceptual foundations are conceptually unpacked through supporting examples of analytical and reflective memos informing the analytical process. In the final part of the chapter conceptual modelling is applied to theoretically inform the emergence of six organizing concepts.

4.2 Analytical Foundations of Categories

4.2.1 Professionally and Vocationally Vested

Policy actors are committed and dedicated as career professionals, where their practice is shaped by sound pedagogy and good judgement. Policy actors expressed a strong connection to teaching and a high degree of professional passion. They care about their practice and demonstrate commitment to doing the best possible job over the course of their professional working lifetime.

The following exchange subject underscores the theme of this category, and is consistently reflected throughout the interviews process by numerous participants.

Researcher: It sounds to me as though you’re taking a longer term vision of mathematics implementation …
Interviewee 01: I think so, in the main. Some people are just interested in coming in, doing the job and leaving, but most of us wouldn’t be here if it was just for the money and we wouldn’t be here if we thought it was an easy job. So most people are here because they are committed to it …

Another policy actor reflected on the importance of personal satisfaction in building connections with students.

Researcher: Personal enjoyment is always important in teaching?

Interviewee 02: Yes, I think that is true in any job you do … … So, if I like math, and I like working with kids, then that hopefully translates; I’m enjoying it and hopefully they will enjoy it as well.

Commitment to the profession is evidently built upon the nature of the connections that are established by policy actors to students and to the community. Where this connection is strong, policy actors experience a higher degree of attachment and commitment to the profession. The following transcript excerpt sums up the essence of this connection.

Researcher: Have you always been in this school district?

Interviewee 13: Yeah, it’s the only place I want to be.

Researcher: And how long have you been at Southside?

Interviewee 13: I’m in my third year.

Researcher: Like the school?

Interviewee 13: Love the school, yeah. It is an interesting school, and you’re teaching more than a curriculum.

It is evident that policy actors who look towards a long term commitment to their profession consistently reinforce their capacity to become fully vested in the system by creating supportive structures and positive mindsets that will sustain their passion as they progress along their career path. The ability to gain autonomy in the practice of their professional is highly valued, as reflected by the codes exemplifying elements of this category:
ethics, competency, duty, growth, expertise, knowledgeable and responsibility. Each of these codes speaks to the professional traits and characteristics associated with individuals who have a “stake” in their professional identity and a commitment to ensuring the responsibilities associated with that identity are fulfilled.

Policy actors’ investment in their career is moderated by an awareness of the realities of their professional responsibilities, which requires that their passion for teaching to be guided and informed by good instructional practice based on sound pedagogy. In essence, being professionally invested requires policy actors to be knowledgeable, informed and competent, whilst holding themselves to high ethical standards related to their professional duties. At the same time, this professional investment also demands that they challenge educational policy that, in their judgement, contradicts good teaching. Policy actors consistently reference the characteristics of duty, commitment and responsibility as professional underpinnings guiding their daily practice.

The following excerpts highlight examples of these policy actor beliefs.

*Interviewee 01: I could be teaching it next year, so I want to know what’s happening this year, because we don’t know what we’re going to be teaching next year. I want to know how it works, what problems you’re having, and if we can provide help.*

*Interviewee 03: Every time there is something new every teacher looks at it and discusses it with his/her colleagues.*

*Interviewee 04: I don’t resist the ideas, but I certainly look at them and I certainly think about them.*

*Interviewee 06: I want to know more of what’s behind things, so I’m not just going to accept that something is problematic based on hearing it ... I’m going to step back and try and look at things through a little more critical lens ...*

*Interviewee 08: I’m passionate about teaching. I’m passionate about being in the trenches, you know being here, you know, front line, being the one, having that, the communication, the interactions with the students, rather – I’m not interested in, you know, being outside the classroom. This is where my passion is.*
Interviewee 08: Sometimes I want to know more, and it's just my, because of my personality, I want to find, I have questions, and I want to ask those questions.

The above analysis resonates with the notion of affective commitment advanced by Meyer at al (1991, 2004) in explaining the “emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement with the organization” (1991, p.67) of individuals. Linkage to this idea of affective commitment is further sharpened by Meyer et al’s (2004) discussion of a need by individuals to meet internally set standards of performance reflective of the ideals and goals vested in their professional responsibilities. This suggests that the notion of professionally and vocationally vested policy actors is reciprocally contingent on both an internal desire to meet personal goals, standards and expectations regarding their professional performance and by the resulting higher levels of affective commitment to the profession elicited by meeting those goals, standards and expectations. These notions of good pedagogy and sound professional judgement resonate with the work of Ware and Kitsantas (2007) examining the perceptions of efficacy beliefs shaping teacher professional commitment. Ware and Kitsantas (2007) advance the notions that teacher commitment is established by experiences that support professional control over the work environment, which establishes positive perceptions of self efficacy, which in turn reinforces greater professional commitment. The ideas elaborated above support the thematic development of this category, in that consistently recurring themes arising out of the coding and thematic analysis are those notions of commitment, responsibility, competence, care, duty.
4.2.2 Emotional Investment

Emotional Investment reflects the committed engagement of policy actors to supporting students and meeting their needs as they perceive them. It is anchored by an emotional attachment to a student care perspective that focusses their actions on promoting and protecting student well being.

Student care forms the foundation for policy actors in terms of their investment in their professional practice. Policy processes that challenge this principle are held up to scrutiny and scrutinized for their validity and relevance in terms of their attention to student care. Interviewee 3 exemplifies this pre-eminence of a climate of care.

Interviewee 03: I don’t know, it’s a funny choice what they’re doing in the new curriculum. … It’s so hard. You’re going to fail all these kids, why? They’re 14 years old and they’re struggling with percents still. Do they need it? I don’t know. I see a disconnect, and I see so many kids who can’t make it in math.

The above memos articulate the researcher’s analytical understanding of the emergent code, student care, in relation to learner’s needs that consistently emerged from analysis of several interviews.

This notion of student care is perceived by policy actors to be a moral responsibility within the scope of their professional duties in that teaching professionals view themselves as the key gatekeepers of good
practice in this respect. The following excerpt underlines this widely held position regarding policy actor responsibility in assuming the gate-keeping role.

*Interviewee 08:* Well, I’d take a look and see in terms of the kids I’m dealing with and whether I think there was … I’m meeting their needs with the new initiative or not. Whether I think that’s what they truly need

*Researcher:* Okay. And that’s important to you?

*Interviewee 08:* That’s extremely to me.

*Researcher:* Why?

*Interviewee 08:* Because I don’t like making these students be, have them be guinea pigs, and having a whole year go by just because – in the name of a new initiative, have them be the guinea pig, and if it fails, well, it just fails. Oh, well, well let’s move on. Let’s try – and I just want to make sure I give those students the best I can under my – you know, under me.

Policy actors take this responsibility seriously and are guided by their own internal moral and ethical compass to assess where, when and how student care may be compromised by policy shifts and to assess the personal actions that may be required to safeguard that responsibility.

Throughout the interviews, research subjects consistently cited their beliefs that learners needs were sacrosanct and that these needs should drive policy processes at all levels of the system, but most particularly at the school sites. Teachers viewed themselves as being more acutely aware of student needs than any other group, by virtue of their connectedness to their students and that this connectedness placed them in the pre-eminent position of best understanding how those
needs should be met. Most teachers could not cite evidence in support of this position; rather they relied on their intuitive feelings, based on their relationships with students.

Interviewee 03: I like the location of the school to where I live … I like the kids here. … There are some great kids, there are some kids that drive you crazy, I think for the type of teaching I do, I prefer kids that are not the Richie Rich’s of the world, I like the kids who are more ordinary. … it starts to feel like home.

Researcher: A good feeling you’ve got for being here that long?

Interviewee 03: Yeah, the kids know you and they know your style, and because I’m here at night I see a lot of other kids and I see another side of kids which I like. The non-academic side, I like that.

Interviewee 06: … kids view the school as an extension of their home. So, if they’re comfortable, and welcome, and treated respectfully, they give that back to you in the building.

Interviewee 08: I don’t want to stay stagnant in my profession. I think there’s a danger to that. Like any profession, I want to grow. I want to feel excited about, you know, going to work and I – so, I’m all ears.

Interviewee 13: If I’m teaching to my class, especially when my grade 8’s walk in the door, I don’t say, “Sit down, we’re going to do this project.” I say, “Hi. My name is such and such. Who are you guys? What are you interested in? Let’s build a project together.”

This foregoing suggests that this emotional investment is linked to the type of relationships that policy actors establish with their students and the connectivity they develop within their school community over the course of their professional lives. Where these relationships are socially and emotionally rewarding they act to strengthen community connectivity, which in turn solidifies and enhances policy actor well being, precipitating further relationship building to consolidate their emotional commitment to the profession. The following quote from interviewee 06 underscores and highlights this notion

“I very much believe the personal, as those personal connections that an individual teacher can have cannot be underemphasized”.
This category also has affective commitment (Meyer et al 1991, 2004) as its conceptual foundation, but with a nuanced difference that incorporates emotions and sensemaking. In the preceding category the focus was on processes internal to policy actors, whereas within this category the focus is entirely embedded within the external emotional connections of policy actors to their learners.

In this respect this category thus elaborates the reactions of policy actors in implementing curriculum that they perceive as negatively impacting the learners for whom they are responsible and the mechanisms employed to cope with those reactions. While the professional duties of policy actors drives their affective commitment to the organization, a competing dimension exists in the form of commitment to the learners, who are perceived as the core concern motivating their professional purpose. This tension between organization and learner in terms of affective commitment thus positions emotional responses as foundational to mediating positive or negative sensemaking (Bartunek at al 2006, Avey et al 2008), with the preferred outcome being the minimizing of negative affect and the maximizing of emotional comfort (Seo et al 2004, 2010). The analysis suggests that the balance is tilted in the direction of heightened affective commitment towards the learners, whom they perceive as being negatively impacted by the shift in policy, with a resultant strengthening of the emotional investment in their professional responsibilities towards those learners. This idea is reinforced by the work of Maitlis et al (2013) who note that “individuals generally pay more attention to negative than positive events” and that negative feelings are interpreted “as a sign of problems in the environment” requiring “systematic processing of information”, suggesting that “events that produce negative emotions are likely to energize our search for meaning” (p.226). In this instance the negative perceptions of the policy on learners act as the stimulus for building positive emotional investment through sensemaking.
4.2.3 Locus of Control

Policy actors are faced with policy shifts that require adherence and compliance to external hierarchies, giving rise to perceptions of being controlled and subject to oversight, resulting in feelings of powerlessness.

Policy shifts impact policy actors’ practice and may create anxiety through lack of clarity regarding its intent if it is perceived as a drastic reshaping of policy actor work.

Externally imposed changes are outside policy actors’ locus of control and are perceived as threatening, especially if these changes are implemented in a non-inclusive, non-participatory and non-consultative manner. Compliance with the changes occurs, but unwillingly and with trepidation.

Interviewee 11: Well, if we need to change our delivery methods in a certain way to incorporate tech, maybe for the sake of tech rather than for the sake of education, that has an impact. In addition, there’s no release time, to – we already work scads of overtime with marking, etcetera, there’s no release time really, to learn new things and change our unit, etcetera, or how we approach the course, to change those up in such a short space of time

Forced compliance places policy actors in the position of having to adjust to new realities, whether they like them or not. Whilst policy actors are obliged to incorporate new policy and adapt to its demands, this process creates an emotional imbalance, precipitating feelings of discomfort and unease in relation to professional well-being.
Policy actors view autonomy as critical elements of their professional lives. Policy processes that diminish or remove such autonomy places them a position of professional and emotional upheaval. This category encompasses a range of codes which reveal that policy actors' beliefs and perceptions regarding the erosion of their autonomy are real and palpable. Codes representative of this category include imposed, prescriptive, mandated, conformity, compliance, top-down, rigid, inflexible and dictated.

Change that is externally imposed and prescriptive elicits a range of emotions and reactions that are contingent on such factors as policy actors' mindset, career path and professional resilience. A consistent theme that emerges from the analysis is the futility of opposing policy change, resulting in resigned compliance on the part of policy actors. The following range of interview excerpts support this notion of resigned compliance, which undergirds policy actors' perceptions and beliefs regarding their subordinated autonomy.

Researcher: I am sensing a bit of dissonance between what you believe is important, through your 14 years of experience ... dissonance between that and a new policy document. How does that make you feel?

Interviewee 02: I am kind of like the kids and toss your eyes back and say I have to do something new, and it may not be new. I am not averse to change, and I realize it happens, but I am an old dog in terms of where I am in my teaching life, so it's sort of like “Okay, I get it, go down this road or this road”.

Interviewee 03: Like I don't like this whole chapter on graphing, but I'm being told I have to teach it in grade 9. I don't think they have to learn chord theory, but I'm being told they have to learn it.

Interviewee 04: If a policy coming down says “we are now going to change this, and change this, change this”, because they see it from a different perspective, my sense is more often than not the word “good” or “innovative” is attached to it, and the assumption is, just like those car advertisements, that makes it better. I don't think it makes it better. ... So, when a new policy comes along, whatever it might be, whatever it might be, am I somewhat jaded sometimes? Yep. And that's the luxury of age, I
think as you get older and you have greater context, then you have, it’s your right to be a little bit sceptical and to be a little bit jaded.

Interviewee 05: Some policy comes in and doesn’t give you any “how’s” ... it seems like a lot of the times when you take it, the reaction from staff and from the union is here comes another thou shalt mandate, via policy.

Interviewee 06: I think teachers certainly see a lot of stress around “prescribed” ... “here’s your PLOs. You must meet this stuff.” I think teachers when they feel their students are being examined in a course in a given year ... I think those teachers feel a lot more pressure to ensure they’re walking the straight and narrow path ...

Interviewee 10: Well, if I’m thinking about the math curriculum ... it filters down to this level, to the teacher level, where we have to implement, put in place what the policies are in terms of the changes in the curriculum

Interviewee 10: ... well there just seems to be problems, nothing seems to go smoothly
Researcher: ... it sounds as though they come up from on high, you mentioned hierarchy, and it sounds as though at the school level we are at the bottom rung of the food chain. And so almost as though we’ve got to do what ever we’re told, is that what I’m getting from you?

Interviewee 10: Pretty much yes,

Researcher: How does that make you feel? How does that make you feel as an educator with your 25 years of experience?

Interviewee 10: Well I guess within that mandate that we have, we have a certain degree of autonomy but there are boundaries within that autonomy. ... it restricts, but it also guides, there area certain parameters within which we have to work. And I guess that makes sense too because it gives some consistency to the educators in the province.

Interviewee 11: Just suddenly, “here’s the five year plan”. And in some ways the implication is if you’re not prepared to do that maybe there’s another school for you.

Interviewee 11: So, it’s feeling that some of the top-down decisions are arbitrary. ... Or, like, it’s almost as though they don’t even, they’ve got MBAs or something and they’ve never taught, they don’t have an understanding. ... I don’t know what their educational backgrounds are or what they really know about teaching.
The foregoing analysis suggests that teachers place high value on the idea that their training, skills, knowledge and experience, ideally places them in the position to exercise autonomy within their professional practice. The imposition of policy that limits this autonomy creates conditions that are perceived as negating their expertise, leading to subordination of their professional autonomy to external forces outside their domain of control.

The external imposition of these changes also gives policy actors a perceived loss of control over their professional practice. This perception is intensified by the belief that policy processes are shaped in a top-down, hierarchical manner by externally located forces. Furthermore, these forces are beyond the realm of policy actors’ influence, which creates in them internalized feelings of powerlessness with respect to their ability to act to regain control and autonomy. Sample codes embedded within this category include locus of control, barriers, political, fiscal, accountability, hierarchy and authority. The following excerpts reflect this notion of policy actors’ powerlessness in relation to external, hierarchical control within the range of codes specific to this category.

*Interviewee 02: I guess in the big picture I would like to somehow be consulted, or, have more people to seem to know what’s going on, it seems that it’s only a handful that ever really know and they just funnel it down, like the pyramid thing that is happening, but it should really be the reverse.*

*Interviewee 03: The Ministry of Education decided it was not a mandatory course, ... Teachers, we still thought it was still important, but without it being a mandatory course it was hard for kids to get them to sign up for it after that. ... We react to what they want. They've mandated it.*

*Interviewee 05: I find with the ever shifting sand in terms of ministry policy that a lot of it is created in the backroom by a few people ...*

*Interviewee 06: I think you just become disenfranchised or disillusioned. ... if I can't change my practice to improve things for students because I'm limited by a policy, that’s a huge challenge.*
Interviewee 06: This is driven from the top. I’m not receptive to this because it’s someone’s agenda to change, change for the sake of change as opposed to change for a genuine reason.

Interviewee 07: I’ve never found out about a policy in advance. Usually by the time I find out about a policy it’s been passed or implemented.

Interviewee 07: I think sometimes teachers just think they’re powerless and can’t do anything.

Interviewee 11: ... it seems like a small group of people are making decisions that affect a lot of people and affect the education of our students, and it seems like a very top-down approach.

Interviewee 13: I think people at the board, from what I can tell, are just trying to gather more control.

Researcher: Control over?

Interviewee 13: Over what happens in schools.

The excerpt below underscores the emotional impact of policy actors’ feelings of powerlessness in the face of a hierarchical, imposed policy process over which they have no control.

Interviewee 11: ... even if people don’t want to consult, at least tell us what’s coming, instead of making us guess, because it’s highly stressful.

This notion of locus of control is explored by Maguire et al (2011) and Ball et al (2011a). Maguire et al (2011) construct the notion of dominant discourses driving policy implementation, whereas Ball et al (2011a) elaborate the reactions of policy actors towards policies deemed to be imperative or exhortative. In both cases the idea of policy being imposed underscores the loss of locus of control for policy actors, where the reactions to this perceived loss is contingent on the positional role adopted by policy actors (Ball et al 2011b). These positional roles are presented below (table 4.1) and embody a range of cognitive responses encompassing potential reactions of policy actors to policy imposition.
As Ball et al (2011b) suggest “Actors in schools are positioned differently and take up different positions in relation to policy, including positions of indifference or avoidance or irrelevance” (p.625). This conceptual model locating the different roles adopted by policy actors serves as a useful heuristic in understanding the types of cognitive processing they may engage at various phases and stages of implementation; however it does not account for the emotional components undergirding their actions. Further analysis addressing this point suggests that insofar as policy actors in specific positional roles may operationalize a range of positive or negative cognitive responses in reacting to erosion of their locus of control, there may be a consistency in the activation of emotional responses regardless of their positional role.

### Table 4.1 – Positional Role (Ball et 2011b p.625)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Actors</th>
<th>Policy Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrators</td>
<td>Interpretation, selection and enforcement of meanings, mainly done by headteachers and the SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Advocacy, creativity and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsiders</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship, partnership and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactors</td>
<td>Accounting, reporting, monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasts</td>
<td>Investment, creativity, satisfaction and career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td>Production of texts, artifacts and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critics</td>
<td>Union representatives: monitoring of management, maintaining counter-discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivers</td>
<td>Mainly junior teachers and teaching assistants: coping, defending and dependency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Ball et al (2011b) suggest “Actors in schools are positioned differently and take up different positions in relation to policy, including positions of indifference or avoidance or irrelevance” (p.625). This conceptual model locating the different roles adopted by policy actors serves as a useful heuristic in understanding the types of cognitive processing they may engage at various phases and stages of implementation; however it does not account for the emotional components undergirding their actions. Further analysis addressing this point suggests that insofar as policy actors in specific positional roles may operationalize a range of positive or negative cognitive responses in reacting to erosion of their locus of control, there may be a consistency in the activation of emotional responses regardless of their positional role.

### 4.2.4 System Integrity and Viability

**ANALYTICAL MEMO 105:** When a change in direction is viewed as repetitive and non-productive, it is marginalized and ignored. The cynicism of reaction arises out of continual changes that are deemed invalid, meaningless and irrelevant. **ANALYTICAL MEMO 158:** There is a difference between the “rapidity” with which a policy shift takes hold vs. the “constant cyclical” nature of policy change. It hasn’t had time to take hold and work … boom … the next change cycle hits! **ANALYTICAL MEMO 130:** Policy relating to curriculum implementation fosters competition for diminishing resources across the system. Suggests that policy impacts the sustainability of initiatives. May lead to policy actor balkanization. The impact becomes know when decisions must trade of against competing choices.
Policy actors perceive the illogical cycles of change that constantly bombard the system, coupled with the inconsistent financial support given to change initiatives, as having a systemically debilitating and destabilizing effect.

The longer policy actors remain in the system, the more they adopt an increasingly cynical and sceptical view towards the repetitive cycles of policy change. They perceive these changes as superficial and cosmetic, with no real depth in terms of real impact on improving outcomes for learners. Numerous interviewees look at these cycles of change as unnecessary and irrelevant, in that they appear to be re-packaged versions of previous policies. The following excerpts from a number of research subjects are consistent in illustrating these perceptions.

Interviewee 02: I go “ugh”. It is sort of, somebody asked me, one of the new guys that said “Oh so we’re having a new change to the math curriculum!” and I would say “Yes we had that 5 years ago too”. So it is almost expected every 5 or 7 years, whatever it happens to be, that someone wants to change something.

Interviewee 03: Myself after 20 years? I don’t jump up and down too fast any more. I’ve seen the pendulum swing. I never thought I’d be one of those people who sat in the back and says; oh we’ve seen this before. But it’s true. The longer I teach the more I see things cycle and recycle, come back in a different way; it’s interesting to see that. Is it really new? Or is it just repackaged sometimes? I guess I am more cynical about it.

Interviewee 04: … there in 8 seconds I’ve named 5 different initiatives that came through. And I know it’s almost trite to say its flavour of the week …

Interviewee 08: So, that – I’ll take a look at it, but I will step back. With having years of experience and being able to fall back on my years of experience, being able to assess, no, been there, done that, tried that. It’s the same thing, but under a new name. We tried it, you know fifteen years ago. It wasn’t successful then, and I’m not going to go that route again by wasting my time, or wasting the children’s time, or at the expense of the students.

Interviewee 09: Because the policies that I hear keep – it’s like they recycle. They come and they go, and they change. And I don’t believe
there’s much that comes out that’s brand new. I believe there’s a lot of edited recycling …

Interviewee 11: …we all take it with a grain of salt … we also know in a way that a lot of it is just re-jigging what already exits.

Each of these excerpts reinforces the notion that policy actors view constant, repetitive cycles of change as non-productive and lacking relevancy. However, faced with imposed change, policy actors react in a variety of ways in order to minimize what they perceive to be the destabilizing effects of those changes. The degree to which they are successful in shaping or re-shaping the change determines the degree to which they perceive the system to be stable or unstable.

In addition to the impact of constant structural change, policy actors exhibit a high degree of concern regarding the financial and economic viability of the system arising out of a perceived lack of commitment by policymakers towards the provision of adequate levels of resource allocation in the face of constant change. These concerns resonate with the notion of material contexts advanced by Braun et al (2010) elaborating how allocation and access to resources may impact on policy processes. In this instance site based implementation of a new curriculum created competitive conditions amongst various groups of policy actors in terms of accessing limited resources. The ensuing resource allocations attached to the mandated policy change, thus acted to precipitate perceptions by policy actors of broad based structural destabilization through erosion of the quality of educational offerings when critical competing requests for resource support were not considered. These perceptions in turn may act to reposition core affect (Seo 2004, 2010) through the activation of negative reactions in response to the resulting system degradation.
4.2.5 Alienation

Policy actors experience an internal disconnect at an emotional level in terms of their capacity to make sense of change, precipitating feelings of isolation and alienation.

Alienation of policy actors is triggered by a deficit of relationships and professional networks to mediate the emotional disconnect. Many policy actors experience top-down policy processes in isolation and are disconnected from meaningful interactions to inform and guide them through those processes. This disconnect precipitates disengagement and disempowerment as policy actors withdraw in order to erect personal comfort zones that allow them to maintain some degree of emotional well being. The following excerpt from Interviewee 4 reflects this notion of alienation, rooted in policy actors’ disconnect. In this case, the disconnect serves to balkanize policy actors’ perceptions with respect to policy makers’ being distant and apart from the “action”, which serves to further enhance and deepen their feelings of alienation.

*Interviewee 04:* All of a sudden we heard a statement that came from the ministry to the school districts, to the vice principals and the principals, then to the kids. The kids didn’t hear about it. Who did they hear about it from? Us. We went and said here is what is going to happen. … It’s because the people who are making these policy statements don’t have their sleeves rolled up, and aren’t in the school.

The perception that policymakers exacerbate the isolation of policy actors through their actions – or inactions as the case may be – is widely represented by several interview subjects. Recognition is given to several key ideas embedded within this category of codes, which make it a powerful conceptual lens through which policy actors’ perceptions may be viewed. Examples of codes that build the category alienation include: disengagement, voiceless, isolation, dissatisfaction, disenfranchised, dissonance, devalued. Each of these codes drawn out from the interview transcripts speak to the creation of a perceptual chasm that enhances the emotional disconnect that leads to policy actors’ alienation. This divide
becomes even more marked when policy actors engage with informal networks that support a worldview (Coburn 2005) that is in direct contradiction to the stated position advanced by the new policy. These contradictory positions in turn feed into the destabilization of the core affect (Seo 2004) experienced by policy actors where “people in negative affective states are more likely to focus on avoiding and preventing possible occurrences of negative outcomes, thus exhibiting a defensive behavioural orientation” (p.433), thus supporting the notion of increased occurrences of alienation.

4.2.6 Retrenchment

Policy actors engage strategies and act in ways that promote self preservation and preserve their feelings of autonomy and control.

Policy actors act to consciously engage strategies designed to remove threats to individual autonomy in order to safeguard personal and professional identity. Codes in this category exemplifying such behaviour include retrenchment, avoidance, resistant, reticence, entrenched, avoidance. Each of these codes occurred with consistent regularity during analysis of numerous interview transcripts. The following interview excerpts illustrate how policy actors engage conscious, strategic behaviours in order to safeguard professional identity.

Interviewee 01: But if a teacher is not comfortable doing manipulatives, then they’re going to slide right by that and continue doing their own thing.

Interviewee 02: I realize that change is necessary, and someone out there thinks that it is necessary to change the set up or when things
should be taught or if they should be taught at all, but I just question at times … Why? Here is the wheel, why rebuild it?

Interviewee 03: I think we all adapt the curriculum; we change it a little bit, pad it, take out or teach less of some things we don’t think are important

Interviewee 06: … because teachers are simply operating in their classroom, aren't necessarily receptive to new policy…

Interviewee 06: … but I don’t think most people are actively pursuing change. I think change is something that is quite stressful, you know, could be positive and negative, that change, people don’t put themselves in a situation where they need to change unless they’re, they’ve developed some sort of crisis or some situation where something is driving the change.

Interviewee 06: I know what’s best for my students, but if I’m not allowed to do things, continue to do things the way that I’ve been doing, which I feel is best, or if I can’t change my practice to improve things for my students because I’m limited by a policy, that’s a huge challenge.

Interviewee 07: I think sometimes people just go through the motions, and they either limit what they do to the policy, or they do just enough to stay within the policy.

Interviewee 09: I think people get frustrated at times, or they just, some just don’t bother. Some people don’t pay attention, or some people still say “Oh well, that’s interesting” … and you’ve got the other people that are doing the “I don’t want to hear about it”.

Interviewee 11: I know some teachers just say, “We’re keeping our heads down and what happens, happens. Is it the latest, is it the flavour of the month, or is this going to be something that actually sticks?”

These behaviours seem to be purposefully activated in order to shift away from an external locus of control, to one reflective of personal autonomy. Emergent codes associated with this category underscoring this notion include: resistance, entrenched, avoidance, circumvent, withdraw, reject, ignore; each of which connote conscious actions on the part of policy actors to remove themselves from the conditions and circumstances threatening their professional identity.
The conceptual understanding that emerges from the analysis is that policy actors may view any externally imposed policy change that doesn’t resonate or align with personally established practice as a threat to autonomy. This threat is mediated through behaviours and actions that serve to preserve autonomy and as a consequence safeguard professional identity and the notion of a shift in core affect (Seo et al 2004) may be seen as such as a mediating factor.

4.2.7 Policy Legitimacy

Policy actors view policy shifts through a lens of scepticism and question the professional authenticity of the change.

Throughout the analysis, codes emerged that interrogated the sources and origins of policy. Codes such as: validity, relevance, authenticity, congruence and alignment reflect this scepticism that questions who, where and how a policy shift has been vetted in terms of its rationale with respect to meeting the needs of the system. Policy actors consistently questioned overarching policy direction in terms of its ideological positioning, its genesis, its purpose and its applicability and relevance to learners, as exemplified in the following interview excerpts:

Interviewee 01: Well you know, like “we’re going to embrace this policy” and every student will be able to do this that and the other; but they don’t relate to the fact that you get kids coming in with grade 4 level math in your grade 8 class. So they don’t relate to the student population that we
have; a blanket statement policy without considering how it affects different districts, which I assume will affect them in different ways.

Interviewee 02: … I’ll do it to the best of my ability and try to make it functional for the kids and work for the kids, but I still sort of go; “why do we have to do that now? The kids aren’t ready for that.” Or, “why did we drop this? It is important for kids”.

Interviewee 03: I often wonder if the people at the top are doing it for the kids … Are they qualified to be minister of education, or is it just their portfolio? Who is advising them? I think when you’re in the trenches you think, “Were they really thinking about the kids? Or, is this going to look good on paper? Or, is it what the business world wants, or what PAC wants? Or, what the universities want? What about the kids? Do they really want this?”

Researcher: So, you’re questioning the external motivators that drive policy, is that right?

Interviewee 03: Yes, whether its universities, or whatever, there are always these groups, and you’re always afraid that the kids get left out.

Interviewee 05: Policies look great on paper, and they sound very firm in purpose, and there is usually a lot of thought process behind it, but when you contextualize it, educational setting by educational setting, it can’t be firm, there’s nothing black and white in high school, And that’s the beautiful part about the job, everything is gray.

Interviewee 07: So that’s where I kind of think sometimes policy isn’t made for the best interests of the student. It’s made to protect the institution or a certain policy actor.

Interviewee 12: … there’s an assumption … there’s a certain trust … not everything happens in our best interests, and that there are forces in play which affect policy, which affect implementation. … So, there are other forces in play when we talk about implementation of these policies that are just sometimes completely behind the scenes.

Interviewee 13: … the IRP seems to have been written for people who don’t know anything about my curriculum. … So, I’m very glad they’ve left it up to me to figure out what my students need and how to teach them that appropriately. … Where I totally disagree with the curriculum as presented. It just doesn’t make sense.
A consistent theme permeating each of the preceding excerpts is the notion that policy actors have difficulty locating the meaning and applicability of the policy to their every day professional experiences, and in turn relating the relevance in meeting the needs of learners. Malen (2006) underscores this point in observing that “Policies embody values, theories of interventions and orientations to social and educational issues that may or may not conform to the ideas, interests, and ideals of the actors who were involved in their adoption” (p.87). This notion is succinctly captured by the observations of Ball et al (2012) who suggest that “what we take to be policies are power relations, practices and subjectivities which articulate forms of learning and forms of behaviour” (p.140). These values, interventions and orientations represent embedded discourses (Maguire et al 2011) which are perceived as advancing the interests of the external forces that frame the policy and are scrutinized by policy actors and questioned for legitimacy. As a result policy actors interrogate policy through personally constructed notions of professional care and experiential history, reframing their actions and behaviour to challenge its legitimacy when there is perceived misalignment with those structures.

4.2.8  Collegetially Connected

Policy actors value professional networks that sustain conversations that enhance and support their professional practice. They promote the establishment of a collaborative environment and work collegially to establish a culture of professional interdependency.

Site based policy actors work in an environment where they balance their autonomy against the need to build collegial relationships in order to have the ability to establish ongoing conversations regarding their
own professional needs. While these conversations are not mandated, they are sought out for two purposes, one purely relational, in terms of mediating the isolation of classroom instruction and the second more professional, to inform their individual and collective needs regarding the implications of the shifting policy landscape. Examples of codes in this category that underscore these two perspectives are: collegial, networks, relationships, community, interdependent, cooperation, and discourse.

Policy actors understand the importance of this culture of collaboration and utilize both formal and informal processes in working to develop and maintain their professional networks. However, the rigid and structured nature of their daily work day gives preference to the informal approach as the avenue that is more readily accessible. The following excerpts illustrate the importance of these collaborative networks, how they arise and how they tend to function within the day-to-day context.

*Interviewee 01*: It’s a leadership thing by modelling a way of teaching by saying this is what I’ve tried and it has worked. Sharing ideas, someone will say, I have tried this and it worked, so we take it on board and try that. It is informal professional discussion.

*Interviewee 01*: In math we tend to have meetings every Thursday morning at 8:00am, so we could touch base and keep up to date with what’s going on. ... I don’t think it’s written anywhere that you must have department meeting every week or month; but if you have some collegiality then you want to touch base with everyone.

*Interviewee 03*: Every time there is something new, every teacher looks at it on his own and discusses it with his/her colleagues.

*Interviewee 06*: Beyond that, I am a reflective individual. I want to spend time and say ... what’s going on? I want to engage in the conversations with other teachers and say, “What do you think of this? Where is this coming from? How do you see this impacting your practice and your delivery in your classroom? Here’s what I think. How are you going to do that? How would you proceed forward?” I really would like that interaction, that discourse with other teachers, with other educators, with other administrators, with Board people when possible, just to get a sense of where things are going.
Interviewee 07: I think it’s because we work in a collaborative setting where, yes, I could have my own classroom and my own space. But our work is so interconnected, that there’s going to be a time when you need to communicate or work with someone or rely on someone or to have to collaborate with someone for growth or success, or just out of necessity to keep things going. And I think relationships are huge and powerful.

Interviewee 12: All the members in the department, they’ve got colleagues in other schools. They’ve got contacts. They would be able to reach out for that information. ...

Interviewee 12: And I think there’s partial responsibility on the individual to be informed of these changes, to see the winds coming. But also on those who are in charge to make it aware that this is what we’re working on. You should be aware. There might be something going on in the next year or so. Just be cognizant of that.

In analyzing the context of policy actors’ professional needs regarding policy shifts, it is evident that clarity of understanding does not arise in isolation. Rather, it develops through interactive processes with colleagues through focused conversations, albeit of an ad hoc, informal or formal nature. Thus it can be posited that the types of collaborative interactions illustrated in the above excerpts provide policy actors the opportunity to engage with different ideas and approaches to the circumstances they face and to reflect and think about how those ideas might impact and alter their approach to the shift in policy. This presence of collaborative culture appears to be central to shaping the professional work of individual policy actors, who ultimately have the responsibility of incorporating the changes into their practice.

This analysis resonates with the ideas elaborated by Coburn (2001) in elaborating the interwoven dynamics of the sensemaking process with respect collegial collaboration. In Coburn’s (2001) terms sensemaking is enhanced when “individual and collective worldviews represented in a group” operate to build “shared understandings” (p.153). Furthermore the professional collegiality established by these collaborative processes provides a common ground for policy
“gatekeeping” (Coburn 2001), where an established network of policy actors screens ideas for alignment and consistency with the accepted policy premises arrived at through collective group sensemaking. This notion of collegial gatekeeping is further extended in Braun et al.’s (2011) elaboration of professional context, wherein the “potential dissonances between embedded institutional values and national policy trends” (p.591), subjugates individual policy practice to the collegially developed institutional norms.

4.2.9 Ideological Repurposing

| REFLECTIVE MEMO 37: What are the embedded values and beliefs that drive the system to success? Are these successes being compromised by policy that moves away from these values and beliefs, if so, why? Or, what are the new values and beliefs and how are they relevant to learners’ needs?
| REFLECTIVE MEMO 45: What are the real motivations behind policy change? There seems to be a disconnect between learners’ needs and other needs as the driver of change, with no clear statement behind the change. This is exemplified in the new math curriculum changes.
| REFLECTIVE MEMO 129: Whose needs are served by educational policy? Industry? Politicians? Learners? Is there mis-alignment or is there something more at work? Is this ideological? Is it social engineering? What’s the purpose of change, if the change disrupts successful outcomes?

Policy actors view policymakers as leveraging communication tools for the social repurposing of education through an ideological lens. The uses of communication tools and channels by policymakers are perceived as message control mechanisms, allowing the shapers of policy to create messages that portray policy shifts in a mostly positive light, aligned to the ideological intent of the policy shift.

A theme within this category of codes is the perception by policy actors of policy processes being shaped by lack of access to relevant and meaningful communication to inform and support site based implementation. Codes associated with this category reflecting this
perception include clarity, timely, restricted, access(ibility), awareness and messaging.

Policy actors question whether the communication deficit is purposeful, designed to mask a concealed intent or whether it arises from the lack of a coherent plan or vision for driving implementation forward. Control over information access serves policymakers purposes if the intent is to implement change regardless of policy actor acceptance. In such a scenario, clarity of communication is irrelevant, since policymakers are simply seeking compliance and indeed the communication is used as a policy control mechanism. On the other hand, if the issue is a lack of a coherent vision, the lack of information access may arise out of policymakers themselves not knowing what it is they want to accomplish, giving rise to a message devoid of meaning and resonance for both policymakers and policy actors. In either case the message mediation leaves policy actors in a state of confused ignorance and disjointed awareness with respect to the pending policy, resulting in policy processes that are devoid of policy actors’ confidence and conviction. The above reflective memos reference a sampling of interview transcripts that elaborate and underscore this notion.

Coding and analysis of researcher memos suggests that message mediation is bilateral. Messages may be mediated by policy actors in light of their perceptions of its intent and purpose, regardless of whether the communication is clear or unclear. Similarly, messages may also be mediated by policymakers, who frame communications in a manner that is designed to advance their intent and purpose, regardless of how the resulting message will be received and perceived by policy actors. This lack in clarity and attention to careful communication may act to reinforce and validate policy actor perceptions and beliefs regarding policy purpose and intent, precipitating the widening of an unbridgeable gulf between policy actors and policymakers.
Policy actors perceive policy as being articulated within the ideological framework, driving forward a political agenda of social repurposing. For policy actors this framework is not overt and transparent, rather it is embedded within the policy in a manner that masks its true intent. Codes within this category reflecting these policy actor perceptions include: beliefs, values, economy, purpose, ideology, discourse, rhetoric and agenda. Policy actors hold the position of the sanctity of the educational enterprise, whose sole focus should be on the needs of the learners, requiring it to be devoid of ideological considerations.

Policymakers however are perceived to operate in an environment which contains a plethora of political perspectives, all declaring themselves as important educational constituencies and wanting direct input into the policy process. Each of these constituencies comes to the table promoting their interests with rational arguments, consistent with their own ideological principles. This places policymakers in the position of having to make decisions that preserve their own positional power, whilst concurrently appeasing the broad based and dominant political thinking of the various constituencies. Based on this argument, site based educational policy actors perceive themselves as occupying the lowest rung on the ladder of influence in terms of shaping policymakers decision making.

The following interview excerpts reinforce and highlight this analysis and underscore the whole idea that the political imperative, which by definition is intensely ideological, shapes decisions that require the trade off of one group’s interests against another.

Interviewee 13: I think there are many little interest groups, large interest groups. On top – off the top of my head there are late immersion French groups that are coming in, parents. There’s the no wi-fi in school parent groups. There have been First Nations, as we see with the developments in School X and School Y. There’s a lot of different, you know policy actors in our education, and I think that’s great. And they’re always coming up with their agendas and ideas and sometimes rightfully so, things need to be changed. Others, I think people put in place things just to pacify people
Researcher: So, its optics and politics are at play here. That’s what I’m hearing.

Interviewee 13: That is education in this province, isn’t it? A lot of optics, a lot of stuff.

Interviewee 12: ... not everything happens in our best interests, and that there are other forces at play which affect policy, which affect implementation.

Interviewee 12: ... what was the whole point of that “dog & pony” exercise? What was the – why did they take our opinion, not listen to us and go and do something else? Was there another – were there – was there a hidden agenda in doing – in asking us? Was there another opinion that wasn’t voice or what have you?

Interviewee 12: So there are other forces in play when we talk about the implementation of these policies, that are sometimes just completely behind the scenes.

Researcher: So, policies are a political – educational policies – are a political decision, is that what you’re saying?

Interviewee 10: I think that would be safe to say.

Researcher: And so what drives that, what drive some of these political decisions then?

Interviewee 10: Partly self interests, partly the voters, and partly pressure by policy actors, people that are funding the educational system. I believe it’s not always in the best interests of the students, that there are undertones, underlying issues, that – self interests in the political system

Interviewee 09: I think what happens in education and – is a big part for a government to get in or get re-elected because it’s such a main part of our society and it affects people. ... it’s something that everyone understands. ... in education everyone’s got an opinion.

Interviewee 07: ... sometimes policy isn’t made for the best interests of the student. It’s made to protect the institution or a certain policy actor.
Interviewee 06: But I’m not sure the main driving factor is always in the spirit of improvement so much as increased efficiencies in delivering education.

The views expressed by these policy actors add credence to their beliefs that groups which are ideologically aligned are perceived to hold greater influence over policymakers’ self interests and these are the dominant groups that ultimately shape and influence policy processes.

The foregoing analysis is reflected in the observations of Chan et al (2007) in examining the developmental pathways of British Columbia educational policy. Chan et al (2007) conclude that “Political ideology is central to our interpretation of education and education policies” (p.11) and further suggest that the “ideology of the Government since 2001 is having a substantial impact on school agents” (p.26). The above transcript excerpts lend analytical support to Chan et al’s (2007) position in suggesting that policy is scrutinized by policy actors and filtered through their professional and philosophical lenses, giving rise to an understanding of purposeful linkage to ideological beliefs in order to achieve specific outcomes that may not be readily apparent.

4.2.10 Social Inequity

Policy actors perceive educational pathways as being shaped by social inequities that privilege the cultural capacity of specific groups.

Policy actors perceive cultural and social drivers as purposefully shaping policy processes to benefit those groups that possess the means and ability to successfully negotiate the system to their educational and economic advantages. Those groups are increasingly parents who are “seen to be co-educators alongside their children’s teachers” (Reay 2004,
p.76). Reay (2004) further suggests that the “educational marketplace and policies underpinning it” (p.83) act in a manner to reinforce the benefits accruing to those groups and reinforcing the advantages they experience by virtue of their status within the system. Codes embedded within this category analytically representing these notions include: success, performance, expectations, outcomes, results and options.

This category reflects perceptions that policy processes privilege the demands of certain groups with respect to the provision of educational services, based upon the outcomes that those groups expect of the system. These demands are used to validate and gate-keep proposed policy changes, regardless of the implications of those policies for the population at large. The following excerpt from interviewee 03 encapsulates this idea of expectations and the use of curriculum policy as a shaper of outcomes.

Interviewee 03: You come to a mandatory academic course, and they hate it. They absolutely hate it, so many kids, why is that? Why is it so hard that they hate it, and they’re not successful? To me, something is wrong there with the curriculum.

Interviewee 03: In this day and age most parents don’t agree with streaming. It’s not that they don’t agree, they don’t want their kids streamed. They want their kid to go to college or university ... there is more emphasis on going to post-secondary to get the job ... I think there are more kids trying to stay in regular than when we were in school. They’re not ready to handle it at the time it’s asked of them, and so they fail. Or, they struggle ... I think math is one of those ones that is really tough, far harder than some of the other subjects. And I think there is something wrong there.

Researcher: I’m hearing societal pressures. Things from parents, families, external things ...

Interviewee 03: I think so. I think the post-secondary’s do too, more kids want to try and go on and try to get the two years of college, whatever it takes to get into that field, that industry, that job; you can’t just have high school, they want two years college. The kids can’t handle that math either.
Interviewee 04 locates the concern regarding social stratification through a lens that focusses on the needs of the majority in negotiating the policy landscape.

*Interviewee 04:* ... we have done a horrible, horrible job of helping families understand how the school system works, being prepared for the school system, giving them more support than they need, because they don’t know about it. We have stumbled around as bums and we have not given families enough help to make sure that they work with their kids to be successful in this context. What do we do instead? We change the context ...

The corollary to the above scenario suggests that those groups who understand the how policy processes work are privileged in terms of their ability to negotiate the educational landscape, gain access to their preferred pathways in order to successfully attain their expected outcomes from the system.

The following extensive interview excerpt further underscores policy actors’ perceptions of a wholesale policy change privileging certain outcomes and pathways

*Interviewee 10:* At the end of the grade 10 year ... what surprised me was the number of students who failed the course. And that surprised me because I thought that with this adjustment in curriculum that it would address more the weaker students’ needs, and that didn’t happen. And then in discussions with my math colleagues I realized that even though the curriculum had changed, it wasn’t, it had left the weaker students, it had left them at a disadvantage.

*Researcher:* That’s interesting. But why, what are you hearing, why did that happen? Why do you think that happened?

*Interviewee 10:* The curriculum, one of the math courses was for university, students who were planning to go to university. The other course was designed for technical types of students. However there are students that have such weak math skills, whereas in the previous curriculum we had an essentials math and that addressed those basic, functional types of math skills that students needed, and it didn’t do that. And the students who tried to, who struggled with the apprenticeship math, it just didn’t cut it, because it was still, the level was still too difficult for them.
Researcher: Okay, so, what happened, what’s happening to those students? You say the new curriculum is supposed to help, but it didn’t. You said sometimes these changes are not in students best interests.

Interviewee 10: Obviously it’s doing a disservice to the kids. They don’t get it and they’re just being pushed along because there isn’t any other course.

In this case, the teacher’s initial understanding and acceptance of the underlying premise purpose of the policy change was not borne out by its application in practice. The policy change only served to extend and intensify a problem that it purported to solve, thereby further privileging an already established preferential educational pathway

Policy actors perceive a disparity in the capacity of educational participants to negotiate the policy landscape, which creates client inequities within a system that purports to promote equity. This perception is framed by understanding of policy actors that socio-economic disparities act to reinforce differential in social and cultural capital required to negotiate the system. Reay’s (2004) observation that “the mobilization of middle-class cultural capital both feeds into and has been fuelled by policy initiatives that prioritize the role of parents” (p. 83) underscores these perceptions. The following excerpts illustrate policy actors’ understanding of the differences giving rise to these inequities.

Interviewee 01: So they don’t relate to the student population we have; a blanket policy statement without considering how it affects different districts.

Interviewee 04: ... everyone forgets that the nature of the population coming in is different, and they may not have bought into the school, and they may have come into the school system less prepared for the demands of the system.

Interviewee 04: ... and in our school the number of parents who never ask about report cards from their kids is because they don’t know the school system, they don’t know how it works!

Interviewee 12: there seems to be a certain capital that parents over at School C have that our parents don’t seem to have and their voice is not
heard nearly as well. And so there is a certain – people do have an impact on things that happen around the, government, their kids and their schools. ... We’re talking about people who have more social capital, more cultural capital, more financial capital and they’re exchanging that capital for things that they want.

The foregoing analysis underscores the perceived connection between social inequity and cultural capital in terms of privileging certain groups as they negotiate policy processes. These perceptions of policy actors reinforce a commitment to their roles as advocates for those they view as being disadvantaged by a lack of cultural capital.

4.2.11 Ethical Trust

| ANALYTICAL MEMO 52: Site leadership has to conform to the hierarchical, top-down flow ... and has to manoeuvre between the two worlds of compliance & relevance ... and act to make policy meaningful at the site level. |
| REFLECTIVE MEMO 87: Teachers need to feel supported ... that someone’s 'got their back' in a sea of change. If there are strong site-based relationships, linked to a set of core values, with a common purpose ... all's well! |
| REFLECTIVE MEMO 93: Site based leadership has a large role to play in creating the conditions that promote and support active implementation engagement for the policy actors ... i.e. how willing they are to share, impart, communicate ... they must elaborate the VISION for the teachers at different stages of professional and personal growth/development, with different needs cognitively, intellectually, emotionally and socially => different stages of intellectual, social and emotional readiness for change. |

| REFLECTIVE MEMO 145: Compliance to higher authority must happen. (Hierarchy of policy enactment). It's a professional duty & legal obligation, but this compliance is based on “trust” that decision makers are "doing the right thing" from a moral, intellectual and professional perspective. Trust in decision makers is exemplified in the intent & purpose of the policy. If there is no 'resonance' between this intent/purpose and the implementers' perspectives this leads to disconnect, disengagement & policy disruption. |

Policy actors value ethical leadership that demonstrates coherence of vision and that promotes trust through credibility of actions.

Policy actors perceive site based leadership to be at the front lines of policy processes and as such are placed in the position of negotiating policy processes at the local level. These perceptions of policy actors are
reflected by codes associated with this category such as: leadership, coach, mentor, gate-keeping, vision and confidence.

Inasmuch as policy processes are articulated in hierarchical manner (i.e. political level to governance level to management level to local site level) policy actors do not expect site based implementation to be hierarchical in nature. Rather, policy actors expect site based leaders to lay out a transparent framework to operationalize policy by creating structures that build trust and establish consensus.

*Interviewee 04:* I think policy, you can be at the top and have a sense of where you want things to go, but what you need to do then, is that you need to go down to the rank and file and do your work there. That’s where it needs to happen. So even if the idea or thought came from somewhere else, at least it starts growing down here, at this particular area, so that gets buy-in.

The following excerpts from a site based leader underscore the significance of this idea.

*Interviewee 05:* The new policy for me always means professional development, and how do we find, not about money, it’s about changing conversations around it. Changing conversations from the congenial to the collegial, so that it’s embedded into the rhythm of the day in terms of how we’re going to approach it.

... it’s about the dialogue moving into practice. It’s not about the fixation on “I have to teach this now because it’s the new policy.”

... So is ours a business that is personality based and dependent on front-end relationships? Absolutely, and that’s what makes this one so difficult. You’re not a manager, we are middle managers, but we’re not middle managers in a corporation where we tell them to work harder and give them bonuses in Christmas and Easter; we’re in a place where we have to create relationships with staff all the time if we’re going to move forward, if we’re going to turn policy into best practice.

The importance of a human face which engenders policy actor trust is a critical role of site based leadership with respect to policy processes. Without this face, this real person, to give it shape and substance, the policy process remains disconnected from policy actors’ reality; it remains as an amorphous entity that only exists for the policy
actor as an abstract idea, with no internal resonance or sense of personal meaning. The following two excerpts illustrate this point.

Interviewee 06: Or whether it’s in a school-based situation, or whether it’s all human – I don’t know how you compartmentalize the groups, but I think that maybe mentorship, one-on-one piece, so that the initiative or policy gets some face and has a personalized human component, humanized component and allows people to not just say, “This is driven from the top. I’m not receptive to this because it’s someone’s agenda to change, change for the sake of change as opposed to change for a genuine reason.”

Researcher: Are you saying it’s depersonalized and dehumanized now?

Interviewee 06: I just think that people view it in such a cynical way that it creates challenges. So, in some ways it’s depersonalized that way. If people are cynical they don’t, if you don’t have that human connection with someone who is fostering it or helping to implement it, I think it’s much easier to be cynical of what’s going on.

Interviewee 09: We used to have people come over and present workshops and talk to people, come into schools and explain things. You used to receive things, and I don’t want to go back to the days when everybody receives a binder of information. Like that was overkill. But something that’s in the school for people to look at and refer to, for people to talk to. Like it’s almost like there’s no people anymore. ... And I mean there’s still people, but they’re not there and I think the personal part is important.

Researcher: Are you saying that the human element or the relationship element is critical then?

Interviewee 09: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Researcher: Why is that?

Interviewee 09 ... we have this communication thing, an understanding of messages ... 60% of your of your understanding of your message comes from your body language, your voice tone ... and all we get now are words ... And I think we’ve taken personal contact away. ... it takes the heart part away ... and if you don’t have that face-to-face and you don’t see that thing, it starts to take that away. ... It’s not as personal anymore.
The preceding suggests that for policy actors’, site based leadership assumes the role of creating meaning and resonance regarding policy processes, through clearly articulating their vision of the policy, communicating its purpose and bringing it to life in terms of its relevance to policy actors and the local policy arena. Where site based leaders successfully fulfill this role, positional trust with policy actors is enhanced. The following line from interviewee encapsulates this notion.

*Interviewee 03:* Almost to the point, I’d almost like to hope that in that utopia of strong relationship building, a person’s word and commitment to one another could almost replace policy.

Policy actors examine the policy landscape for ethical resonance with their internalized set of values and principles. They view policymakers’ actions within the policy process through this lens. Codes reflective of these policy actor beliefs within this category include: trust, impersonal, credibility, transparency, authenticity, self-worth, identity, humanize, valued and respect.

This notion of ethical validity within the system is reflected in the following excerpts. The first policy actor statement underlines the need for credibility and authenticity in terms of policy directions.

*Interviewee 04:* The system either believes in what it’s doing, and stays true to it, or it changes and becomes less committed to what it was in order to “meet the needs” of the new population coming in.

This excerpt captures the ideas regarding the impersonal nature and humanizing aspects of policy processes.

*Interviewee 05:* ... but when policy comes to us that purpose isn’t there. That the ... it’s policy without being, without having a human pulse to it

Ethical resonance with policy actors’ internalized values is highlighted in the reflection below.

*Interviewee 07:* I just think, as busy people, when you find out where the source is from, if it’s one you can relate to or agree with, I think you’re a little more accepting of it.
Ethical resonance also rests upon the idea that policy actors hold out the notion that being valued by policymakers is linked to their personal self-worth and self-image, in terms of their relevance to the policy process.

Interviewee 08: And I’d like my input to be valued as well. If I’m trying something, I want to have a say in terms of, you know, how it’s going and the direction that it’s taking, and if there are any changes that need to be made in terms of what I think, then I’d like those to be heard.

Interviewee 08: If I don’t agree with it I will do it reluctantly.

Researcher: Well, how does that make you feel?

Interviewee 08: Oh, gosh, how does that make me feel? Like my opinion isn’t valued, that my profession or me as a teacher, I, you know, I’ve, sort of my credibility as well the value that I think I have in the classroom has been degraded, like it has been, you know, it just doesn’t make me feel very good.

Interviewee 10: I just don’t think a lot of people trust the autonomy of the teacher anymore.

The preceding analysis with respect to ethical trust is supported by investigations examining leadership factors such as ethics (Zhu 2004), integrity (Palanski 2009) and trust (Johnson 2010) in terms of their impact on individuals with whom leaders interact. Zhu et al (2004) posit the requirement of ethical leadership as a foundation for building trust and organizational commitment. Palanski (2009) argues that groups and individuals within organizations examine leaders’ actions for alignment to internalized norms of behavioural integrity. Johnson (2010) identifies the emergence of trust as being integrally related to the ethical behaviour demonstrated by leaders, as well as the notion of leadership proximity to operational activities in relation to building trust. These lines of investigation support the notions advanced by the analysis.

The foregoing suggests that policy actors’ internalized ethical compass seems to act as a benchmark against which leadership’s policy processes are judged and legitimated. Where there is resonance of leaders’ actions and behaviours with respect to this internal compass,
policy processes are validated; where it is non-existent, processes are disrupted.

The next section presents a conceptual framework that analytically links these eleven categories. In developing this framework, I have given careful attention to analytically connecting the notions embedded within each category through higher levels of analytical abstraction, in order to remain theoretically sensitive and open (Glaser & Strauss 1967) to fully locating the emergent concepts within the data.

4.3 Concept Formation

I analyzed the eleven categories derived from the coding process in terms of their conceptual context and significance. I employed graphical concept mapping as an analytical tool allowing me to “specify the bins that hold the discrete phenomena” (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p.22). I conceptually located the eleven categories (Figure 4.2) around two axes; site based/system based and positive/negative. I selected these two axes as being representative of the range of perceptions held by policy actors with respect to the identified factors associated with policy processes. I framed site based factors as relating to those aspects of policy processes that were specific to the case study site and deemed to be within the domain of policy actors at the site level. System based factors were viewed as being externally located to the case site and beyond the scope of site based policy actors. The positive/negative axis analytically situates for each category the internalized perceptions adopted by policy actors arising from their engagement and interactions with policy processes. A positive valence was ascribed to engagement outcomes that were favourably perceived and a negative valence to those viewed as being unfavourable.

I mapped each category within the defined axial boundaries of the concept map based on the emergent constructs and perceptions derived from coding and memoing. I grouped categories that were proximally located
Figure 4.1 – Conceptually Mapping the Emergent Categories
within the axial boundaries and analytically developed these groupings at a higher level of conceptual abstraction. Conceptual fluidity along the axial dimensions in terms of locating categories was accounted through the use of bi-directional vectors to indicate such fluidity.

This process led to the emergence of six distinct concepts. These emergent concepts are labelled as (1) Professional and Emotional Investment (PEI), (2) Decisional Legitimacy (DL), (3) Hierarchical Trust, (4) System Integrity and Viability, (5) De-professionalization (DP) and (6) Identity Safeguarding (IS).

The following chapter discusses the analytical construction of these six concepts leading to the identification of the theoretical core concept – Affective Disruption.
Chapter 5  Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This case study has set out to uncover how policy actors’ perceive, engage and interact with a new policy as it is implemented and the impact of these factors on during the processes of implementation. The study examined the introduction of a new mathematics curriculum at Southside Secondary School utilizing a Classic Grounded Theory approach (Glaser & Strauss 1967) as the method of inquiry. The use of this methodology permitted me to approach the data without any theoretical preconceptions and to remain analytically open throughout the ensuing analysis in order to develop a theoretical model that was fully and completely grounded within the data.

This investigation led to the identification of a core concept that articulates a theoretical understanding of how policy actors are impacted through their interactions and engagement with policy processes. As stated at the conclusion of the previous chapter, I have ascribed the term Affective Disruption to this core concept.

The use of concept mapping (chapter 4, fig. 4.1) in the analysis of the thematic categories elicited the emergence of the six concepts identified at the end of the previous chapter. The initial part of this discussion chapter examines these six concepts in terms of their analytically conceptualized frameworks. The latter part of the chapter posits a theoretical model for the core concept Affective Disruption. The subsequent discussion examines this model in terms of the theoretical underpinnings from the examined literature and in terms of its proposed structure in relation to the six emergent concepts.
5.1.1 Professional and Emotional Investment (PEI)

Policy actors have a professional and emotional investment in the education system. This concept encompasses categories 01, 02 and 08 … Professionally and Vocationally Vested, Emotionally Invested, and Collegially Connected. PEI has a high positive valence in terms of the perceptions of policy actors and in combination with its position along the site based axis is conceptually located away from external influences and factors and positively proximal to policy actors. This suggests that the concept PEI is internal to policy actors and is framed by their emotional and affective positions from a vocational and professional perspective. Policy actors at Southside perceive their policy site to be a setting with a caring culture, which promotes professionally connectivity. They invest emotional and professional capital with a view to nurturing this environment and expect this investment to sustain them professionally over the long run. Themes from the categories systemic to this concept underscore the importance of affective factors driving policy actors’ engagement at a professional level. The degree of positive collegial connectedness is perceived by policy actors as a means of maintaining the balance between emotional and professional well being, which in turn reinforces and strengthens ongoing collegial behaviours. This notion of professional and emotional investment thus becomes self-sustaining when viewed by policy actors as a positive experience. This analysis is reinforces the ideas of Bartunek et al (2006) and Avey et al (2008) in laying out the relationship between emotional affect and sensemaking.

The notion of teacher life cycle (Huberman 1989, Steffy 2001, and Maskit 2011) conceptually reinforce this linkage of emotional affect to PEI. The models (Huberman 1989, Steffy 2001) identifying teacher’s professional career phases serve as useful heuristics in understanding the reactions and perceptions of policy actors at different stages of their professional path. Steffy (2001) further suggests that these paths may
offer divergent outcomes contingent on the degree of professional
engagement or disengagement promoted by the teaching environment.

The policy actors interviewed at Southside Secondary presented
themselves as educators with a strong and abiding professional
commitment to doing their best for student learning. They could all be
classified as “mid-career teachers” (Huberman 1989) or
“professional/expert” (Steffy 2001) and as a group, they worked
collaboratively to create a sense of community at all levels of the school
site, including looking after their own needs as professionals. This
culture of care and supportive interpersonal network sustains their
emotional, collegial and professional connectedness, positively reinforcing
their career path and eliciting a high degree of professional and emotional
investment in their roles as educators. These practices reflect the analysis
by Maskit (2011) in indentifying core phases of teacher professional life,
informational, professional and psychological, where the latter two are
systemically representative of those who are at mid-career or later in their
professional lives. This suggests that the PEI of policy actors to their
duties and responsibilities maybe emotionally and affectively impacted by
their temporal and situational positioning within their career pathways. For
this group of policy actors with a mid-career, professional/expert
orientation PEI was deemed to be significant.

5.1.2 Decisional Legitimacy (DL)

Policy actors question the decisional legitimacy of policy processes.
This concept encompasses categories 07, 09 and 10… Policy Legitimacy,
Ideological Repurposing and Social Inequity. DL is perceived by policy
actors in terms of negative valence and this, in combination with its
location along the system based axis, serves to construct the concept
externally to policy actors in terms of their domain of influence.
The conceptual construction of DL as suggested by the analysis leads policy actors to exhibit scepticism regarding system based policy processes, which they perceive as being inauthentic, controlling and ideologically based. They view the system with an untrusting eye, based on history and experience. Furthermore, they question the motivation and agenda of policymakers in comparing the overt stated intent attached to policy text, in contrast with the covert messages embedded by policy processes. Ball et al (2011) provide a foundation for understanding the shaping of these perceptions by elaborating the idea that embedded discourses privilege and advance certain policy positions to the exclusion of others. Ball et al’s (2012) notions of performativity and deliverology serve as examples of such discourses that place external demands on policy actors, where the expected policy outcomes are “encoded in a litany of policy statements, documents and legislation” (p. 9) that advance specific positions within policy processes.

Policy actors also view policy processes as privileging groups that advance certain policy viewpoints and as a result feel an obligation to be the policy “conscience” and act as the gate-keepers for equity of access. They view the system as privileging certain socio-economic groups and certain educational outcomes. Policy statements reinforcing these beliefs are exemplified by a foundational goal within the BC Ministry of Education 2010/11 Service Plan stating that “Choice, excellence, and accountability are the hallmarks of a high-quality education system and inspire higher levels of student literacy and achievement” (p.12) through discourses such as choice and flexibility. They also recognize the influential role of externally located agents who advocate and advance policy positions framed by ideological discourses. An example of such a discourse suggests that “politicians should abandon strict central control in favour of increased professional and school autonomy, and market accountability” (Fraser Institute 2006, p. 13), where the specific policy views advanced are clear and unequivocal.
Policy actors at Southside Secondary constantly questioned the authenticity and legitimacy of policy processes when the decision points controlling such processes were perceived as being externally located. For policy actors at Southside Secondary, the question of “meaning and purpose” (Case, 1994 p.81) analytically resonates in terms of policy legitimacy. This questioning of decisional legitimacy in terms of the inception of policy initiatives supports the ideas of Coburn (2006) and Honig (2006) suggesting a need to unpack and understand the idea of authenticity in relation to policy processes.

5.1.3 Hierarchical Trust (HT)

Policy actors value an authority structure that promotes trust. This concept encompasses category 11 … Ethical Trust. The conceptual grounding of this category is bounded within both internal and external conditions that impinge on policy actors. At one end there is a negative valence associated with hierarchy that is distally located to policy actors and system based; at the other end a positive valence is associated with site based hierarchy that is situated proximally to policy actors. This suggests that hierarchical trust is conceptually located along a continuum as represented in figure 4.2; where site based or system based leadership represent the defining factors.

Zhu et al (2004) identifies the degree of leadership trust as an indicator of the commitment of policy actors to organizational imperatives. Zhu et al (2004) further advances the notions of conditional and unconditional trust, where the former is dependent on a negotiated framework of action and the latter on implicitly aligned values framing such action. According to Zhu et al (2004) this notion of trust is contingent on ethically situated leadership behaviours that are perceived to be in the best interest of those towards whom the actions are directed, that promote individual empowerment and that are authentic and transparent. Closely linked to trust is the notion of leader integrity (Palanski et al 2009) where
they frame integrity as a demonstrated consistency between words and actions exhibited by leaders. Palanski et al (2009) suggest that when this consistency is observed of leaders in their interactions, there is enhancement of trust, satisfaction and social comfort between interacting parties and the leader. Johnson et al (2012) add to the conceptual framework in considering the ethical lens of leadership and organizational trust. Johnson et al (2012) consider not only personally constructed ethical behaviour of leaders, but also the leader’s promotion of organizational ethical behaviour that establishes organizational trust. In these terms, organizational trust is contingent on the satisfaction of those interacting with the organization that policies and procedures are ethically aligned and not open to interpretive reconstruction.

At the site level HT is viewed positively. Policy actors’ perceive site based leaders as modelling the facets of ethical leadership elaborated above (Zhu et al 2004, Palanski et al 2009, Johnson et al 2012) that promote and encourage mutually trusting and respectful relationships. At the system level the opposite is perceived to be the case; there is a perceived misalignment between the ethical compasses framing the behaviours of system based leadership, precipitating a lack of trust and a leadership credibility gap with policy actors.

At Southside Secondary policy actors understand that site based leadership has to conform to the hierarchical, top-down flow when managing policy implementation processes. They trust site based leaders who act to engage and enlist them in the process through articulating a policy vision that is clear and understood. On the other hand, they question the ethical validity of policy makers who are removed from the point of action, are externally embedded and are perceived to lack site based experience with policy processes. These policy actor perceptions are underscored by the notions of Darling-Hammond (1990) wherein policymakers’ prior knowledge and experience inform their understanding of new policy processes and those of Ball (1993) that relationships
between policy actors play a key role in advancing or restricting implementation processes.

To the extent that policy actors embrace these perceptions, the credibility and trust of policymakers, along with the processes of implementation, are called into question.

5.1.4 System Integrity and Viability (SIV)

Policy actors are concerned about ongoing cycles of change and the accompanying resource deficiencies caused by those changes. This concept is solely contingent on themes within category 4 and maintains the same name … System Integrity and Viability. The conceptual framework is entirely external to policy actors, being system based with a high negative valence in terms of proximity, locating it at the distal extremities of the concept map (figure 4.2) beyond the immediate scope of influence of site based policy processes.

As referenced in the previous section, this concept is linked to the notion of material contexts (Braun et al 2011, Ball et al 2012) which are reliant on system based resource allocations to ensure their sustainability. The relevance of this notion of sustainability to policy processes is recognized by Ball et al (2012) in suggesting that “Policy initiatives related to school funding can shape investment decisions in unexpected ways, so that, in particular, capital spending becomes less about priorities and more about opportunities” (p. 31), wherein “types of funding and spending decisions inevitably lead to uneven outcomes across individual schools” (p. 31). Ball et al (2012) further recognize that “school budgets are perhaps the most ‘material’ of all the contextual factors” (p. 34) and are driven by enrollment, location, demographics and a host of other site based factors. Despite this recognition highlighting the uniqueness of individual site based needs, the cyclical and repetitive nature of policy processes fails to account for these needs. Rather, those processes treat all sites equally, writ large, and ignore discrepancies in the capacities of
individual sites to economically cope with and manage the resource needs attached to repetitive policy processes.

Southside Secondary policy actors grow frustrated with continuous and ongoing change that seems repetitive and/or redundant. Policy actors view the constant cycle of policy change and as being illogical, of no educational value and self-defeating. This perceived lack of relevance of continuous policy shifts impacting their day-to-day work precipitates system instability. This is of particular relevance to policy processes specific to Southside Secondary, which is a school that sits near the bottom of the achievement ladder and has a declining student enrollment factors which exacerbate an ongoing decline in regular resource support. These factors intensify the negative perceptions of policy actors towards system sustainability when they subsequently encounter a further lack of resources attached to repetitive policy processes, rendering their implementation untenable. This precipitates a questioning by policy actors of the understanding of those initiating policy processes, regarding the needs of the system in order maintain its integrity and ultimately its viability.

This questioning by policy actors aligns with Stensaker et al (2008) who posit that those closer to actual implementation of policy have a bias towards action, in contrast to planning, based on prior experience of planning not adequately addressing the needs of implementation. Policy actors, who deal with the day-to-day aspects of policy implementation, may be more attenuated to the impact and implications arising from implementation of that policy and may be better situated to understand the long term negative impact in terms of the integrity and viability of the system.

5.1.5 De-professionalization (DP)

Policy actors believe that current policy processes create ongoing challenges that erode their capacity to act as autonomous professionals.
This concept encompasses categories 03 and 05 … Locus of Control and Alienation. The mapping of de-professionalization positions the concept mid-way on the system/site axis along with a high negative valence suggests that the construct may be located internally within policy actors and is independent on the source and origin of the policy processes.

Analytical development of this concept through higher levels of thematic abstraction suggests that this internal manifestation of the concept within policy actors may be linked to affective structures premised on their emotions and behaviours. From earlier analysis examining the categories the suggestion was advanced of a consistently activated emotional response regardless of the positional role (Ball 2011b) adopted by policy actors. The construct of core affect advanced by Seo et al (2004, 2010) may represent the foundation to this response. Core affect (Russell et al 1999, Russell 2003) is a representation of one’s current condition framed in terms of (in)activation and (dis)pleasure, where the former denotes a physiological state of readiness and the latter an emotional state of being. Core affect thus may be considered as a psycho-physiological response by individuals to the external environments impinging on their state of affective and emotional well being at any given point in time. Russell et al (1999) refer to core affect as “the most elementary consciously accessible affective feelings (and their neurophysiological counterparts) that need not be directed at anything” (p. 806). In essence, core affect may represent that consistently activated emotional response referred to above regardless of the cognitive processes associated with specific positional roles (Ball 2011b). Core affect may then be deemed to be associated to a fundamentally emotional laden process that frames the internalized responses of policy actors to externally imposed policy processes.

Policy actors at Southside Secondary are thoroughly consumed by the day-to-day actions of teaching and engaging with students. They enjoy their positions as educators with the autonomy to conduct their
practice based on informed pedagogy and professional standards. Imposed policy shifts however, create a situation for policy actors of forced adaptation, where practice is externally shaped and autonomy eroded. Policy actors draw upon prior history and collective understanding to decode the impact of such imposed policy shifts (Spillane 2002) where what a policy means is “constituted in the interaction of their existing cognitive structures (including knowledge, beliefs and attitudes), their situation and the policy signals” (Spillane, 2002 p. 388). When these cognitive schema recall prior policy processes that eroded personal autonomy, imposed conditions on their working environment and utilized policy control mechanisms to shape their professional practice, policy actor feel powerless, anticipating a similar outcome with the imminent policy shift. This powerlessness is further reinforced when collective understanding of policy actors is located within specific “thought communities” or a “worldview” (Spillane 2002) to which they subscribe, based on professional and/or social affiliations. Imposition of change thus precipitates waves of cognitive and emotional dissonance, leading to feelings of devaluation and degradation, resulting in a shift in core affect (Russell et al 1999) in order to respond to the change in conditions. This shift in core affect may result in an internalized emotional disconnect which exacerbates feelings of alienation and further diminishes their capacity to perform as professionals. This emotional disconnect thus acts to reinforce their feelings of being subjected to intentional de-professionalization at both the system and site based levels, which in turn shapes their emotional responses and affective responses.

5.1.6 Identity Safeguarding (IS)

Policy actors enlist a range of coping strategies and mechanisms to preserve and safeguard their professional identity. This concept is solely encompassed by category 6 … retrenchment … where policy actors withdraw and self-isolate to preserve their professional identity. Identity
Safeguarding exhibits a high positive valence but is neutral in terms of its positioning on the site/system axis, suggesting that it is similar in conceptual construction to the concept of de-professionalization, in terms of being internally located to policy actors. The conceptual difference however lies in the notion that IS may be perceived as a positive affective response in terms of a being a vehicle whereby policy actors preserve their professional identity through controlling the external factors that are negatively impacting their core affect (Russell et al 1999, Russell 2003, Seo et al 2004, 2009). The control mechanisms employed by policy actors in this instance involve the preservation of authority over their professional practice by withdrawing to positions that support states of activation (Russell et al 1999) where their authority is not subject to external scrutiny.

Based on the analytical framework constructing this concept, policy actors feel they are faced with multiple threats that undermine many facets of their persona: their professionalism, their autonomy, their sense of self worth, their judgement. They act to safeguard this persona by engaging strategies that remove these threats from their field of vision and operational environment. The reaction of policy actors to these multiple threats may be understood as activation of sensemaking (Louis 1980, Weick 1995, Spillane 2002) as a cognitive adaptive mechanism in reaction to change.

Spillane’s (2002) conceptualization of sensemaking as a lens through which individuals interpret and re-interpret the environment in which they operate offers a possible explanation as to the motivation for retrenchment. Spillane’s (2002) notion suggests that individuals “construct understandings of the policy message, construct an interpretation of their own practice in light of the message and draw conclusions about potential changes in their practice as a result” (Spillane, 2002 p.392). Southside Secondary policy actors cite that career trajectory and professional state of mind were mitigating factors in dictating how they
engaged with the policy implementation process. Policy actors in later stages of their career path had a larger historical lens through which to compare implementation processes. They had more at stake in terms of preserving established beliefs about learning and familiar patterns of work. In essence they exhibited a greater need for preserving conditions of emotional and professional security. Policy shifts that challenged this state of security elicited actions designed to promote preservation of professional identity.

For policy actors the safest path to self-preservation is to retreat to the safety of the classroom, where they have the ability to close the classroom door and shut out all external influences, giving them full control over their professional lives within the framework of their working day. This avoidance strategy is rationalized by policy actors as placing student care and learners’ needs at the centre of their concern, whereas it may be simply self-preservation in order to safeguard their identity as professionals.

5.2 Core Concept – Affective Disruption

The research question under examination seeks to uncover how the primary partners in mathematics education at Southside Secondary School perceive, understand and engage with a new Provincial Mathematics Curriculum and what this perception, understanding and engagement brings to bear on the implementation process. This study has utilized a methodology of concurrent, iterative cycles of data collection and analysis in a manner consistent with a Classic Grounded Theory (CGT) research approach. This approach has narrowed codes from interview transcripts into broad conceptual categories through a process of analytical abstraction. Subsequent analysis at a deeper level of abstraction linked the ideas embedded within these categories to six emergent concepts indicative of policy actor engagement with policy processes. Further analysis of these six concepts led to the identification of a Core Concept elaborating a theoretical understanding of the impact of
policy processes on policy actors arising out of their engagement with such processes. I have named this theoretical core concept – *Affective Disruption* – and figure 5.1 below lays out a conceptual model illustrating its analytical development.
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**Figure 5.1 – The Model Locating Affective Disruption as the Core Concept**
I define this core concept, *Affective Disruption*, as an interruption to the emotional equilibrium of individuals arising out of interference to the cognitive process of sensemaking that they access in negotiating an understanding of externally initiated structural change. In the proposed model, the core concept *Affective Disruption* is precipitated within policy actors in response to the tensions created by the internal and external conceptual forces impacting policy processes. The degree of *Affective Disruption* varies according to the perceptions of policy actors regarding the magnitude of these forces, which in turn is dependent on the degree to which each conceptual component is deemed to be intensified or mitigated by policy processes.

In the following section I will locate my theoretical underpinnings of the model elaborating this core concept. I will discuss the model in terms of how it adds to the understanding of policy processes. In addition, I will also discuss this core concept in terms of implications for practice and for further research.

5.3 Core Concept – Theoretical Underpinnings to Policy Processes

As shown, figure 5.1 lays out a conceptual framework for the theoretical core concept of *Affective Disruption* identified from the CGT case study of policy processes at Southside Secondary School. Restating my theoretical proposition, I posit *Affective Disruption* to be an interruption to the emotional equilibrium of individuals arising out of interference to the cognitive process of sensemaking that is accessed in negotiating an understanding of externally initiated structural change. I propose that *Affective Disruption* is precipitated within policy actors in response to the tensions created by the internal and external conceptual forces impacting policy processes. I further argue that this theoretical notion of *Affective Disruption* varies according to the perceptions of policy actors regarding the magnitude of these forces,
which in turn is dependent on the degree to which each conceptual component is deemed to be intensified or mitigated by policy processes.

I will discuss this core concept from the perspective of the Classic Grounded Theory approach adopted for this investigation. I will then draw on the work presented in the literature review to explicate how this theoretical core concept builds on and adds to the understanding of policy processes.

According to Glaser (2002, p.15) a core concept “organizes the other categories” at a higher level of conceptualization. In essence, this core concept must comprehensively account for the range of theoretical variability through its overarching conceptual “grab” (p.16), whereby relevant concepts are generated from the data and “integrated into a theory” (p.17). Glaser & Holton (2004) further suggest that it “takes time and much coding and analysis to verify a core category through saturation” and that it should be “central, relating to as many other categories and their properties as possible and accounting for a large portion of the variation in a pattern of behaviour” (sect 3.10 p.15). I argue that through careful adherence to the constant comparative process embedded within the CGT of Glaser & Strauss (1967), forcing me to be analytically robust and conceptually reflective, the identified core concept of **Affective Disruption** meets these criteria.

The emergent core concept of **Affective Disruption** brings recognition to an underlying emotional response that is elicited in the course of policy actors’ engagement with policy processes. This emotional response builds on the notion of core affect advanced by Russell (2003) elaborating the existence within individuals of a state affective disposition in terms of their activation levels in response to pleasure or pain producing external stimuli.

**Affective Disruption** is theoretically envisioned as being precipitated by the competing and opposing forces at play both internally and externally to individuals involved in policy processes. I identify internal forces as acting in a manner that positively reinforces an individual’s personal sphere of control over policy processes, whereas with external forces such control is called into question. In attempting to process this conflict through the cognitive lens of
sensemaking, individuals are thus faced with the dilemma of intellectually rationalizing policy processes so as to preserve those personal areas of control. However, when this cognitive framework of sensemaking fails to resolve the dilemma, emotional responses are activated within individuals that provide an alternate method of negotiating the conflict. This overarching emotional response is posited to be in the form of **Affective Disruption**, wherein an individual’s emotional equilibrium becomes displaced, requiring a recalibration of the emotional and affective processes in order for equilibrium to be re-established. This formulation of **Affective Disruption** thus forces those individuals to re-establish equilibrium through either reassessing and reconfiguring their emotional framework in the light of externally formulated challenges, or reverting to an emotional mindset where those challenges may be discounted and disregarded. **Affective Disruption** thus forces individuals to recognize that their emotional responses in coping with the challenges of change are as critically important as their cognitive responses. The theoretical implication of this model in building on and adding to understanding of policy processes is now presented.

From the examined literature (Spillane 2002, Bartunek 2006, Avey 2008, Stensaker 2008) it appears that activation of the social cognition processes of sensemaking does not fully account for how individuals mediate an understanding of change processes. In this light Bartunek et al (2006) and Avey et al (2008) advance the idea that affect and emotions have a role in mediating individuals’ behaviours during their negotiation of change processes. Furthermore, the notion of core affect advanced by Russell (2003) as being systemically present and situationally fluid in terms of its activation levels in response to external conditions, lends conceptual support to further consideration of the impact of affect and emotions as mediating factors influencing the responses of individuals during their interactions and engagement with change processes. In this context, the notion of **Affective Disruption** offers a theoretical explanation of the manner in which affective emotional components impinge on policy actors during their engagement and
interactions with policy processes. In this respect, my construction of *Affective Disruption* as an emotion based response mechanism is theoretically located as operating parallel to, but separate and distinct from, the cognitively situated process of sensemaking. This formulation has theoretical fit with the model (figure 2.2) advanced by Bartunek et al (2006) where sensemaking and affect are viewed as distinct mediating variables governing individual engagement with change processes. This framework also fits with the conceptual model (figure 2.3) of Avey et al (2008) positioning emotion and affect as factors mediating the emergence of positive or negative attitudes and behaviours in the process of negotiating change processes.

The model I have presented articulating *Affective Disruption* as a response to ‘an interruption to emotional equilibrium’ is strengthened through consideration of the theoretical positions advanced by Hargreaves (2001, 2004, 2005), van Veen (2005), Schmidt and Datnow (2005), Kelchtermans (2005) and Gorozidis (2014). Each of the ideas presented within these lines of research provide a supportive explanatory foundation to both the analysis presented within the conceptual map (fig.4.1) and the model depicting *Affective Disruption* (fig 5.1) as the core concept.

Hargreaves’ (2001, 2004, 2005) construct of emotional distances between policy actors and environmental forces supports locating positive or negative perceptions of the emergent concepts (fig 4.1) around site/system based axes. Mapping of these concepts may thus be deemed to constitute a geographical mapping of the emotional landscape. van Veen’s (2005) identification of the push-pull tensions impacting identity reinforce the graphical conceptualization and location of the forces precipitating those tensions. Schmidt and Datnow’s (2005) recognition that a demarcation between factors framing individual or collective construction of meaning influences agency and action supports the conceptual distinction between impact of system and site based influences. Kelchtermans (2005) recognition that the affective impact of change creates conditions that threaten emotional stability, thereby inducing actions to safeguard that stability also reinforces
this distinction. Finally, Gorozidis’ (2014) recent work incorporating consideration of choice and control over motivation and agency lends further support to how the perceptions of policy actors are shaped by environmental conditions shaping policy processes.

Further conceptual support for the theoretical proposition presented by the core concept of Affective Disruption is embedded within the work of Meyer et al (1991, 2004), Seo et al (2004, 2010), Sonenshein (2012) and Maitlis et al (2013). Firstly, the linkage of core affect and affective experiences to employee commitment and behaviour (Meyer et al 1991, 2004; Seo et al 2004, 2010) underscores the need to further elaborate an understanding of the affective dimensions impacting the interactions and engagement of policy actors with policy processes. Secondly, the demonstrated interdependency between cognitive and affective processes requiring heightened attention to the latter in formulating successful change strategies (Sonenshein 2012), combined with the need to fully account for the role of emotions in relation to bringing completion to the sensemaking process (Maitlis 2013) lends further support to the emergence of the core concept of Affective Disruption in terms of its relationship to understanding how the interactions and engagement of policy actors shapes and is shaped by policy processes.

In this sense, Affective Disruption as a core concept offers a theoretical explanation for the reactions brought about within policy actors in the face of a wide range of internal and external factors impinging on and shaping their interactions and engagement with policy processes.

5.4 Theoretical Foundations Locating the Core Concept

The application of a conceptual mapping technique (figure 4.2) (Miles & Huberman 1994) to the eleven categories developed through the grounded theory method led to the emergence of six analytically derived concepts that form the theoretical foundation to identifying the core concept. An
examination of these six concepts in terms of their theoretical contribution now bears consideration.

The model presented in figure 5.1 suggests a clear demarcation between the perceptions of policy actors regarding concepts that are identified as being system based versus those that are site based. Concepts related to policy processes identified as being system based include Systemic Integrity and Viability and Decisional Legitimacy, whereas the notion of Professional and Emotional Investment is locationally mapped as being site based. Two concepts, Identity Safeguarding and De-Professionalization, are neutrally located in terms of site/system axis, whereas Hierarchical Trust is deemed to exhibit conceptual fluidity depending on the context and positioning of the hierarchical structures in terms of their relationship to policy actors. In addition to the system/site based demarcation, the conceptual mapping ascribes a positive or negative valence to the foundational categories and the emergent concepts attached to those categories, reflective of their perceived impact on the responses of policy actors during the course of their interactions and engagement with policy processes. Those concepts identified as being within policy actors’ domain of control and perceived as lending support to policy actors in terms of their cognitive and/or emotional responses were mapped with a positive valence; a negative valence was ascribed to those concepts that were deemed to elicit opposing outcomes.

The discussion below elaborates the understanding developed through this conceptual mapping that informs the theoretical relationship between these six concepts in building the core concept of Affective Disruption.

Firstly, the system based concepts of Systemic Integrity and Viability (SIV) and Decisional Legitimacy (DL) are presented as having a high negative valence, indicative of their external location to policy actors. This negative valence is reflective of the perceived limitations and restrictions to policy actors of their role and participation in the processes of decision making and in framing the actions required to promote system stability. Policy actors perceive SIV as being governed by such factors as uneven resource
allocation and policy inconsistency that act to destabilize the structural
stability and ongoing sustainability of the system. This leads to the policy
actors questioning the DL of decision making processes that they perceive as
being illogical and inequitable in terms of the advancing the required support
structures to sustain system viability. DL thus is called into question by
policy actors' in terms of the perceived authenticity, values and purpose of
policy as it is represented within the policy arena. As such, DL becomes
embedded within a perceived disconnect between policy actors' conceptions
of the policy and the perceptions of those in decision making positions who
advance specific policy positions. In these terms, DL is viewed as being
incongruent by policy actors in terms of alignment to their values and
purpose, precipitating potential internal cognitive, emotional and affective
conflict. To mitigate this conflict, policy actors reject the legitimacy of a
decision making process that is contradictory to their internal values and
propose. Since these system based concepts of DL & SIV are perceived as
being embedded within policy processes outside their influence and control,
this acts to negate any perceived benefits that may be derived through
interaction and engagement with policy processes, leading policy actors to
question the purpose of such interaction and engagement. In response, SIV
& DL precipitates an emotional and affectively grounded response within
policy actors that is represented with a high negative valence, reflective of
these conditions.

The site based concept Professional and Emotional Investment (PEI)
arises from the activation by policy actors of internal emotional and cognitive
structures that act in a manner to promote feelings of personal control and
influence over their professional lives. PEI is located with a high positive
valence for policy actors, reflective of their interactions and engagement with
policy processes in ways that validate, support and promote their professional
identity. These interactions are intra-personal and inter-personal in nature and
designed to establish and enhance collegial connectedness, emotional
balance and professional stature. In this sense PEI is posited as being an
internally constructed affective framework within policy actors, which acts to positively support personal perceptions of competency, emotional commitment and intellectual engagement within the context of good professional practice. Since PEI emerges from interactions that are site based and perceived as permitting policy actors to govern the manner of their engagement with policy processes, it is attributed a high positive valence reflective of the domain of control being internally located within policy actors, thus precipitating positive affective responses.

Secondly, De-Professionalization (DP) and Identity Safeguarding (IS) as concepts are posited to be affective constructions located internally within policy actors. It is proposed that these two concepts are independent of site or systems based factors and are oppositely located in terms of valence, with IS exhibiting a high positive and DP a high negative valence. This mapping suggests that these two concepts exist along a linear continuum within policy actors, further suggesting that Identity Safeguarding is an internally constructed response to counteract the perceptions of De-Professionalization elicited by their engagement and interactions with policy processes. In this context, both IS and DP may be viewed as emotion based internal affective responses to imposed pressures originating from either system based and/or site based sources. The emotional aspects of DP for policy actors are manifested through an array of constricting forces that act to disempower and devalue their professional standing. In this respect the emergence of such notions as powerlessness, loss of autonomy and alienation arising out of their engagement and interactions with policy processes become contributing factors towards identity deconstruction. As a result of these forces, policy actors are faced with forced adaptation in order to safeguard their professional identity and mediate further de-professionalization. The resulting fear and anxiety internally aroused in response to such forces acts to elicit mechanisms to safeguard this professional identity. Identity Safeguarding is thus conceptually constructed as an affective vehicle utilized by policy actors to emotionally preserve who they are in terms of their professional identity in
the face of policy processes that are perceived as acting to deconstruct that identity.

Thirdly, Hierarchical Trust (HT) as a concept is mapped as demonstrating theoretical fluidity, its location being dependent on the structure and nature of the hierarchical relationship governing the interactions of policy actors during policy processes. Hierarchical relationships that are system based are negatively perceived by policy actors, whereas those that are site based are perceived positively. The interests advanced by externally based hierarchical structures are perceived as being detached from site based realities, lacking in transparency and exhibiting a low threshold of credibility. As such, these interests are perceived by policy actors as restrictive to positive and productive interactions in advancing site based policy processes. Within this context, HT exhibits a high negative valence, creating an emotional disconnect within policy actors that does not engender or support trust building with externally located hierarchical structures. On the other hand, policy actors perceive site based hierarchical structures to be situationally authentic and mutually beneficial. These perceptions are based on their positive experiences with site based leaders during policy processes characterized by respectful, transparent and trusting interactions. This results in the attribution of a high positive valence to site based Hierarchical Trust arising from positive affective responses. This suggests that the emergence of HT during policy processes is contingent on the degree to which such processes are viewed as being driven by internal or external hierarchical structures. Within this context it is posited that HT is premised on where policy actors perceive the dominant hierarchy driving policy processes forward to be locationally situated. If it is perceived to be pre-eminent at the system level, this precipitates a shift of HT towards a negative valence, despite the positive attributions of HT that may be associated with site based hierarchal structures

The conceptual model (figure 5.1) mapping each of the above six emergent concepts presents a clear demarcation between internal and
external factors shaping the responses of policy actors to their engagement and interactions with policy processes. Analytic interpretation of the model also suggests the existence of an overarching affective emotional framework within which these responses are embedded. I have posited this framework to be Affective Disruption

5.5 Study Limitations

There are methodological and theoretical limitations to this CGT case study worthy of consideration prior to discussion of the research findings, which I enumerate as follows.

First, this study makes no claims to being empirically valid. This limitation is bounded by the nature of the chosen methodology. A CGT case study by nature purports to examine only the phenomenon of the particular case, with the emergent concepts being grounded only in the data from that case. In that sense the theoretical formulation of the core concept is limited in time to this case study, at this case site.

Second, as the sole researcher who was also a policy actor at the chosen case study site, I had to be reflexively aware of the potential impact of my positional influence during interactions with interview subjects. This reflexive awareness necessitated a constant self interrogation with respect to my analysis and to the conclusions drawn from that analysis. In this case I am forced to recognize that the core concept is limited by the conceptual depth of my analysis and by my abilities to draw out conclusions to a substantive level of theoretical abstraction.

Thirdly, the notion of sampling in a grounded theory study is subject to academic contestation, in terms of an appropriate sample size. Qualitative research approaches call for a range of sample sizes from 10 to 50 depending on the qualitative methodology employed. Martin (1996) contends that the “appropriate sample size is one that adequately answers the research question” and that “the number of required subjects usually becomes obvious
as the study progresses, as new categories, themes or explanations stop emerging from the data” (p. 522). For CGT data saturation is a key notion that delimits where and when initial interviewing and subsequent interviewing through theoretical sampling ceases. Martin (1996) offers the proposition that “new themes stopped emerging after 15 interviews” (p. 523) and Creswell (1998) suggests that grounded theory sample sizes may range from twenty to thirty. Morse (2000) suggests that there is an inverse relationship” between the amount of “usable data” that is obtained from the interview process and the “number of participants” (p. 4) that are required. Finally, Guest (2006), in reviewing the literature regarding sample size concludes that there were “no practical guidelines for estimating sample sizes for purposively sampled interviews” and that “very little headway” (p. 60) had been made in setting such guidelines for qualitative research to determine the level required for analytic saturation. To this latter point Guest’s (2006) investigation suggests that analytic data saturation may occur at a threshold level of 12 initial interviews, in terms of no new information being derived from the coding process. In this respect, I am confident that the initial sample of thirteen interviews, with an additional seven subjects theoretically sampled for follow up interviews, provided me with a broad spectrum of usable data for deep conceptual analysis.

Lastly, the analysis being grounded in an iterative process of constant comparison of incidents requires me as the researcher to exhibit good intellectual judgement as to when theoretical saturation has been reached. As a novice researcher, this proved to be a challenge. Should I stop coding? Should I be writing more theoretical or analytical memos? When is a category truly a category, or a concept truly a concept? Is my theoretical lens sound? Have I grounded my argument solidly in the data?

Each of these questions implies limitations to the value of my research in terms of the findings of this study. However it may be also be argued that arrival at the point of data saturation leading to the articulation of a theoretical core concepts rests entirely on my judgement as a researcher, on my
adherence to a sound research methodology and on my level of confidence in the conceptual strength and depth of my analysis. In this respect I am confident that my research has adequately addressed these issues.

5.6 Methodological Observations

Consideration of the application of the grounded theory methodology to this case study presents a number of methodological observations that I have learned that may offer refinements to the grounded theory analysis of this case study.

One observation arises in relation to my position as an embedded researcher at the case study in terms of my pre-existing relationships with site based policy actors. A question worth exploring is whether the research dynamics would change if I conducted the research at a location where I was an unknown individual, with no site based policy responsibilities. A concomitant question to be posed is if this were the case, would the analysis be influenced in any way by the removal of this relational dynamic and if so, how?

Another observation pertains to the case study site itself. The question arises as to whether the demographic make up of the population specific to the case site impacts or influences study participants in terms of their perceptions of policy processes and if so, how? This observation poses an additional question of the methodology in terms of the analysis as to whether policy actors’ perceptions are shaped by factors other than their engagement and interactions with policy processes.

A third methodological observation relates to the CGT notion of theoretical sampling as a key element informing the ongoing process of data collection and analysis. Since theoretical sampling is informed by the researcher’s perceptions of whom to approach for additional data collection, is there a case to be made for a prior vetting of those to be theoretically
sampled to uncover predilections or biases prior to follow up interviews? Such a process may be useful in reinforcing the selection of those that are theoretically sampled as viable candidates informing the subsequent analysis.

While consideration of each of the preceding observations is not inherently consistent with the classic grounded theory approach, their incorporation into the analytic process may strengthen the theoretical understanding gained through use of the methodology.

5.7 Implications for Practice

Policy actors’ interactions and engagement with policy processes are subjected to a range of forces that elicit \textit{Affective Disruption} with respect to the internal impact of those forces. This emotion laden core concept arising within policy actors presents implications for practice in terms of understanding and mediating \textit{Affective Disruption} in terms of its impact on the policy implementation processes.

First, implementation processes must give recognition and importance to the emergent affective responses that may impinge on policy enactment. Such recognition must take account of the differentiation in these responses along site based and system based lines, in order to better understand their potential impact on policy processes as they unfold.

Second, policy processes need to encompass structures that mitigate negative and advance positive affective responses towards policy enactment. In these terms, such structures must diminish and counteract the emergent emotional tensions between forces internal to and external to policy actors, that precipitate the conditions for \textit{Affective Disruption} to be realized.

Third, any such mediating structures must be aligned with the internal emotional and affective priorities of policy actors, as opposed to being perceived as negating those priorities. This alignment thus sharpens the focus of policy processes towards understanding the affective dimensions that influence policy actors as they negotiate the policy landscape.
Finally, increased prominence must be given to the emotional affective dimension impacting policy processes, separate and apart from sole considerations of the cognitive dimensions. Policy processes are dependent on human interactions and engagement in terms of their efficacy. Failure to pay attention to this affective dimension, which has embedded within it an emotional framework, is a failure to recognize the indispensability of the human dimension to policy processes.

5.8 Implications for Research

The latter point from the previous section provides a lens through which to consider ongoing research implications attached to the identification of the theoretical core concept of Affective Disruption developed through this research study. This emergent notion builds on the ideas elaborated through the research lens of organizational psychology (Meyer & Allen 1991, Meyer et al 2004, Sonenshein & Dholakia 2012, Maitlis et al 2013) in terms of the mediating nature of emotions on behaviour during change processes.

Meyer & Allen (1991) suggest that the affective commitment of individuals to an organization is reflected by the degree to which their personal needs are met and their values reflected through their experiences within the organizational environment. Meyer et al (2004) build on this notion by suggesting that affective commitment is linked to the degree to which behaviours are shaped by intrinsic or extrinsic motivating factors. These notions parallel the components presented within my theoretical model that show factors internal and external to policy actors as eliciting opposing tensions.

Sonenshein & Dholakia (2012) propose a model incorporating cognitive and affective pathways, that are both deemed to be “vital in explaining employees behaviour during strategic change implementation” (p. 18). Sonenshein & Dholakia (2012) acknowledge however that investigations privileging the cognitive approach have taken precedence. These
investigators suggest that “future research should untangle the role of affect versus cognition in explaining change implementation behaviours” (p. 18).

Maitlis et al (2013) acknowledge that an “important but under examined facet of sensemaking is the role of emotion” (p. 223), which they recognize as playing a key role in triggering certain aspects of behaviour in response to external conditions. Maitlis et al (2013) make the argument that sensemaking and emotion are inextricably linked, with the latter shaping the how the former takes place.

Each of these preceding lines of research from the discipline of psychology adds a theoretical perspective that is worthy of greater consideration in terms of the impact of affect and emotions on the interactions and engagement of policy actors with policy processes. In light of the above considerations, I suggest that this case study has added a layer of understanding of how emotions are mediated through Affective Disruption in the course of policy actors’ interactions and engagement with policy processes.

As previously observed, educational policy implementation research has paid scant attention to these affective and emotional dimensions, focussing instead on social cognition frameworks such as sensemaking to explain how policy actors rationalize their engagement with policy processes. This case study has opened the door to looking at such policy processes through the lens of human interactions. A next step in continuing this line of investigation would be to expand this CGT study of policy processes to multiple case sites in order to confirm (or disconfirm) the findings through data triangulation, for the purpose of incorporating the core concept of Affective Disruption into a Formal Grounded Theory that explains the emotional aspects of interactions with policy processes on a broad based conceptual and theoretical level.
5.9 Study Significance

The notion of affect has been previously recognized by lines of research (Bartunek et al 2006, Avey et al 2008) as a mediating component that acts in parallel to the cognitive process of sensemaking in shaping the interactions of individuals with policy processes that require them to adapt and/or change their practice. What is not understood is the role that affect and emotions occupy in terms of how they act on the individual with respect to their interactions and engagement with policy processes. This research thesis has presented three seminal ideas in relation to building this understanding.

First, the notion of Affective Disruption advances a theoretical framework for understanding the impact of affective and emotional forces on policy actors in terms of their interactions with policy processes. This finding suggests that emotive forces within policy actors need to be recognized as key factors shaping behaviour and further examined for their behavioural impact.

The second finding recognizes the existence of opposing internal and external forces operating on policy actors, which act to elicit the emotional tension that gives rise to Affective Disruption. This finding suggests a need to examine how these internal and external forces are shaped by policy processes, in order to mediate their impact in creating this emotional tension.

The third finding suggests a role for those involved in policy leadership – whether site or system based – in mediating the affective and emotional responses that elicit Affective Disruption.

These findings suggest the need to examine the intersection of research across disciplines such as sociology, psychology and organizational behaviour, to enlist additional theoretical perspectives that may add to and advance the understanding of the role of affect and emotions in mediating
policy actors’ responses to policy processes. In this vein, Gooty et al (2010) present an excellent example of a research review that offers a window into the contributions that these disciplines may add to this research discourse. This research thesis purports to open that window.
Appendices
Appendix 1 – Interview Questions

ADULT PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Background
   a. Do you have school age children? Ages? Grade level?
   b. Where did you complete your teacher training?
   c. What subjects have you taught?
   d. Have you always worked with VBE?
   e. How long have you been at JO?

2. Policy context questions
   a. Do policy statements impact you in your capacity as a ____________?
   b. Can you explain how & why?
   c. How do you react when you hear about a new educational policy?
   d. How do you find out about new educational policy initiatives?
   e. From where do you get information & why do you use these sources?
   f. Do these sources give you what you need? Why...why not?
   g. How would you change the way information is given regarding new educational policy initiatives?
   h. Why would you make these changes?

3. Mathematics curriculum change
   a. What do you know about the new mathematics curriculum that is being implemented this September?
   b. Why do you think the Ministry is changing the curriculum?
   c. How have you been informed about the curriculum change in your school?
   d. Describe the implementation process in your school?
   e. How have you participated in the implementation process? Why ... why not?
   f. Has this provided you with the information needed in relation to your role? Why ... why not?
   g. How would you have changed the implementation process? Why these changes?
Participant: Because a lot of policies that I’ve seen, can I say that? Let’s see, a lot of things that people talk about and make big fusses about, portfolio 12, all those sort of things, simply die because they are—they might appease one interest group. But the practicality of them in school systems, does not fit.

Interviewer: So let’s go down that road a little bit. They simply die because they don’t appease one interest group. Are there interest groups that impact policy in education, stuff like that?

Participant: Yes.

Interviewer: Tell me a little bit more about what you think in that area.

Participant: I think there are many little interest groups, large interest groups. On top, off the top of my head there are the late immersion French groups that are coming in, parents. There’s the no wi-fi in school parent gro... There have been First Nations, as we see with the developments in Britannia or McDonald—Britannia. There’s a lot of different, you know, stakeholders in our education, and I think that’s great. And they’re always coming up with their agendas and ideas and sometimes rightfully so, things need to be changed. Others, I think people put in place things just to pacify people.

Interviewer: So it’s optics and politics are at play here. That’s what I’m hearing.

Participant: That is education in this province, isn’t it? A lot of optics, a lot of stuff.

Interviewer: And so I’m hearing that you as a classroom teacher, you want to bypass a lot of that and you want to teach to the kid. And you said you—the term you used was, is it actually going to be around? And so you kind of adopt the old, “Okay, I’ll do what I’m doing and I’ll wait and see.” Is that what happens? Or do you just say, “Nah, I’m not going to wait and see. I know what’s working and I’m going to continue on with that,” kind of thing. What happens?

Participant: I usually say, “Hmm, this isn’t working. I’m going to do this.” So right now, I’ve—I’m starting to develop a little project for myself for next year, which is all—it’s going to be a visual portfolio of each of my kids. So that I’m taking videos and pictures of them working and their work, so I can email it to parents. I can email it to kids. Kids can have access for their blogs, and there will be just a much more truer evaluation practice. Which I think BCeSIS does not give us. And even though they—BCeSIS allows for the emailing home, it doesn’t work. It’s been turned off.

So I think there’s so many things that we could be doing to further the educational process, and that’s what I like to develop in my own projects and my own policies.
Participant: Why to adapt?

Interviewer: So what I’m hearing again you say, is that whatever’s out there in the ether in terms of the top down, filtering down, it comes down to the local level. And in your best professional judgement as a school, with the people with whom you work, you look at it and you go, okay, what does this mean for us? And what does this mean for our population? And so you adapt. Why do you need to do that?
Appendix 3a – Sample Codes Derived From Transcripts

Codes (CP) Transcript

1. General Teacher Experience
   Purpose
   Experience
   Intended
   Inherent

2. Context
   Locality of Context
   External
   Purpose
   Learning Focus
   Complexity
   Discount
   Engage
   Understand
   Be Frame
   Context
   Interests
   Intent
   Pollution
   Values
   Assignment
   Charity
   Guilt
   Judgment
   Professionalism
   Responsibility
   Perpet
   Meaning
   Sensibility
   Professionalism
   Responsibility
   Values

3. Professionalism
   Duty
   Sensibility
   Engagement
   Footprint
   Purpose
   Student Focus
   General Narrative
   Student Success
   Least Context
   Critical
   Receptive
   Skepticism

4. Cynicism
   Student Narrative
   Learning Focus
   Professionalism
   Collaboration
   Engaged
   Reflective
   Purpose
   Context
   Agenda
   Purpose
   Learning Context

5. Relational
   Influence
   Context
   Cycles
   Engagement
   Professionalism
   Learner Focus
   Autonomy
   Choice
   Learner Focus
   Relationship
   Student MFP
   Information
   Self Directed
   Engaged
   Professionalism
   Responsibility
   Collaborative
   Network

   Connected
   Information
   APC BDP
   Context
   Judgment
   Relationship
   Hierarchical
1. PREP
   - COMPETENCY
   - CONTENT
   - ADAPT

   2. LEADS
   - FOCUS
   - EXPECTATION
   - MEETING

   3. OPTICS
   - VALUES
   - EXPECTATION
   - IMPACT
   - CONNECT

   4. PERSONALIZE
   - HUMANIZE
   - RELATIONSHIP
   - AGENDA
   - INVEST
   - INVEST
   - CONNECTION
   - INVEST

   5. LEAD
   - FOR
   - QUALITY
   - CUSTOM
   - LEARNING
   - RELEVANCE
   - STANDARD
   - ENGAGE
   - CONNECT
   - LEAD FOCUS
Appendix 3b – Sample Grouping of Codes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Teacher Memo</th>
<th>Transcript Page</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Analytical or Reflective</th>
<th>Concept Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy has the effect of shaping teaching practice. Policy shift creates anxiety through lack of understanding of intent.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continuous and ongoing change causes frustration. Expectations and beliefs of teachers shape interaction with policy and influence adoption. Enforced practices may cause resistance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do policy makers actually understand the realities of the classroom setting?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy implementation collaboration occurs in a vacuum since there is no communication that contextualizes the changes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Despite a lack of clarity in communication, the professional responsibility of reflecting on the required changes creates teacher engagement with the policy shift.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy shift seems to be challenging the professional knowledge of teachers with no valid explanation regarding the purpose of the change. Leads to questioning the relevance and validity. Evidence required to mediate the negativity of change.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SW7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shifting of responsibilities caused by policy results in increased workload. What impact will this have on teachers’ morale, passion, commitment, etc.?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SW8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>External drivers of change towards a more student centered, learner-focused product is positive, but it has to resonate with teachers to be effective and take hold.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SW9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teacher autonomy is in conflict with top-down policy implementation processes. No teacher buy-in. No implementation success. Requires a shared vision and collegial collaboration at multiple levels, where teacher engagement is real/valued.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SW10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Implementation of curriculum is organic and ongoing. Follow up and review will be necessary to determine the successes... Until the jury’s out.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SW11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High degree of professional investment to do the best possible job for student learning... Strong learner focus... Function of teaching is important and taken seriously as a commitment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TL1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High degree of passion and care along with deep engagement with content area. This is critical in that this “positive mindset” drives student-teacher interactions and the ability of students to engage with the subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TL2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Policy” is a large blanket that covers many areas. It must be viewed contextually, philosophically, and operationally; but all areas must integrate in order for the system to function... must demonstrate coherence, cohesion, and alignment.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TL3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy-curriculum change may be anticipated on a cyclical basis, but, there is a lack of clarity in the purpose for the change(s) and the forces behind the change(s), especially when it seems that the change is not required.</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TL4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No direct communication to teachers re policy shift... so... where is the information? To whom does it go? How is implementation information mediated?</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TL5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication and support during implementation is at a premium. Individual stakeholders are left on their own to muddle through; information is controlled and access limited... The engagement needs to be multi-layered and bottom-up.</td>
<td>9 &amp; 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TL6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curriculum changes cannot be done in isolation from other subject areas. Knowledge is sacrificed and learning builds on pre-existing knowledge... If subject curricula are misaligned... learning suffers.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TL7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers are disconnected from decision making, even school site levels. Are decisions being made with teachers in mind or are there other pre-existing factors that drive decisions forward?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TL8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Policy seems devoid of practical consideration of the needs of learners ... changes are ineffectual and do not work!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Getting all parties on board can be challenging when the relationships/networks are not strong --&gt; this presents a challenge to effective implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Why does policy shift ... who sets the priorities and why do some priorities that are &quot;valid&quot; disappear for no apparent reason? Teachers with a sense of the historical landscape &amp; cycles of change, tend to invalidate imminent changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Politicians lack of experience and educational expertise is evident by the types of policies that emerge, which seem to have no bearing on learner needs ... so ... what's the driver?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>EE3a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication vehicles are inefficient; they don't distill what teachers need to make the policy work for them in an instructional setting ... Teachers are forced to assess it themselves ... but time constraints/workload relegates low priority ... so ... practice happens devoid of valid information needed to make policy changes work ... which causes teacher resentment, retrenchment and withdrawal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reasons for policy changes are not communicated. Teachers are left in limbo, thus question the policy validity based on their experiences and understanding of students' learning needs and history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Impact of policy change on learners is debilitating to their self-esteem, efficacy and sense of math ability. When policy shifts exacerbate these feelings in learners ... what's the point of the change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>If the policy shift is not grounded in enhancing educational outcomes for learners, then what is it grounded in? Math in particular is a subject learners struggle with ... these changes don't seem to make it easier for them to succeed ... so why change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>EE7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibility for learning about policy/curriculum change falls on individual teachers ... while there is a dependence on a collaborative culture to implement through the process in a manner that makes sense, process rests on individual engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EE8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whils there is professional (judgement/autonomy, teachers still have to comply with prescribed policy ... albeit grudgingly. What impact does this have on teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EE9a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of coherence in curriculum implementation ... i.e. long-term process unclear. Destination drives the journey, but this journey is starting with the destination marker yet to be unfolded (like 10, then 11, then 12) ... Implication is that policy needs to understood and explained in its entirety, rather than piecemeal. Implementers/frames need to reconcile communication/engagement processes to provide a more coherent vision to those charged with using it!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>TH1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site based educators need to understand the context of their situation and how policy will play out in that context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>TH2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>If a policy process is organic/dynamic, not static, it will succeed. How do we get that? ... Engagement, meaning making and commitment from the ground up. Imposed/prescribed policy doesn't work, i.e. that people may &quot;conform&quot; but they won't &quot;align&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TH3</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Is change necessarily an improvement? Where's the evidence? If something's working, why throw it out? Where's the grounding of policy in good practice in people's learners' needs?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TH4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy cannot be &quot;one size fits all&quot;. We're dealing with differences in... people... learning... history... readiness. Policy needs to be flexible or people need to be able to adjust policy to fit their needs.</td>
<td>5 &amp; 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>TH5a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>What are the embedded values &amp; beliefs that drive the system to succeed? Are these successes being compromised by policy that moves away from these values &amp; beliefs? If so, why... or... what are the new values &amp; beliefs, and how are they relevant to learners' needs?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TH6a</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>The context in which a policy operates must be understood, along with the players who will be the subject of that policy. &quot;So policy, in theory sometimes, is absolutely superb, but if policy doesn't understand the realities of the situation, of the families, of the kids, if it doesn't understand their needs, then it's not going to work.&quot; (Note: it must also understand the same with respect to the policy implementers!)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>TH7</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Context! Context! Context! Do policymakers really understand school context, learner needs and cultural capacity of families to successfully engage with the system?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TH8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communication &amp; teacher disconnect have resulted in failed / withdrawn policies. Policymakers are completely isolated from the realities of everyday school life and its requirements for success. &quot;Gated Cage&quot; syndrome!</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>TH9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engagement, resonance &amp; buy-in are critical... How do we get to that point at the gras roots level? How do policymakers create MEANING for implementers?</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>TH10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>What are the real motivations behind policy change. There seems to be a disconnect between learners' needs and other needs as the driver of change, with no clear statement behind the change. This is exemplified in the new math curriculum changes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>TH11a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Input, participation, engagement of those working directly with the outcome of a policy, in its formulation, is critical if it is to have any chance of success. Why? Is policy redefines the &quot;work&quot; of professional... professional need control over their work... anything that denies them input/access/control is doomed to fail, because it invalidates current/past professional practice, which in turn invalidates the status of the professional as a professional.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TH12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The trains are running on time, but where are they going? Policy without buy-in is like a train without tracks... it will be de-railed.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>TH13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>In the context of education, policy must remain intensely personal for each individual who is subjected to that policy within the system (teacher, learner, leader, parent). If this personal connection is missing, negated or broken, the policy will fail.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>GB1a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy must be contextualized to everyday practice in situ, as opposed to the external imposition of constant change by those who don't understand the context of schools and their individual needs... local relevance is critical. If this is absent, the policy is marginalized... IGNORED!</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>GB2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site leadership has to conform to the hierarchical, top-down flow... and has to manoeuvre between the two worlds of compliance &amp; relevance... and act to make policy meaningful at the site level.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>GB3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The abstract notion of a policy statement versus the actual impact of policy on individual learners/staff, leaves leaders in a position of having to err on the side of the learner/staff/staff... the human connection is critical.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>GB4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>GB5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>GB6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>GB7a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>GB8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>GB9a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>GB10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>GB11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>GB12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>RF1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>RF2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>RF3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>RF4a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>RF6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>RF6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Week 3: Information Processing - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Week 4: Problem-Solving Strategies - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Week 5: Decision-Making - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Week 6: Communication - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Week 7: Conflict Resolution - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Week 8: Negotiation - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Week 9: Leadership - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Week 10: Team Building - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Week 11: Time Management - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Week 12: Stress Management - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Week 13: Goal Setting - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Week 14: Evaluation - Group by Use (Analytical or Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Group by Use (Analytical or Report)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>People are at the core of the system. Education policies that don't value people/relationships are doomed to failure, since they will not elicit ownership/buy-in ... Instead they will cause affective disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Policy changes must always serve students' best interests. It seems that teachers see themselves as the gatekeepers of good practice and what's best for learners ... again, a part of their duty and professional responsibility and moral purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>For policy changes to be sustainable, they must have contextual resonance and meaning at the site/location in which they are being implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Teachers work on the front lines of education and have a direct and meaningful impact on students. They come from a place of care/passion. Anything that threatens that care is viewed with skepticism/doubt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Site-based leadership has a large role to play in creating the conditions that promote and support active implementation engagement for the policy actors ... i.e. how willing they are to share, impart, communicate ... They must elaborate the VISION for the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Teachers at different stages of professional and personal growth/development, with different needs cognitively, intellectually, emotionally and socially = different stages of intellectual, social and emotional readiness for change ... understand this!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Policy change must not only be contextually relevant, but it must also have pragmatic relevance and be seen to be useful for students in order for teachers to engage and adopt the change. Tension = Reflectivity = Practicality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Communication, clarity and building consensus critical. The establishment of trusting relationships between all policy actors is critical to success. Here to be urgent, interactive and collaborative process, inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Policy change does not necessarily change practice completely. Teachers have ownership and an investment in their professional practice. They want control over it ... So they ADAPT change BEFORE adopting it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Teachers can be quite compartmentalized and insulated from the policy environment, which creates a lack of awareness of change. Become dependent on their professional network to raise the level of policy awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Imposition causes waves of cognitive dissonance and affective disruption. Feelings of alienation, degradation ... devalued. De-professionalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nothing happens if no one gets along! Relations/real. Policy change is rooted in how people relate to each other ... How the process is handled and this dictates how open people are to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ1e</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Engagement with policy is contextual in terms of the impact of that policy on the players. Some teaching professionals need to understand the wider array of policy impact; some are confined to a narrow focus. Implication = positional/identity conflict ... teachers value their autonomy and are frustrated by an imposed/external focus of control; yet their engagement is compartmentalized depending on the focus and relevance to them as individual teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>WJ2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>WJ3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>WJ4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>WJ5a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>WJ6a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>WJ7a</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>WJ8a</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>WJ9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>WJ10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>WJ11a</td>
<td>10 &amp; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Memo Code</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>WJ12s</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>JW1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>JW2</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>JW3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>JW4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>JW5a</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JW6a</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>JW7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>MO1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>MO2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>MO3</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo No</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>MO4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>MO5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>MO6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>MO7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>MO8a</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>MO9a</td>
<td>8 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>MO10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>MO11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>MO12</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>LL2a</td>
<td>3 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>LL3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo No.</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>LL6a</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>LL5a</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10 &amp; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>L6a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>LL7a</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>LL8a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>LL9a</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>DK1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>DK2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo No.</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>DK3a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>DK4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>DK5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>DK6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>DK7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>DK9a</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>DK9c</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>DK10a</td>
<td>10 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>DK11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SW11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TL1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>TH1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>DM4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>DM13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>LL7a</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>DK1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEMOS SORTED BY CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo ID</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TH6a</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>TH7</td>
<td>5 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>RP6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>DM2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>DM7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>JW4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>DKS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SW7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SW9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EE8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>MO2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>MO4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>MO5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>LL6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>WJ4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>WJ5a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>WJ6a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>MO1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>MO11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>LL8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>DK7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TH8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>GB11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>DM11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>JP1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>WJ7a</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy enactment requires commitment of resources to make it viable/sustainable. When this doesn't happen it has a detrimental effect on the policy actors, who have to be inventive to facilitate the change. This is compounded when the change becomes redundant on the wave of the next &quot;new&quot; initiative? Analytical impact of this on policy actors with respect to emotional mindset regarding change.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the change is continuous and recurring, the ability to reflect on its validity &amp; relevance is lost, especially if the pace of change is rapid. This reflection is crucial to sense-making and sorting the policy into a coherent framework...that incorporates what has been working, with what is now expected. When the time for reflection is truncated &gt;&gt; dissonance &gt;&gt; affective disruption.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy relating to curriculum fosters competition for diminishing resources across system. Calls to mind how policy impacts the SUSTAINABILITY of initiatives -&gt; departmental balkanization ... impact known when decisions must trade off competing choices.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers are perceived as having no conception as to the needs of the front-line staff ... lack in situ experience. This unshaped, uninformed policy landscape gives rise to confusion &amp; conjecture and is de-stabilizing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a difference between the &quot;speed&quot; with which a policy shift takes hold vs. the &quot;constant oscillating&quot; nature of policy change ... IT HASN'T HAD THE TIME TO TAKE HOLD AND WORK ... BOOM ... THE NEXT CHANGE CYCLE HITS!</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of imposed policies is called into question due to lack of practical relevancy to day-to-day teaching. Are policies for teachers or are they to mollify interest groups who have a loud political voice?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting all parties on board can be challenging when the relationships/networks are not strong --&gt; this presents a challenge to effective implementation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; teacher disconnect have resulted in failed or withdrawn policies. Policymakers are completely isolated from the realities of everyday school life and its requirements for success. &quot;Gilded Cage&quot; syndrome!</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who provides the leadership to drive policy to a successful conclusion? Persistence, will &amp; passion are key, but how will this come about if the policy change disengages practitioners?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposition causes waves of cognitive dissonance and affective disruption. Feelings of alienation, degradation ... devalued. De-professionalization.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy that restricts, relieves barriers or is deemed bureaucratic is non-productive to teachers' work &amp; if these situations exist, teachers renege and are less engaged ... or ... teachers work around/against the policy.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career path and state of mind are critical factors in how policy actors engage with policy. Established beliefs, preferred ways of working and history of educational socialisation frame practice ... which creates &quot;security&quot; ... when change challenges this security, discontent/stress are set off ... leading to coping mechanisms that conserve the state of security and well-being ... Impact is Affective!</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 WJ12a</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of reality are framed by different worldviews. Teachers subscribing to a personal worldview that dominates and drives their beliefs, are in the position of allowing these beliefs to frame their engagement, interaction ... and operationalization of policy. Discord may arise when competing worldviews (personal vs. system) are in conflict. When this happens, self-preservation takes over, personal beliefs dominate, which then frame actions in order to conserve ...self-image (identity/professionalism), to the detriment of competing views/vision. The status quo thus remains in effect as a butterfly of these identity preserving behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy shift seems to be challenging the professional knowledge of teachers with no valid explanation regarding the purpose of the change. Leads to questioning the relevance and validity. Evidence required to mediate the negativity of change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TL8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum changes cannot be done in isolation from other subject areas. Knowledge is a construct; and learning builds on pre-existing knowledge ... if subject curricula are misaligned ... learning suffers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TL8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy seems devoid of practical consideration of the needs of learners ... changes are ineffectual and do not work!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why does policy shift ... who sets the priorities and why do some priorities that are &quot;valid&quot; disappear for no apparent reason? Teachers with a sense of the historical landscape &amp; cycles of change, tend to invalidate imminent changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If a policy process is organic/dynamic, not static, it will succeed. How do we get that? ... Engagement, meaning making and commitment from the ground up. Imposed/prescribed policy doesn't work, in that people may &quot;comform&quot; but they won't &quot;affirm&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>TH3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is change necessarily an improvement? Where's the evidence? If something's working, why throw it out? Where's the grounding of policy in good practice/in people/in learner's needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>RF6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The context of change being considered drives how individuals react. Certain policies which are mandated &amp; prescribed leave no room for personal judgement → teachers in a dilemma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>DK5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy is examined, classified, sorted, and either accepted or marginalized/dismissed. If the latter, teachers continue on with what has worked ... and what they believe will continue to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>GB4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy changes must be used as opportunities to engage in conversations. This is critical to its successful implementation, since without engagement/thinking/reflection ... there is no buy-in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>RF10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy that disrupts the building of relationships disrupts successful teaching. Teachers will always resist that disruptive process, because teaching (to many) is all about pursing personal &amp; professional relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>DM11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers can be quite compartmentalised and insulated from the policy environment, which creates a lack of awareness of the change. Become dependent on their professional network to raise the level of policy awareness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>SW4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy implementation collaboration occurs in a vacuum since there is no communication that contextualizes the changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SW8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External drivers of change towards a more student friendly, learner focussed product is positive ... but it has to resonate with teachers to be effective and take hold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SW10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of curriculum is organic and ongoing. Follow up and review will be necessary to determine the success ... until then the jury's out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TL2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ESSa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>TH6a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>TH10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TH12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>TH13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>GBS1a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>GBS5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>GBS7s</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>RF1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>RF2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>RF3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>RF4s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>JP2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Policy" is a large tent that covers many areas. It must be viewed contextually, philosophically and/or operationally; but all areas must integrate in order for the system to function. A policy must demonstrate coherence, cohesion and alignment. Communication vehicles are inefficient; they don't distill what teachers need to make the policy work for them in an instructional setting. Teachers are forced to access it themselves - but then constrained/overwrought to keep priority... so... practice happens devoid of valid information needed to make policy changes work... which causes teacher resentment, reinforcement and withdrawal.

What are the embedded values & beliefs that drive the system to success? Are these successes being compromised by policy that moves away from these values & beliefs? If so, why... or... what ARE the new values & beliefs, and how are they relevant to learner's needs?

What are the real motivations behind policy change. There seems to be a disconnect between teacher needs and other needs as the driver of change, with no clear statement behind the change. This is exemplified in the new math curriculum changes.

The trains are running on time, but where are they going? Policy without buy-in is like a train without tracks... it will be derailed!

In the context of education, policy must remain intensely personal for each individual who is subjected to that policy within the system (teacher, learner, leader, parent). If this personal connection is missing, negated or Bradley, the policy will fail.

Policy must be contextualized to everyday practice in situ, as opposed to the external imposition of consistent change by those who don't understand the context of schools and their individual needs. Local relevancy is critical. If this is absent, the policy is marginalized... IGNORED!

The HOW is missing! Policy is mandated with no clear/consistent plan for how it will actually roll out in schools...leads to confusion. Lack of clear communication & process gives rise to trial & error adoption; creating confusion, mistrust, recalcitrance.

There may be a disconnect in the level of understanding behind the educational intent of a policy change. Why is this the case? Understood one way by teachers and another by leaders... however, there seems to be a consistent understanding of the ECONOMICS behind policy change.

Context is critical. Policy context must be understood by those who have to engage with it/Implement it.

Policy intent, purpose, meaning are critical elements in helping to frame implementation.

Change is unsettling; it re-arranges people's lives... people don't like to move out of comfort zones... change is resisted, especially if it is not clearly communicated and understood.

Information flow re policy change not clear, adequate... lack of communication & knowledge to those who need it... or is this purposeful misdirection?? Is the true intent masked... if so... what is the intended impact on those who are supposed to implement the policy?

Pragmatism comes into play when looking at policy... context is critical, but intent and purpose must be transparent. If this is clear, teachers can make decisions around the way they put policy into action.

Purpose and intent of policy need to be communicated with clarity... Teachers need to understand. This is not always the case and policy change may be seen to be change for the sake of change!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 DM3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>For policy changes to be sustainable, they must have contextual resonance and meaning at the site/location in which they are being implemented.</td>
<td>9 2 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 WJ3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impact/ownership/economics of educational policy cuts across all segments of society who all want a say in how it should be articulated ... Flashpoint based on common beliefs/preconceptions/history (populism?) which in turn frames policymakers reactions.</td>
<td>9 2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 JW1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy is framed in a political environment with many competing interests driving the agenda. The net effect is not always one that provides clear benefit to the educational system.</td>
<td>9 2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 JW3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary imperative of policy framers is to drive economic agenda that supports the formation of HUMAN CAPITAL. Educational policy is seen as a means to a political end.</td>
<td>9 2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 JW7</td>
<td>6 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Whose needs are served by ed policy? Industry? Politicians? Lastwitz? Is there mis-alignment or has something more at work? Is this ideological? ... Social engineering? What’s the purpose of change if it changes disrupts successful outcomes?</td>
<td>9 2 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 LL3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Things are not always as they seem. Policymakers want to be seen to be consultative, collaborative &amp; collegial, but their actions/words don’t match up ... other factors “trump their talent”.</td>
<td>9 2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 DK2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policymakers are often marginalized, ignored or irrelevant, depending on the degree of autonomy teachers wish to exercise ... however it is contextual to what is being taught (i.e. subject matter scope &amp; sequence, exams etc).</td>
<td>8 2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SW3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do policymakers actually understand the realities of the classroom setting?</td>
<td>11 3 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 TL7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers are disconnected from decision making, even school site levels. Are decisions being made with teachers in mind or are there other pre-eminent factors that drive decisions forward?</td>
<td>11 3 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 EE2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policymakers lack of experience and educational expertise is evident by the types of policies that emerge, which seem to have no bearing on learner needs ... so what’s the driver?</td>
<td>11 3 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 GB2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site leadership has to conform to the hierarchal, top down flow ... and has to manoeuvre between the two worlds of compliance &amp; relevance ... and act to make policy meaningful at the site level.</td>
<td>11 3 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 GB3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The habitual notion of a policy statement versus the actual impact of policy on individual learners/teachers/staff, leaves leaders in a position of having to err on the side of the learner/staff/teacher ... the human connection is critical.</td>
<td>11 3 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 JP4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethical validity ... those invested with the locus of control do not possess the capacity, competency, or expertise with respect to education ... Policy Wowsa with no direct experience ... How can they be meaningful for education?</td>
<td>11 3 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 JP7</td>
<td>10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Policy players must have a degree of confidence in policy sources, i.e. from where the change originates and by whom the change is driven. If this confidence is lacking, there is dissonance and ineffective disruption.</td>
<td>11 3 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 JP9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Policy landscape must operate in a setting that promotes mutual trust/respect ... doesn’t work otherwise ... can’t build the necessary relationships needed to successfully navigate through the policy implementation process.</td>
<td>11 3 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>JP11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>DM5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>DM8</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>DMH2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>WJ10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>LL2a</td>
<td>3 &amp; 3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>DK4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TH4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TL5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TU4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>GB8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>WJ2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>JW2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>MO3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teachers need to feel supported ... that someone's 'got their back' in a sea of change. If there are strong site-based relationships, linked to a set of core values, with a common purpose ... all's well!
- Site-based leadership has a large role to play in creating the conditions that promote and support active implementation: engagement for the policy actor ... i.e. how willing they are to share, impart, communicate ... They must elaborate the VISION for the policy.
- Communication, clarity and building consensus critical. The establishment of trusting relationships between all policy actors is critical to success. Has to be organic, interactive and collaborative process. Inclusive.
- Nothing happens if no one gets along! - Relationships! Policy change is rooted in how people relate to each other ... How the process is handled and this dictates how open people are to change.
- Depersonalization of the system has led to a diminishment of the essence of the educational fabric. Personal contact at all levels (especially from top-down) is the crucial element for successful policy engagement.
- Compliance to higher authority must happen. [Hierarchy of policy enactment]. It's a professional duty & legal obligation, but this compliance is based on 'trust' that decision makers are "doing the right thing" from more, intellectual ... and professional perspective. Trust in decision making is exemplified in the intent & purpose of the policy. If there is no 'resonance' between this intent/purpose and the implementer's perspectives -> disconnect/disengagement/policy disruption.
- Policy makers must act in a way that recognizes, values & validates those on the front lines who engage with the policy on a day-to-day basis, in a way that elevates the expertise/knowledge of those front line professionals.
- Policy cannot be "one size fits all". We're dealing with differences in ... people ... learning ... history ... readiness. Policy needs to be flexible or people need to be able to adjust policy to fit their needs.
- Policy/curriculum change may be anticipated on a cyclical basis, but there is a lack of clarity as the purpose for the change(s) and the forces behind the change(s), especially when it seems that the change is not required.
- No direct communication to teachers re policy shift ... so ... where is the information? To whom does it go? How is implementation information mediated?
- Reasons for policy changes are not communicated. Teachers are left in limbo, thus question the policy validity based on their experiences and understanding of students' learning needs and mastery.
- Divide between the philosophical intent of policy change and the culture of teaching with its balkanized, entrenched practices.
- Context of policy changes are viewed as being politically and ideologically driven, which factors in turn are perceived as being without a solid educational foundation -> thus invalid.
- Policy actors question the validity of those who frame educational policy. They are the political masters and their engagement is seemingly driven by POLITICS, not by educational interests.
- When policies are localized to a site, is there clarity regarding their genesis? The line seems to be blurred for teachers. Policy is attributed "up the ladder" ... or at the site ... depending on its intent/purpose ... the latter however is unclear.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Memo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>EE7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibility for learning about policy/curriculum change falls on individual teachers ... while there is a dependence on a collaborative culture to manoeuvre through the process in a manner that makes sense, process rests on individual engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TL5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication and support during implementation is at a premium. Individuals/sites are left on their own to muscle through information and access limited ... The engagement needs to be multi-layered and bottom-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EE8a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of coherence in curriculum implementation ... i.e. long term process unclear. Destination drives the journey, but this journey is starting with the destination marker yet to be unfolded (Ma 10, then 11, then 12) ... Implication is that policy needs to be understood and explicated in its entirety, rather than piecemeal. Implementers need to reconsider communication/engagement processes to provide a more coherent vision those charged with using it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>WJ8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>People are the heart and soul of the system and they rely on valid and meaningful communication to bring some sense and order to their work. Human interaction, with clear communication, is the key component of effective policy articulation/engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>MO10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposed policies are floated like trial balloons at the local site ... what’s the intent/purpose? Are policy makers ... looking for feedback? ... gauging reaction? There’s no clarity of purpose or intent — no communication!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>LL5a</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Policy in the global context must be made to have meaning in the local context! Local policy makers must be able to engage with the policy in a manner that allows the global intent to be tempered by local needs ... otherwise policy will be lost, ... or the other hand ... ignoring the global intent may lead to negative local outcomes, since the policy is here to stay and it’s not going away! Implementers must strike a balance between conforming to global intent and meeting local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>TH9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engagement, resonance &amp; buy-in are critical ... How do we get to that point at the grass roots level? How do policymakers create MEANING for implementers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>TH11a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Input, participation, engagement of those working directly with the outcome of a policy, in its formulation, is critical if it is to have any chance of success ... why? ... policy reshapes the “work” of professionals ... “professionals need control” over their work ... anything that denies them input/access/control is doomed to fail, because it invalidates current/past professional practice, which in turn invalidates the status of the profession as a professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>GS8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is a need for greater collaboration across site. The practice of isolated implementation does not allow for synergy in ideas/thinking when approaching an implementation problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>GS8a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implementation at the site level focuses on the operational aspects as they relate to “doing the job” ... there seems to be no real engagement with the philosophy behind policy changes ... Is this due to (a) entrenched, (b) resistance or is it (c) an adaptive method of coping with change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>GS10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy shifts inevitably draw a standardized response ... lack of resources ... lack of time ... but ... no real engagement with the change process. Why this disconnect? How do leaders get there ... Build Vision/Dialogue/Consequences/Common Purpose/Relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>GS12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Policy purpose is not understood by those who have to enact it, thus there can be no buy-in, ownership or commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>RF5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-threatening communication that is seen as being valid, authentic is required. Real communication via real people. Need for a human connection/fac... effective domain influence!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo Code</td>
<td>Code Type</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>RF8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers can be isolated from change in policy if they are not 'networked'. Very easy to 'go merrily along' oblivious to all around you. Won't actively seek out information, especially if it is deemed of no relevance, meaning or consequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>RF7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Policy change is always mediated by teacher judgement. Experience begins privilege in sorting, selecting &amp; discarding, based on professional judgement... however... it is contextual to the degree of control exercised by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Negative impact of policy on teacher engagement leads to retrenchment (especially if imposed without input, buy-in, ownership). Teaching is a highly passionate profession... if that passion is stunted... the professional practice of teaching suffers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>JP10a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The text of policy is not as important as the process by which it is enacted. The process must be one that is inclusive, promotes respect, builds relationships. If the process does not do these things, it has a deleterious impact on policy players... causes affective imbalance... giving rise to affective disruption, which in turn mitigates &amp; exacerbates ongoing interactions with the policy implementation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>JP12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>People are at the core of the system. Education policies that don't value people/relationships are doomed to failure, since they will not elicit ownership/buy-in... instead they will cause affective disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>DM5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers at different stages of professional and personal growth/development, with different needs cognitively, intellectually, emotionally and socially... different stages of intellectual, social and emotional readiness for change... understand this!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>WJ1a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Engagement with policy is contextual in terms of the impact of that policy on the player. Some teaching professionals need to understand the wider array of policy impacts; some are confined to a narrower focus. Implication = positional/status conflict... teachers value their autonomy and are frustrated by an imposed/external locus of control; yet their engagement is compartmentalized depending on the focus and relevance to them as individual teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>WJ9a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication required to create meaning is lacking. This has given rise to confused states of being regarding the understanding of policy change. Result = lack of ownership/engagement. People need clarity and a process that is personal... personal contact in the process has been lost and de-personalization has taken the human element out of policy enactment/interaction... RELATIONSHIPS! The web of interaction between people is what validates trust &amp; builds meaning/understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>WJ11a</td>
<td>10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Policy enactment/implementation is framed by policy engagement. Where the engagement is OPEN, RECEPSTIVE &amp; REFLECTIVE, implementation will demonstrate coherence and alignment (CA) to intent. If engagement is CLOSED, PREDETERMINED &amp; ENTRANCED... there will be limited CA, hence the conditions that influence the implementation process include the background/historical/experiences of the policy actors, which they bring to the table during their engagement with the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>JW5a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy framers receive input from a variety of sources/stakeholders. Valid input?? Who provides it and where are these priorities? Teachers have direct contact with students and see that many of the tangible student needs...are not met by emerging policies which focus only on curriculum areas. Student needs that impact learning are more nuanced, which is something that policymakers from a distance are unable to gauge and understand, hence the policy lacks resonance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy that is not validated by those who understand learner's needs is INVALID! Front line engagement with learners lends credence to the voice of policy actors. They know what works ... and what doesn't. Hence, their engagement ... until involvement in the policy framing process is critical to its formulation in order to (a) maximize impact on learner success and (b) mediate buy-in & successful implementation. Lack of this creates doubt ... Dissonance ... Retrenchment.

The validity of constant change is called into question, especially when the changes appear to be cosmetic, rather than structural and meaningful. When this happens, change is ignored, avoided ... practice is not impacted.

A cycle of constant change that is perceived as having no value and meaning for teachers/learners. These changes (policies) come to effect, but have no lasting durability, sustainability or viability ... thus implementers/teachers never OWN them.

Imposition of rapid change causes stress to the system. Teachers withdraw in to the safety of the classroom, where they have control & autonomy. Policy "will large" is meaningless ... policy "will local" is contested ... in that it needs to demonstrate an impact on learning. If this is not perceived to be the case, it is called into question. The issue is one of "Authentic Validity" for the improvement of student learning.

Teachers feel strongly about having ownership & control over policy changes that impact their professional lives. The hierarchical approach creates confusion, dissonance & dislocation ... this is demoralizing ... leading to ... avoidance, cynicism & withdrawal from engagement -> the Tyranny of Time/Curriculum takes over, urging teachers onwards with their everyday practice, serving as an escape from the need to cope with the imminent change making autonomy/control.

The general direction of policy shifts is perceived as being strategic in front of forms of advancing de-professionalisation of the system. This is destructive to the psyche and well-being of a professional, autonomous, passionate teaching force.

Educational policy is framed in a political climate, where competing interests operate to access finite financial resources. Policies that "cost" will always be compromised by these competing interests. Education is cost intensive .... policymakers make judgements on these priorities and since education is viewed as a cost-intensive enterprise, without visible short term results, it becomes the targeted object of economic discourse in terms of value for money, ROI, etc .... within a results-oriented, fiscal accountability, political framework, ideological priorities then become the basis for decision making. The policymakers (the politicians) hold the levers of control and are predisposed to make decisions based on their views/beliefs/ideas of how the world should work, regardless of competing visions/worldviews. The exercise of power drives policy directions.

Policy frames & implementers must create the conditions for policy actors to succeed ... people want to feel successful ... want to have control over their work environment and want to believe that their work is meaningful. .... any actions that negate any of these constructs creates disruption on an emotional level. People want peace of mind and reassurance that they are good at their jobs, and they must have the right tools at their disposal that are needed to do the job .... i.e. ... they want information to know what's happening, how things are supposed to work with new processes, what improvements the new way will bring and who will benefit. If policies fail to address these key aspects of implementation .... people will shut it down ... one way or another!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>DK3a 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>DK3a 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>DK3e 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>DK10a 10 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>DK11 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEMOS SORTED BY CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Teacher Memo</th>
<th>Transcript Page</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Analytical or Reflective</th>
<th>Concept Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Despite a lack of clarity in communication, the professional responsibility of reflecting on the required changes creates teacher engagement with the policy shift.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>EE7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibility for learning about policy/curriculum change falls on individual teachers ... while there is a dependence on a collaborative culture to manoeuvre through the process in a manner that makes sense, process rests on individual engagement.</td>
<td>8 &amp; 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TH8s</td>
<td>5 &amp; 8</td>
<td>The context in which a policy operates must be understood, along with the players who will be the subject of that policy. &quot;So policy, in theory sometimes, is absolutely superb, but if policy doesn't understand the realities of the situation, ... of the families, of the kids, if it doesn't understand their needs, then it's not going to work.&quot; (Note: It must also understand the same with respect to the policy implementation)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>RF10</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Policy that disrupts the building of relationships disrupts successful teaching. Teachers will always resist that disruptive process, because teaching (to many) is all about pursuing personal &amp; professional relationships.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Policy must allow space for teacher judgement and autonomy. Cannot be black &amp; white! Flexibility needed in human interactive processes ... of which teaching is a highly interactive human process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>The system turns on trust, professional expectations and is taken at face value ... there are no &quot;police&quot; policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Teachers have a strong sense of professional responsibility &amp; duty. They care and they are passionate ... but this is tempered by good judgement, good practice and broad experience ... not blind duty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>DM4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers work on the front lines of education and have a direct and meaningful impact on students. They come from a place of care/purpose. Anything that threatens that care is viewed with skepticism/doubt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>DM7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy change must not only be contextually relevant, but it also must have pragmatic relevance and be seen as useful for students in order for teachers to engage and adopt the change. Tension ... Reflectively vs. Practically.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>DM10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Policy change does not necessarily change practice completely. Teachers have ownership and an investment in their professional practice. They want control over it ... So they ADAPT change BEFORE adopting it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>DM11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teachers can be quite compartmentalized and insulated from the policy environment, which creates a lack of awareness of change. Become dependent on their professional network to raise the level of policy awareness.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Policies are layered (1) Overarching (2) Thematic &amp; (3) Contextual. Whilst each lower layer may be aligned to the higher level, professional judgement of teachers becomes the key factor in what parts get operationalized and the degree of alignment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>LL7e</td>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Individuals react differently to change ... thus they use different methods to cope with that change ... Coping &amp; response processes filter how the change will be mediated &amp; negotiated. Policy is never implemented &quot;immediatley &amp; wholesale&quot; ... it is filtered, mediated, adjusted, re-worked, refined and re-framed. The professional judgement i.e. the process of weighing/weaning, the professional dialogue around what's good/bad/working/not working is the &quot;actuality&quot; of implementation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>DK1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many teachers are passionate, care about their students &amp; their responsibilities and are invested professionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>DK8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers must navigate throughout curriculum by engaging learners with projects/assignments that maintain a desire to learn. The teacher &quot;controls&quot; and sorts the curriculum into meaningful relevance for learners ... JUDGEMENTS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEMOS SORTED BY CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Teacher Memo</th>
<th>Transcript Page</th>
<th>Memo</th>
<th>Category #</th>
<th>Concept #</th>
<th>Analytical or Reflective</th>
<th>Concept Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy implementation collaboration occurs in a vacuum since there is no communication that contextualizes the change...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SW10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Implementation of curriculum is organic and ongoing. Follow up and review will be necessary to determine the success ... until then the jury's out.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TL2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;Polic...&quot; is a large blanket that covers many areas. It must be viewed contextually, philosophically and/or operationally; but all areas must integrate or the system to function ... must demonstrate coherence, cohesion and alignment.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TL3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy/curriculum change may be anticipated on a cyclical basis, but there is a lack of clarity re the purpose for the change(s) and the forces behind the change(s), especially when it seems that the change is not required.</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TL5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication and support during implementation is at a premium. Individuals/teams are left on their own to muddle through; information is controlled and access limited ... The engagement needs to be multi-layered and bottom-up.</td>
<td>9 &amp; 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Why does policy shift ... who sets the priorities and why do some priorities that are &quot;valid&quot; disappear for no apparent reason? Teachers with a sense of the historical landscape &amp; cycles of change, tend to invalidate imminent changes.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>EE3a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication vehicles are inefficient: they don't distill what teachers need to make the policy work for them in an instructional setting ... Teachers are forced to access it themselves ... but time constraints workload delegate to low priority ... so ... practice happens devoid of valid information needed to make policy changes work ... which causes teacher resentment, retribution and withdrawal.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reasons for policy changes are not communicated. Teachers are left in limbo, thus question the policy validity based on their experiences and understanding of students' learning needs and history.</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>GB1a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy must be contextualized to everyday practice in situ, as opposed to the external imposition of constant change by those who don't understand the context of schools and their individual needs ... local relevancy is critical. If this is absent, the policy is marginalized ... IGNORED!</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>GB5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The HOW is missing! Policy is mandated with no clear/plan for how it will actually roll out in schools... leads to confusion. Lack of clear communication &amp; process gives rise to trial &amp; error adoption; creating confusion, mistrust, recalcitrance.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>GB7a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>There may be a disconnect in the level of understanding behind the educational intent of a policy change. Why is this the case? Understood one way by teachers and another by leaders ... however, seems to be a consistent understanding of the ECONOMICS behind policy change.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>GB8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Divide between the philosophical intent of policy change and the culture of teaching with its entrenched, entrenched practices.</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>RF1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Context is critical. Policy context must be understood by those who have to engage with/Impelment it.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>RF2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy intent, purpose, meaning are critical elements in helping to frame implementation.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>RF8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The context/type of change being considered drives how individuals react. Certain policies which are mandated &amp; prescribed leave no room for personal judgement → teachers in a dilemma.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>JP2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pragmatism comes into play when looking at policy ... context is critical, but intent and purpose must be transparent. If this is clear, teachers can make decisions around the way they put policy into action.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo ID</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Memo ID</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Memo Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Purpose and intent of policy need to be communicated with clarity ... Teachers need to understand. This is not always the case and policy change may be seen to be change for the sake of change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>WJ2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Context of policy changes are viewed as being politically and ideologically driven, which factors in turn are perceived as being without a solid educational foundation so thus invalid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>WJ3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impact/township/austerity of educational policy cuts across all segments of society who all want a say in how it should be articulated ... Fleshpout based on common beliefs/reconceptions/history (populist?) which in turn frames policymakers reactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>WJ9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>People are the heart and soul of the system and they rely on valid and meaningful communication to bring some sense and order to their world. Human interaction, with clear communication, is the key component of effective policy articulation/engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>JW1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy is framed in a political environment with many competing interests driving the agenda. The net effect is not always one that provides clear benefits to the educational system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>JW2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy makers question the validity of those who frame educational policy. They are the political masters and their engagement is seemingly driven by POLITICAL, not by educational interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>JW3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary imperative of policy framers is to drive economic agenda that supports the formation of HUMAN CAPITAL. Educational policy is seen as a means to an end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>MO10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposed policies are tested like trial balloons at the local level ... what's the intent/purpose? Are policymakers looking for feedback? ... gauging reaction? There's no clarity of purpose or intent -&gt; no communication!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>LL3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Things are not always as they seem. Policymakers want to be seen to be consultative, collaborative &amp; collegial, but their actions/words don't match up ... other factors &quot;trump their intent&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>LL5a</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Policy in the global context must be made to have meaning in the local context! Local policy makers must be able to engage with the policy in a manner that allows the global intent to be tempered by local needs ... otherwise policy fit will be lost. ... on the other hand ... ignoring the global intent may lead to negative local outcomes, since the policy is here to stay and it's not going away! Implementers must strike a balance between conforming to global intent and meeting local needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>DK2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy/curricula are either marginalized, ignored or irrelevant, depending on the degree of autonomy teachers wish to exercise ... however it is contextual to what is being taught (i.e. subject matter scope &amp; sequence, exams etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category #</td>
<td>Concept #</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>G82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site leadership has to conform to the hierarchical, top-down flow ... and has to manoeuvre between the two worlds of compliance &amp; relevance ... and act to make policy meaningful at the site level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethical validity ... those invested with the Locus of Control do not possess the capacity, competency, or expertise with respect to education ... &quot;Policy Wonks&quot; with no direct experience ... how can they be meaningful for education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>JP7</td>
<td>10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>Policy makers must have a degree of confidence in policy makers, i.e., from where the change originates and by whom the change is driven. If this confidence is lacking, there is dissonance and ineffective implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>DMH2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nothing happens if no one gets along! - Relationships! Policy change is rooted in how people relate to each other ... How the process is handled and this dictates how open people are to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>WU10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Depersonalization of the system has led to a diminishment of the essence of the educational fabric. Personal contact at all levels (especially from top-down) is the crucial element for successful policy engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continuous and ongoing change causes frustration. Expectations and beliefs of teachers shape interaction with policy and influences adoption. Enraged practices may cause resistance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>WJ4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>When a change in direction is viewed as repetitive and non-productive, it is marginalized and ignored. The cynicism of reaction arises out of continual changes that are deemed invalid, meaningless and irrelevant.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>MO1</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Policy relating to curriculum fosters competition for diminishing resources across system. Calls to mind how policy impacts the SUSTAINABILITY of initiatives --- departamental balkanization ... Impact known when decisions must trade off competing choices.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>MO11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Policymakers are perceived as having no conception as to the needs of the front-line staff ... lack in situ experience. This unshaped, uninformed policy landscape give rise to confusion &amp; conjecture and is de-stabilizing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>LL8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>There is a difference between the &quot;rapidly&quot; with which a policy shift takes hold vs. the &quot;constant cyclical&quot; nature of policy change ... IT HASN'T HAD THE TIME TO TAKE HOLD AND WORK ... BOOM ... THE NEXT CHANGE CYCLE HITS!</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>DK7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sustainability of imposed policies is called into question due to lack of practical relevancy to day-to-day teaching. Are policies for teachers or are they to mollify interest groups who have a loud political voice?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy has the effect of shaping teaching practice. Policy shift creating anxiety through lack of understanding of intent.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SW7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shifting of responsibilities caused by policy results in increased workload. What impact will this have on teacher ... morale, passion, commitment etc?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SW9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teacher autonomy is in conflict with top down policy implementation processes. No teacher buy-in ... No implementation success. Requires a shared vision and collegial collaboration at multiple levels, where teacher engagement is required.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TL9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Getting all parties on board can be challenging when the relationships/networks are not strong → this presents a challenge to effective implementation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TH8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communication &amp; teacher disconnect have resulted in failed or withdrawn policies. Policymakers are completely isolated from the realities of everyday school life and its requirements for success. &quot;Gilded Cage&quot; syndrome!</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>DM11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Imposition causes waves of cognitive dissonance and affective disruption. Feelings of alienation, degradation - devalued. De-professionalisation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>MO2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy change gets buried/lost in the day-to-day working of teachers' lives. There is a need for collaborative reflection, but the pressures of the instructional calendar are prohibitive to this happening → STRESS INDUCING → ANXIETY!</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>LL5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Despite not wanting to change/adapt ... if the rules are changing, forced adaptation becomes the norm. This may create discomfort/anxiety ... but it is unavoidable and cannot be dismissed ... therefore teachers must adjust.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TH11a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Input, participation, engagement of those working directly with the outcome of a policy. In its formulation, is critical if it is to have any chance of success. Why? policy redefines the “work” of professionals. Professionals need control over their work. Anything that denies them input/feedback is doomed to fail, because it invalidates commitment to professional practice, which in turn invalidates the status of the professional as a professional.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>GB12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Policy purpose is not understood by those who have to enact it, thus there can be no buy-in, ownership or commitment.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JW16e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy that is not validated by those who understand learners needs is INVALID. Front line engagement with learners lends credence to the voice of policy actors. They know what works and what doesn’t. Hence, their engagement—and involvement in the policy framing process—is critical to its formulation in order to (a) maximize impact on learner success and (b) mediate buy-in &amp; successful implementation. Lack of this creates doubt. Defense—Retrenchment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,2,4,5,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>LL4a</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>Educational policy is framed in a political climate, where competing interests operate to access finite financial resources. Policies that “cost” will always be compromised by these competing interests. Education is cost intensive … policymakers make judgments on these priorities and when education is viewed as a cost-intensive enterprise, without visible short term results, it becomes the targeted object of economic disinvestment in terms of value for money, ROI, etc. … within a results oriented, fiscal accountability, political framework. Ideological priorities then become the basis for decision making. The policymakers (the politicians) hold the levers of control and are pre-disposed to make decisions based on their worldview. How the world should work regardless of competing visions/worldviews. The exercise of power drives policy directions.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2,4,5,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>DK3a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policymakers are disconnected from the fabric of policy implementation, policy enactment and policy validity. They are disconnected from the front lines where the action of education takes place—they have no local context, to serve … as a frame of reference to provide meaning, relevance &amp; validity with respect to the policies they formulate and enact. This leads to a lack of meaning and resonance for teachers.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2,6,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>DK11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Polarization of political agendas leads to adversarial positions based on ideological premises. Policy in this backdrop becomes contested &amp; contentious leading to academic dysfunction/imbalance.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Concept #</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>High degree of professional investment to do the best possible job for student learning ... Strong learner focus ... Function of teaching is important and taken seriously as a commitment.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>High degree of passion and care along with deep engagement with content areas. This is critical in that this &quot;positive mindset&quot; drives student-teacher interactions and the ability of students to engage with the subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Impact of policy change on learners is debilitating to their self-esteem, efficacy and sense of math ability. When policy shifts exacerbate these feelings in learners ... what's the point of the change?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>If the policy shift is not grounded in enhancing educational outcomes for learners, then what is it grounded in? Math in particular is a subject learners struggle with ... these changes don't seem to make it easier for them to succeed ... so why change?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Site-based educators need to understand the context of their situation and how policy will play out in that context.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Context! Context! Context! Do policymakers really understand school context, learner needs and cultural capacity of families to successfully engage with the system?</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Policy changes must be used as opportunities to engage in conversation. This is critical to its successful implementation, since without engagement/thinking/reflection ... there is no buy-in.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Policy changes must always keep the focus on learner's needs ... if they don't, what's the point?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Policy changes must always serve students' best interests. (It seems that teachers see themselves as the gatekeepers of good practice and what's best for learners ... again, a part of their duty and professional responsibility and moral purpose.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Policy statements cater to the dominant segment of educational needs. The needs of all learners are not necessarily met. The framers of policy do not look at the individual ... rather they look at broad brush strokes. (≠ site level &amp; individual case.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category #</td>
<td>Concept #</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SW8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy shift seems to be challenging the professional knowledge of teachers with no valid explanation regarding the purpose of the change. Leads to questioning the relevance and validity. Evidence required to mediate the negativity of change.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SW8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>External drivers of change towards a more student-friendly, learner-focused product is positive, but it has to resonate with teachers to be effective and take hold.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TL8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curriculum changes cannot be done in isolation from other subject areas. Knowledge is scaffolded and learning builds on pre-existing knowledge - if subject curricula are misaligned; learning suffers.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TL8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Policy seems devoid of practical consideration of the needs of learners - changes are intellectual and do not work!</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EE3s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of coherence in curriculum implementation - i.e. long term process unclear. Disconnection drives the journey, but this journey is starting with the destination marker yet to be unfolded (Mar 10, then 11, then 12) - implications is that policy needs to be understood and explicated in its entirety, rather than piecemeal. Implementers/learners need to reconsider communication/engagement processes to provide a more coherent vision to those charged with using it.</td>
<td>9 &amp; 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>TH2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>If a policy process is organic/dynamic, not static, it will succeed. How do we get that? ... Engagement, meaning making and commitment from the ground up. Imposed/prescribed policy doesn't work, in that people may &quot;comply&quot; but they won't &quot;affirm&quot;.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TH3</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Is change necessary on improvement? Where's the evidence? If something's working, why throw it out? Where's the grounding of policy in good practice in people's learner's needs?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>TH6s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>What are the embedded values &amp; beliefs that drive the system to success? Are these successes being compromised by policy that moves away from these values &amp; beliefs? ... If so, why ... or ... what ARE the new values &amp; beliefs, and how are they relevant to learner's needs?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>TH10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>What are the real motivations behind policy change? There seems to be a disconnect between learners' needs and other needs as the driver of change, with no clear statement behind the change. This is exemplified in the new math curriculum changes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TH12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The trains are running on time, but where are they going? Policy without buy-in is like a train without tracks ... It will be derailed!</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>TH13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>In the context of education, policy must remain intensely personal for each individual who is subjected to that policy within the system (teacher, learner, leader, parent). If this personal connection is missing, negated or broken, the policy will fail.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>RF3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Change is upsetting; it re-arranges people's life ... people don't like to move out of comfort zones ... change is resisted, especially if it is not clearly communicated and understood.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>RF4a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information flow re policy change not clear, adequate ... lack of communication &amp; knowledge to those who need it ... or is this purposeful misdirection??? Is the true intent masked ... if so ... what is the intended impact on those who are supposed to implement the policy?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>DM3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>For policy changes to be sustainable, they must have contextual resonance and meaning at the stakeholder in which they are being implemented.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMOS SORTED BY CONCEPT</td>
<td>Grouped by use (Analytical or Reflective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 JW7 9 &amp; 10 Whose needs are served by ad policy? Industry? Politicians? Learners? Is there mis-alignment or is there something more at work? Is this ideological? ... Social engineering? What's the purpose of change if the change disrupts successful outcomes?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 WCO 4 When policies are localized to a site, is there clarity regarding their genesis? The line seem to be blurred for teachers. Policy is attributed &quot;up the ladder&quot; ... or at the site ... depending on its intent/purpose ... the latter however is unclear.</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 DKS 5 Policy is examined, classified, sorted, and either accepted or marginalized/discard. If the latter, teachers continue on with what has worked ... and what they believe will continue to work.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do policy makers actually understand the realities of the classroom setting?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TL7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers are disconnected from decision making, even school site levels. Are decisions being made with teachers in mind or are there other pre-eminent factors that drive decisions forward?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>GE2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Politicians lack of experience and educational expertise is evident by the types of policies that emerge, which seem to have no bearing on learner needs... so... what's the driver?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>GBS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The abstract notion of a policy statement versus the actual impact of policy on individual learner/teachers/staff leaves leaders in a position of having to err on the side of the learner/teacher/staff... the human connection is critical.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>JPB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Policy landscape must operate in a setting that promotes mutual trust/ respect... doesn't work otherwise... can't build the necessary relationships needed to successfully navigate through the policy implementation process.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>JP11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teachers need to feel supported... that someone's 'got their back' in a sea of change. If there are strong site-based relationships, tied to a set of core values, with a common purpose... all's well!</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>DM5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Site based leadership has a large role to play in creating the conditions that promote and support active implementation engagement for the policy actors... i.e. how willing they are to share, impact, communicate... They must elaborate the VISION for the policy.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>DM8</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Communication, clarity and building consensus critical. The establishment of trusting relationships between all policy actors is critical to success. Has to be organic, interactive and collaborative process. Inclusive.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>L12a</td>
<td>3 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Compliance to higher authority must happen. (Hierarchy of policy enactment). It's a professional duty &amp; legal obligation, but this the compliance is based on &quot;trust&quot; that decision makers are &quot;doing the right thing&quot; from moral, intellectual... and professional perspective. &quot;Trust in decision makers is exemplified in the intent &amp; purpose of the policy. If there is no 'resonance' between this intent/purpose and the implementers' perspectives -&gt; disconnect/engagement/policy disruption.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>DK4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policymakers must act in a way that recognizes, values &amp; validates those on the front lines who engage with the policy on a day-to-day basis, in a way that elevates the expertise/knowledge of those front line professionals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Teacher Memo</td>
<td>Transcript Page</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Category #</td>
<td>Concept #</td>
<td>Analytical or Reflective</td>
<td>Concept Subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EE8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whilst there is professional judgement and autonomy, teachers still have to comply with prescribed policy... albeit grudgingly. What impact does this have on teachers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TH4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy cannot be &quot;one size fits all&quot;. We're dealing with differences in... people... learning... history... readiness. Policy needs to be flexible or people need to be able to adjust policy to fit their needs.</td>
<td>5 &amp; 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Q811</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Who provides the leadership to drive policy to a successful conclusion? Persistence, will &amp; passion are key, but how will this come about if the policy change disengages practitioners?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change which is not understood incurs stress. Teachers respond to the &quot;tyranny of the instructional calendar&quot;. Policy that does not mediate this tyranny by providing time to reflect/think on its meaning/impact causes discomfort/stress/anxiety.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>M05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Change is necessary... and welcome. Constant change, at a rapid pace is threatening (especially if it is non-inclusive, non-participatory, non-consultative).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 – Sample of Field Notes

[Handwritten notes with various annotations and highlights, including dates and symbols]
affirmative representation. The principle of majority rule requires that proposals favored by a majority of the membership shall be adopted. The need for a legislative quorum is also required to ensure that the body may act and that its actions shall be binding.

In summary, the legislative process is a fundamental aspect of the democratic system. It provides a mechanism for the expression of the will of the people and for the enactment of laws that govern the society. The principle of majority rule is integral to the functioning of the legislative process and ensures that the interests of the majority are represented.
- May be personally called into question...
- Act of preservation...
- Possibility... individual action... environment... can be...
- How preserved... how feel... gives interaction with...
- How clearly... can't... the importance of affective interactions... what causes and conduits of affective...

- Reflect conversation.
- Core premise... student at centre
- Based adaptation/structure.
- Systemic instability.
- Attention can only learn to make from human/other.
- Trust needed that always there.
- Policy legitimacy separate.
- 3-4 respond to policy.

- Concept... lack of picture.
- Not a term of policy.
- Not entitlement, not identity.
- Not feeling... why him, not me.
- Situation high... time intent... personal not system-based.
- So long as they can follow procedures... turn kids into happy... do what want to do or what come along.
- Change restricted by degree of emotional investment... in profession... mixed by passion, challenge...
Everyday driven by emotion/pannic - Can't break thing down intellectually/analytically
- Planners don't understand what actually took place in classrooms - what creating engagement involves
- Noting new in policy process...
  But a much the what... how...
  How require from our cell... dynamic peronality
  Support to your end heurist... and...
  The why? meaning/relevance

Motivation... why key to fit @ heartshp...

They [advanced & told] they do have merit...
Appendix 6 – Sample of Codes Grouped to Categories

- Experienced, Seniority, Direct Background, Invented
- Student, Focus, Success, talent, Engagement, Needs, Development
- Leadership: Determined, Confidence, Effective, Competency, Skills, Diversity, Background, Choice Option
- Shift, Expectations, Unfairness, Time, stress, Overload, Challenge, Anxiety, Efficiency, Uncertainty, Dis-equilibrium (Constrained), Perseverance, Fear, Concern, Threatened, Imbalance, Dis comfort
- Quick, Apathetic, Skepticism, Recycled, Assumptions, Rapid, Repetitive, Suspicion, Inconsistency, Ongoing, Redundant, Guarded, Reservations, Indifferent, Place
- Ownership, Understanding, Disengagement, History, Confusion, Unfamiliar, Unknown, Race, Religion, Disconnected, Fraudulent, Dishonest, Excluded, Avoiding, Confused, Marginalized, Uninformed, Dehumanized, Lack Clarity, Discomfort, Emotion, Disrespected, Discounted, Inadequate
- Resisted, Excluded, Selective, Preferences, Discount, Avoidance, Comfort Zone, Confusion, Disruptive, Disengagement, Resistance, Mitigate, Withdrawal, Ignored, Colossal, Defeat, Retire, Rejek, Discard, Subliminal, Dissimulate, Coping, Redirect
- Involved, Engaged, Open, Invited, Competitive, Demanding, Connected, Effective, Committed, Strategic, Discursive, Receptive, Open-Minded, Self-Directed, Personalized, Exceptional, Resilient, Valued, Empowered, Award, Care, Supportive, Innovative, Capable, Confident, Focused, Active
- Competence, Validity, Relevance, Meaning, Coherence, Complexity, Reform, Interpretation, Authenticity, Relevant, Equity, Utility, Practical, Realistic, Resources, Reform
- Support, Finance, Resources, Capacity, Time, Seminars, Sustained, Unity, Connected, Senior, Limitation, Visibility
- Collegiality, Interdependent, Network, Cooperation, Relationships, Desire, Gene, Intermediate, Participatory, Resistance, Collaboration, Criminal, Personalize, Social
- Access, Clarity, Accountable, Memory, Cloud, Strategic, Timeline, Indirect, Impressed
Concepts

1. Professional, emotional investment in an educational system & its success

2. Concerned about ethical transparency of policymakers

3. Conflicted feelings regarding hierarchical desk

4. Lack of confidence in structural integrity & viability

5. Growing feelings of depersonalization

6. Establishing the need for identity safeguarding
University of Durham School of Education

Department Code of Practice on Research Ethics

The University of Durham School of Education believes that all educational research should be conducted within an ethic of respect for persons, knowledge, democratic values and quality of educational research.

Code of Conduct: Responsibility to students and participants

1. The securing of participants’ voluntary informed consent prior to research is considered the norm for the conduct of research. Rare cases of proposals where the research design does not make informed consent appropriate (e.g. covert research or deception studies) must be fully scrutinised by the full ethics committee.

2. Informants have a right to remain anonymous. Researchers are responsible for taking appropriate precautions to protect the confidentiality of both participants and data. Where data is kept on a computer the researchers will be responsible for ensuring that the requirements of the Data Protection Act are fulfilled.

3. In the case of interviews involving children below school leaving age, permission should be obtained from the school and if they so suggest, the parents.

4. When filming or recording, researchers should make it clear to research participants the purpose of the recording and to whom the recording will be communicated.

5. Researchers should not deceive or coerce their students into serving as research subjects or assistants. They should not represent a student’s work as their own.

6. In planning, and in the conduct and reporting of research, researchers should act in ways that ensure that no participant is disadvantaged by their age, class, ‘race’, gender, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs or disability.

7. Sexual and racial harassment are recognised as abuses of power. Researchers have a duty to refrain from, and actively oppose such behaviour. Researchers should not use the inequalities of power which characterise the tutor – student, researcher – respondent relationship to obtain personal, sexual, economic or professional advantages.

8. Where a tutor/supervisor enters into an intimate or sexual relationship with their student, the emotional involvement, whether reciprocal or otherwise, is liable to compromise evaluation and assessment. Particular dangers arise in post-graduate supervision where the relationship between student and supervisor is necessarily one-to-one, protracted and supportive. In any such cases it is the tutor/supervisors responsibility to ensure that an alternative tutor/supervisor is found for the student.
Responsibility to the research profession

Educational researchers should;

1. Avoid fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of evidence, data, findings or conclusions.

2. In case study and evaluative research, actively seek and include data and evidence provided by all relevant stakeholders.

3. Report their findings to all relevant stakeholders and avoid selective communication of findings.

4. Report research conceptions, procedures, results, and analysis accurately and in sufficient detail for other researchers to understand and interpret them.

5. Never knowingly, omit reference to any relevant work by others.

Responsibility to research assistants/partners

1. All employees should be properly informed of the terms and conditions of their employment. Care should be taken not to underpay part-time staff or to use them or secretarial staff for duties for which they are not being paid.

2. All those involved in research should be aware of the intellectual property rights with respect to the data collected or to which they have access. The general principle of academic freedom means that freedom to analyse and publish the results of research should only be limited in exceptional circumstances.

3. Researchers should never present other people’s work as their own, nor hold up the publication of work by others so that their own gets precedence.

4. Researchers should acknowledge fully all of those who contributed to their research and publications.

5. Attribution and ordering of authorship and acknowledgements should accurately reflect the contributions of all main participants in both research and writing processes, including students.

6. Material quoted verbatim from the writing of others must be clearly identified and referenced to the author.
Relationship with Funding Agencies

The University of Durham School of Education code of practice governs ethical principles and establishes appropriate standards of academic freedom, including the right to disseminate research findings. While this code should be observed within all research it is particularly important in respect to contract research. The code should be honoured by researchers in the negotiation of contractual arrangements put forward by funding agencies, and in the carrying out of these obligations once they have been agreed.

1. The aims and sponsorship of research should always be made explicit by researchers.

2. Researchers should not agree to conduct research that conflicts with academic freedom, nor any other principles included in these guidelines. They should not agree to any undue or questionable influence by government or other funding agency in the conduct, analysis or reporting of research.

3. Academic staff should not engage in contract research without agreement by the institution and the institution will not compel academic staff to engage in any particular contract research.
Appendix 8 b – Ethics and Data Protection Monitoring Form

Durham University
School of Education

Research Ethics and Data Protection Monitoring Form

Research involving humans by all academic and related Staff and Students in the Department is subject to the standards set out in the Department Code of Practice on Research Ethics. The Sub-Committee will assess the research against the British Educational Research Association’s Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2004).

It is a requirement that prior to the commencement of all research that this form be completed and submitted to the Department’s Research Ethics and Data Protection Sub-Committee. The Committee will be responsible for issuing certification that the research meets acceptable ethical standards and will, if necessary, require changes to the research methodology or reporting strategy.

A copy of the research proposal which details methods and reporting strategies must be attached and should be no longer than two typed A4 pages. In addition you should also attach any information and consent form (written in layperson’s language) you plan to use. An example of a consent form is included at the end of the code of practice.

Please send the signed application form and proposal to the Secretary of the Ethics Advisory Committee (Sheena Smith, School of Education, tel. (0191) 334 8403, e-mail: Sheena.Smith@Durham.ac.uk). Returned applications must be either typed or word-processed and it would assist members if you could forward your form, once signed, to the Secretary as an e-mail attachment.

Name: Irfan Z. H. Sheikh

Title of research project:
An examination of the impact of stakeholder engagement on the implementation of a new education policy in British Columbia: A case study of mathematics curriculum implementation at John Oliver Secondary School, Vancouver, BC.

Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does your research involve living human subjects?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IF NOT, GO TO DECLARATION AT END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does your research involve only the analysis of large, secondary and anonymised datasets?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>IF YES, GO TO DECLARATION AT END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Will you give your informants a written summary of your research and its uses?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, please provide further details and go to 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Will you give your informants a verbal summary of your research and its uses?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, please provide further details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3c. Will you ask your informants to sign a consent form?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, please provide further details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does your research involve covert surveillance (for example, participant observation)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If YES, please provide further details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Will your information automatically be anonymised in your research?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, please provide further details and go to 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Will you explicitly give all your informants the right to remain anonymous?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will monitoring devices be used openly and only with the permission of informants?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Will your informants be provided with a summary of your research findings?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Will your research be available to informants and the general public without authorities restrictions placed by sponsoring authorities?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If NO, please provide further details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Have you considered the implications of your research intervention on your informants?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Please provide full details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there any other ethical issues arising from your research?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>If YES, please provide further details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Further details:

**Question 9:**

I am an embedded researcher at the research site, being one of two Vice Principals and a member of the school administrative team. In this capacity I serve as mathematics department liaison, vice principal for student discipline, administration of material & learning resource allocation. Along with the other members of the administrative team, I am responsible for the implementation of ministry and school district policy. Additionally, I am required to follow directives of the School Principal, as the de facto decision maker for the school.

As I will be interviewing individuals and groups from each of the above parties, I will need to have an awareness of the pre-existing relationship and its potential impact on the data gathering process. This impact will also need to be accounted for during analysis of the data.
Declaration

I have read the Department's Code of Practice on Research Ethics and believe that my research complies fully with its precepts. I will not deviate from the methodology or reporting strategy without further permission from the Department's Research Ethics Committee.

Signed ........................................ Date: June 20

Submissions without a copy of the research proposal will not be considered.
Appendix 8 c – Ethical Approval Letter

17 July 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

Ethical approval: Mr. Irfah M.B. Sheikh

This is to confirm that the Ethics Committee of the School of Education, Durham University has now approved Mr. Sheikh's application for ethical approval in respect of 'An examination of the impact of stakeholder engagement on the implementation of a new education policy in British Columbia: A case study of mathematics curriculum implementation at John Oliver Secondary School, Vancouver, BC'.

The Committee would like to take this opportunity to wish him all the very best with his research.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Professor J. Elliott
Director of Research

Leazes Road
Durham, DH1 1TA
Telephone +44 (0)191 334 2000 Fax +44 (0)191 334 8041
www.dur.ac.uk/education
Appendix 9 a – VSB Research Guidelines

VANCOUVER SCHOOL BOARD
GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH STUDIES
IN VANCOUVER SCHOOLS

Procedures

1. Research proposal requests will be accepted from teachers, graduate students, or faculty members. As many demands are being placed upon Vancouver schools, research requests from undergraduate students will not be approved. Research requests will not be accepted from marketing companies.

2. Researchers affiliated with a university must ensure that their completed research proposal requests are accompanied by a letter or certificate from the appropriate ethical review committee at their university. All completed proposal requests need to be sent first to: VSB Research Committee. Once researchers have received written approval for their work by the VSB Research Committee, then, notification of this approval and the research proposal package should be sent to the school principal. Principals, in consultation with staff and students, always have the option to decline research, despite approval from the VSB Research Committee and the University Ethics Boards.

3. Completed proposal packages should contain seven (7) collated copies of the proposed research instruments, parent permission letter (if applicable), and certificate or letter of ethical acceptability. Submissions that are not collated will not be considered.

4. Research that entails disclosure of personal information in the District’s possession (e.g. access to student files) requires further attention. In these cases, researchers need to complete the VSB document called “Terms and Conditions relating to the Disclosure of Personal Information for Research or Statistical Purposes”. Completed “TERMS and CONDITIONS AGREEMENTS” will be reviewed by the Secretary-Treasurer’s Office to ensure adherence to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy requirements. Once the agreement has been approved the Project Manager of Administration Systems will monitor to ensure the conditions of the agreement are met. Prior to the Research Committee review, these requests will be reviewed by Learning and Information Technology staff to determine the work entailed. Subsequently, if it is deemed the work can be done, the request will be reviewed by the Freedom of Information Officer to ensure it meets with the protection of privacy requirements.

5. Upon completion of the research, an abstract of the completed report must be sent to Learning Services, Vancouver School Board, Attention: VSB Research Committee. The District will publish the abstract on a VSB Database (see attached template)
Criteria

1. The Vancouver School Board will only approve research studies in which care is taken:
   a) with contentious or personal topics that may be considered by students or parent/guardians to be an invasion of privacy;
   b) with demands upon the time of participating students, teachers, or principals is reasonable;
   c) to ensure that potential contribution to the improvement of educational well-being of Vancouver staff and students in Vancouver Schools is addressed.

2. Whenever students (under the age of 19) are involved in proposed external research, parent/guardian permission letters are required. Parents/guardians must be informed of the purpose of the study, type of activity child will be involved in, the nature of any questionnaires, interviews, or tests, and the amount of time required by the research project. Translation of information will be the researcher's responsibility.

3. Teacher and/or administrator permission letters which provide informed consent are required for all external research studies which involve teachers and/or administrators.

4. The anonymity of students and teachers who cooperate in research studies must be maintained. In the case of action research, requests to include participant names may be considered.

5. Tape recordings, pictures, films, or videotape recordings of student performance must have written consent from parents/guardians and teachers.

6. Studies involving class groups are generally preferable to studies of individual students. The former are less disruptive to the regular school program.

7. Studies that place unreasonable demands upon the time of participating students, teachers, or administrators will not be approved.
Vancouver School Board

Checklist for Conducting Research Studies
in
Vancouver Schools

☐ Completed Proposal Package submitted to District Learning Services, Attention: VSB Research Committee

☐ Completed Proposal Package contains seven (7) collated and stapled copies of:
Proposals not collated or less than 7 copies will not be considered.

- all relevant letters of permission
- all surveys/tasks required of participants
- a letter(s) of approval from appropriate Ethics Board
- a clear, succinct outline of objectives that pertain to VSB Guidelines and criteria
- mailing address

☐ I plan to submit to VSB Research Committee an abstract of my results by (see attached):

(approximate date)

Name:

Signature:

Thank you!

Appendix 9 b – VSB Checklist for Conducting Research
Abstract Template

Researcher Names:

Researcher email address (one only):

Researcher mailing address (not email):

Phone Number:

Study Completion Date:

Study Title:

Target Study Group:

Other Relevant Contact Information:

Abstract:
2009 July 13

Dear __________________________,

I am presently enrolled in a Doctor of Education program at Durham University in the UK. A critical part of the program is the completion of a research project for my Doctoral thesis addressing an educational issue related to my professional duties. I have chosen to study educational policy in BC, using John Oliver as a case study in looking at implementation of the new BC secondary school mathematics curriculum.

I will be conducting a series of group interviews with students and individual interviews with parents, teachers and administrators to help me understand the viewpoints of different stakeholders who are impacted by this change in policy. These interviews will take approximately 45 minutes. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and all identifying names will be removed from the interview records at the completion of the data collection cycle. The responses to all questions will be combined with those of other respondents and will be analysed anonymously. Complete results of the findings will be made publicly available upon completion of the research project.

I am requesting your participation as an interview participant to assist in my research. The interview will be conversational in nature, consisting of a series of questions designed to gain an understanding of your views regarding educational policy implementation. The interviews will be conducted in September 2009, March 2010 and October 2010 (if required).

Please sign and return the enclosed form, indicating your consent to participate in the research project. I have provided a stamped & addressed envelope for use in returning the form.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require any additional information about this research project.

Yours sincerely,

Irfan Z. H. Sheikh
Vice Principal
2009/_________/____

Mr. I. Sheikh

Dear Mr. Sheikh:

RE: Participation the research project

(Please tick appropriate box, sign and return to Mr. Sheikh in envelope as provided)

☐ I agree to be interviewed for the research project as described in the letter dated 2009 July 13.

☐ I DO NOT agree to participate in the research project as described in the letter dated 2009 July 13.

Participant signature ______________________________ Date ______________

Contact information: Telephone number(s) _______________ _______________
Vancouver School Board  
School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

LEARNING SERVICES  
1580 West Broadway  
Vancouver, B.C. V6J 5K8  
Tel: 604-713-5000  Fax: 604-713-5076

September 8, 2009

Mr. Irfan Sheikh  
John Oliver Secondary School  
530 E. 41st Avenue  
Vancouver, B.C.  
V5W 1P3

Dear Irfan,

Thank you for your research proposal “An examination of the impact of stakeholder engagement on the implementation of a new education policy in British Columbia: A case study of mathematics curriculum implementation at John Oliver Secondary School, Vancouver, B.C.” On behalf of the VSB Research Committee please accept this letter as approval for you to complete your research in Vancouver schools. You have permission to contact teachers, parents and students in the Vancouver district. We request that you make your initial contact with the principal of the school to inform them of your study and provide them with a copy of this letter. Please note that teachers and administrators are very busy with many obligations and that schools have the right of refusal to participate in any research studies. Also, the Vancouver School District does not find subjects for researchers.

The VSB Research Committee would be very interested in learning of your results and its implications for students. When your research is completed please send us an abstract of the results.

Thank you for focusing your work within the Vancouver School District. I wish you the best of luck as you proceed with your inquiry.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Valerie Overgaard, Associate Superintendent  
Learning Services
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