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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the meaning of arbitration as a lived event. My approach to the study was interpretive and narrative in nature. Field texts consisted of twenty-one interviews of people who have experienced arbitration: four grievors, three administrators, one witness, seven union representatives, two arbitrators, two lawyers, one observer, and one teacher. In Chapter 5 I dealt with one specific story as told by three different parties: a union representative, a school board director, and an arbitrator while in Chapter 6 I recounted the story of a grievor. The remaining 17 interviews were used to enrich both the stories and the analysis. References were also drawn from arbitration documents, movies, literary works, literature on law, education, and philosophy, and television documentaries. I also drew from my own partial autobiography.

Using and extending Connelly and Clandinin's metaphors of landscape, conduit, competing and conflicting stories, positioned plot lines, and identities of hierarchy, I explore what it means to go to arbitration through the stories of those who have experienced
the process. My discussion is based on the premise that arbitration by definition is a conflicting story which is intensely felt by its participants. For the opposing parties there exists no means of personal resolution.

More questions have been asked than have been answered leaving ample room for future study. One point, however, is made clear, arbitration as a lived event is indeed a complex, multifaceted issue which needs to be storied and restoried, told and retold to bring the issues to the forefront and be dealt with. There is a need for a space for dialogue between employers and employees as they live out their competing and conflicting stories. Only by bridging the positional gaps will we come to know each other and in coming to know maybe we will understand.
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Chapter 1
Entering the Thesis

Alice had never been in a court of justice before, but she had read about them in books, and she was quite pleased to find that she knew the name of nearly everything there. "That's the judge," she said to herself, "because of his great wig."

(Carroll, Lewis, 1965)

Setting the Stage

This is a narrative study of arbitration and what that process means to those who experience it. The idea for the thesis stems from a personal experience which has made me critical of organizations. In that sense I, like Dickson (1993), am judging practice and therefore plead guilty to violating the ethics of narrativists. However, my being critical of organizations is one of the reasons that I wanted to write this thesis. Being critical is a part of my search for reconstructing meaning. It is a reflection-on-action within organizational living. I draw attention to this personal dimension as it has been one of the threads which drives the study.

This particular thesis is one of law and justice. It is a story of perception and experience. It is a story of organizations. But, most of all, it is a story of humans, and what humans do as they interact with each other. In short, it is a thesis of lived experiences and how this living is expressed within the rules of our institutions and the larger society. Throughout the study I re-present sacred, secret, and cover
stories (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) which illuminate the landscape as an organizational metaphor. Sacred stories are those which live deep within the consciousness of people, so deep that, according to Crites (1971), they cannot be directly told. Secret stories are told in private places, behind closed doors and away from scrutiny (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). Cover stories are the front, abstract stories people tell which help establish their identity as professionals. Since the landscape metaphor, which is dominant throughout the thesis, is a way to talk about secret, sacred, and cover stories, I will elaborate.

I see people as existing in an institutionalized world which forms the landscape on which and through which we live. The organization is the landscape. There are different elevations on the land. That is to say, we live in and on different positions and move back and forth as required in order to function in our daily living. These landscape positions create boundaries. To describe the boundaries, I have adapted Clandinin and Connelly's (1995) idea of conduit. To them, "the conduit is a metaphor that allows us to name the sacred story and to give a sense of how it functions in relating theory and practice in education" (p. 9). It provides me with a way to talk about positional roles and how they are lived out as identities on the landscape.

The conduit reins in the landscape and creates boundaries which become our limitations and our possibilities. Not only does the conduit create the boundaries but it is also part of the story we tell as we feel constrained or freed by its borders.
These boundaries too, are socially, historically, and culturally constructed through the stories we live and the stories we tell (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, 1994).

Clandinin and Connelly (1995) use the conduit or funnel metaphor in their discussions on how such things as district policies get passed to teachers - down the funnel by someone in an administrative role higher up in the funnel. Having information funnelled down via the conduit creates the positional divisions between administrators and teachers. In other words, the conduit allows for multiple positions on the different elevations of the landscape. If seen from this point of view, conduited living helps to explain the existence of multiple realities which compose competing and conflicting stories.

I refer to the conduit as the pipeline of organizational living. It is the privileges and limitations which orchestrate the living landscape. It is enacted life by the interaction of individuals who live their competing and conflicting stories. The conduited living is what creates the tensions and makes living "dilemma-laden" (Cuban, 1992).

We live out our lives through values (Greenfield, 1993). Since everyone lives values and, if we take the position that no two people are completely alike, chances are the stories they live will compete and conflict. Competing stories exist side by side. Conflicting stories cause a greater strain which creates a rift or split and forces people to shift their positions on the
organizational landscape\textsuperscript{1}.

These competing and conflicting stories, which exist in a person's personal and professional story, play a significant role in determining who we are, in other words, in defining our identities. These are connected to our positional roles within the conduited landscape and establish hierarchies of authority in our organizational lives. As Connelly and Clandinin (WIP, p. 113) explain it in reference to teachers and professional knowledge landscapes, "[I]dentity conflicts . . . come from not being able to live out that conduit-prescribed story for reasons confronted in their working lives." From their point of view "institutional stories are crucial influences on teachers' identity" (p. 114). Teachers' lives are shaped by both organizational and personal stories and these "stories to live by" compose identity. Borrowing from Connelly and Clandinin's "school as a landscape of interacting stories" (p. 123), I see organizations as life's landscape historically, culturally, and socially bounded and lived through secret, sacred, and cover stories.

Framing the Thesis

The conceptual framework is based on the premise that "life is a story we live" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1992, p. 9). People

\textsuperscript{1}In this thesis I focus on competing and conflicting stories, and therefore have not dealt with living on a landscape where everyone lives the same story. What it would mean for everyone to live the same story is, indeed, a topic worthy of dialogue. My guess is that competing stories would evolve.
are characters who live stories with plot lines, those plot lines are played out in different positions in the conduit, people's stories about their lives are of significance as a source of identity, the language used and the connections made through stories reveal the multiple values of the world in which people live. These assumptions of mine are framed in the writings of others (Goffman, 1959; Berger & Luckman, 1966; Greene, 1978; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gilligan, 1982; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1990, 1992, WIP; Johnson, 1993; Greenfield, 1993).

As I strove to thread the chapters of the thesis together I discovered that besides the metaphor of the conduited landscape which I use to portray the experiences of participants' stories, there was something more needed to substantiate what was surfacing as competing and conflicting stories, tensions and dilemmas. With the help of my supervisor, Dr. Michael Connelly, I began to explore the stories that we live by as the metaphor of how we come to know ourselves and create for ourselves an identity. Hence, there are two principal metaphors. One focuses on the terrain, the landscape, and the other homes in on people and how they identify themselves through themselves and through others. One of the people I identify is myself.

My personal encounter with the arbitration process occurred a few years ago when a teacher at our school was facing demotion for alleged insubordination. It was an accusation which had to
be resolved through union arbitration. As a teacher on staff, I was subpoenaed as a witness for the union defence. The stories which unfurled as I allowed myself to be taken through the arbitration process left me both personally and professionally perplexed as I simultaneously filtered them through my own stories of conflict and reflected upon and sorted out meaning in what I saw and heard.

Some may see my involvement as a bias. I believe it to have been an experience. I was exposed to an arbitration and therefore gained first-hand knowledge of its workings, or at least the workings of that particular hearing. It is this experience which has driven my inquiry. I am not saying this is the truth because I experienced it, I am saying this is what I believe I saw and this is how I felt. It encouraged me to ask what other participants saw and how they felt.

Hence, the retelling of the participants' stories in Chapter 2, 5, and 6 is underlain by my own partial autobiography in Chapter 7 as I move from arbitration to organizational narratives and human experience in general in Chapter 8.

The field texts for the study consist of 21 people who have

---

Bargaining agents under School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Acts are designated by provincial statutes. For example, in Newfoundland and in Alberta the teachers' bargaining agent is referred to as an "association," in Prince Edward Island the agent is a federation, and in Ontario the agents are designated by the statute as "branch Affiliates." For the purpose of nonidentifiability of individual bargaining agents I use the more generic term of union throughout the thesis.

See Chapter 2 for a more thorough description of arbitration and its procedures.
experienced arbitration. Four of the participants, labelled as grievors, went to arbitration against their employers (a university, a college and two school boards). Hence, when I refer to the employee as teacher, it is a general term which is used for all four grievors. I do not differentiate between a school teacher or a college teacher except in one interview where the teacher referred to her colleagues as professors. I also interviewed 3 administrators from school districts (labelled as the Employer), one teacher who was a witness, 7 union representatives (one of whom worked at the government level in a Ministry of labour), 2 arbitrators versed in arbitration procedures, 2 lawyers, one educator who sat in and watched an arbitration without official participation in it, and one teacher who observed the arbitration of a colleague with whom he had worked. The teacher's observation became part of a school story even though he observed, as did the other staff members, from a distance. What I mean by distance is that neither the teacher nor the staff actually viewed the arbitration. The stories they lived by were other people's renditions of what was going on in the hearing, which means that there were multiple interpretations of the event.

I do not delve into the stories of all the participants individually. Instead, I draw on four (a superintendent⁴,_________________)

⁴Throughout the thesis I use the terms director and superintendent. The director is the chief executive officer of a school district and is responsible for the running of all the schools in that district. He or she is employed by a school board. The superintendent, sometimes referred to as an assistant director
labour relations employee, union representative, and grievor) of these to discuss human experience and organizations. The thesis focuses on employer-employee relationships and therefore, in Chapter 5, I centre the story around the employer and the union, and in Chapter 6, re-present a grievor's story. I interviewed 4 grievors but chose only one to recount as fully as possible while using the others sparingly. The reasons for that decision concerned ethics and time, in that order.

Ethically and legally three of my participants were in danger of being identified as they presently reside in Ontario. Also, the documentation used during the grievance meetings which I acquired from these participants remain hidden within the walls of their institutions. To my knowledge, none of the legal documentation became accessible for public viewing except for one newspaper article which would have identified a participant.\footnote{Most provinces have a government department which oversees labour negotiations, disputes and settlements. In Newfoundland it is the Department of Labour Relations. In Chapter 2 I point out, through one participant's interview, that not all arbitration awards get sent to this Department to be assigned a file number which could make it obtainable for public viewing. In Ontario Section 60 of the School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Act established the Education Relations Commission (ERC) which has been described as "a watchdog" for teachers, trustees, pupils and parents (Gilbert, Martin, and Sheehan, 1989, p. 38). However, one Ontario participant (1994) told me that "the Education Relations Commission . . . tried over the years to become the official repository of all arbitration awards in education. It isn't a legislated duty so the records tend to be unreliable but the best source." This is similar to the story portrayed in Chapter 2. With the four grievors I interviewed, they believed their cases remained with the parties involved, namely the employer and the union. I asked for one of the cases at a Department of Labour where I was told it had been filed, the case was not there.}
In other words, their files are not documented at a government agency for public viewing. They were what one of my participants refer to in Chapter 2 as "private arbitrations." The story I use in Chapter 6 was made public enough to talk about both legally and ethically. The remainder are used for theme enrichment. I add further richness to the text through reference to arbitration documents, literature on law, education, philosophy, television documentaries, movies, and literary works which carry the theme of human interaction and organizations, both fiction and nonfiction, and my own partial autobiography.

This phenomenon is a narrative blending. As Connelly and Clandinin (1990, p. 4) explain, I am embedded in the process of narrative inquiry where I continually attempt to recount the multiple levels of living "which are temporally continuous and socially interactive." It is a process where people are seen as "both living their stories in an ongoing experiential text and telling their stories in words as they reflect upon life and explain themselves to others" (p. 4). It is a process, I believe, whereby we tell who we are, in other words, establish our own identities. For this thesis, who we are and how and where we position ourselves on the conduited landscape are key to explaining why competing and conflicting stories exist. They also help to explain why we live tensioned, dilemma-filled, value-laden lives.
Shaping The Problem

In the Canadian education system, school teachers are employees of school boards. As such, legally they are subject to the law of "master and servant" which states that a "master employs someone and directs how the work is done, as well as the finished product" (Freedman, 1990, p. 170). This law, currently referred to as employer-employee relationship, is significant for at least three reasons. First of all, teachers clearly live in a different position on the landscape than vice-principals, principals, coordinators, consultants, assistant superintendents, superintendents, directors, and school board members. In short, teachers are "civil servants under the political control of elected school trustees and their appointed officials"
(Czuboka, 1985, p. 2). This implies, secondly, that there are what one might call privileged positions. This means that it is the duty of teachers to do as they are told by significant others in such positions. And finally, the employer-employee law permits school boards to dismiss teachers for non-compliance which can mean anything from unsatisfactory work to any conduct deemed to be unsuitable or inconsistent with employment.

The fact that organizations are legally, socially, historically, and culturally composed indicates that there is an awareness and maybe even an acceptance that competing and conflicting stories and conduited positional roles are part of working relationships. Machiavelli (1981ed) is accurate in portraying the cynicism which can be experienced between administrators and teachers. In a journal entry (Sept/93) I noted:

---

9In many cases, at least in Canada, control is also established by Churches. And although Newfoundland is often cited as the most blatant example, court cases attest to the fact that other provinces (Huber et al v. St. Paul's Roman Catholic Separate School Board [1982]; Caldwell v. Stuart [1984]) have set the stage.

10This sounds archaic. However, although some things have changed since Pearce v. Foster (supra) the storyline of positional roles within a hierarchically designed conduit still exists. Although in Chapter 6 I only use the story of one grievor, the other three grievors I interviewed created similar plot lines in that they saw themselves as having to do what they were told by those in higher positions. When they did not a new storyline surfaced. Writers such as Czuboka (1985), Proudfoot & Hutchings 1988), Thistle & Donovan (1994), and Green (1995) confirm that hierarchies of identity have been well established within the stories we live by.

Where do teachers get the notion that they cannot really say what is on their minds? Expressions such as 'walking the line, walking on eggs, and wrist slapping' come from somewhere. To locate these perceptions we must hear the stories of those who think they have experienced the pre-eminence of force/authority. Are they illusions?

In their position on the landscape, school boards have the right to demote, suspend, or dismiss teachers for any reason (both on-the-job and off-the-job\(^\text{12}\)) which is deemed inconsistent with school board policies\(^\text{13}\). In other words, our social systems give employers such as school boards a legal right to act and teachers as members of collective bargaining units a right to react\(^\text{14}\). The mechanism used to pursue employee grievances is arbitration\(^\text{15}\).

\(^{12}\) Shewan, 1987, supra. Most collective agreements refer to such inconsistencies or misconduct as "just cause." It is also generally agreed in employment that dismissal may occur "where there is sufficient fault or wrong doing by the employee" (Thistle & Donovan, 1994, p. 338).

\(^{13}\) This does not mean to imply that school boards have more powers than other employers. Since it was not intended to be a part of this study it was not something that I investigated. However, it is certainly a question that may warrant future investigation.

\(^{14}\) I should point out that such disciplinary action is sometimes perceived as being unjust in the eyes of employees. However, according to a study done by Czuboka (1985), many teachers agree with the disciplinary action taken against colleagues if such action is accompanied by ethical, legal, and clearly understood procedures. Recent jurisprudence (Knight v. Indian Head [1990], 69 D.L.R. [4th] 489 at 499; Toronto Board of Education v. OSSTF [1997], 44 D.L.R. [4th] 385) have held that the employer has a duty to act fairly when making the decision to dismiss.

\(^{15}\) Arbitration enables an arbitrator, chosen by the two disputants, to call evidence and listen to submissions by both sides in order to make an award in favour of one of the parties involved. It is quasi-judicial in that, although it has many of
Evaluating the performance of such a complex event as arbitration has sometimes been understood as a matter of merely measuring its case output, that is to say, whether or not an article of a collective agreement has been argued and established as precedent for future cases. This product-oriented view has its limits as it neglects all the processes that account for the shared understanding of institutional culture\textsuperscript{16}.

The written procedures of arbitration are all too often taken at face value and "the tensions involved in the dynamic relationship between different dimensions of the [arbitration] structure, and between the formal role positions and the unique individuals who fill them, are ignored" (Ribbins et al., 1988, p. 157). To explore these tensions it is necessary to pry into the meanings that people attach to the procedures and processes which constitute arbitration as a lived event\textsuperscript{17}.

I am preoccupied with unravelling the past and present threads which bind participants to an arbitration reality, meaning, arbitration as a lived event. In general terms, I am also preoccupied with how an arbitration reality relates to organizations. In other words, the micro study leads to a much

---

\textsuperscript{16}This argument is taken from Schratz (1993) in his discussion of schools as institutions.

\textsuperscript{17}Nyberg (1993, p. 76) says that "an event is an experience that starts to form at some time and ends up somehow, but in a life full of experiences it's hard to tell how one event can be separated from the others."
wider macro landscape as I take a look at my own life and the lives of others as presented through films, books, legal cases, and interviews. From that point of view, in this thesis I take a wide lens look at society as organization. It is the arbitration narrative recorded through story which sets the precedent for this study.

Research Question

I have based my thesis intent upon these questions: What does it mean to go to arbitration; through what stories is arbitration understood and expressed; and how are participants affected by the retelling and reliving of the experience?

Fine Tuning The Problem

The legal and formal realities of arbitration have been addressed in the literature both on law and education (MacKay, 1984; Zuker, 1988, 1992; Sussel, 1990) and on arbitration in general (Lieberman & Moskow, 1966; Ostrander, 1981; Brown & Beatty, 1988, 1997; Elliott et al, 1994). Through the process of arbitration a decision is rendered to the parties involved but arbitrators have no control over the relationships which evolve in the process or what happens in the aftermath. What is

---

18 This question has been adapted from Connelly and Clandinin (1994, p. 23) "What does it mean to live an educated life?"

19 I am reminded of the novelist Durrenmatt (1989, p. 176) who wrote "But whenever someone took it upon himself to execute justice, things got damned inhuman."
experienced by the participants goes beyond the procedures used in order to reach an award.

Teachers who try to live out their own plot lines in the operations of their schools sometimes find themselves in frustrating situations, headlocked with administrators. As indicated in Elbaz's (1983) study, teachers become the mere instruments for performing duties handed down to them in managerial fashion. Noncompliance or questioning places teachers in situations of possible verbal reprimand, demotion, or lay-off which often leads to arbitration. This is a layer of knowledge which has not been examined as a part of what constitutes a teacher's sense of the educational landscape. Like Clandinin and Connelly (1992, p. 364) who believe there is a need to work with teachers, I believe there is a need to work with arbitration participants "and their stories, lived and told, to create new interpretations" i.e., new meanings for employer - employee relations.

One of my assumptions is that arbitration is not merely a system of rules and regulations to be observed. Rather, within

---

20 See Bailey (1995) with regard to what happens to teachers who want to rely on their own knowledge as opposed to what gets handed to them from district office.

21 I use teacher with the understanding that it is not always teachers v. others. The same scenario could be experienced by a principal, coordinator, or an assistant superintendent. In other words as long as there is someone in a higher administerial position than those mentioned there can be threat of disciplinary action. It is just that in most cases teachers form a union of their own which gives them the collective bargaining right to grieve. Some administrators, if they are not in a union, may not have any form of grievance rights protection.
the context of the narratives which give the arbitration meaning, it is part of what participants live\textsuperscript{22}. It is part of the personal and professional landscape of those who work within schools.

It is hoped that the trajectories plotted in this thesis will encourage readers\textsuperscript{23} to find meaning in the stories of the participants which will raise both questions and understanding about our own practices and the practices of others.

The Why of Research

The purpose of the study is to explore below the procedural surface of organizations, to make people aware, and to expand understanding of arbitration as a lived event\textsuperscript{24}. Wanting to look at the key principles of the bargaining process from a human perspective may lead to a much broader, critical look at the arrangement of society in general within the context of living stories as a conduited organizational landscape.

In this thesis I explore arbitration in an attempt to create an awareness of the effect it has on people whose knowledge is formed and whose feelings are created through their

\textsuperscript{22}My connection of arbitration to narrative stems from Cover's (1992) discussion of the relationship between law and narrative.

\textsuperscript{23}As researcher I include myself as a reader as are my participants and others.

\textsuperscript{24}I have used the word "lived" to imply that, without it, the word "event" can be stripped of anything that might be personally revealing. Such an analysis abstracts events from emotions, separating things that affect the quality of people's lives. Anything which is "lived" implies the opposite.
participation. I intend to look at how participants experience and respond to arbitration, to draw attention to a conception of enacted arbitration\textsuperscript{25}, that is to say, arbitration as experienced. It is a narrative knowing, gathered and collected through the stories of the people who have experienced the process.

I use the conduit metaphor throughout and therefore concepts such as knowledge, power, decision-making, hierarchy, and conflict, which are common to people in general, are part of this study. Since arbitration is part of teachers' collective bargaining, and indeed, is a part of all collective bargaining, the summary and possibilities, as Tucker (1993, p. 123) indicates in her study on Employee Assistance Programs, "may be epistemologically in harmony with the experiences of a great many readers."

Over the last few decades educators' knowledge and skills have become more defined in the literature in terms of industrial requirements and "school boards have adopted industrially designed organizational structures and lines of authority" (Tucker, 1993, p. 6). Arbitration as a means of settling disputes has become an accepted part of that structure. Most of the literature on arbitration suggests procedures to be followed in order for judgement to be reached. On the basis of available records, it appears that very few accounts, if any, exist

\textsuperscript{25}The conception of an enacted arbitration derives from Clandinin and Connelly's (1992) discussion of enacted curriculum.
concerning the effects such an experience has on humans. There is a potential for this study to go beyond the faceless names referred to in a legal document and give voice to actual people.

This is a dissertation on the stories that are almost always buried under the objectified facts of collective agreements and management rights, but yet resonate from the lived reality of those who have experienced. I am attempting to bring to the surface the undercurrents which, I believe have as much, if not more, of an impact on a person's life than what one finds written in an arbitration award. In doing so, I hope to convey the human side of the workings of an employee-employer dispute. The thesis contains stories, reports, and descriptions of arbitration experiences which I connect to my own partial narrative. As Greenfield (1993) writes:

If . . . our ideas for understanding the world determine our action within it, then our ideas about the world - what really exists in it, how we should behave in it - are of the utmost importance. And if our ideas about the world are shaped by our experience, then the interpretation of experience is also of paramount importance. (p. 22)

As a teacher and principal working with other staff members, I feel the tensions of a dilemma-laden world in which we work. Job security and the threat of disciplinary action which surfaces in the form of suspensions, demotions, re-assignments, or loss of job, are part of what Young (1992) refers to as the "competing urgencies." They become the personal and professional tensions

---

26 Schratz (1993, p. 1) discusses different research approaches which "aim at changing the nature of pedagogical knowledge by allowing the emotive and often more disturbing qualities of individuals in their culture to penetrate the research process."
of teachers. Dispute settlements through arbitration are on the increase. The consequences of such action warrant a study.

Stories are made plausible through experiences; therefore themes embedded in people and/or situations extend beyond the actual stories and as such become applicable elsewhere. Such studies are consciousness raisers rather than fact finders. Narrative serves as a means to refining perception and deepening conversation (Rorty, 1979) in dealing with research. For readers and researchers alike, reading and reflecting are the seeds which awaken, cultivate, and transform (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) perception. They open the door to deeper conversation and allow the opportunity for change to take place.

In addressing the experience I hope to make educators aware of a wider arbitration reality, one of competing and conflicting stories. As Zuker (1988, p. 68) points out, "Few teachers seem to receive as part of their formal training very much information about the laws that affect their teaching." As a teacher I have never learned about the laws or how to handle myself in legal situations; neither did any of my participants. Like me, they were counselled as the process went along. The walk through is done during the reality of the grievance hearing. It is learning by doing (Dewey, 1938).

Arbitration is a confrontational system. This is made clear by both the literature in Chapter 2 and my participants. It is a system which competes with how people see themselves creating conflicting plot lines for our own life stories. For both
employees and employers, this study offers the opportunity to share understanding and reflect on practice.

The stories may also awaken an awareness in administrators and teachers' union representatives of the need for more effort at solving grievance problems before they reach the hearing stage. As Zuker (1988, p. 3) maintains, "The resolution of disputes in an adversarial manner needs reassessment. Perhaps it has become too easy to activate complex mechanisms to deal with . . . complaints." Conversely, the complex web of human relationships may not be easily comprehended through the mechanistic approach of labour procedures. As one colleague (1995) told me with reference to divorce procedures, "I watched my whole life fall before me with the lowering of a gavel." Disputes run much deeper than procedures.

The educational significance of the research rests on its ability to expose and address narratives of arbitration and describe how they affect those involved. Such an awareness could play a significant role in school improvement, one that builds on administrators working collaboratively and congenially with teachers rather than on (the moulded clay syndrome) or against them (Machiavellianism). The sharing of stories in this thesis may foster different ways of knowing the teacher - administrator relationship.

In summary, this thesis is intended to touch a human chord.  

27 Again, readers are reminded that union can be replaced by affiliates, associations, or federations, depending on the province in which they are found.
Its general significance lies, not only with the specific people who are the participants, but also with the issues which evolve from the stories they tell. Eisner (1991) sums it up succinctly when he writes:

If we learn something about a case that we did not know at the outset of the study, not only have we achieved consciousness of that quality or feature, but also we learn to look for that quality or feature in other places. (p. 207)

The intent of this study is not to master the subject matter of arbitration, to write a prescription, or to offer a guarantee. Rather, it is a tentative guide of ideas which may foster understanding as to what arbitration is as "a story we live by" (Connelly & Clandinin, WIP).

Bridging the Literature Gaps

Although I draw on a wide variety of literature, the framework for the thesis originates from four main sources: narrative, the presentation of self within institutions, organizations, and education and law.

The idea that people in education live stories and communicate them to others through telling life stories comes from Connelly and Clandinin (1990, 1992, WIP). They contend that life is a story we live. It has plot lines and we, with others, become gendered characters in our stories and the stories of others. These stories are shaped by our cultural, historical, and social settings. Through story we imagine "who we are, where we have been and where we are going" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1992,
p. 9). In other words, it orchestrates our identity. It is also from their writings that I use the notion of people living sacred, secret and cover stories via the conduit and landscape metaphors.

Some of the current literature depicts administrators as neutral organizational agents. In this thesis administration is about people living out positional roles on a conduited landscape. It is the art of determining goals and motivating them by having them acted upon. In other words, it is the playing out of the organization's sacred narrative.

Administrators, according to Hodgkinson (1996, p. 18), "make decisions about others [and themselves]. . . . They affect directly and forcefully that quality of human life first in the work place and hence and thereafter in every place." I draw on the assumption that everyone has an organizational role which is played out on a complex web of lived events which, as Hodgkinson (p. 18) ascertains, "serve to establish identity, meaning, and purpose in life." In short, we live in and by organizations. Our identity is qualified by our organizational experience.

I use Hodgkinson (1978, 1983, 1991) and Greenfield (1980, 1993) to talk about organizations as part of the human landscape. Both writers deal with the personal and moral sides of administration and discuss organizations as humane systems. Hodgkinson (1978) looks at administration as philosophy in action and Greenfield (1993) points out the significance of personal meaning in educational leadership, leadership being a moral art
with organizations as "moral orders" (p. 217). Both writers look at the movement from behaviour to experience of administrators and try to understand that process through interpretation. In a sense, it is the observation and theoretical interpretation of administrative action. From a narrative point of view, they see administrators as living storied lives. In short, they reconnect theory and practice for administrators as do Clandinin and Connelly for teachers.

The conduit/funnel effect metaphor helped me to see more clearly the existence of a staff line structure that some believe exists upon the organizational landscape. Members in organizations require some form of social, historical, and cultural structure, that is, some form of status or positional differentiation. I have referred to these throughout this chapter as positional roles on a conduited landscape.

Goffman (1959, 1971, 1974) looks at human action within the frame of organizations. He points out the dramaturgy in people's lives. He talks about how people learn to live out their narratives within the institutional narrative by looking at specific institutions such as hospitals and asylums whose routines may be more prominent, more protruding (more intrusive?) than others such as schools. From his study one can still discuss the institution as a conduited landscape, as patients being made generic, as administrative hegemony in

28I think of movies like One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest starring Jack Nickleson when I make this comparison.
practice. He uses the metaphor of the theatrical performance. People in everyday living present their activities to others, attempt to guide and control the impressions others form and attempt to guide and employ certain techniques in order to sustain their performance.

Goffman does not use the term narrative. But I regard his form of role playing as an integral part of how one lives out/creates an identity through the use of sacred, secret, and cover stories. I have placed Connelly and Clandinin's idea of narrative in Goffman's writing, just as I have in Hodgkinson's and Greenfield's, as I see a significant connection between how people behave and how they tell their stories. These writers put stories as lived in institutional terms whereas Connelly and Clandinin discuss them narratively with reference to professional and personal knowledge landscapes and sacred, secret, and cover stories. What connects the two is the idea that we are characters who live stories with plot lines. We assume roles and in that sense become role players in both our own stories and the stories of others.

Within those storied plot lines we seek, find, and try to establish our own identity (Connelly & Clandinin, WIP). In Goffman's (1959) terms, we present ourselves. Although this may appear to be a very simple process, what often forms underneath are the tensions and uncertainty of relationships which create competing and conflicting stories. Those kinds of stories can destroy the sense of who we are especially when we encounter a
story of conflict such as a story of arbitration.

Arbitration is a conflicting story by its very definition of being a process for dispute resolution. Zuker (1992, p. 365) says that "the hearing, by its very nature, is an adjudicatory process rather than a consensual process, which has been characterized as one of the most rigid and least satisfying approaches to conflict resolution." As Connelly and Clandinin (WIP, p. 115) explain, the working lives of teachers are shaped by stories which can result in "intensely felt dilemmas."

According to the participants in this study, arbitration is a story which is intensely felt. In Chapter 2 I look at what arbitration means according to the literature and then from my own plot line as researcher. I use field notes I gathered from a participant who works in labour relations.
CHAPTER 2

Collective Agreements and Arbitration

Discretion, like the hole in a doughnut, does not exist except as an area left open by a surrounding belt of restriction.

(Dworkin, 1977)

Introduction

In this thesis I focus on enacted arbitration, rerooting theoretical knowledge claims to what may be practised. Therefore, this study is personal, intentional, and interpretive. I begin this chapter by focusing on arbitration as it is described in the literature. This is followed by arbitration as defined by a representative of a provincial department of labour. The chapter ends with a section on researching arbitration.

Arbitration Within Collective Agreements

According to Black's Law Dictionary (6th ed, 1990), arbitration is a "process of dispute resolution in which a neutral\textsuperscript{25} third party (arbitrator) renders a decision after a hearing at which both parties have an opportunity to be

\textsuperscript{25}The writings of Brown and Beatty (1988), Kuttner (1988), and Piddocke (1993) indicate there exist degrees of neutrality. My conversations with participants clearly indicated that there is a game process to choosing the arbitrator. For example, one name may be submitted by one of the parties because that arbitrator might have sided for that party in a previous grievance dealing with a particular issue. It is not uncommon to hear union representatives say they do not want a particular arbitrator because he or she sides with management on certain issues. And I assume the reverse is true as well.
Brown and Beatty (1997, p. 1-1) explain that "grievance arbitration is an adjudicative process through which disputes arising out of the application and operation of a collective agreement are finally resolved." In short, "[I]t is a quasi-judicial system created for each collective bargaining relationship" which is limited to the interpretation and application of a collective agreement. Each collective agreement stipulates who can file a grievance and when it can be filed. Agreements vary from province to province and one from another. Here is one example from The Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (1991):

A teacher may file a grievance\(^{30}\) against the School Board . . . in the manner prescribed herein on the teacher's own behalf or on behalf of himself/herself and one or more teachers.

Where a grievance has not been settled under the grievance procedure, or where there is a dispute as to whether the matter is arbitrable: (a) the teacher with the consent of the Association; or (b) in the case of a grievance arising in accordance with Clause 31.02, the Association or the Employer, as the case may be, may, within seven (7) calendar days after exhausting the grievance procedure, notify the other party in writing of the desire to submit the grievance to arbitration and the notice shall contain the name of the person appointed to be an arbitrator by the party giving notice. For the purpose of a referral to arbitration by either the Association or the Employer, the grievance procedure will be deemed to be exhausted when either party so notifies the other in writing either by personal service or by registered mail.

Since grievance arbitration has become an "institutionalized

\(^{30}\)Grievance means a dispute over the interpretation, application, administration, or alleged violation of the Collective Agreement referred to in this paragraph.
process" (Brown & Beatty, 1997, p. 1-2) it has resulted in a jurisprudence of its own.

Arbitration is similar to the judicial system in both process and jurisprudence. Based on the same principle as common law a "large body of arbitral jurisprudence has been developed with respect to many common issues which arise in collective bargaining relationships" (p. 1-12). These awards help shape and direct the drafting of new articles in collective agreements and are used as points of reference for future grievances. Arbitration contrasts with judicial decisions in that the award of an arbitrator is not considered to be a binding precedent for all future cases. That is to say, there is no legal stare decisis, although prior cases are used and "have been given substantial persuasive weight by arbitrators" (p. 1-13).

According to some, arbitration is considered to be a

---


32Re City of Toronto and CUPE, Local 79 (1982), 133 D.L.R. (3d) 94 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused 36 O.R. (2d) 386n, where it was held that a refusal to admit evidence because a prior arbitration award was 'binding authority' constituted an error in law (Brown and Beatty, 1997, p. 1-14, fn2).

33Stare decisis meaning "Let the decision stand," is a leading case or precedent in law. "It is a legal rule that when a court has decided a case by applying a legal principle to a set of facts, that court should stick by that principle and apply it to all later cases with clearly similar facts unless there is a good reason not to. This rule helps promote fairness and reliability in judicial decision-making and is inherent in the common law system" (Proudfoot & Hutchings, 1988, p. 377).
private affair. As Curtis (1957)\(^{34}\) states:

[U]nion-management disputes are private matters that are most satisfactorily settled by the parties themselves before their own private tribunals. Arbitration, free from the formalities, the tensions, and the antagonisms which characterize courts of law is . . . the better method of settlement.

However, in some cases these private matters are treated as public. Brown and Beatty (1997, p. 3-19) recognize the conflicting theories as to whether grievances are public or private when they say that "generally, consensual arbitration has been viewed as a private process and closed to the public except with the consent of both parties." As will be indicated in the participant section of this chapter, there is no hard and fast rule. It seems to depend on the parties involved and who wants to observe. Also, I should point out that the parties involved are considered to be the union and the employer, hence a grievor might not be asked for consent.

The disputing parties jointly agree upon the arbitrator who will then have the power to render a binding decision\(^{35}\). The arbitrator adjudicates "upon specific, concrete disputes which he or she resolves by applying the legal regime established by the collective agreement to the facts which he or she finds on the basis of the evidence and argument

---

\(^{34}\)As cited by Brown and Beatty (1997, p. 1-8.2)

\(^{35}\)Unless an issue arises under The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. See Slaight Communications Inc. (Operating as Q107 FM Radio) v. Davidson, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 1038, 59 D.L.R. (4th) 416, where it was held that the Charter applies to adjudicators exercising delegated powers, such as under s. 61.5 of the Canada Labour Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. L-2, ss. 240-244).
presented to him[or her]" (p. 1-9). In short, arbitration disputes are argued on the basis of policy as set out within collective agreements, "the hallmark of which is the settlement of disputes through an adversary process by which an established system is applied to the [facts of a] particular dispute" (p. 1-11). The arbitration serves one of two functions, either (a) to ensure that the collective agreement is interpreted in a manner which is consistent with previous cases or (b) to secure an argument based on the collective agreement which, if upheld, sets a precedent for future cases. Collective agreements solidify through bargaining negotiations and case law and hence, are the "touchstone" in establishing the process and procedure to which both parties are expected to follow and conform.

It should be noted that I have used the term arbitrator, rather than arbiter, throughout. According to Black (1990), an arbiter, although sometimes used synonymously with arbitrator, is distinguished from it in legal terms as a person who is bound to decide according to the rules of law and equity. An arbitrator may proceed at "his [or her] own discretion, so that it be according to the judgement of a sound man [or woman]." In Roman law an arbiter was appointed

36 The precedent is set by the first case within the area of a particular dispute. Case law, in its legal sense, refers to the aggregate of reported cases as forming a body of jurisprudence, or the law of a particular subject as evidenced or formed by the adjudged cases in distinction to statutes and other law sources.
by the praetor to examine *bonae fidei* causes of action and had the power of judging according to the principles of equity (ex aequo et bono). This was distinguished from the judex who was bound to decide according to strict law.

In present day arbitrations, arbitrators are limited to making decisions based on evidence and argument presented before them. In that sense, arbitrators are expected to "be neutral both in fact and in action" (Brown & Beatty, 1997, p. 1-11). Also, although arbitration awards are often considered to be final and binding, the processes and awards are subject to judicial review in particular circumstances. Brown and Beatty (p. 1-24) have grouped those circumstances into three categories: (1) the rules of natural justice have to be followed, the arbitration board must be neutral, and the award must be properly made; (2) the arbitration board must not exceed its jurisdiction; (3) the arbitrators must not err in law either procedurally or on the face of the award.

---


* Bona fide occupational qualifications refers to being "[I]posed honestly, in good faith, and in the sincerely held belief that such limitation is imposed in the interests of the adequate performance of the work involved with all reasonable dispatch, safety and economy, and not for ulterior or extraneous reasons. . . . It must be related in an objective sense to the performance of the employment concerned, in that it is reasonably necessary to assure the efficient and economical performance of the job without endangering the employee, his [or her] fellow employees and the general public (Ontario Human Rights Commission vs Etobicoke [Borough] [1982] 1 S.C.R. 202 at 208, 40 N.R. 159, 82 C.L.L.C. 17,005, 132 D.L.R. [3d] 14, 3 C.H.R.R. D/781, McIntyre J.).
Other forms of alternative dispute resolutions (ADR) include conciliation and mediation. There are also a variety of forms of arbitration: compulsory, final offer, interest grievance, and voluntary. The binding decision is called an arbitrium, an award, or a judgement. "Arbitrium est judicium boni veri, secundum aequum et bonum - an award is the judgement of a good [person], according to justice" (Black, 1990).

The idea of carrying out arbitration as opposed to using an established tribunal of justice, as in a court system, is to avoid judicial "formalities, the delay, the expense, and the vexation of ordinary litigation" (Black, 1990). This explanation conflicts with the stories of participants. According to them, even though there appear to be set formalities in arbitration, there can be and are major delays, it is very expensive, and the event is highly emotional. These conflicts should become clearer to the reader through the participant stories in chapters 5 and 6.

With regard to costs, in the interviews that I did, all participants told me arbitration was expensive, although some had difficulty putting a figure value on it. When I asked how much it cost to have a grievance hearing the following responses were given: "I couldn't even guess. . . . It isn't cheap" (Joanne, 1994). Lois (1994) said:

A straight forward arbitration hearing - one day would cost [around] $2500.00 that includes cost of the chair, our nominee, and the travel expenditures that we pay out to our district. In terms of dismissal cases that run
days and days and days, I can only estimate that it's in the thousands because they are also paying for the legal council.

Another participant (Eric, 1994) said:

[T]here would be some travel costs. . . . In an arbitration hearing, generally you're looking at half the cost of the chairperson, which could run to about a couple of thousand depending on the number of days of hearings . . . , the cost of your own nominee in terms of that person getting to the hearing, the cost of legal counsel as well as their fees, any expenses encountered by the grievor, and so on. So it's difficult to put a cost figure on the arbitration aspect. But, it could run . . . anywhere from maybe three or four thousand dollars upwards to ten or fifteen or more if you had six or seven days of hearings.

In listening to the union representatives, I wondered why they had such a difficult time putting a dollar figure on individual arbitration cases. Upon reflection I have drawn the conclusion that it is very difficult to put monetary value on someone's life story. Each case has its own personal plot line within the procedural plot line. Some take longer than others, requiring more money. In addition, people have to travel different distances, stay in hotels, pay airfare, pay substitute teachers, and the list goes on because of the diverse backgrounds of those involved. However, one can make a guess that the average cost is about twenty-five hundred dollars per day for one side. The total, then, may be closer to five thousand dollars per day as each side pays for legal counsel, witness expenses, transportation, and so forth. I should point out here that the grievors I interviewed agreed that they would not have been able to bear the cost themselves and were appreciative of the fact that they had the union
covering the expenses. Expense was not a concern for either of the four grievors. What appeared to be of major concern were the competing and conflicting plot lines which emerged, not only through their stories but also through the stories of other participants and through the literature.

What I had intended to do in this section was give a clear, generalized picture of arbitration and its process. Because it is a quasi-judicial affair it is commonly believed that there is a fixed plot line to follow. And many live out this plot line by using references such as Brown and Beatty who offer some consistency in definition of terms, legal interpretations, sample cases, and so forth. However, from my point of view, the steps are generic enough to be used in a more complex plot line, set by the individuals responsible for seeing that the process is lived out, namely unions and employers. In that sense, the rules only appear to be fixed but in reality are flexible enough to be reshaped via legal storying and restorying.

Just to give one example, for grievance purposes many collective agreements set time limits for the filing of a grievance and for the presentation of the award once the hearing of evidence has been completed. It has been stated by one arbitrator (Canada Post Corp. [1994], 40 L.A.C. [4th] 19 [Burkett]) that:

Where a party merely fails to reply within the stipulated time, that failure will not result in the allowance or forfeiture of the grievance. Rather, apart from contract language to the contrary, the consequence of a failure to
reply is simply to permit the party wishing to proceed to take the next step.

Most collective agreements stipulate time restraints for both filing a grievance and then receiving the award. Article 32.07 of the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Collective Agreement (1991) states:

The arbitration board shall render its decision on the grievance within fifteen (15) calendar days of the date on which the board is fully constituted and the decision of the board shall be committed to writing and submitted to the parties concerned within a further ten (10) calendar days.

The four grievors in this study, each from a different province, clearly indicated that the time lines are often not followed. Union representatives, as well, admitted that the handing down of awards can take longer than actually stipulated in their collective agreements.

According to Goffman (1974), there are normative expectations in all events. Boundaries sustain the degree and the kind of involvement and some deviation is tolerated, that is to say, becomes a competing story. In Chapter 6 the reader gets a sense of what happens when that competing story is not tolerated and hence becomes a conflicting story.

In summary then, collective agreements serve to define the general scope of an arbitration plot line in the sense that grievance procedures are outlined in collective agreements in articles which teachers are instructed to

---

38In Ontario the School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Act (SBTCA) gives the right to negotiate and the right to pursue grievances arising from the collective agreement to
follow when filing a grievance. These articles form a code of procedures which says who can file a grievance, what form the grievance will take, and what time limits will be adhered to. That story becomes reshaped through the living out of the grievance process. Hence, in their explanations, Brown and Beatty (1997) quite frequently use a change indicator such as "normally" thus informing their readers that this is not always the case. It depends on the story.

Therefore, participants such as grievors may never get a full sense of a story as to what it means to go to arbitration until the arbitration is over. It is a story shaped as it is being lived. This is one of the reasons why I find Clandinin and Connelly's metaphors of stories we live by, conduits, landscapes, and competing and conflicting stories, to which I referred in Chapter 1, so applicable to this thesis.

Conduited, positional landscaping creates competing stories under an umbrella of sacred stories. Finding one's way through the funnel, especially if one appears to be gazing upward, is a challenging process as one dodges the shoulds and should nots of competing voices. Some of the competing views come from those living and telling stories from within the arbitration. Section 51 of the Act stipulates that if there is a conflict between a collective agreement and the Act, the Act prevails. However, from the various provincial collective agreements I have perused, it is clear that teachers' unions shape their collective agreements to ensure that they are aligned with government acts. In point of fact, collective agreements are negotiated between teachers' unions and government thus ensuring that articles formed in those agreements are agreed upon conjointly.
labour relations' plot line as indicated by the following participant story.

Arbitration as Defined By Participants

According to one labour relations employee (Fred, 1993), in his province, grievance procedures for all collective bargaining parties are the same. There is usually a three to five step procedure which is fairly similar throughout. The first step for an employee is to go to the supervisor with the complaint. Then, if the problem is unresolved it goes to the director. Once that is rejected the complaint goes to the Minister in charge or the department head. At that point of the grievance procedure, a committee is formed by the Deputy Minister of the grieving department which has representatives from both management and union. If, during that step, the grievance is withheld, the arbitration process is next.

The process described in the above field notes is fairly straightforward. However, when I turned to specific union groups the story of procedure began to reshape itself.

\[\text{In the interviews I did there was similarity in the procedures for arbitration in that there were usually 4 stages: (1) the teacher would first discuss the issue with the appropriate administrative officer; (2) the grievance would be submitted to the Director; (3) the grievance would be discussed by a grievance committee; (4) the grievance would be referred to arbitration. However, each union and its affiliates negotiate their contracts which creates variations in the grievance procedure. Since I am focusing on what arbitration means as a lived event for the participants I interviewed I left Fred's statement intact as that was how he began his story. It is possible that in his job he may treat all collective bargaining units as being the same.}\]
depending on the union involved. For example, when I asked about the Teachers' Union Fred said that they were a little different and he went to look for the teachers' collective agreement. In the province in which he was working, a teacher's grievance would first go to the director of the school board in which the grievor was employed. He continued by quoting, "If the decision of the [director] does not result in a settlement of the grievance, they then submit the grievance to the chairperson of the school board. And then, if the decision of the chairperson does not result in settlement, it goes to arbitration." Fred assumed that the chairperson of the school board would be the same as a deputy minister or minister of labour relations when it came to auditing a grievance.

In most unions, if the grievance is not resolved at this level, it goes to arbitration. The only function a chairperson, department head or deputy minister serves after the grievance procedure is to choose an arbitrator if the parties cannot agree on one. If each party puts forward the name of a person who it would like to hear the arbitration, and if the parties cannot mutually decide, they ask the minister to appoint an arbitrator for them. They use an arbitrator list which is supplied by the labour management corporation and an appointment is done on a rotation basis based on ability. Who assesses the ability was not discussed. I assume it would be the department head, the
deputy minister, or whoever is in charge of doing the selection. However, unions and employers can get their own private arbitrator if they wish and many unions do.

After the decision is made the award is sent to the parties and a copy is required to be forwarded to the Ministry through an agency such as a department of labour relations or an education relations committee. Fred went on to say that, in his province, there was an agreement with the panel of arbitrators that had formed, probably through past years, that all arbitrators were required to send a copy to the Department. He referred to it as "a rule of thumb." However, sometimes the department gets the awards and sometimes they do not. There is no penalty if the award is not sent to the Department of Labour so the agreement is rather hard to enforce. According to Fred, private arbitrators had no written agreement with the Department.

To Fred, this created a problem because notice of awards may not be sent to the Department which meant that case decisions would not be on file for precedent. Also, if the awards were not sent to the Department, they no longer remained documents which could be accessed by the public sector, which is what is suppose to happen. As Fred explained it, "When looking at ways of determining trends in collective bargaining and in negotiating collective agreements, this Department is required, I would think, by the public side that if there is something happening out there we should know about
it. And, if something is going on in arbitration which might be useful down the road in this Department, then this Department in its conciliation process is really missing out on something." I took that to mean, the Department of Labour is not able to fulfil its obligation to provide a public service if the documents are not handed over to his department.

As Fred saw it, sometimes the awards were not sent to the Department through oversight and sometimes this non-delivery was deliberate. He did not go into detail as to what he meant by 'deliberate'. I took it to mean that sometimes, for whatever reasons, one party or another did not want a copy of the award to be sent to the Department of Labour Relations. Whether it has anything to do with the fact that it would become a public document I can only speculate.

There was a concern by others in government that some awards were not being sent in and the Department that Fred worked in was looking into the matter. It wanted to know how many awards were not being submitted. As Fred explained it:

[T]hey're appointing these people under the guise of being upfront with us with regards to submitting all the arbitration awards. And so, they just want to see how many are not being submitted. And I got a feeling that there could be a fair number.

Apparently the arbitrations being sent to the Department began to decrease and, he said, "That's when that private arbitration process started." His use of "private arbitrations" refers to some unions not using the bank of
arbitrators who are usually available from the government agency such as a department of labour. Instead, some unions hire their own arbitrators outside of government jurisdiction. Some government officials see this as a private arbitration in the sense that they may have little, if any, control over it. His answer echoed my thoughts when he said, "[U]nless we know that there was a particular arbitration, we really have no way of knowing." In other words, it is possible for an arbitration to take place and a decision be handed down without the department of labour knowing about it or having access to the award.

According to Fred, the only department in his provincial government who might have a copy of all the arbitration awards of teachers would be Treasury Board because it works with school trustees associations as the employer. Even though the employer may have its own people to represent it in giving evidence at arbitration hearings, there is always somebody from Treasury Board present because it is the collective bargaining unit for the government.

As Fred understood it, Treasury Board negotiates the collective agreement with school trustees' associations and is therefore party to the collective agreements. They do have a say in each arbitration hearing that comes from a collective bargaining agreement that they have negotiated. However, in the arbitrations I observed and/or investigated there had not been a Treasury Board representative present. When I told
Fred this, his response was, "Then maybe they do not have a complete list [of arbitrations] either."

Fred went on to say that "it definitely has been a precedent over the last couple of years because of the private arbitration." I took this to mean that some unions are going outside of the Department of Labour to choose their arbitrators as he continued by saying that if this continues [the Department] is "going to be at a loss as to how we are going to get them. Especially considering the fact that Treasury Board may not even be involved." To Fred that seemed to close off his Department which serves the public sector as it is his Department which gives people the freedom to access arbitration information.

The conclusion which was drawn by Fred was that "this makes it [arbitration] really private." And as participant Betty (1993) remarked, "I think it raises a lot of issues of what becomes public and what does not." This is an example of a competing story between arbitration as a public or private affair. I should also point out that being private because an arbitration event takes place outside of the jurisdiction of a government agency can mean something different from arbitration being a private affair. Grievance hearings can be privately screened from government and still be made a public event by those present at the actual hearing.

I commented to Fred that according to one lawyer with whom I spoke (Ford, 1993), the complete document is public
once the final award has been handed in; yet I noticed in perusing the awards at the Department that all the personal consents which were offered as exhibits to the arbitrators were not included. He said no, that in most cases it was "not attached to the rest of the important stuff." Sometimes, he said, the attachments come in with the award, but, not very often. They just get the "body of the report." The scenarios which were suggested as to why this would happen was the amount of paper it would require to photocopy everything and the other was the possibility that it might be kept by the arbitrator "as an intent to protect." Who it would protect was not made clear.

The point was made that, in some provinces, arbitrators do not use tape recordings of the event but rather, "as a rule of thumb," use note taking as their means of gathering data. Fred believed that most arbitration hearings are more like a court. People are sworn in and cross-examined, and so forth. However, when it came to the actual transcripts of the proceedings it was different from legal court in that no taped recordings were kept.

I asked whether or not an arbitration hearing was open to the general and he felt that it was. He said, "I know that it's up to the arbitrator whether or not he or she wants other people in the room. And, I would think that if either side had objections to people being at the hearing, then they can't stay." He knew of students who had attended just to observe
and to get some knowledge of the process because they were doing a particular university course." And, in that regard they would be considered "general public." As far as he was concerned "There's nothing to preclude them from attending unless one of the sides in the dispute has a reason not to want a particular person."

Fred had only ever attended one arbitration hearing. His job has been dealing with the awards once they came to his department. "You don't realize what goes on inside," he said, "It was a real eye opener for me." He thought the whole process had functioned particularly well. Both sides had been able to voice their concerns, ask their questions, and make their statements. In other words, everything went quite smoothly. It seemed to him, however, that the witnesses "didn't appear in the award as they appeared in person. There were differences in it." He explained:

I guess the arbitrators sort of summarize what a witness has to say, or something. To me things could get lost in the translation when the arbitrator sits down to write up the award taken from notes from a lengthy spiel by a particular witness.

To him it seemed that reading the award did not include everything that was said at that particular hearing.

Participant Betty (1994) said she usually referred to the awards as being "sanitized." When I mentioned that to Fred his response was:

That's a good word for it. They are certainly that. . . . There are things in your mind that you remember that you don't see in the document. . . . Because, you know, you've got to miss something when you're jotting down
notes. You can't get it all . . . If it's a transcribed tape you can't miss it.

When I asked him what happens to the person involved he said that he wondered "about that sometimes, too. . . .":

[I]f you look at somebody . . . who has been discharged, and most arbitrators don't like discharge. They will hold more often on substituting the suspension of these. But, I mean, once the trust of an employee is lost by the employer, that employee goes back to work after 4 months or 6 months, whatever is the suspension, what kind of relationship takes place afterwards? . . . How long can it last? . . . There's a breakdown between the employer and employee. So, even though he wins his case, he goes back to work, he loses because the employer doesn't trust him any more and he doesn't trust the employer after going through that process. . . . And here . . . they got to face each other every day. . . . I know that most people, I mean, they're all human. They harbour stuff for a long time.

He went on to explain that the word "arbitration" means it is an arbitrary process. From his point of view, that was the only way it could be as it exists because of differences between management personnel and union personnel and "after that the wounds are open and . . . ." He had seen it himself, that:

once a management person and a union person have one disagreement which leads to a grievance procedure or the arbitration procedure, it doesn't stop. Because, as soon as . . . the least tiny thing at all then is cause for one of those two people to get on the other one. . . . I mean, I've seen it happen in my 10 years working with government, seeing people finally reach the end of the line where they just make up a vendetta to get that person out of there. Eventually they do. . . . That's part of the thing that doesn't come up in documentation.

From The Researcher

This interview brings forward some interesting points.
In the first place, unless there is some way of knowing that there has been an arbitration there is no way of asking for the award. If some agency, such as a department of labour, does not receive a copy, the award no longer remains the property of the public sector.

This allows arbitration to be a private affair even after the award is handed down, private in the sense that the award is not available for public reading. This competes with another participant's story. In Chapter 4 I quote another participant who worked as a lawyer for a provincial union who states that once an award has been handed out to the parties involved, it becomes a public document. Other interviews indicate that the award only becomes public for certain interest groups such as unions and school federations, those in more official positions on the landscape.

Secondly, Fred was only one of twenty-one with whom I completed an interview but his telling has similarities with others in that many of them make the point that the arbitration process is structured to be confrontational as resolution itself implies problems which have to be solved. To the participants, once that process begins, there is no way to change that it involves competing stories which evolve into conflicting stories and adversarial role play.

Another point which has to be acknowledged is that within the organizational narrative when two groups go to arbitration each group takes on a different role and therefore finds
itself in a different position on the landscape. Not only are they positioned, but the positions appear to be elevated and portray the employer as being higher in authority than the union and the grievor. This is evident in the grievor's story in Chapter 6. Although there is a contrary image which depicts arbitration as a procedure which allows both parties to voice their concerns, and the union may perceive itself as being on an equal playing field with management, the four grievors with whom I spoke, and significant others, on whose behalf the union is acting, did not feel that way.

The term "employer versus employee" still rings through, and the organizational landscape has cultivated different positions for these people. The issue then becomes more than a conflicting story, it becomes a conflicting story as told from different positions on the landscape, positions which are found at different levels of cultivation making the whole process very complex.

I need to make clear here that this does not necessarily mean that the process may be more traumatic for one group than the other but rather that there are different stories at stake. In that sense, both groups have much to lose if their actions are not upheld. This is elaborated on in Chapters 5, 6, and 8.

However, I do believe that field notes such as those involving Fred indicate that grievors feel they have more to lose in the sense that because of their position on the
organizational landscape even when their grievance is upheld, they have to work under the employer who is still recognized as their boss. In other words, there are limitations/boundaries which exist on the landscape, the extent of which is determined by the position one holds, the role one plays, and the story one tells.

In listening to Fred's story there seem to be privileged positions on the landscape which give those who play the role of that position more advantage in living out their stories, or at least that is how it is seen by others. Within the sacred story of arbitration, personal stories come to life through the enactment of the hearing. The process can appear as if one person is out to get someone else. The chance of that happening may increase with the position one holds. Fred referred to some actions as being "deliberate" and he also talked about observing some people paying other people back, in other words getting even. Fred used the word "vendetta."

The fact that people believe that some acts committed are deliberate attempts to bend a sacred story hints at Greenfield's (1993, p. 32) suggestion that "no theory of administration . . . can be adequate unless it comes to terms with that condition of human life which inextricably interweaves fact and value." Looking at administrators from this point of view recognizes the complexity and tensions which exist in human life.

To Greenfield (p. 54), "All organizations are patterns of
living, ways of seeing the world. . . . They are the rules we choose to live by; they are also the rules that others have chosen for us and that we accept. . . . The self cannot escape organizations." If, as Connelly and Clandinin (1990, 1992, WIP) ascertain, life is the stories we live by, then stories of organizations and organization stories are our life stories. In other words, life is the organized stories we live.

How we tell our stories is at least partially determined by how we position ourselves on the conduited landscape. The stories created on one position can be seen as moral or immoral acts from another position. Hence, words such as "deliberate", or "sanitized", and phrases like "once the trust of an employee is lost", "there's a break down", "they harbour stuff", or "make up a vendetta", in the context of Fred's conversation with me, indicate the tension (even malice), of conflicting feelings which can evolve from a person's story.

This is explained in more detail in Chapter 6 but since the crux of this thesis is focused on what it means for someone to go to arbitration and that this is discussed through metaphors of storied lives on conduited landscape, I felt it necessary to set the stage here. The idea that I am seeking meaning of what it is like to be on an arbitration playing field implies peering at lived narratives from different positions on the landscape.

As I attempt to peer into positions and roles which I
have not experienced, I may be creating a competing story of
my own by questioning others in different positions on the
landscape and interpreting their stories. Because of this I
feel as if I am dealing with a sensitive topic.

Researching Arbitration:

Being one of the hinges upon which society swings can
make discussion about a justice system a delicate affair.
There are limits to what can be talked about or written about
without anticipated consequences as those closest to the
sacred story of the organization become protective when there
is probing. Writers such as Michael Harris (1990) and Randy
Schilts (1987) attest to that. Stories of cover-up and
government interference abound. In the *Globe and Mail* (July
19, 1997) it was reported with reference to the David Milgaard
story, that "in lawsuits and yesterday in public, the Milgaard
camp has alleged police and prosecutors knew in 1970 that they
had the wrong man and then covered it up." In the same paper
another article reported that "the Liberal government ended
the [Somalia] inquiry just as it was to look into allegations
that senior military and civilian officials tried to cover up
the killings of two Somali civilians by Canadian soldiers in
1993." There often seems to be a fear of having to re-create
the organizational story.

Whenever someone takes a critical look at an organization
those who act on its behalf become visible. The spotlight is
turned on those who operate from the higher plateaus of the landscape. Few want to be under a spotlight, especially an accusing one.

Renzetti and Lee (1993) define sensitive topics as "those that have potential costs (or threats) to the participant and the researcher" such as research of a sexual nature or which examines the "private sphere," deals with the sacred, delves into "deviance and social control," and "impinges on the vested interest of powerful persons or the exercise of coercion or domination" (p. 6). Arbitration meets the criteria of a sensitive topic. It is private, sacred, and falls within the realm of the vested interests of powerful people. Since this may require some explanation I finish this chapter by discussing each.

**Arbitration in the Private Sphere**

As pointed out earlier, arbitration is considered by many to be a private adjudicatory affair. Collective bargaining legislation mandates a basic procedure which parties may modify to suit their own needs. In other words, the parties formulate procedures, select adjudicators, and take responsibility for any costs incurred. In other words, they fix their own plot lines, plot lines which grievors and witnesses have to live out in conduit fashion and make part of their story.

The conduit metaphor (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) infers
that someone else already living that plot line is going to tell others, such as grievors and witnesses, how to play their role. It is not a role they will be permitted to play entirely on their own. They will be guided through the process by the stories of others, namely, union representatives, lawyers, and arbitrators.

Although there appear to be conflicting stories, most of the literature and some of the participants in this study state that an arbitration only becomes public when its award is handed over to a government agency such as a department of labour relations. It is at that point that members of the public, if they know the names of the parties involved in the dispute, may obtain a copy of the document. However, lists of awards with the names of parties involved, which are needed to identify particular cases if one wished to obtain a copy, are usually not made available, especially to those who might be in a position to grieve.

Some unions have an unwritten policy which denies their members the right to obtain copies of arbitrations from them. In some provinces teachers are told to go to their provincial department of labour where they may or may not find copies of all awards. Meanwhile, although the arbitration argument and its outcome is published in teachers' bulletins, the names of the parties involved are often left out. One example of a union report is given in Chapter 5. If the name of the case is not given, one cannot ask for a copy at a department of...
labour. Hence, unless teachers have prior knowledge of a particular case, they have no way of getting access to the complete report. Instead, what they may get is a one hundred page arbitration award summarized to a quarter of a page in a teachers' bulletin. Therefore, there are limits to how accessible a document may be even when we say an arbitration becomes public once the award is handed down.

I have since learned that there are fewer restrictions placed on employers, many of whom get a legally typed copy of each arbitration award. It is probably assumed that people who live their plot lines in an employer's position on the landscape need the information to determine future decisions regarding employees. According to Brown and Beatty (1997, p. 1-3) the most comprehensive collection of arbitration cases in Canada is found in the Labour Arbitration Cases (L.A.C.) series.

However, it is generally noted that arbitration hearings are not made as public as court cases. As an example, within the collective agreements I perused, there was neither article to stipulate what happens to an award once it is handed down by the arbitration board except that a copy must go to the union and the employer. One reason for this may be because it is described as a mechanism established to settle disputes between employer and employee. As such the process remains a private affair, at least as private as the parties involved wish to make it.
Some cases I have read indicate that the question as to whether observers will be permitted, is addressed at the preliminary stages of the hearing. In some, the request is made not to have outsiders present. In one case I explored, employees common to district office wandered in and out of the proceedings at their leisure. In another, the spouse of a grievor was denied entry until the summation day of the hearings.

Hence, the door to an arbitration event is not wide open as is the case with regular court proceedings. For arbitration, the set stage and the plot line are less "fixed" than common law court. This creates a degree of secrecy which minimizes participants' actions from visible\(^4\) outside scrutiny. The indeterminant story of whether the arbitration story is public or private makes for a fuzzy plot line. How is a grievor to know what the plot line is if it keeps shifting?

The shifting plot line becomes part of the tensioned story. One of my participants (Betty, 1993) saw it as an invasion of privacy especially since many believe that the

\(^4\) I say visible because participants are certainly scrutinized through whatever means possible: conversations of those who may have attended the hearing, family members talking to others, comments made among people, assumptions drawn while searching for meaning, interpretations made, and so forth. Examination and cross-examination, in particular also allow for deeper probing of a person's story. It remains a glass fish bowl even when the bowl is made from stained glass and one is unable to see clearly. In some ways this may protect but it may also be a threat, a place for innuendo and misinformation.
acting out of the arbitration is a private affair. Having the award public did not seem to be as big an issue for the participants although it seemed to have a significant effect on them. One participant (Claude, 1994) said that the award from his grievance was sitting on a shelf and another (BethAnn, 1994) said, "I didn't even go through the folder [since the grievance hearing]. I thought, well, maybe I should look and see. There's all kinds of garbage in there that Barb is not even interested in." How I felt as researcher in going through those documents is discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 as I had ethical concerns about the lived stories. At times I felt as if I was prying.

There is an invasion of privacy when the lived stories take the researcher into the private lives of participants and their families, of asking personal questions about feelings, listening to family discussions and spousal opinion, and looking at personal documents in the form of letters.

I am not an expert in the affective domain. However, the actions, expressions, and vocal sounds, in other words, the physical and verbal body language of some of my participants, clearly indicated to me how stressful the arbitration experience had been.

Renzetti and Lee (1993) argue that this area is not as much private as it is "emotionally charged." From my perspective one is a reflection of the other. Many people take great pains to cover their emotions in order to keep them
private. Hence, arbitration awards can be left on a shelf or stored away in a box only to be brought out when probed by others, like researchers. And the story only needs to be recounted when the need arises. BethAnn (1994) told me that I was the second researcher to ask for her grievance story but she had not been ready to tell it the first time.

What is kept inside, if not exposed to others, is private, so private that it may even become sacred (Crites, 1971), a pervasive story embedded in our sense of self. It raises the question, at what point does the person's private story become a cover story for someone else's agenda? The grievor's story in Chapter 6 points to this question.

The perceived privacy of arbitration creates an image of safety where grievors are free to tell their stories of practice. The admittance of observers into some hearings may threaten that privacy depending on the story that is being lived. If there are no observers, the fact that it is private may make the stories secret ones. If there are observers and they are perceived as being in privileged positions, the stories still remain as secret but under a new tension: how are they going to be told by those listening?

Connelly and Clandinin (1993, p. 20), in reference to teaching, say, "The power of the teaching act comes in its secrecy. But, at the same time, the secrecy of the teaching

---

41This may also be another reason why an arbitration award is private, all the emotions are removed.
act also opens it to abuse." This is also true of the arbitration act. Its fuzzy plot lines may allow it to be a secret enterprise, inasmuch as those responsible for narrating the arbitration story want it to be, with its success depending on the maintenance of that secrecy.

With such competing and conflicting stories the process becomes a plot line of story maintenance. If, as Connelly and Clandinin (1993) assert, being in a secret place can lead to an inward-looking cultivation, arbitration is placed in a delicate position indeed.

**Arbitration As Sacred**

In discussing sensitive topics, Renzetti and Lee's use of the term sacred leans towards the investigation into religious practices, beliefs, and so forth. Although arbitration hearings have dealt with religious issues, that is not my intent in referring to such procedures as being sacred.

Sacred, in this paper, refers to the stories which evolve from people's experiences within an institutionalized landscape. They are those which cause us to make decisions, make us behave as we do even though we may not know why we are behaving that way, or at least hamper us from putting our reasons into words. Such an experience as arbitration becomes sacred in that it lives within the memories of its participants. It is the private depth of a person's narrative.
According to Connelly and Clandinin (1994), since sacred stories are often too abstract to put into words, metaphors are sometimes used to talk about the relationships between theory and practice. From my perspective this implies that the sacred story is the "inner" form of experience, the embodied self. In that sense, this thesis delves into the sacred stories of organizations and the competing/conflicting stories which evolve as part of our living within the landscaped organizational conduit.

This idea of sacredness is of major significance to teachers. First of all, in the field of education the commonly accepted supremacy of theory over practice gives theory the quality of a sacred story (Connelly and Clandinin, 1994). This identifies those who spread the theory as being more expert or better knowers of education than those who teach. This may, in part, explain why teaching is dilemma-laden. For teachers who live by their practices, the practice is felt as being sacred as they enact the theory. For administrators the theories of programs being implemented from their stories are sacred. One becomes a competing story against the other and in the end, it appears the sacred story of the organization plays a more dominant role than does that of an individual and is lived out in the conflicting story of group rights versus individual rights. This leaves a story of organizational importance suspended over the landscape.

Connelly and Clandinin (1992) discuss sacred and mundane
stories within the context of professional knowledge and education. Although their discussion is based on the collaborative relationship between schools and universities, a parallel can be seen between schools, school boards, and unions. In both areas "sacred stories define professional knowledge contexts and govern the political relation . . . by shaping the specific, mundane stories to which individuals adhere" (p. 6). This idea is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 when I address the question: should arbitration be the means used to settle disputes within the education system?

Arbitration, Deviance, and Control

The act of alleged insubordination carries with it implications of deviatory behaviour in the sense that one is seen as diverging from an expected course of thought or an accepted standard of practice in a group. Participants' fear of being identified, stigmatized, or incriminated gives research into arbitration a sensitive character. Arbitration is adversarial, it is shaped from competing/conflicting stories. A researcher probing the stories of both parties may be seen as "threatening the alignments, interests, or security of those in conflict, especially those who are in positions of relative power"

Tucker (1994) gives a vivid account of how teachers feel about having to seek help through employee assistant programs which parallel those given by teachers who have to use arbitration as a means of settling disputes.
(Renzetti & Lee, 1993, p. 6), those playing out positional roles as administrators.

Concerns may arise as to what kinds of stories the researcher will tell. Will the sacred story of the organization be placed in question? Some may feel it to be part of Toni Morrison's (1993, pp. 13-14) policing narrative, which means that if the organization watches me, I in turn should watch the organization as we contribute to the shaping of each other's stories. In short, the researcher may be perceived as a troublemaker restorying the sacred organizational story, intruding upon what has already been shaped as the organizational narrative.

Since I have begun this study my spouse has asked me (journal entry, July/93) if I was not trying to get into an ant hill without disturbing the ants. He also asked if I was willing to accept any possible consequences which may occur as a result of my having written this thesis. One administrator has told me that board directors and superintendents are going to come out looking less favourable. A professor said something to the effect that he disliked administrators as much as I did but administrators had a job to do. I interpreted the comments to mean that I should not be talking about any administrator's actions in an arbitration case, if that was my intent.

The point I am making is that none of these people asked me what I thought of administrators. They drew conclusions,
they restored my story. Is that because of the organizational story which has already been established? Is it expected that the sacred story of an organization will remain intact while individual stories change? In point of fact, I am an administrator and as an administrator I try to reflect on what it is we as administrators do. But, in making assumptions from my storying these people raise some significant questions for me about the importance of positioning on the landscape and how that identifies people with greater or lesser power when shaping the organizational story.

There seems to be prevalent acceptance, by those in lower positions on the organizational landscape, that those in higher positions get more protection than those below, for the good of the organization. This was a common theme in the four grievors' stories and at least two of the union stories in this study. Two concerns arise from this discussion. One is that of individual rights versus group rights or management rights, both of which may be affected by the study. Another is the protection of the organizations' sacred stories. This probing surfaces several questions. Does legitimated authority4) or a positional landscape give a person the right not to be questioned, studied, or written about? Can the sacred story be shaken enough to be reshaped into a new story,

4)See Dennis Wrong (1979) for a more extensive discussion of power and legitimated authority.
or at least a changing story? At what cost do we protect the sacred story as it is being told? Can we assume that those in the upper-echelon-story tell a more moral story because of their positions on the landscape or that they should be excluded from research because of their positions? Is there a need for voice at the administrative level and between the administrative level and teachers to allow these stories to be told? Are these some of the same issues which blocked exposure of the Mount Cashel scandal for over twenty years?

Arbitration and the Invested Interests of Powerful People

Organizational positions are occupied by humans, a "flesh-and-blood personality with motivation" (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 40). We come to our position on the landscape with a complex set of values, desires, expectations, and other orientations which influence our actions. In short, we bring our own stories. There are things we may wish to preserve or expand or positions we may want to protect or achieve.

Gronn's (1985) study, which is referred to in Chapter 8, is

_____

Mount Cashel was an orphanage run by the Christian Brothers in Newfoundland. In 1988 the disclosure of decades of sexual abuse within the orphanage led to its closure, a provincial inquiry into the justice system, and other disclosures within orphanages and other institutions rocked the country. Harris' (1990) book, Unholy Orders gives a detailed account of the hearings which took place under the Hugh's inquiry. The results are yet to be released from the provincial Department of Justice. Secret stories abound and from time to time surface through the media. Arrests are still being made in 1997. One such arrest was Brother Lawlor, son of John Lawlor who was the Chief of Police during the Mount Cashel Scandal.
one example of this kind of story.

According to Morgan (1986, p. 149), "we live in the midst of our interests," see others as encroachers, and spend time engaging in defense or attack mechanisms in order to keep what we believe to be rightfully ours. In narrative terms, we want to construct, live, and protect our own stories. Since organizations operate on the basis of more than one player the interactions of many bear witness to the thick and rich plot lines of competing and conflicting stories in organizational life.

This is the shaping story of an organizational landscape. Its terrain is not flat but rather is conduit positioned and diversely layered. We live on/in different positions and move back and forth as required in order to function in the roles which make up our daily lives. This is the shaping story in education that Connelly and Clandinin (1992) refer to as the sacred story. "The mundane stories are those of the everyday institutional life" (p. 5). Both intertwine as stories within the personal and professional knowledge contexts of educators. Both have limits which are encountered by those who push its seams as the conduit sets its own boundaries.

These limits are discussed in Chapter 3 with reference to doing research and again in Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 with reference to the participants' stories and my own partial autobiography. In Chapter 3 I discuss some of the dilemmas encountered as I went through the decision-making process of
how I was going to shape the methodology for the thesis.
Chapter 3
Research and Its Limitations

I never wake, at first without recalling, chilled, all those other waking times, those similar stark views from similarly lighted precipices: dizzying precipices from which the distant, glittering world revealed itself as a brooding and separated scene - and so let slip a queer implication, that I myself was both observer and observable, and so a possible object of my own humming awareness.

(Dillard, 1987)

The Ethical Review

As with most research which involves human subjects, an ethical review protocol was completed before the commencement of the study. The data includes an autobiography; government, ministry, school board and teachers' union documents and reports; and personal letters. In July, 1993 when I completed the ethical review I wrote, "There may be an issue as I am not sure of the legality of using personal letters. In this case the recipient is aware of my intent and has given permission for their use in the study. Pseudonyms will be used." The ethical review also included the following information. I have left the text in the future tense to indicate a thought process which occurred before the writing of the thesis. It is as follows:

The data is to be collected through semi-structured interviews, autobiographical reflection, and a perusal of documents. Formal contact will be made with teachers' unions to obtain access and informal interview contact with participants. There will also be member checks for the autobiography. Sample letters have been attached in appendix A. Information to be taken from existing
records include decision awards from arbitration cases, government acts/policies, teachers' union policies, newspapers, memos, and journal reports. Identifiability will be removed from all official papers.

There will be twenty subjects who include school board administrators, ministry officials, union officials, teachers, other community members (maybe some students/former students), the grievor of an arbitration case, and a witness of an arbitration case. Subjects will be selected for inclusion in the study from the researcher's personal knowledge of the subjects and, later, as appropriate for the study. The researcher and members of the thesis committee will have access to the raw data. Names will be deleted and replaced by codes known only to the investigator. All data will be stored in a locked file. Stored tapes and transcripts will eventually be destroyed. Some tapes will be returned to interviewees as requested. Interview notes will be distributed to interviewees for clarification and verification. Participants will be informed that pseudonyms will be used in the written report. Participants will be informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time and the researcher will share interview interpretations with participants. Written consent will be obtained from all participants. The forms in appendix A include a letter to a union official, a letter to participants, and a letter to a lawyer for clarification of terms.

Since some of the initial methodology has changed and the proposal is much longer than the above excerpt, I conclude this section with just the final paragraph which reads:

The validity of the study can be checked in a number of ways. First of all, I am using multiple sources of evidence which provides what Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) refer to as "thick description." Stories of the arbitration event will originate from several individuals who observed or took part in a number of different roles or positions: school support staff, family, administration, teachers, outside observers, union representatives, lawyers, and others. As well, interviews with government officials, union representatives, and lawyers will be used to establish an interpretation of arbitration procedures. Documents such as government acts, school board acts/policies, newsletters, and filed arbitration decisions will be compared and contrasted. Throughout the whole writing process I, as researcher, will be practicing reflexivity by keeping a continuing journal in which introspections
are recorded daily (Spradley, 1979). However, even within my attempts to triangulate, difficulties will arise.

I use this and the remainder of this chapter to demonstrate that there is more to writing a thesis than simply completing an ethical review. Once other people become involved the researcher has both legal and moral obligations to contend with for the university, the committee, the participants, and for herself.

The Ethical Dilemmas of Research

From the initial stages of this thesis, ethical issues surfaced and remained prevalent throughout the writing. In a journal entry (Feb. 1/94) I wrote: "I look at books like Courting Disaster (Barker, 1990) and The Satanic Verses (Rushdie, 1988) and feel like I'm on the shore of an ocean about ready to step on an [ice pan] that may accept my weight or sink. . . ." In order for the writing to have taken the shape of a narrative, the stories of many had to be told and then retold. It was and is an inspection of lives, a quest (Taylor, 1989) of both participants and researcher. This has given the research a "tone of intimacy", which involves the researcher, the author of each story, and the reader. Such an interrelationship raised a number of ethical questions

---

"Measor and Sikes (1992) refer to this in their discussion on biography and, in particular, life history. They define life history as "sociologically read biography" (p. 209) and indicate that biography is life recreated, placing the work of biographers in a "tone of intimacy" (p. 10)."
dealing with secondhand stories, participant stories, large
group reaction to other's stories, questioning from
participants who were in authority positions, participant
identity, and confidentiality. The following journal entry
(Jan/94) clearly indicates how I was feeling:

I've been transcribing interviews and thinking about just how consequential some of these stories are. I've been asking myself just what is research? Who is it that we are allowed to question? Do I have the right to question superiors? And, if I don't, what is the point of doing this project? Will it cause more harm than good?

How much cover-up will I have to use in order to uncover the issues which, I feel, are detrimental\(^6\) to this thesis?

Is it just as wrong not to question as it is to question, and do I find a workable balance? How much of me do I give to this research and how much do I take from my participants?

Are things true because we see them? How much of what we see is real? How much is imagination and interpretation? Does it matter?

As can be seen from the initial ethical review, it was my intent when I began this study to take one arbitration case and reconstruct it according to the stories of each participant. However, by the time I had gotten through the process which I am about to describe, I had changed my mind. My reasons for changing from a one-case study to interviewing twenty-one participants from several cases is related in the following story.

I set out to interview as many participants as I could in

\(^6\)I used the word 'detrimental' in 1994. I think now it should have been a word like central. Maybe it was not detrimental to the thesis at all but rather maybe it was detrimental to my understanding.
one specific case and felt that I was doing an adequate job of maintaining confidentiality until I interviewed participant Claude (Journal, Oct/93). Questions surfaced such as "how was I going to analyze my data? Was I going to question and re-question interviewees? Was I going to interview participant Larry? And, if I was, could I do it on the same day as I interviewed Claude?" Before I realized it I had fallen into the trap of disclosing another possible participant even though I had not given Claude a definite answer. I knew that the suggestion was enough to draw conclusions. At that point I also knew that even if I stated that I could not disclose that information as a right of protection for Larry, I had literally given up the right to ask him for an interview.

One question which arises from this incident is who am I supporting with this degree of confidentiality, the status quo or the participants? Did the participants want to be protected? I do not know as I never asked either party. There were signs from questions asked, hesitations, and comments that led me to believe some of them wanted to be protected. I was very much aware that I had signed an ethical review which I did not want to breach. It is an issue which underlies this thesis in the sense that I have already acknowledged that in researching arbitration from my position on the landscape, I felt like I was dealing with a sensitive topic.

Another participant, Mark (1994), at least on three
occasions during our interview, told a telephone caller that he was in the middle of doing an interview. It could have been taken as a job interview or a position evaluation interview but I got the feeling that the person on the other end of the line knew what kind of interview he was doing. In other words, it could have been more of my own fears rather than the participant's. I did find it interesting, however, that for someone who had already stated that he did not want to be identified he was advertising the fact that he was doing an interview. I had expected him to say that he was busy at the moment, that he would get back to the caller.

When I was getting ready to leave, a man, who I suspected to be one of the callers, came into Mark's office and may have recognized me as a teacher doing a research project. I wondered (journal entry Jan/94) how seriously Mark was taking the research. Was the whole interview a cover story? It made me question: how could one write about one arbitration case and protect all the participants? Better still, how could I maintain non-identifiability if the participant did not? Was it as big a deal for the participants as it was for me as researcher?

In offering participants the opportunity to tell their stories I was providing access to the doings of others in a written form for, in telling their stories, participants also related the stories of others by using names and talking about what may be perceived to be the justices and injustices caused
by significant others. In other words, they had competing stories. Many complexities arose from these types of accounts in that accusations surfaced and story tellers took sides. Hence, the potential for harm was great both for the sacred story of the organization and for the individuals. There were sacred stories that some wanted kept secret.

How was I to deal with both observing and recording stories which might be damaging to individuals? How was a balance between an honest project and participant confidentiality to be maintained? I felt that some of the participants were conscious of this as well as some of them tried to avoid the interview. For example, when I called one participant (1993) we agreed that I would do an interview, but then, when I called back to set up the appointment I was told that the participant was too busy, or would not be home at that time. I made several attempts at getting an interview (Oct. 28/93; Oct. 31/93; May 8/94; May 9/94; May 19/94) before I finally gave up, except for what he agreed to offer during our telephone conversations. When I called participant Janet (Jan/94), spouse Tom, who left me waiting on the phone for quite a while, returned to say Janet was "asleep or something." Tom left me with the impression that Janet did not want to talk with me. In another interview participant Mark (1994) felt that the interview was taking a long time, an estimated 90 minutes when, in fact, we had been talking for

\[^{17}\text{See Woods (1986) discussion on research observation.}\]
Therefore, although participants did not openly discuss protection, I found that some of them did not find it easy to talk, especially the administrators. Hence, I spent a considerable amount of time talking about non-identifiability and confidentiality and returned the participants' stories to them for deletions, edits, and clarification.

The easiest participants to get interviews with were the grievors. Three offered me their stories after they heard what my thesis was about. A fourth took one phone call with no coaxing or discussion, just an outright "yes." In the midst of all this interview interaction I was quite unsure as to how I should proceed.

According to Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) a "research bargain" could have been struck which laid out a series of clauses to be observed by both parties. For example, I could have established an understanding of what kind of relationship would be expected between participants and me, setting down rules about what both participants and I were allowed to do within the context of the research, airing each others' expectations and accepting these conditions as being fair. In other words, I could have organized it according to a justice-rule type of interaction. For this to have happened a positive relationship had to be established between the researcher and each person telling the stories. Such a building of trust and commitment between the participants and me would have been easier if a minimal number of participants
had been involved. Also, the fact that I interviewed participants in more than one province, consistent or continual ongoing relationships became difficult except via the phone or by mail.

In using the landscape as an organizational metaphor and in recognizing that the landscape is a positioned conduit, moving from one level to another created some difficulty. For some participants it meant talking about their bosses, for others it meant talking about employees. It felt like risky business.

In such an interactive, intimate situation as an arbitration hearing, I found it difficult to "research bargain" with participants as many of them interacted not only with me but also among themselves. One participant wanted to tell me how to conduct the study, what questions should be asked, and how it had to be written up. Whether this is an experience other researchers have had, I am not sure. But, arbitrations are witnessed by select groups of people, mostly administrators, some of whom may have written theses themselves, and who also work in the same office as other participants, go to the same meetings with significant others, and so forth. I feared that the interviews would turn to gossip, another form of storying over which I knew I had no control. This became an issue as well as I felt the need to control, direct, and shape what I was doing.

Hence, I began to feel that the larger or closer the
group became, the more problematic the relationships. The deeper I penetrated the boundaries of each participant, the more competing stories I had to deal with. It soon became obvious that I had to ask myself how a sense of trust could be established if the webs of "she said this and he said that" became a prominent part of the study? The landscape metaphor is strong here as it indicates the tense situations which can be caused through human interaction. People strive to interpret, understand, and live out their identities in positional roles on the organizational landscape. The multiple interpretations are a basis for competing and conflicting stories.

That conflict would have become a part of my dilemma if I made all participants identifiable, allowing them to see the final product, and obtaining permission from them to use the information that I had gathered. Although this form of participant disclosure carries ethical safeguards in that each participant knows what the others are saying about him or her, knowledge of this sort becomes a risk (Bertaux, 1981). Although it diminished the distance between the researcher and the participant, I was concerned with opening old wounds among participants with which some of them, I believe, did not wish to deal. This concern was validated by one of the participants when he remarked that the arbitration award was in a binder sitting on his shelf and he had not opened it since the day he received it in the mail (Journal entry,
BethAnn (1993) began her interview by saying "I [haven't] even picked up a paper. I didn't even go through the folder in all this time. . . . " From an interview with another participant I journaled (Nov/93):

I had visions of having people 'spill their guts' and not being able to find closure, or breaking down and not being able to regain composure, or having to relive their story after they left me. Were they lying awake concerned about what they said? Were they reliving their experiences? How painful was it for them? What about the files they turned over to me? What do I do with those? There are many questions going through my mind that I would like to have answered. It's not an easy process. At times I feel totally incompetent.48

I then decided to identify people already revealed in the public documents and make the participants on the periphery of the study non-identifiable. However, I knew that for both of these options I would have to ensure that all the identifiable participants saw any evidence which pertained to them, pertained to the issues with which they had dealt, and be permitted to give counterstories. According to Heron (1981), people "have a moral right to participate in decisions that claim to generate information about them." As such, I had to share power with the participants. However, problems arose in that some of the participants held a higher position in the line of employment than I. Therefore, it became rather difficult for a sharing of power to be established. How can

48I no longer think that incompetent is the appropriate word. It is more a feeling of helplessness, of believing in the importance of the information and needing it, wanting it, and yet being very concerned over failing my participants. I want to be able to give something back.
one share a mutual position with another if they are living different plot lines? The director of the school district for the case I had intended to use would not participate in the study. One superintendent (1993) agreed to an interview but then wanted input into the writing of the thesis and later gave enough reasons as to why he could not do the interview each time I called, that I eventually took his evasion as a decline. One director never responded to my letter requesting to do an interview, just dead silence. I never had the nerve from my teacher position on the landscape to ask a second time.

In a manner of speaking, the administrators may have had nothing to gain by telling their stories and therefore, had a legitimate reason for either opting out of the study or wanting to be in control of what was written. Another reason why a thesis from a subordinate may not be welcome may echo from the words of Becker (1970) when he writes:

> Officials usually have to lie. That is a gross way of putting it, but not inaccurate. Officials must lie because things are seldom as they ought to be. For a great variety of reasons, well-known to sociologists, institutions are refractory. They do not perform as society would like them to. Hospitals do not cure people; prisons do not rehabilitate prisoners; schools do not educate students.

> Since they are supposed to, officials develop ways both of denying the failure of the institution to perform as it should and explaining those failures which cannot be hidden. An account of an institution's operation from the point of view of subordinates therefore casts doubt on the official line and may possibly expose it as a lie. (p. 128)

I anticipated that another dilemma may have been
encountered if I used one case and the participants in
authority positions gained access to the stories of others on
lower positions of the conduit\textsuperscript{49}. As clearly indicated by
Tucker (1993, p. 219), preconceived consequences make
participants wary of talking. Here is part of the dialogue
that Tucker, as the researcher had with one teacher (T =
Tucker and R = Respondent):

\begin{quote}
T: What are the advantages of having an EAP (Employee
Assistance Programs) connected with your place of
employment?

R: Now, to me, that's a two way street.

T: Well, I'm interested in exploring both sides of the
street.

R: My name is not on that is it (the tape)? It
won't be used will it?

T: No, I won't use any real names. I'll give
everyone a pseudonym or omit the name entirely.

R: Oh, o.k. Now our conversation is confidential,
isn't it? No one from here will hear that tape?

T: No one. And your name is not on the tape. I
may use parts of the conversation to make a
point in my thesis, but no identification will
accompany it.

R: I'll give you a perfect example....

What this respondent told Tucker was that the fear was
not that confidentiality would be broken between client and
counsellor. The fear was that other administrators might hear

\textsuperscript{49}Delamont (1978) makes reference to "guilty knowledge" which
teachers obtain from students' files. The teacher-student
relationship here parallels school district director-teacher
relations in terms of file accessibility.
about it and decide that the client could not do his or her job because of the problem and then label him or her as being an alcoholic or being emotionally disturbed.

The fear of those in higher positions of authority finding out something about an employee is common in many jobs. Possible consequences, although they may never happen, can stop the best of us from talking. Most people want to keep their jobs and therefore people like to remain on the good side of their bosses. Few want to rock the boat or tell conflicting stories. Most would probably like to play their roles as they think others expect them to play them. As indicated by the participant's dialogue with Tucker, identification can be costly. In my view, identification of this sort is counter productive and if used could possibly destroy the whole thesis. To use a much quoted verse from the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, "The moving finger writes; and having writ, moves on: nor all our piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all our tears wash out a word of it." I wanted to avoid creating a situation which disabled participation 50.

The third solution was to make everyone non-identifiable and mask the setting so that participants were at least not automatically recognizable. For this option I decided to put together a theoretical base that described an arbitration set

50 This is part of the sensitive topic issue discussed in Chapter 2.
of circumstances through the use of legitimate deception. In other words, cast the stories in a parallel situation with characters who would be non-identifiable. The setting would take place in another province, in a school of a fictitious town run by a fictitious school board. In doing so, all participants, including myself as the researcher, would have been protected, at least legally, and the essence of the storying central to the study, could have remained intact. Fictionalizing would have allowed me freedom to refer to all who shared similar experiences without pointing a finger at people who may have been identified. Even then, there was no guarantee that readers would not be able to assume who some of the participants were. Ask people of Burgeo, Newfoundland, if they can make assumptions about characters in Mowat's (1972) A Whale For A Killing. Anyone talking to the more familiar residents of the town might hear, "Oh, I know who that is!" Mowat may have stated that his book was a fiction but within that fiction lies a deeper reality. What fictionalizing does is minimize participant identification and lessens the chances of legal action by allowing a writer to say these characters do not exist.

However, other issues of non-identification arose as indicated by a journal entry (Nov/93):

As I sit here waiting for a possible participant I have become very much aware of how conscious I have become over participant nonidentifiability.

Tierney (1993) uses this method to write about a university.
I had set up an appointment to do an interview with a person who had gone through a grievance procedure. We decided to meet at OISE, as she was in Toronto for a short stay, find a room, maybe on the 10th floor, and do the interview. Meanwhile, I received a phone call from a friend who wanted to meet for lunch, and I was to be free at that time. As she was making plans with me she sensed a kind of hesitation in me and asked if she was intruding on my daily planned activities.

Her question made me realize that as she was speaking I was going over predetermined visions I had of her arriving at OISE at the same time my participant was leaving, see me with this person and put two and two together. It bothered me enough that I changed my time with the participant and when we met I ushered her to the 2nd floor, instead of the 10th, and found a vacant classroom. I was afraid to take her to the 10th floor, afraid that we might be interrupted, or that someone would ask what we were doing, or ask questions that would put us on the spot. Where do you go with a participant where: (a) you are not going to run into people one or both of you know? (b) you will not be interrupted? (c) you feel comfortable and safe? (d) no one is going to [listen in]? (e) there is a sense of privacy? I was worried to death.

What had to be decided was which style or combination would be reasonable for the thesis which would both protect the participants as much as possible and maintain an acceptable level of credibility as a piece of academic writing for me as researcher. For me the decision was aided by several books.

Writing Styles and Approaches to Sensitive Topics:

Harris (1990), when he wrote on the Mount Cashel scandal, used the names of all those who had testified at the Hughes Inquiry in very much the same way that they had been referred to in court transcripts. However, any participants who were protected under the Young Offender's Act or had charges
pending were given pseudonyms to protect their identity. As such, a combination of both identifiable and non-identifiable names was used. However, reliable sources have told me that Harris did not seek permission to write his book from those about whom he wrote. He took the names from published documents. Technically he did not have to obtain permission or approval. But, ethically was he being fair to those who might now have wanted to put the matter to rest? According to some of his characters Harris was not fair. Since I heard a story from a relative of one of the victims about how that particular victim reacted to Harris' book, I became both legally and ethically dubious to discuss field notes from legal sources without masking identities. Also, if I were to use this style of writing, the field notes I have collected would be limited to what I can legally disclose through evidence which has already been made public.

Peter Irons (1988), after prefacing his book with his own personal story, told the court version of each case that he used and then allowed the complainants to tell the story in their own words. In this case, those in charge of "the system" were not given the opportunity to counter-argue. One reason for this may have been that any new accusations were generalized more towards either the public at large or the justice system in general rather than specific individuals. From my perspective, however, he did slap a couple of judges on the wrists for how they handled particular cases. Irons'
style of writing, as Dorsen explains in the preface, "presents constitutional law with a human face," most of whose faces are identifiable. There was no mention of the procedure he used to produce the final product. Whether he conferred with all the participants to obtain permission for any descriptions written about them or even for their actual participation in the book is unknown.

In *Small Town in Mass Society*, Vidich and Bensman (1960) gave a detailed description of the daily life of one small American town. The two sociologists noted the roles which politics, religion, social position, and education played in the experience of the town's people, and the impact larger society had on the residents' ideas, opinions, and actions. In a footnote, Vidich and Bensman explained:

> All personal names throughout the text are fictitious. Although this may not hide personal identities from those who are familiar with Springdale, our material could not be meaningfully presented without reference to individuals. Since political affairs are public in the broadest sense of the term, our procedure of using names and reports of official public meetings is necessary. (p. 114)

Whether or not the author considered future repercussions of using data that could identify participants was not made clear in the text. Measor and Sikes (1992) suggest that any point which is likely to adversely affect any of the participants should not be made at all. But, how do we, as researchers, know when a point is going to have a future adverse affect? By what we know now?
The Dilemma Continues:

There is cause for concern in Measor and Sike's (1992) position in that by limiting our sources of knowledge, we limit knowledge. Many participants who choose to disclose their stories do so not so much for themselves since they have already paid the price through what they have experienced, but for others. There are those (White & Epstein, 1990) who might say that such action is a narrative means to a therapeutic end. It seems to me there are issues of voice here. There is therapy in using real voice, in telling real stories in that to construct and reconstruct helps to create meaning. No one can deny the price paid by the victims of Mount Cashel but how many more would have been victimized if disclosure had not happened? Concealment and protection, for the good of the sacred story, has its limits.

The issues which have been raised throughout my writing have been difficult ones and I do not claim to have the answers. However, Beattie (1965, p. 55) offers this advice, "No hard and fast rule can be laid down; these are matters of conscience rather than science." As researcher I was faced with making the decisions as I experienced the thesis process. I believe that participants as people were not forced into telling their stories. If they opened up their lives to me it was because they wanted to have their stories told, especially

52At least three of the participants interviewed said that they not only did it for themselves but for others.
the grievors. And some of those with whom I had encountered some hesitation became more willing as they moved into new positions or retired from their professions. I believe that in telling their stories participants added their own safeguards to the research situation, as was the case with some of the administrators, lawyers, and union representatives who only told me the organizational story. According to Nyberg (1993) adding safeguards is normal in any storying situation, and so presumably participants only told me what they wanted me to know.

One of the major ethical issues pointed towards me. I did not come to this study as a neutral scientist. When I began this thesis I believe that my position as a teacher flavoured my writing with employee prejudices. However, if that is the case, then I also think I have offered a counter balance to the current literature on teacher–administrator relations, which I believe reveals an administrative bias. In my opinion, any literature which focuses on how to shape teachers or writes about teachers as resisters tells an administrative story. But, besides that, four years ago I became principal of a secondary school and I suspect that the longer I stay in this position and continue to write my thesis, the more my writing will be slanted again as I take on new experiences via my new position on the professional landscape. There will be a dialogical mix as I live the administrator's story.
Secondly, my personal involvement in Teachers' Union vs. Employer has inevitably revealed some teacher biases throughout the thesis. Durrenmatt (1989), in his novel, explains it clearly when he writes:

> Now there is no such thing as an objective witness. Every witness tends to blend subconscious invention into his experience. An event to which he is witness takes place both outside and inside the witness. He perceives the event in his own way, imprints the event on his memory, and his memory goes on re-imprinting. His memory reproduces a very different event. (p. 134)

As Connelly and Clandinin (1992, p. 11) explain, "The more important and powerful something is to us, the riskier and more dangerous it may be to our being." I do not want to be, as Britzman (1986) puts it, a prisoner of my own biography, locked in and limited by my own way of knowing. In a journal entry (Dec/93) I wrote:

> My method is . . . based on the field notes gathered from interviews, experiences of the writer, and reflected thoughts which have been recorded on little bits of paper.

> The use of narrative becomes increasingly more difficult as I become even more conscious of the fact that as researcher I am doing more than collecting data. I'm feeling for the participants as well as for myself. I have already been asked what form the thesis is going to take as if I have or should have some pre-determined shape with which I should be working. And, I don't. What I have is pages upon pages of stories which I somehow want to piece together into a unified whole without taking pieces out of the participants.

> It's easy to say that I am going to describe an arbitration but as diverse factors come into play the picture becomes muddled. It reminds me of the poem by Dennis Lee which goes like this:

---

I am sitting
In the middle
Of a rather Muddy
Puddle
With my bottom
Full of bubbles
And my rubbers
Full of Mud.

While my jacket
And my sweater
Go on slowly
Getting wetter
As I very
Slowly settle
To the Bottom
Of the Mud.

And I find
What a person
With a puddle
Round his middle
Thinks of mostly
In the muddle
Is the Muddiness of Mud.

These stories are human experiences, human living. What appears to be data for me, as researcher, is life to them [the participants]. And the fact that I become a part of the stories by listening, questioning, and responding makes it living for me. It is easier to keep it clean by rationalizing that you must keep a distance but saying that in a thesis does not mean that you are doing it . . . . The reader never has the complete experience and neither does the researcher or the participant. Writing so that a whole picture emerges in the process of writing a thesis is the most difficult of all. I could write it in a thesis funnel, a model or guide, and then fill in the blanks like writing a Hardy Boy novel or I can risk searching for my own style. (Barter, Journal Entry, 1993)

I believe that we should take a closer look at Connelly and Clandinin's (1992, p. 12) argument that "instead of denigrating our biographies we . . . need to acknowledge that our lives and our stories of our lives are important."
A Personal Encounter With Research:

Writers such as Weber (1947), Greenfield (1993), and Clandinin and Connelly (1995) suggest that no such thing as neutrality exists. I am a teacher. I am a principal. I have experienced an arbitration hearing. If I have shown a bias towards grievors it is because I have watched grievors suffer and have heard about the sufferings of others. If I have worn "right and wrong" blinders it is not because I questioned the actual grievances, the decisions for those have already been awarded by the arbitrators, but rather that I questioned the actions of participants. In at least two cases, I believe I saw two people's rights violated and responded to what I saw. Other grievors told similar stories of feeling violated. Taylor (1989, p. 52) writes "because we have to determine our place in relation to the good, therefore we cannot be without orientation to it." It is an "inescapable structural requirement of human agency" (p. 52). And arbitration is seen as a human agency in that its process is storied by humans whose modus operandi is institutionally framed. By that I mean there exists formally systematized written procedures positioned to activate a particular process, in this case, arbitration.

According to Clandinin and Connelly (1991, p. 274), narrativist inquirers usually do not start research with a preconceived problem but rather they begin with "an interest in a particular phenomenon that could be understood
narratively . . . and then try to make sense of the practice from the perspective of the participants, researcher, and practitioner." As defined by Reber (1985) the word 'phenomenon' as taken from the Greeks, refers to "an appearance, that which appears." In other words, "any perceptible change, any occurrence that is open to observation." This change can be physical, a fact, an event, or "an internal experience of which one is aware." In short, phenomenon is the data of personal experience.

I was a participant in an event. I judged and responded in order to ask myself the questions which I felt needed to be asked, not only of others, but also of myself. I see this as a Deweyian concept of inquiry advanced in steps from "belief to doubt to reflection to empirical reference"54 created from an experience. Judging the practice of arbitration participants, in other words, having a preconceived notion, being critical and then, reflecting, is part of the means through which I reconstructed meaning. As stated in Chapter 1, my being critical of the situation was one of the reasons why I took an interest in the phenomenon, why I wanted or needed to make sense of the practice of arbitration, and why I wanted to write this thesis in the first place.

My personal involvement, from this perspective, could be seen as a delimitation. Much of the data for the research has been obtained from written awards of arbitration boards and

54As cited by Greene (1973, p. 127).
from the stories of participants with written documentation as evidence. My personal involvement provides additional experiential detail for understanding. Technically, with a different methodology I could have avoided acknowledging that experience. Readers might have wondered if I had encountered arbitration but they would not have known for sure. Would the "not knowing" have made the research more valid for the reader? Omitting detail, especially one as prominent as the position of the researcher, offered a view that would be contradictory to the intent of the study which was to "explore arbitration as a lived event." And, in my case, I am both researcher and an experienced participant. The leaving out of such a detail might have made it less cumbersome for me because I would not have needed to explain and the reader would not have had to deal with another issue. Since this thesis focuses on the experience of arbitration as told by participants, I felt that readers should know that I, as researcher, have an arbitration story of my own. In a journal entry (Feb. 2/94) I asked "Does the authenticity of researcher[s] mean that [they] come clean or that [they] look clean?" And as participant Neil (Interview, 1993) said, "I have to live with myself." To deny that would have been to ignore the reality of a narrative thesis.

55 See Wolcott (1994) for more on research disclosure.

56 Again, Wolcott (1994) is a prime example of selected disclosure.
In order for me to find meaning, negotiation had to take place between the participants and me which included coming to terms with my own reflectivity/reflexivity. As the researcher of this study I feel a certain obligation to state my experience and attempt to deal with it as a part of the study, rather than try to screen it and pretend it nonexistent. I wanted to learn from my experience by claiming authority and assuming responsibility for what I have written. If, for example, I have tried to unduly or unfairly influence the study or impose a steady negative potential upon the thesis, then I have ethically overstepped my bounds as a researcher. If, on the other hand, I have used my story as a part of the data which I had to reconstruct, I am using arbitration episodes to show how images of arbitration within an education context reflect personal and professional experiences, which in turn, get expressed in practice both personally and professionally.

The teacher in Clandinin's (1985) study portrayed her classroom as home, an image which Clandinin says originates in both the "personal and professional spheres" of a teacher's life. I too, from both my personal and professional experiences of an arbitration case have offered "a theoretical outline of the experiential dimensions of an image." As such, my story is a component of both my personal, practical, and

---

\(^{57}\)See Tappan and Brown (1989) for a discussion on lessons learned from stories.
theoretical knowledge and is, therefore, a part of my narrative. Part of the justification for my thesis is that story is a component of everyone's knowledge\textsuperscript{58}.

In the arbitration I experienced there was a multiple interrelationship which moved through the whole process: the grievor's side which involved his or her associates, the administrator's side which involved his or her colleagues, and then there was a possible crossing of boundaries between the parties in the two groups. Facts became separated from stories and attached to new ones, the consequences of which were both expected and unexpected. As Pirandello\textsuperscript{59} says "But a fact is like a sack . . . when it's empty it won't stand up. And in order to make it stand up you must first of all pour into it all the reasons and all the feelings which have caused it to exist." Part of that lies within the realm of personal reflection and experience on the part of the researcher. In other words, a researcher's balancing act lies between narcissism and research and has to be dealt with before the completion of a thesis.

Another limitation arises with my experience of narrative. As much as I believe that the most appropriate way to construct this thesis is through narrative, I have found that such writing can become so personal in a broad,

\textsuperscript{58}See Lakoff and Johnson (1980) for argument which places human experience and understanding at the core of knowledge.

\textsuperscript{59}As cited by Greenfield (1979, p. 52).
enveloping sense, that it can run out of control. There are so many loose ends when one is dealing with life that I sometimes feel the only way they can be tied together is between birth and death. Certain points of living become bolder and more memorable than others, experiences overlap, and memory is fallible. This creates a murkiness that can cause a writer to write indefinitely or to write without limits or closure. This may be one of the differences between life and a play. A play has limits which are shorter than life and less layered in conflict. I have to find some way to set some limits for myself, in order to finish my task. There is life before and after living an event. It can never be rewritten exactly as lived, recapped verbatim. Instead, what we are left with in the recapping are bits and pieces of things, frames of experiences which can be isolated for a moment in order to be retold but yet connected to the self in a permanent way. In a grain of sand there is a universe.

Conclusion:

In this chapter I have tried to place in context what a researcher goes through to shape the text of a thesis. It is much like the stage rehearsals of a play which the audience does not see. It is like the enacted process of arbitration that is not portrayed in the final award. It is the mundane story of everyday living which is very much connected to the sacred story referred to in Chapter 2. It is the messiness of
living on a conduited landscape with significant others which leads to the actual methodology used. What I have attempted to convey is that the decision to write a thesis is not a spur of the moment choice. Rather, it is a deliberate, conscious process of reflection and decision-making. The methodology upon which I decided is described in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4
Methodology

Through telling we come to know our experiences in new ways. In planning the story to tell, we reveal our understandings to ourselves first. We share both insider and outsider perceptions of the experience. We look over our own shoulders to watch ourselves. (Gomez and Tabachnick, 1992)

Resolving the Ethical Dilemma: Becoming a Narrative Researcher

Recent writings on narrative inquiry indicate the newness of using story as a means of inquiry. According to Carter (1993, p. 11) when story is made a focal point in the study of teaching, researchers enter "unfamiliar and quite turbulent waters." The relationship between researchers and participants become complex. Since lives are being lived even as stories are being told, researchers become part of the process of inquiry. The stories of participants and researchers intertwine in a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through the narrative inquiry process.

Narrative is "both phenomenon and method" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1991, p. 121). As researcher I participate in the phenomenon, a phenomenon in which I feel very insecure, not because I fear it but rather because I am intrigued by its richness and by what I believe it has to offer in research. Toni Morrison (1993, p. 27) sums it up succinctly when she writes: "Narrative is radical, creating us at the very moment it is being created." My difficulty with narrative does not rest with the writers of narrative but rather with myself. I
have experienced other methods. I have read the writings and discussed inquiry with significant others who express themselves in ways that are different from narrative.

In writing this thesis I feel that I am crossing boundaries between the employer and the employee, between the administrative world and the teaching world, between the university Department of Educational Administration and the Department of Curriculum. Having been exposed to both fields I use the language of both. The section on Bridging the Literature Gaps in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 are examples of that dilemma.

In saying that, I demonstrate the theory/practice positional split which I believe exists between teachers and administrators. The split is lived out and reinforced via such conduits as our own university structures in that educational administrators are more apt to complete their studies in departments of administration while teachers go to what is sometimes referred to as departments of education or departments of curriculum and instruction. The former conveys a story of theory and policy-making while the latter represents a story of curriculum-making, teaching and learning. This may mean that I am not writing a purely narrative thesis but rather am exposing the dual voice of education through a dual method, one that speaks to administrators and one that speaks to teachers. The teacher side of me reaches out to narrative writers and theorists such
as Connelly and Clandinin. The administrator side of me reaches out to writers who are closest to narrative in the sense that they deal with the human side of administration, the writings of Greenfield and Hodgkinson.

According to Clandinin and Connelly (1996, p. 30), teachers, administrators, and children live out their lives on a "complex, narrative, historical, interwoven, and constantly changing landscape." These professional knowledge landscapes are viewed as very complex places with "multiple layers of meaning that depend on individuals' stories and how individuals are positioned on that landscape, as well as the landscape's own narrative history of shifting values, beliefs, and stories" (p. 30). Two very significant points are made: (a) "Every specific landscape situation should be worked through on its own terms" and (b) "[P]eople are always complex mixes of different plot lines" (p. 30). I believe that I am both experiencing and exhibiting mine by writing in at least dual voices, if not multiple, in order to connect myself to narrative.

In narrative, we as researchers gather empirical evidence by being there, involving participant observation, and by engaging in informal interviews but we also "write ourselves into" the thesis. We not only document the participants' points of view but also write about the process of engaging with others and how our reconstructions are formed as both

---

Footnote: Found in footnote #6.
researcher and person. Connelly and Clandinin (1990, p. 2) differentiate between stories of experience and narrative inquiry by stating that "people by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of those lives, whereas narrative researchers describe such lives, collect and tell stories of them, and write narratives of experience." The whole process is enmeshed in both the living of a narrative and in the writing of a text, "a translation of experience with textual form" (Clifford, 1988).

Not only do I listen to the stories of my participants but my own experience of having testified at an arbitration hearing has left me with stories that I restory as I try to find meaning in what I saw and heard. I believed and I believe that I had been invited to experience procedures and a process which were contradictory to those I thought existed before the experience. In listening to and observing participants at work, and reflecting upon my own life experiences as a daughter, teacher, witness, principal, and a former assistant probation officer for adult offenders, I felt caught between taking part in procedures which conflicted with my underlying sense of what was just and real. Over time I started believing that arbitration procedures did not do all I thought they would, should, or even could accomplish. I felt disillusioned and found myself mentally comparing group rights to individual rights, lived reality to written reality, and asking myself if and how these may affect participants.
Also, in reflecting back, I believe that in experiencing the case to which I was party, I observed the interrelatedness of many of its participants. I heard the stories grow as the circle around the case enlarged its perimeters to people outside the actual grievance hearing. Inside the arbitration room nine people sat around a T-shaped table, the three arbitrators sat at the T, the union representative, the union lawyer, and the grievor sat on one side of the stem while the director, the superintendent, and the school board lawyer sat on the other side. The room also had observers, usually three to five at a time. They were comprised of school principals, superintendents, consultants, and a school district business manager. Some of them took notes as the case progressed. Group pockets formed during coffee breaks, certain people ate together during meals, some teachers back at school talked as if they had a bird's eye view of the proceedings, family members and friends of the opposing parties, and community members speculated. It became evident throughout the process that the arbitration award would not be the only story with which a grievor would have to contend. For me, as I realized the complexity of human relations and its spin-off effects, it meant concentrating on arbitration stories and gathering as many of the experiences as I could.

I believe my involvement to have been an experience,\(^6\)

---

\(^6\)Heshusius (1994, p. 16) refers to "participatory consciousness" or a "mode of consciousness, a way of being in the world, . . . a way of knowing that is concerned with both, the
one that made me interested in others who had experienced arbitration and led me to the writing of this thesis. I was exposed to an arbitration and therefore gained first-hand knowledge of its workings. It is this experience which has driven my inquiry. I am not saying that this is truth because I have experienced it, I am saying that this is what I believe I saw and this is how I felt. I wanted to know if others had encountered similar experiences. It was as if I needed to confirm whether or not this was what "arbitration" is. Therefore, it drove the inquiry in that it encouraged me to ask what other participants saw and how they felt.

In questioning others about what they had experienced and in watching some participants play out their roles, I came to realize that there could be commonality as well as diversity in experience and that an experience can have a lasting effect on the person having the experience. As Eisner (1991) makes clear, we learn lessons from life and daily living is composed of lessons learned from the ad hoc. If we work on the premise that there are competing stories found in educational life, we also have to make the assumption that there are commonalities of experiences found through understanding. The vital question is, could the happenings and feelings of these total act of interest and the participation of the total person." I am not convinced that I reached that level where I can "completely let go of all preoccupation with self and move into a state of complete attention" (p. 17). But, if participatory consciousness reflects a holistic epistemology relationship between truth and interpretation that renders the act of knowing an ethical act, then I certainly have been striving for that state.
participants apply to others? That the issues and decisions of one arbitration case can be used as a precedent for building arguments for future cases and is presented as case law, indicates an affirmative answer. Stories build cases.

As a participant I became immersed in the personal, but it also became evident that my practice, and the practice of others, were not simply the product of our own individuality. Rather, both inside and outside the arbitration hearings, we existed in relation to each other and to others on a landscape which made certain practices possible. From this came my thesis question.

The thesis question, however, did not help in trying to connect theory to practice or in learning how these get played out in organizations. Hence, I used Connelly and Clandinin's (1995, WIP) idea of competing and conflicting stories existing on a conduited landscape where people play out their roles in positioned plot lines. Characters seek to establish their own identities through living secret, sacred, and cover stories on an organizational landscape. The landscape is used to show the complexity of the interconnectedness of interacting with others. These have already been discussed in Chapter 1. The plot line effect is another metaphor which evolved as I searched for a way to show how I felt about the multiple realities my participants had experienced. I also wanted to indicate how complex these realities became as they were shaped into a legal procedure.
I was having difficulty contextualizing how it felt to move about on both the professional and personal landscape. I found a solution in what I experienced when I participated in an arbitration hearing. I wondered about what kinds of stories get recounted. When did I consider something to be an experience? Was it the mundane, day-to-day activity that I encountered or was it more likely to be the out of the ordinary shockers which isolated me or took me out of the mundane? For me, the arbitration event was something that happened in isolation even though it related to and entwined into life as lived. Parts of it were mundane but parts were also awakeners. I could restory it, as could other participants, without bringing other day-to-day activity into it. It had characters, a plot line, a beginning, middle, and end. People had roles to play. I felt as though I could step in and out of it like stepping in and out of a play. The arbitration room was part of a landscape with different plot lines. The room had been physically arranged for a grievance hearing so, to me, it had the feeling of being framed, staged for a performance. I, like other participants, was going to be one of the players in the drama.

Once there, significant others played out the procedures and told me how I was to proceed. When a break was announced, the pause button was pushed, and we all stepped out of that room, out of that enclosed frame into one that allowed us to become something other than a witness, an arbitrator, or a
grievor. We became coffee conversationalists in a coffee room while arbitration procedures were left behind in the other room. It was as though the whole scene could be turned on and off by changing rooms, or changing positions in the room, or by changing the scene. Each scene had some of its own story even though it had threads of the previous one and created threads to move us into the next to help weave the bigger picture. And each participant in the scene, when given the opportunity to story, had variants of the bigger story.

Hence, a theatre metaphor emerged that allowed both my participants and me to move back and forth on our landscapes (various scenes and stages) as we lived the reality of the arbitration process. The procedure was both a story and storied as we tried to explain to others what had happened to us through our participation in the event.

By treating each participant's story as part of a narrative scene, taken from life's play and slowed down for the viewer so to speak, I hope to at least temporarily clear away the murkiness that exists in such an interactive event as arbitration. Each scene adds to others to help create a larger story, each may be led in a different direction carried off and retold by its teller. However, what I want to look at is how each participant played out his or her own story and discuss the competing and conflicting plot lines I see flowing from each. The reader has already been given a sense of that from the arbitration story in Chapter 2.
I probably could have used the image of a ripple in the current rather than a scene since I used words like murkiness and flowed. However, a ripple in a current is still too fast for me and disappears too quickly in the flowing water. Hence, I decided to stay with words like scene and framed. I should also point out here that I did not stick to my original idea of having all the participants from one case. Rather, I chose to go outside of one arbitration case and interview participants who have played a role in other arbitration cases. Hence, my participants come from several arbitration cases, school districts, unions, or government departments. As I said in Chapter 1, I have used a narrative fusion of arbitration stories.

A person's narrative is a "reconstruction of a person's experience in relation to others and to a social milieu" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990, p. 244). This is a narrative study of experience which connects procedure to process and places characters and physical environment within a context. From this point of view, it is possible to consider arbitration as a story, with scenes - the place "where the action occurs, where characters are formed and live out their stories and where cultural and social context play constraining and enabling roles" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990[a], p. 8).
The Role of Narrative

The thesis questions which I ask are responsive to interpretive methods, in particular narrative. In an unpublished paper Davies (1995, p. 15) ascertains, as I have already pointed out in Chapter 1, that "such methods draw out phenomena that otherwise would remain beyond, below, and behind the surface of social and cultural formulation." Moreover, as previously stated, experience derives from the actions and behaviours of people interacting and is expressed through the metaphorical qualities of language. Therefore, narratives, reconstructed through conversations, observations, and experiences of arbitration, my continuous perusal of the literature on law, education, and arbitration, four years of journal writing, personal autobiographical analysis, and interpretive methods of research, shape the writing of this thesis.

In reflecting back and retracing the path I have chosen, I believe that I did not seek a method in which to do research, but rather, that I perceived an issue which I believed warranted exploration and the method found me. In other words, as the thesis problem has evolved so has the method as the study is both personal and experiential.

I found that participants needed to tell their story, the information could not be given to me by facts alone, and thus the study has taken the shape of a narrative. Eisner (1979) would say that my choice is not accidental, but intentional in
that narrative is a mode of discourse which better captures the complexity of a study which is both story and storied. As Donmoyer (1987, p. 100) puts it, "One can say more in narrative than one can say in propositional form." And, I have found that my participants have had a lot to say. They have had an experience they are not going to forget, ever.

Narrative is a form of inquiry which "substitutes meaning for the straightforward copy of events recounted" (Barthes, 1977, p. 79). It penetrates the roots of peoples' experiences and enables participants to "tell their stories and reveal their understandings - their personally created, experiential knowledge bases" (Schubert, 1991, p. 211). According to Connelly and Clandinin (1990) narrative derives from knowledge in action; a knowledge embedded in the way we live. Or, as Barthes (1977, p. 79) explains, "It is simply there like life itself . . . international, transhistorical, transcultural." It is a way of translating knowing into telling, thus opening new doors for retelling and new meanings.

Therefore, in using narrative, where many organizational theorists argue for a single interpretation of reality I am arguing for multiple interpretations. Multiplicity finds people, both as individuals and as groups, in contention over what reality is and how they should behave in it62 making competing and conflicting stories a key issue in the thesis.

Stories are told in value context, shared by others. In

---

short, it is a form of moral theory⁵⁴. Therefore, from a research point of view there is much more going on than just a story. As Johnson (1993, p. 155) says, "Moral reasoning is purposive." In Connelly and Clandinin's (1990, p. 8) words, "Stories function as arguments in which we learn something essentially human by understanding an actual life or community as lived." That kind of reasoning is directed toward helping to resolve indeterminant situations, solve problems, and justify those actions to others. It is the varied shades of living, both visible and invisible, with all of its complexity. The fundamental form of such storied activity is narrative in nature.

I am using personal narrative in conjunction with legal documented narratives of arbitration because I have found that the writing-up of the grievance award is sanitized, void of human emotion, stripped down to a factual representation, a rhetoric of conclusions as Schwab (1978) explains it. Although Schwab was referring to the term in reference to theoretical knowledge claims as being void of their origins and standing in abstract, objectified independence, I see a similarity in what evolves from an arbitration hearing in the writing of the final document. That is to say, the document, ⁵⁴

According to Eldridge (1989), it is mainly through narrative that we search for and give concrete meaning to our moral principles to find understanding in explaining how those principles might be relevant to the different kinds of situations in which we find ourselves. Taylor (1989) refers to moral horizons and Clandinin and Connelly (1995) talk about living on intellectual and moral landscapes.
as a narrative, is stripped of much of the verbal argument which may have taken place during the proceedings. The award may not mention time changes, place changes, lawyer tactics, presence of observers, all of which fuel human emotions, all of which are very much a part of the arbitration process.

What I am seeking, because I believe it to be missing in legal awards, is the emotion\(^6\) of the experience, the personal which tells people who they are, gives them their sense of identity. Identity is exposed through narrative. According to Clandinin and Connelly (1996, WIP) identity is the story we live by.

One of the key elements I found missing from arbitration awards is emotion, yet it is very present in participant stories, including my own\(^5\). Narrative, as a study of life stories, reconnects that missing element. In much the same way as Bullough and coauthors (1992, p. 12) explain with regard to case studies, narratives "present tales of human triumph and failure, that, in the telling, hold the potential to enrich and enliven the reader's self-understanding." As

---

\(^6\)I do not mean to imply emotivism in the sense of 20th century objectivism. That is to say, it is not my view that moral judgements and evaluations are only expressions of emotion or attitude rather than being based on reason. I am focusing on emotions because I believe that the self cannot be fragmented into rational and emotional parts, but rather that these two are interconnected and therefore inseparable.

\(^5\)This is a conclusion which formed as I listened to and then transcribed participants' stories. In that sense, I feel that I am jumping the gun so to speak and relaying a finding before I reach the participant chapters. However, I have already reached the participant chapters and therefore have formed some opinions, one of which was important to the method I chose.
such, narrative has a unique pedagogical power in that it invites readers to enter into discourse and to compare their own experiences to those given in the study. In the words of Shulman (1986, p. 32), stories are "memorable, and lodge in memory as the basis for later judgements." They become our experiences.

As I began my thesis I saw no better way to approach arbitration as an experience than through narrative. To demonstrate the complexity, or at least the diversity, or incompatibility of human relations and how these relations affect those involved, requires a recounting of experience. It is the recounting which enables me to reveal the multiple realitied patterning of human relations which shows itself during an enacted event. In that sense, this thesis is a polyphonic account of voices.

My own methodology is a cacophony of voices. To Bakhtin (1981:434) voice is "the speaking personality, the consciousness" which, as Diamond (1992, p. 62) explains, has its own "individual purpose and distinctive overtones." This implies that within such an event as arbitration each person has a voice, either formally or informally, and makes a contribution but, only in relation to others. The complexity of trying to make sense of voices that often do not sing the same tune makes for a characteristically narrative thesis.

Narrative is one of the main sources of human expression. It is the essence of human communication providing the
foundation, storying new understandings of human behaviour.
For Connelly and Clandinin (1990, p. 2), "The main claim for
the use of narrative in educational research is that humans
are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially,
lead storied lives." Not only do we lead storied lives but we
reconstruct them for our self-understanding and for others to
understand as well. If arbitration is looked upon as a
narrative rather than as a procedure one can see the
participants as storytellers, as authors and co-authors of
life. As Fisher (1987) explains:

The narrative paradigm sees people as storytellers, . . .
who creatively read and evaluate the texts of life. . . .
A narrative perspective focuses on existing institutions
as providing plots that are always in the process of re-
creation rather than existing as settled scripts.
Viewing human communication narratively stresses that
people are full participants in the making of
messages. (pp. 18-20)

Looking at arbitration from this point of view makes it
amenable to storytelling.

One other very important point, narrative is allegorical.
In other words, it is an extended metaphor which conveys moral
and spiritual meanings. It is the moral and spiritual, in
other words, the personal, which is removed from the written
awards. In short, the personal narrative focuses on
experience, the giving of voice, and the search for meaning.
The institutionalized narrative already has meaning through
those who act on its behalf and focus on telling others what
that meaning is. These are elements which I intend to
explore.
The Narratives of Others

My participants related their arbitration experiences during our interviews through story. The interviews were not a series of questions and answers but rather became storied events relayed in sequential order with characters who played roles. For the most part I did very little talking. The experience has led me to believe that narrative is a means through which we understand. It allows us to make sense of human action. As Johnson (1993, p. 154) explains, "We tend to see our lives, and those of others, narratively. We continually reinterpret and revise our narrative self-understanding." In other words, narrative is constitutive of the way we experience things.

Conversations, the knowledge that someone is listening, understanding, and being supportive, may be what lets participants recount experiences. The grievors, in particular, wanted to talk about how it felt, what had been done to them, and how it was done. I believe they came forward because they knew I had experienced an arbitration and felt that some of the feelings I was expressing had been experienced by them. And I wanted them to talk. I wanted to hear if they had felt what I had felt. I wanted to know if it had been as traumatic for each of them as grievors as I felt it had been for the teacher in our school. I wanted to find out if they had lived the intimidation, felt the loss of control, observed how the game was played as participant Janet
(1994) referred to it, and wanted a place to voice their ordeal. In short, I longed to find out how other people had experienced the arbitration event. If these tensions exist on, and are a part of, our organizational landscape, people should be able to verbalize their place in the organization narrative.

Other participants (union representatives, district office personnel, lawyers) took more convincing to tell their stories, maybe because they already had a voice through the institutionalized story in which they worked. From the interviews, I have been led to believe that it was their narratives which each grievor had been forced to live out. But, I was driven to hear as many sides of the story as I could.

Arbitration is multicephalous. Pondy (1978) uses this term to refer to organizations in general. It means that arbitration functions through the actions of many that sustain mind, meaning, values, and culture. It is a complexity that is often ignored by many theorists such as those who rely upon the "systems theory" as the model for explaining what the world is about. It is a complexity that is usually ignored in an arbitration award as the writers stick to the facts by deleting the emotive acts and conversations which have taken place.

How the meaning is found during the hearing, in other words, how the hearing is played out, and how it is presented
in the decision can appear to represent two different narratives. In point of fact, they may even be two different narratives. To give an example, during one arbitration hearing two observers, one of whom was participant Betty (1993), were sitting side by side observing what was going on during the cross-examination of a grievor. One observer, who seemed to be a supporter of the union, felt that the lawyer for district office had no idea about schools and how they were run and his line of questioning was weak. The other observer, who worked at district office leaned over, shook his head and said something like, "That was a very thorough line of questioning." The situation was as it was, the grievor was being cross-examined. It was the meaning that each observer made of the questioning that was different. Were they viewing the proceeding from two different places on the landscape? It was evident that there were at least two competing stories of what was taking place during the questioning. This realization is one of the reasons mine is an exploration for new meanings into the effects, perceptions, and questions that people associate with arbitration. Hence I chose narrative out of necessity.

From a Narrative Other to a Narrative Self

As a researcher, once I determined that I wanted to do a thesis on lived experience it seemed only natural that the writing would take shape through narrative. The beginning of
my question, "What does it mean to go to arbitration," indicates that I was and am searching for meaning about arbitration experiences. And it may even go deeper than that. It may be a reflection of how I see myself positioned as a woman on a conduited landscape. Human experience and understanding be it one's own or someone else's, is narrative in character. Johnson (1993) sums up the significance of narrative in research succinctly when he writes:

There is abundant empirical evidence that narrative is a fundamental mode of understanding by means of which we make sense of all forms of human action. There are various types of narrative structure that play a role in how we understand actions, evaluate moral character, and project possible solutions to morally problematic situations. Narrative is not just an explanatory device, but is actually constitutive of the way we experience things. No moral theory can be adequate if it does not take into account the narrative character of our experience6. (p. 11)

Experience and its narrative character is the focus of this study. I do this by listening to and representing the narratives of others, and telling my narrative concerning arbitration specifically and how I see that relating to other aspects of my life in general.

However, from a personal point of view and in a broader sense, I have always been attracted to narrative. As a child I listened to my grandparents telling and retelling stories of their lives, the lives of my parents when they were growing

up, and the retelling and reminding of my life as I grew up around both my parents, grandparents, and others. I have a liking for telling stories, often retelling stories of my life which I have heard others tell, or those that I remember as being events which have happened to me. I have always loved to read stories, especially if they are based on "true stories," that is to say, characters I know or have heard of. I buy novels based on true stories such as _And The Band Played On_ by Randy Shilts (1987). I often watch movies if they are based on true events such as _JFK_ or _Mississippi Burning_. As a teacher I am known by my students for disciplining through stories. If I watch a story like _Dead Poets' Society_ I seek out the real life issues which may be present in what would otherwise be considered a fiction.

Just to give one example, my son and I went to see _Total Recall_, an Arnold Swartzsnagger science fiction movie which came out in the early 1990's. Upon leaving the movie my son informed me that I was the only person he knew who could discuss the sociological implications of such a futuristic society from a movie which, as far as he was concerned, had been produced solely for entertainment purposes. He wanted to know if I could watch a film just for entertainment's sake. In thinking over his comments, I am not sure that I can. Story is how I get a grasp on life. It is how I come to terms with my experiences. But besides that, highlighting my interest in books and movies of human issue stories and
discussing science fiction from a sociological point of view calls attention to a larger issue - being reflective about social narratives. I want to understand what they are and be a part of changing the plot lines.

Shaping the Methodology

The birth of the thesis and its intent were the determining factors for the data collection. Field notes have been taken through interviews with people who have participated in arbitration events. Formal documentation has been collected in the form of staff meeting minutes, union reports, arbitration awards, letters, and memos. Since I have woven myself into the study as one who has experienced, I am also using a journal which has been in progress since the beginning of the thesis. I personally find the journal of great value as it literally plots the methodology chapter as I go along. It gives me a visual map of my own thesis procedure and process. In Alice in Wonderland, Lewis Carroll (1964 ed) describes the importance of journal writing clearly in the conversation between the King and Queen:

"The horror of that moment," the King went on, "I shall never, never forget."
"You will, though," said the Queen, "if you don't make a memorandum of it."

Journal writing for me has become of major significance as I use it to write down my thoughts throughout the writing of the thesis. I consistently made written memoranda of my thinking as nothing ever sounded as good if it was left in my thoughts
to be written down later. The same can be said of the meetings which have been held with my advisor as I have taped and transcribed all of those. Comments and questions from colleagues usually come back to me written on thesis pages. These too have been used as part of my reflection and my writing process.

As the writer of this thesis it is my observations, conversations, interviews, and experience with arbitration participants which have provided the basis for writing about arbitration as a lived experience. The primary conduit of information is my narrative reconstruction of arbitration events which incorporates the field notes I have collected. The participant stories are not all from the same arbitration. They come from four different cases as I interviewed four grievors. The union representatives, who come from different provinces, are not tied to any specific cases but some used cases for examples as they told their stories. Therefore, although Chapter 5 is specifically about one case the participants referred to in the analysis may not be from that case and in most instances they are not. To help maintain some sense of confidentiality I have not pointed out which participants took part in which arbitrations. Hence, the superintendent referred to as participant Janet (1994) may not be an employee in the same district as the director who wrote the arbitration synopsis in Chapter 5. Participant Eric may not have worked with the union whose report is given in the
same chapter. The grievor in Chapter 6 may not be from the same case as the one discussed in Chapter 5 and so on. It is my intent to provide descriptions of arbitration experience rather than relate one particular arbitration case.

To discuss my experiences in the field I include taped conversations, participant observation, journal excerpts, an examination of arbitration documents, and make reference to novels, both fiction and nonfiction, and film documentaries. A more thorough description follows.

I have spent some time observing arbitration hearings. I have conducted at least twenty-one tape-recorded, open-ended conversations and leave many more etched in my memory from coffee chit-chat and grievance hearing recesses. I have read over 100 arbitration cases and several exhibits in the form of letters, memos, staff minutes, and school improvement questionnaires.

I contacted government officials in labour relations and spoke with lawyers to find out how far I could go in using legal documents and letters written to and from employers and employees. I wanted to establish what my legal rights were. One lawyer (Participant Ford; May 3, 1993) wrote:

Once an arbitration decision has been made, it is then filed with the Department of Labour and at that stage it becomes a public document. It is my opinion, therefore, that not only is the arbitration award a public document but indeed all letters, documents, reports, correspondence and indeed all material filed with the arbitration board becomes a matter of public record.

The following are part of that document:
1. Findings and decisions in a dispute as filed with the
Peretz & Bromme, 1990, p. from teachers' meetings. documents that record the teachers in an open and professional context.

1. Department of Labour;
2. Exhibits taken into evidence by consent such as the collective agreement, letters/correspondence between parties concerned, discussion papers, and memos;
3. Exhibits taken into evidence through various witnesses such as school improvement plans, memos, minutes from staff meetings, school schedules, graduation requirements, and letters.

The legal documents are a valuable asset for my study yet I approach them with caution. In a study done in Israel (Ben-Peretz & Bromme, 1990, p. 81) Shifia Schonmann "chose minutes from teachers' meetings ... because they are authentic documents that record the spontaneous verbal expression of teachers in an open and autonomous atmosphere and in a professional context." I am apprehensive about the extent to which it can be proclaimed that minutes are open, autonomous, and professional, especially if one is not present at the teachers' meetings to observe what has taken place. Those who attend teachers' meetings are very much aware that minutes can be read by others of higher authority. In at least one province, some school district directors instruct principals to send copies of all staff meeting minutes to district office. Teachers are conscious of that request. If Schonmann had attended the teachers meetings he might have heard the 'minute-taker' say "Should I put this in?", or "How should I word this?", or "We have to be careful of what we say, here!". Mind you, as a teacher for twenty-nine years, I am only speculating from what I have heard at many teachers' meetings.

It is interesting to note that documents formed from handwritten notes are used as part of the arbitration
procedure to make future legal points in other cases. First
time cases can set a precedent. According to one
representative of a provincial employment public relations
department, it has become an accepted procedure in some
provinces to use arbitrators' notes rather than taped
recordings. Therefore, I am using the term 'legal' with the
knowledge that chairpersons of arbitrations construct the
documents from their notes. There are usually no tapes used
to record the dialogue.

Personal letters were given to me by some of the
participants, mainly the grievors, with written permission for
their use in a thesis study. Interviews were returned for
editing and verification. One interview (Participant Eric,
April 22, 1993) will be included under the following
conditions:

It would be expected . . . that the interview would be
within the context which you described in your
correspondence and that such an interview would not focus
on information relative to specific cases or individuals
involved in those cases. In addition, before proceeding
with the interview, I would require your agreement that
any transcription of the interview would be provided to
me for approval before it is used in your thesis and
that, if taped, the actual tapes of the interview would
be returned to me after you have completed your
transcribing. I would also require the right of final
editing of those sections of your thesis which refer,
directly or indirectly, to comments attributed to me.

I returned the transcript to the participant and received
this response (March 3, 1994):

I must apologize for the delay in responding to your
letter accompanying the transcript of the interview we
held in relation to your thesis. . . .
I have made a few minor corrections to the
transcript. I do not think there is anything in it that needs amendment or deletion. You were very adept at couching the questions in general terms, so that they deal with hypothetical situations rather than a specific arbitration.

As I understand from our closing discussion (on the last couple of pages of the transcript) the full interview will not be included with your thesis, but you may be including a quote here or there. If you do make use of specific quotes from the interview, I would appreciate having an opportunity to see the context in which those quotes are used before your thesis is submitted. . . .

All such requests from participants will be adhered to.

The stories are recounted from the participants themselves and are then interpreted and retold as I search for meaning and understanding. "According to naturalism an inquirer can offer only an interpretation" (Smith & Heshusius, 1986, p. 4). It is the only process through which one can derive meaning (Polanyi, 1975). Therefore, my approach is similar to Schonmann's (Ben-Peretz & Bromme, 1990) in that I deal with the images and "give them meaning through contextual interpretation" (p. 85). The interpretation comes from my search of meaning as I try to tie in what I believe to be the case and what other writers say on the issue.

However, the words used in the participant section are those used by each participant. I transcribed the interviews and then read down through, highlighting what I thought to be the story of arbitration as reported in the award in Chapter 5 and as told by a grievor in Chapter 6, as I proceeded. This shortens the award report in Chapter 5 and the interview in Chapter 6 because some sentences, paragraphs, and so forth,
have been left out, as are my questions. But, it leaves a flow to the parts of the conversation which I believed to be the arbitration experience, the arbitration story as told by the teller.

As stated earlier, I simply went down through the interview and marked the conversation. If there was an interjection of another story I skipped over it. As the novelist Durrenmatt (1989, p. 22) says: "In trying to reproduce these conversations . . . I do so not with the intention of writing a novel but rather from the necessity of delineating an event as faithfully as possible." Here is an example from a union representative (1994). The underlined words are those used in the story as I recount it. Those not underlined have been left out.

Laura: Yeah. So, we're seeing more of that now, all of a sudden.
Barb: So what would happen... does that still go on with the teachers in that case? Much as it does in (other provinces)? That, maybe a retired teacher or an experienced teacher will be asked to do a... to sit as a winger in an arbitration?
Laura: I'm sorry, maybe I just didn't understand. Are you saying we still do that?
Barb: Yes.
Laura: Yeah, we still...
Barb: That's still in practice.
Laura: Yeah. We still try, where ever we can to put...

...sometimes we put teachers who are active teachers on the arbitration board. Sometimes a retired teacher or former staff person and only if it's absolutely necessary do we appoint a lawyer.

Barb: Huhum.
Laura: Now, we also avoid the 3 person system. It's been our experience that the 3 person system takes much, much longer. More than 3 times longer and costs much, much more. It's just a function of when you add 2 more people to the process, it's harder to get dates. It obviously requires more organization
to get those people together. It takes a lot longer. There's deliberations, etc., etc. etc. And so, most of our arbitrations now are heard by a single arbitrator.

Barb: Hmmm!
Laura: And unfortunately, we have... and the employers are on to this, cause the employers like the 3 person boards because it plays right into their hand. You know, justice delayed is justice denied.
Barb: Yes.
Laura: And we know that the longer these go on the less likely even the grievor is to hang in there. And also, the cost is exorbitant to the union.
Barb: Huhum.
Laura: And so, we have locals where, we recommended at the outset that they negotiate language that mandated that it be all grievances that be heard by single arbitrators, with the exception of evaluation, dismissal for performance where it's a result... We have universally in this province, virtually universally, a...

In chapter 6 I have reshaped the interview format of the participant's story (which resembles the one above) into paragraph form.

Out of all the interviews I did the grievor's story in Chapter 6 was the one that touched me the most. Not only had it touched me deeply but it also represented what I see as the multiple realities of living on a personal and professional knowledge landscape which creates the competing and conflicting stories of one's life. I was so intrigued by the story that I interviewed four grievors, each from a different case (a university, college, and two schools). All four had their grievances upheld and yet, showed signs of scarred tissues of their entangled conflicting storying with district office. Their tellings were highly tensioned dramas with roles and plot lines which highlighted protagonists' and
antagonists' positions. I relate one to give a sense of wholeness to one story but will refer to the others to enrich my discussion of the participant's story in Chapter 6, my autobiography in Chapter 7, and the conclusion in Chapter 8.

I could have centred the whole thesis on the grievors' stories but chose not to. I needed to both know and understand the administrative, the union's, and the legal points of view. I did not want the thesis to be one-sided, especially since I am dealing with competing and conflicting stories. I have kept asking myself what it all meant for the administration as I recalled hearing the participant in Chapter 6 asking the same question. He said, "During the whole arbitration I felt like I didn't understand why we were going through all this anyway. It seemed like a useless effort." Hence, the whole thesis has been moving back and forth between participants' stories in search of meaning. However, a future book may be the appropriate way to write about the courage of the grievors' convictions.

Method and Other Issues

Besides the issue of writing style and format there were other issues which surfaced as I proceeded. I had to determine whether the rules and regulations in the Arbitration Act governed all provinces or if each province was responsible for its own. In a telephone conversation I had with an employee from the Ontario Minister of Labour, Arbitration
Services (1993), I learned that "each province has its own rules and regulations governing labour relations." According to Brown and Beatty (1997, p. 2-1), "most grievance arbitrations are rooted in a statutory provision." One point I wanted to clarify was whether or not labour relations acts applied to school boards and teachers' collective agreements and, if they did, which provincial act I would follow. The answer I was given was that if any labour laws applied to my work it would be the labour laws of the province from which the arbitration case has been taken. My participants and the cases I use originate from several provinces of Canada, hence, I have not discussed either specific labour act but rather, make reference to Brown and Beatty (1997) as a legal source which seems to be common to all the provinces in which I made contact with potential participants.

Another concern which arose was which act would access school board minutes if I needed to but was denied a reading. I was told by a representative of the Ontario Minister of Labour (telephone call, May/93) that the Freedom of Information Act would access them if a school's act did not. Although I was prepared\(^6\), I met with no resistance on the part of school boards to read their minutes. I was not permitted to copy them but I was allowed to take notes and I was offered a room so that I could read in private.

---

\(^6\)I had been told by a representative of the Department of Education in Newfoundland that I might be denied access.
As part of my own autobiography, I have tried to capture thoughts in my journal during lunch breaks, on bus rides from one destination to another, and during quiet moments of the day. I have filled four journals along the way and a number of little black book jot notes that I would scribble down if I found myself somewhere without my journal. Some of the ideas came during the night as I was aroused from my sleep by my own thoughts. Others were written as I was walking down Bloor Street or en route to the law library. Still others were written over conversation with colleagues pursuing their own queries.

The answers to all my questions have not been found but I have come to terms with some. There are many questions left for, in attempting to answer some questions, others emerge. At first this was a major concern for me. It has taken time for me to accept that I have been both living my stories in "an ongoing experiential text" and telling my stories in words as I "reflect upon life" and explain myself to others (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 4). For the past three years the more I have written and rewritten, and answered and reanswered, the more confident I have become, not in knowing it all, but in believing that what I say and write is not only plausible but also significant when looking at the arbitration process specifically, the legal system, and systems in general.

I have no doubt that my participants gave me the stories
they believe to be truths. In the case of the grievors I saw the pain in their faces, and heard the torment in their voices, some of which, like the stressful sighing, can be detected on the tapes. I have no reason to doubt that they were telling me their stories as they believe they had experienced them. In some incidents I was concerned about opening old wounds without being able to offer a solution or make them feel better. I left one interview with a tremendous headache because of my concerns. When I told participant BethAnn (interview/93) how I felt, she said that she felt fine. She had been ready to tell her story.

As indicated in the previous chapter, I have been concerned about participant identifiability and the implications that could have on those telling their stories. Hence, I have thought about alternate ways of writing the field text. As Berg and Smith (1988) explain:

As social investigators, it is our responsibility to be researching our methods while we are applying them . . . placing the scrutiny of self in the center stage of social inquiry. . . . We are obligated to struggle to understand the complex emotional and intellectual forces that influence the conduct of our inquiry. (p. 11)

In short, I have played several roles in the exploration of arbitration as experience. I am researcher, the one who has thought about and collected stories for over three years. I am also the author of the thesis text. I have taken the stories of the participants and reconstructed them into textual form. And, I have been a participant, both through other participants' stories and my own. I am a character in
this narrative contributing my experiences of arbitration, my personal and professional knowledge.

Constructing the Text: From Experiences to Textual Form

This is my attempt to not only tell the stories of arbitration as lived but also of what happened to me before my encounter with participants' stories and how I think they interweave. You, as reader and I, as researcher, participant and author, will fashion this story together. In an unpublished paper, Davies (1995, p. 23) wrote, "It is the what and the how of my experiences in the field that I have managed to turn into words, words that you reconstruct for your own purposes, filtered through your own prior experiences and knowledge."

I choose to tell of arbitration experiences by constructing narratives based mainly on taped conversations. Specific arbitrations in which my participants were involved, will not be named but sections of some arbitration documents will be quoted without revealing the particular case. Other arbitrations will be named as examples if they are legally on file for public viewing. The conflicting stories which emerge with respect to public viewing have already been discussed in Chapter 2. Just to reiterate, there is a discrepancy in the degree of accessibility to some of these documents. Some claim that all awards are open for public viewing once the decision has been handed down and copies have been sent to the
respective parties. Others say that is not necessarily so. One problem I found through doing the research for this study was that, if awards are public, unless one knows the exact name of a specific case, one is unable to ask for a copy, and sometimes the copy is not even there. Some of the most accessible awards are those which have been appealed and have therefore gone to civil court. These are filed and cross-referenced in law libraries, not only by name but also by subject.

Letters and other forms of documentation will not be quoted in full to protect the identity of the writers and respondents. Small sections may be quoted to make a point or verify a statement.

The Writing of Participants' Experiences

Many of the interviews I conducted both over the telephone and in person were at least an hour long, some were longer depending on the participant. To write everything each participant said would mean including transcripts of approximately 50 pages for each. This would not be practical. Also, to include everything which was said would leave more evidence of who the participants might be. Therefore, once the tapes were transcribed I highlighted the parts of the conversation of the participant which I thought moved their stories along and focused specifically on arbitration experiences. I left out my questions such as the ones I used
with Participant Laura (Feb. 17th, 1994): (1) "Let's start with you, then. What has been your experience in the area of arbitration?" (2) "Alright. Now, before that you said that you had volunteered as a chair. Would that be for an arbitration procedure?" (3) "Would they have a tribunal set up?" (4) "How would the three people be chosen? Where would they come from?". Sometimes I would seek clarification such as "Okay. So it would be someone from maybe the teachers... They wouldn't necessarily be a regular classroom teacher would they?". At other times I would clarify asking the question to begin with as in, "The reason I'm asking is because I have been asked to do one [arbitration hearing]." There are times when I just used listening cues such as "Huhum", or "No?", or "Is that right?!". Therefore, none of my conversation is included in the participants' stories.

Each participant's story is taken directly from the transcribed conversation with no alteration in the wording other than at times I changed contractions to full words as in 'it's been' to 'it has been'. Sometimes we got off track, as in leaving arbitration issues to discuss other education issues which could be theses within themselves. These sections of the interview are left out as I wanted to focus on how each experienced arbitration. If participants gave several examples of cases I may have used only one or two. If participants gave specific articles from their collective agreements I left them out so that the province of the
participant cannot be identified. Any analysis of collective agreements has been done without reference to specific participants. References to specific provinces has been done in a more general sense. In Chapter 2, for example, I used a section of the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Collective Agreement.

When I finished transcribing the interviews I sent them back to the participants asking for additions, corrections and/or deletions. For example in a letter to one participant I wrote (July 1, 1994): "If there is anything you wish to add...Mark it and write on the back. Anything you don't want used or discussed, put a line through.” One participant (Steve, April 23, 1994) wrote to me saying:

I apologize for taking so long to get back to you. I've been a bit busy lately. I read over the interview and made some minor corrections in my grammar. I don't know if you have to include the interview with your thesis. If you do and you're not satisfied with the grammar and sentence structure of my answers, go ahead and make any necessary corrections. I couldn't believe there was so much. Some of my answers appear incoherent but, I suppose, taken in context they make some sense.

I have wondered if participants' painful memories of the arbitration process might have caused some of the delay in revisiting the experience through transcript readings. Some of them were longer than others in returning their transcripts. One possible participant (Oct. 28, 1993), when I approached him about the arbitration he had experienced, said that the award was still sitting on his shelf. He had simply browsed it but had not gotten around to reading it. At least
a year had passed since the arbitration hearing. Another participant (Nov. 22, 1993) who arrived to do an interview brought along all of the documentation used in the hearing and said that this was the first time the material had been looked at since the grievance meeting. There may be something to the idea about painful memories although I have not pursued it in the thesis.

With some participants I found myself questioning, probing, relating my experiences, agreeing, and disagreeing, in search of my own meaning, while with others I remained with a question/answer/clarify format believing that I could not seek out my meaning there. It very much depended on my relationship with the participant. Those who I felt were willing to talk openly became sounding boards for my own thoughts. I wanted to hear how they would react to my perceptions as well as how I reacted to theirs. I am especially thankful to Janet (1994) who allowed me the freedom of asking questions openly and without caution. It was mostly through her that I learned an administrator's story. There were others with whom I felt I could not push the limits in that they proceeded very cautiously and therefore so did I. Both kinds of participants compose the narratives of the three chapters which follow.

Chapter 5 is constructed within the larger picture of the organization and those who speak on its behalf. Chapter 6 has the narrative of a grievor who tells what it means to go to
arbitration. Both chapters are introduced and/or concluded with a brief analysis either through specific literature reference or through my own observations. I also use other participants as evidence of commonality to relate my interpretation of the whole process.

The case selected from Chapter 5 was chosen because I had access to three versions of it. I was not as fortunate with others. The story in Chapter 6 was selected for its non-identifiability rather than for the fact that it was a better story. In point of fact, there were others that I thought were better stories, better in the sense that they seemed less guarded and similar to what I believe I had experienced. However, if their stories had been told in full, disclosure may have placed them in legal or professional jeopardy. Therefore, I chose to use the others (Participants BethAnn, Clara, and Gala) to enrich the text. Their complete stories will not be told but parts will be used as examples.

In retrospect, this situation has been a blessing in itself because it forced me to seek other stories which offered other lenses through which I could peer. If I had been allowed to use the stories I particularly liked I could have locked myself into one experience, mine, the one I wanted to see. Having a theory and going out to find other stories to back up that theory is one thing, trying to understand the stories of others, even if they are different from one's own is another. I wanted a narrative blending in order to
accommodate both.

Coming to terms with experiences was an issue I was not ready to deal with at the outset of this thesis. Four years have passed since the writing of the proposal. When I read that proposal now I find myself thinking that it was very one-sided. I not only had a grievor bias but my writing also sounded angry. I caught myself being a conduit for the grievors without having heard any other views. In other words, I was armed with disclosure, determined to show administrators for what they were in the eyes of grievors. It was a narrative of superordinates versus subordinates. As indicated in Chapter 3, probing from others forced me to widen my horizon and seek out stories from various players within the arbitration process. Through talking with administrators and union representatives I have come to understand that how one is seen in the eyes of others is relative to the view one has. And, just as some views are similar, some are competing, and others are conflicting. For example, a union lawyer, defending an employee may see things from a different point of view than a lawyer working for the employer of that employee. In Chapter 5 readers will get a sense of how an employer can see an employee differently from how an employee may see him or herself while there is a competing story in Chapter 6. This idea of competing and conflicting stories is one of the threads which stitches the thesis together.

Chapter 5 focuses on the institutionalized story as told
by its representatives, in particular directors and superintendents of school districts, union representatives, and arbitrators. I assume in this chapter that the voice of the participant is the voice which has been given to the organization mainly because of the role each person plays and the position he or she has on the conduited landscape. And, because of this I am also assuming that what the representative is doing is telling the other members of the institution what their narratives are, in other words, re-presenting and supporting the institution.

In chapter 6 I write about individual narratives. I did interviews with two witnesses, four grievors, two school district administrators, four union representatives, an arbitrator, a lawyer, an observer, and a staff colleague from various arbitration cases. Out of those I have chosen one, a grievor. The other narrative constructions, told by each participant in her or his own words, are used to make points or to clarify.

My intent was to re-present or re-capture the arbitration event as the participants believe they have experienced it. One point I found in this process is that what gets told, although I tried to represent it lineally, is a spiral affair. Hence, in the storying event participants often had to circle back or back-up to make points in their stories. At the same time they tended to organize their experiences in the telling and retelling. For example, I heard some grievors' stories
more than once as they came up in discussion at other times in other places. In each telling some details got left out. Once reminded, they could pick up the story and go on again. This happened in arbitration as well and was picked up through examination, cross-examination, and re-examination.

On one occasion a participant's spouse was present and if she felt the events of the story were out of sequence she would say something like, "no, that incident had happened before the other" or she would remember what had been recounted to her as having been said to her spouse, not because she had been sitting in on the arbitration but because she had sat in on the conversations during lunch or after-dinner re-assessment and strategy meetings. It got to the point during one interview that I was not sure who was doing the interview, the participant or the spouse. If she thought he told the story wrongly, she intervened. To me it demonstrates how both lived the arbitration experience in their own way. It certainly was a complex "muddy puddle."

The next time I did an interview, I did it in her absence so that I could focus on the participant's story rather than focusing on the spouse focusing on the participant's story. Although, in retrospect, I believe her prodding helped to keep the story teller in chronological order. It was as though the story became verified through general agreement. Between the two of them they formed a consensus as to what happened, how it happened, and in what order. I wish now that I had tape
recorded both of them telling the story together.

Chapter 5 follows with the institutionalized story of a case represented by a school district, a union, and an arbitrator's award. Each is positioned differently on the professional landscape depending on their role and function.
Chapter 5

A Narrative of Organizations

It is perfectly clear that in practice, predictability of most human choices not only is impossible now, but will forever be impossible. This is simply because human choices are determined by a very large number of variables, the crucial values of many of which we cannot obtain, except in a post-mortem examination or a full-life follow-through, and even in a full-life follow-through we are not - nor will we ever be - in a position to obtain all the data that we need to cover the whole of a person's behaviour.

(Scriven, 1966)

An Image of a Landscape: What is the Terrain?

My idea of using landscape as an organizational metaphor comes from Clandinin and Connelly (1996) who use the metaphor of a professional knowledge landscape positioned at the interface of theory and practice in teachers' lives. According to Clandinin and Connelly this interface positioning creates epistemological dilemmas which are talked about as secret, sacred, and cover stories.

The landscape metaphor carries with it the conduit or funnel metaphor from which the theory/practice construct is built. The conduit takes on a positional role upon which secret, sacred, and cover stories are lived out. In this thesis I intend to show how, in its function the conduit maps out a landscape domain which can create multiple stories of the same event. Not only are the stories multiple, they have different plot lines and therefore are competing and sometimes
conflicting. Drawing on the field texts of my participants I make the assumption that competing stories can exist on the landscape but conflicting stories cannot. If the competing stories become conflicting stories one has to win out over the other.

What you are about to read are three different descriptions of one arbitration case. The first was given by the union. The second summary of the same arbitration was taken from a director's report which was distributed to school board trustees, school board personnel such as consultants and superintendents, and all principals of the schools in a school district. The third is a shortened version of a 136 page arbitrator's award for the same grievance. The condensed arbitrator's version has not been reworded by the researcher but rather sections have been copied from the employer's argument, the union's argument, and the arbitrator's reasons and decision which make up the award.

Each will be followed by an explanation as to what the function of an administrator, union representative, and arbitrator is in general terms. Parts of interviews from a number of participants are used to reinforce points made. These participants are not necessarily from the same district, nor do they necessarily discuss the same case. I use sections of conversation from these participants because they have all taken part in some form of arbitration and have played similar roles as those in the three stories. That is to say, they are
directors, superintendents, union representatives, or arbitrators.

This is followed by a brief analysis of each case. The point is to show how different three versions of the same case can be, depending on from which side the interpreter is doing the viewing and for what purpose. The chapter closes with a discussion on competing/conflicting stories and landscape conduit using the three reports and texts from participant interviews.

**Union Report (Disciplinary Action)**

This arbitration concerned allegations of neglect of duty and insubordination against a high school principal resulting in the demotion of the principal to the position of vice-principal of an elementary school. The principal grieved the board's action, claiming a violation of Article 30 (Disciplinary Action) [Provincial Teachers' Federation] in that the demotion was without just cause. The school board alleged that the principal had been given specific directives to undertake certain initiatives and improvements in the administration of the high school and that, either through refusal to carry out those directives or through neglect of duty, he had failed to carry out his responsibilities.

The arbitration hearings in this matter occupied six days in which detailed evidence was given on the areas of school administration where the grievor had been given specific directions by the school board and the grievor's responses and attempts to fulfil those directives. The Arbitration Board Report examined the issue of insubordination in detail and noted the use of the term imports a wilful or intentional disregard of the lawful and reasonable instructions of the employer. The unanimous report of the Arbitration Board concluded that "there is nothing in the evidence to show that

---

68 Weintraub (1993) presents examples of court cases which have different stories for the same incident depending on the authorship and what facts are left in and which ones get left out.

69 I have not stated which specific provincial collective agreement in order to provide some anonymity to the participants.
the grievor defiantly disobeyed directives of his superiors and in the absence of evidence that the grievor either through wilful neglect or wilful defiance refused to obey directives of his superiors, the Board of Arbitration cannot find that he was insubordinate. The circumstances of this case and the evidence before the Board cannot support an allegation of insubordination . . . The employer has not met the onus placed upon it to support, through the evidence, such an allegation."

The Arbitration Board therefore upheld the grievance and the order of the Board was that the principal was to be reinstated in his original position as principal of the high school and that all adjustments be made for salary and benefits for the period of time while he waited for the outcome of the arbitration.

Combined with several other cases over the past number of years, especially in the area of alleged incompetency, this case provided further support for the Association's position that disciplinary action by a school board against a teacher over the carrying out of that teacher's duties must be fully supported by the evidence and a full and unbiased evaluation.

Introduction: A Message To Teachers

"Labour Unions are organizations formed to negotiate the terms and conditions of employment on behalf of employees" (MacKay, 1984, p. 246). Representatives of this organization become the collective voice for teachers' rights. In the case of arbitration, for example, the union is the carrier of the grievance. The process is owned between the bargaining agent and the employer. That agent has the exclusive right at any step of the procedure to stop if it so choses. According to two participants in this study who are union representatives (Participant Eric, 1994; Participant Laura, 1994) a nominee who represents the union side may be told to keep several things in mind when proceeding into a grievance: to represent the position of the grievor (the union) by ensuring that their
position is clearly brought forward and considered by the tribunal board; to consider the implications that a potential arbitration award has on the union, the collective agreement, teachers in general, as well as the individual grievor (sometimes you can lose the battle and still stay in the war); and negotiate the best possible report in light of such implications. The relevancy of discussing the union arbitration nominee in great length is that the same protocol exists for the union representative as seen in the Union Report.

The report opens with a focus on a Collective Agreement article (Disciplinary Action - Article 30) and details the arguments made in the body. It ends with the significance of this case in supporting the union position that discipline allegations by a school board must be supported by evidence and without bias. In that sense it becomes a leading case or precedent to be used for future cases as it states:

"Combined with several other cases . . . this case provided further support for the Association's position. . . . " In the award (Union vs School Board, 1991) the arbitrator cited the following cases:

70 Although I used the voice of some of my participants to point out the tri-partitism and the doctrine of bias which is known to exist in the practices of collective bargaining, writers such as Kuttner (1988) and Authors (1963) have argued the relevancy of such a procedure.

71 A leading case or precedent is also referred to in law as stare decisis which was discussed in Chapter 2.
(a) George Lanthiaet Ltee and Milk and Bread Drivers, Dairy Employees, Caterers and Allied Employees, Local 647

The Union then uses each case with these "leading" cases built in to argue new cases. It is a process that builds upon that which has gone on before. It is evident that in arguing the case for a high school principal the union representative is, at the same time, focusing on the collective agreement and teachers in general. The writer of the report has clearly written an organizational narrative from a union point of view. The grievor's story and award has been reshaped to genericly fit all teachers through the collective agreement in much the same way that the principal's case was argued through article 30. In that sense, the principal's issue becomes the conduit for articles of the collective agreement and the collective agreement becomes the conduit for the principal's story.

The union report is presented in a generic style which allows it to be applied to the collective agreement in a general sense. The grievor and the grievor's story have become depersonalized. Names of the people involved, the school, the school board, and school board personnel have been left out. As Participant Eric (1994) explains:

What we do is summarize in the [Teacher] Bulletin, which goes to every teacher in the province, the arbitration.
ruling. . . . These will not have any details of school board or teacher names or any specific details of the case that will identify a case. It will simply, in a fairly brief report on the circumstances of the case which led to the grievance and, in the basic outcome, . . . what the arbitration result was and on what aspects of the case that was based on and if it is applicable, what are the implications of this award for the application of the collective agreement. So, all of our members would be aware that, yes there has been . . . a ruling for example, on Article 33(a) and that it means that if I do such and such this may possibly be the results of it.

From the union position on the landscape the institutionalized narrative of the collective agreement becomes the sacred story. The story of the grievor stretches to articles of the collective agreement and how those can be applied to circumstances involving other members of the bargaining unit. The individual story gets pushed back under the cover, made secret by application of the collective agreement. The union is saying no one needs to know the personal details, they only need to know how it may or may not affect them as members of the collective bargaining unit.

A second point to note is that time is not an issue in this report. There is no mention of a long wait before the decision is handed down. There is nothing said about the principal's wait before being reinstated. There is no indication that the reassignment took place in June, 1984, that the hearing took place during February, March, and April of 1985, and that the principal was again reassigned on September 9, 1985. What one reads in this report is that the hearing "occupied six days" rather than it was a process which
spanned a year and three months or 15 months or approximately 450 days. It could be argued that the time lines had nothing to do with the application of the award to the collective agreement. But, it could also be argued that it had much to do with the time lines of the grievor and significant others whose positions and responsibilities had been altered due to the reassignment. For the participants in this study who were grievors or witnesses, time became an issue. The reader will get a sense of the significance of time in Chapter 6 where one grievor's story has been recounted. The director as well, in the report which follows in the next section of this chapter, indicates a frustration with respect to time.

The union report in its aseptic treatment of a case raises other questions which may bear significantly on teachers and how they live on the organizational landscape. How much should teachers of a collective bargaining unit know about arbitration cases? How accessible should detailed awards be to teachers and what part should unions play in their accessibility? What part should teachers play in the arbitration process? Are grievors ever offered the opportunity to write a personal anecdote to the union report? Have unions ever asked their members these questions? I do not have answers to these questions. I pose them, not as an arbitrator presenting a final award, but rather as a researcher asking questions which may guide reflection on what it is that we do on our professional knowledge landscapes.
The area director's report follows.

**Outcome of Arbitration Determined (School Board Report)**

After a long wait, the Chairperson of the board arbitrating the reassignment of George Kao\(^{12}\) has rendered a report. The unanimous finding of the Board is that Mr. Kao was not guilty of wilful insubordination. Although he did not accomplish what was expected of him, the arbitration board ruled that his demonstrated willingness to attain goals established for him precluded any connotation of insubordination. The Judgement is that he must be reinstated and his loss of salary must be reimbursed.

Mr. Kao resumed his duties as Principal of R. Chant Memorial High on September 9, 1985. Mr. Oatley, who did a commendable job as the Acting Principal, resumed his duties as Vice Principal of the school.

To ease the transition from Mr. Oatley to Mr. Kao, the director of the School District spent a day in the school meeting with the two administrators and the staff. All look forward to a good year.

**An Introduction To Management**

Management as defined legally, refers to "Government, control, superintendence, physical or manual handling or guidance; act of managing by direction or regulation, or administration" (Black, 1990). As a lived reality it implies people living around a purpose or a set of values in action.

In short, its positional role carries with it a discretionary power of human direction through the conduit of the organized landscape. Management, according to Hodgkinson (1978) and

---

\(^{12}\)Dates and names such as George Kao are pseudonyms to protect the privacy of those involved. The names of the documents from which these write-ups are taken have also been left out. This does not stop readers from having access because these documents were published for a specific group of professionals and are available within that domain. However, by leaving out that information I do put limits on its availability, at least for some.
Greenfield (1993), is a moral enterprise.

From a narrative perspective Clandinin and Connelly (1996) conceptualize the professional knowledge context of education as both a moral and an intellectual landscape made up of people, places, and things. From a landscape metaphor those in management are perceived as living out a plot line higher up on the conduit than those who do not hold management positions or play management roles. Those in management are expected to live out the sacred story of the organization by making policy, developing curriculum and implementation strategies, and cultivating others. Those on the management landscape therefore live a "theory-driven view of practice" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996, p. 25) which is expressed through secret, sacred, and cover stories. They tell management stories, stories of management, teacher stories, stories of teachers, school stories, and stories of schools.

Within the context of organizations, all participants have some scope in determining what the story of the organization is and how that story should be played out. Some writers (Barnard, 1968 ed.; Hodgkinson, 1978; Greenfield, 1993) agree that the higher up the conduit within the organization, the more latitude there is in interpreting the story of the organization. In other words, the closer one is to the sacred story of the institution the more likely one is to be in a position to shape and reshape it. In that sense the administrative act is one of creating and establishing,
shaping and reshaping an organizational narrative which is elaborated out of a sacred story. It is the living out of a plot line in such a way as to cultivate others to accomplish organizational goals. That is to say, it is ends-oriented, the end being performing and living the institutionalized narrative.

The Function of the Director

Directors are hired by school boards to perform the duty of chief executive officers. From their position on the landscape they are responsible for enacting school board and department of education directives. They act as liaisons between schools, district office and other interested parties and shape the actions of others who oversee the operations of their schools. They have specific roles to play in their administrative positions on the organizational landscape.

As participant Janet (1994) explains, "The administrator needs to come across as being in charge, carrying things through, being well organized, well documented, and confident." The role carries with it certain responsibilities including disciplinary action against any members who are seen as not adequately fulfilling their roles as players in the central story. Janet ascertains,

[I]f you are focusing on the performance of an individual, and we all know that with any profession you are going to have your super stars, you are going to have people who are barely making it, and you are going to have people who, from your point of view, are not cutting it.
For those who are not making it "what I want to do (as administrator) is deliver a message. . . . He or she is going to know that I am serious that his or her performance is not up to scratch. There has to be improvement or else." The participant goes on to say:

It is frustrating because you may have an individual who has gone through a curriculum and instruction program, has completed a Master's in teaching, who you assume, therefore, knows how to teach. If I am doing the observing I may feel that I do not need to help that person. The teacher has the background so either the job is done or it is not done. But my job is not to train, the training has already been done before he or she comes to me. Sometimes the teacher may have the teaching experience where perfection was not demanded and got into a rut. How do you turn that around? So my job is to go in and say 'You're not doing your job. Either pull up your socks or else. This is what I want you to do. I'll come back in three months time, if it is not done, you get the boot'. And if he or she does not have it, he or she will move out.

Administrators see this kind of action as part of the responsibility held by those playing administrative roles on the landscape. This was the case with the director who wrote the report. According to participants\(^3\) he had been informed by significant others that there was something not functioning well at R. Chant Memorial High. Consultant stories, teacher stories, stories of teachers, and parent stories about problems at R. Chant Memorial were moving up the conduit and surfacing at district office. The stories of the school were problem stories. It appears that teachers, in particular, had

\(^3\)Some participants talked about a problem beginning at a particular time indicating that there was some sort of undercurrent rumblings of discontent. All three stories, but in particular the directors, verifies that point.
competing stories with district office. Consultants did not feel welcome in the school. According to participant Steve (1994), teachers verbally resented how district office handed things like board policy and curriculum changes down the conduit. The teachers were described by one superintendent (as told by Participant Neil, 1994) as a "bunch of bitchers and complainers." The following is how it was described in one interview:

Sometimes you know that the particular teacher who is grieving is not a good teacher, definitely not. But, the reasons why he or she were not used in the arbitration. Now, why is it that the 'real reasons' are not out on the table? Is someone trying to cover something up? Are the real reasons too personal? Would there be too many other names come out of the testimony? Or, do administrators decide on the best route to be successful in a case? It is much more delicate than this. In the case of a teacher, [an administrator] may have legitimate concerns, disgruntled parents may have made their feelings known, other teachers on staff may have made their opinions known, and therefore complain in the hope of getting someone from District Office to come in and help to turn that teacher around (Janet, 1994).

When these stories of school surface, a director of district office, living his or her plot line as overseer for the district and being a part of the same professional landscape as the teacher, has an obligation to reshape the school story. The director wanted a retelling of that school story. He wanted the principal to live and tell a different story of R. Chant Memorial School, one that was more positive and showed signs of growth and had open communication with district office. "Kids deserve competent teachers. . . . We have to work with teachers to try and turn them around to the
goals and the standards of the organization . . ." (Janet, 1994). When such a conflicting story develops the administrator knows there are going to be repercussions during the reshaping.

Yet, as the chief executive officer for district office, the director also knows he or she has to act. There are certain procedures and duties expected from him or her by significant others. They know they are dealing with, as Hodgkinson (1978, p. 5) puts it, "the formulation of purpose, the value-laden issues, and the human component of organizations." They recognize they are dealing with a professional knowledge landscape of lived stories.

From an organizational point of view there has to be a new story created for that school, maybe with new players if those already there are unwilling to shift or reshape their story. District office also knows that steps may have to be taken to awaken those in competing stories, or worst still, conflicting stories in order for a new story to get its start. Disciplinary action is one example of an awakening to force a new telling. That action becomes part of the story of district office. It is a story that is told to counteract the conflicting school story. In order for this story to be cultivated, a new plot line is created on the landscape, one that brings in the teachers' union as players who story the collective agreement through grievance procedures.

According to Sanderson (1976, p. 1), "Arbitration is a
mechanism for resolving disputes between individuals or corporations on a private basis." As a union representative (Participant Eric 1994) explains it:

[Arbitration] is between the employee and his or her employer. . . . [I]t is a mechanism for them to resolve that kind of dispute. It is not a public court of law. . . . It is a process that the parties to the agreement are paying for, and it is a process that they have agreed to in a Collective Agreement to have in place.

The professional knowledge landscape broadens as new players enter from competing plot lines. What follows is a field note analysis of the director's report. I look at the intentions of the person writing as I run back and forth between the messages in an attempt to create a researcher's story line.

Analyzing the Plot Line

The director's report was written as part of a newsletter which was sent to specific personnel, as already indicated. In that report the grieving principal and the acting principal were named as was the school, the allegations, and the outcome of the award. In some schools principals copied the report and passed it to teachers. There was no attempt on the part of the director to make the affair private. Once the report was written in the newsletter the arbitration was no longer a matter between the employer and employee but rather between the employer and who ever else received the report. This story not only competes with the union representative's story of arbitration "being a privately owned process" but also with
what is stated in the literature on arbitration procedures which were outlined in chapters 1 and 2. However, Fred's (1993) story in Chapter 2 indicated that there was no reason why such events could not be public. Obviously, according to the literature and the participants, there are some arbitrations which are private, some that are public, and some that fall in-between. Arbitration certainly does not rely on a rigid plot line to have its story told.

One of the questions I wanted to ask the director was why he wrote the report so publicly? Why spread the information over a wider landscape than may have been necessary or than had already existed? What purpose did it serve? Since the director did not respond to my letter asking him for an interview I have no way of knowing other than through asking others and speculating.

The report is written in a manner which suggests that those reading it would have prior knowledge of the case as it states, "After a long wait, the chairperson of the board arbitrating the reassignment of Mr. Kao. . . ." It does not start with something like, "There was a case in which this happened" or that "There was a case between the district and the union concerning . . ." which might signify that this was a private affair which took place between the employer and an employee without the knowledge of other employees. Rather, one has to ask whether or not the principal's wilful insubordination as alleged by district office had not already
been discussed at least by select groups of people as it is written in a style which presents the incident as common knowledge. Again, this style of reporting conflicts with the union's idea of employee-employer privacy and according to reliable sources there were people in the district who had no knowledge of the arbitration.

The language of the report implies that although the arbitration board ruled that Mr. Kao was not insubordinate there were still problems. The director wrote, "Although he did not accomplish what was expected of him," his demonstrated willingness "to do what he was told precluded any connotation of insubordination." Connotation (The Random House Dictionary, 1966) refers to the suggestive emotional content or significance of a word in addition to its explicit literal meaning. It carries with it the notion of implication, of an associated or secondary meaning of a word. Insubordination (Black's Law Dictionary, 1990) implies disobedience to constituted authorities, being rebellious, unsubmissive, even mutinous. The arbitration board was saying that the principal was none of those things. I cannot say with certainty what the director is conveying to his readers. He may be implying that the arbitration board might not have found Mr. Kao insubordinate but district office still did.

I took it to mean that the director still saw the principal as not being able to perform his duties. When he did not perform the directives the director gave him he was
reassigned on the grounds of wilful insubordination. It went to grievance and although it was agreed that the principal did not accomplish what was expected of him, the arbitration board saw him as having demonstrated a willingness to try and meet the director's expectations. In that sense, the principal was not insubordinate.

There are others who must have held the same opinion, as a comment made by a teacher on the principal's staff (Journal entry, 1993) was something to the effect that the tribunal decision did not mean that there was nothing wrong, it just meant that it was not insubordination. Who those problems pointed to was not spelled out but considering that a principal is solely responsible for the operation of a school indicates to me that the finger is still pointing in that direction. But, because insubordination was not proven, the principal was to be reinstated which meant that whatever it was the director tried to fix still existed. In other words, he did not get to reshape the story the way he intended. It became another story, probably one he had not wished to deal with. It was now out of the director's hands as the unanimous arbitration decision denied him the right to deal with the problem in the manner he saw fit.

The director could have been saying, "If things do not change in that school do not blame me. I took action and it was blocked by an arbitration tribunal." In other words, "I am no longer responsible for that situation." The story which
evolves becomes a different story, one that the director may feel he has little control over. It may even be a story which shakes the very core of his sacred story. If that is the case, the summary which has been written for the school board could be a cover story for what the director might have wanted to say but was no longer in a legal position to do so.

The director may have been communicating another story of roles and responsibilities. He could also have been saying to other personnel that, as director, it was his responsibility to ensure that schools in his district were operating effectively. Anything less than that expectation would warrant disciplinary action such as reassignment to another position. Any principal who did not tow the line and fulfil the expectations of district office would face similar disciplinary measures, live a similar story as the principal. This concern was given by participant Mark (1994) as he believed that some principals felt that Mr. Kao was being made an example of middle management discipline. Some principals, participant Mark explained, wondered who would be next. If this case had been denied it could establish a precedent for future district office action for the principals in the district. From this point of view, one can look at the disciplining of one principal as a cover story for something much bigger, shaping a middle management story as told by district office. We find ourselves again in the positional roles found in the landscape of organizations. Other
principals may have had a good reason to be concerned.

It should also be noted that in the director's written account there is a concern for time, how much time it took for the arbitrium to be handed down. He begins his report with an adverbial phrase of time, "after a long wait..." Upon perusal of the arbitration award itself and in questioning a couple of the participants it became clear that the principal was told of the reassignment in early June, 1984 and immediately sent a request to grieve to the union. The hearing took place over a period of February, March, and April, 1985, and the award was verbally filed with both parties on August 31, 1985. It was indeed a long wait. However, contrary to the director pointing out the long wait, although the tribunal's decision was known by both parties on August 30, 1985, which should have allowed the principal to resume duties on the first day of school in September, the director did not give the principal permission to return until September 9, 1985, a week after school opened.

It could be argued that there was still a significant difference between a four month waiting period and that of nine days. This is not the case if one considers that the grievor also had to wait four months for the decision. In that sense he had to wait nine days more before being reinstated. The director was conscious of the four months it took to get an award but he makes no reference to Mr. Kao's nine day wait before he is permitted to return to his former
position. For the first week of school he had to return to his reassigned position as vice-principal in another school.

One has to wonder if the time for the arbitration would have been as noticeable to the director if it had been denied or if the changes which had to be made at the school would have been completed sooner if that particular principal had not been returning. Was he prolonging the story he wanted or was he creating a new story which conveys the message, "You might still be the principal but I am still the boss?" Both are just two possibilities.

The last two paragraphs of the director's report paint an 'all is well' scenario. The principal resumed his position as did the acting principal who returned to the vice-principal position. The director eased the transition by spending a day in the school to meet with both the administration and the staff, and the year was off to a good start. The word 'ease' makes me uneasy as conflicting stories again flowed from the school.

According to participant Steve (1994) the staff had already had a week of school without the transition being made. Some of the staff members and the acting principal said that everyone was waiting for something to happen as in the principal coming back to work. When it did, on September 9, 1985, there was what the principal called an uncomfortable meeting between him, the director, and the acting principal. The director, he said, "got a bit excited" and they had
confrontational words over what was to happen within the school. The principal made it quite clear that he did not need the director coming in and telling him how to run the school. He had been a principal for several years and he knew what he had to do in the school (Interview, Feb. 1994).

When the director arrived at the general staff meeting he stated that it had been a good year and he commended the acting principal on a job well done (Interview, April 1994). One staff member made it quite clear in the staff meeting that, in her opinion, it had not been a good year. It had been one of the most frustrating years of her teaching experience. According to some of the teachers the staff meeting opened with the director telling the staff that what he was about to say was not open for discussion. The meeting was described as being tense, not a positive way to begin a school year.

According to district office sources the director was anticipating the animosity because it existed before the reassignment process began. That is one possible explanation as to why it took over a week to go through the reinstatement of the principal. The director knew what was forthcoming and conversations with the acting principal indicate that there was a positive rapport between him and the director, one that obviously did not exist between the director and the reassigned principal. By not allowing the staff the opportunity to say what they wanted, the director may have
thought he was keeping the tension at a minimum. He could have been protecting the acting-principal from an anticipated staff blow-up meeting. In other words, he may have been trying to reshape a story of school that he already had of an outspoken staff who openly verbalized their opinions. He could have been trying to create a different story of the arbitration outcome, one that said the arbitration was over, what happened, happened, and now both teachers and administrators had to get on with what they had been placed in their positions to do.

Conversations between some staff members, school administration, board office personnel, and the researcher (Interviews 1993, 1994) indicate that from where the director stood, he knew a negative story of school that he wanted to change. One thing is clear, each participant, and some groups of participants, saw things from different perspectives. There is no doubt that there existed multiple realities with people being positioned with different plot lines on the organizational landscape.

The Researcher's Story

Connelly and Clandinin (1994) in reference to life stories and education recognize that living an educated life is an ongoing process. To them the ongoing process is one of cultivation, meaning that education occurs "when someone acts intentionally upon someone else in order to change them, to
prepare them for something" (p. 153). They later extend that explanation of cultivation to a process that occurs "when an individual, a group of individuals, an institution, or a culture acts upon a person" (p. 154). In other words, cultivation is found in the intentional and unintentional acts of everyday living (Clandinin & Connelly, 1991).

What Connelly and Clandinin refer to as cultivation is what Hodgkinson (1978, 1991) and Greenfield (1993) refer to as administration. Hodgkinson (1991) lays out the image of administration as a moral art. Greenfield (1993, p. 194) ascertains that administration "is a matter of will and power: of bending others to one's will and of being bent in turn by others." It is Connelly and Clandinin's (1994) cultivation as experienced in the intentional and unintentional acts, the dilemmas and tensions of everyday living.

If one accepts the landscape as an organizational metaphor, as is the case for the mapping of this thesis, it makes it easier to connect Connelly and Clandinin's theory of cultivation as being one and the same with Hodgkinson's and Greenfield's notion of administration. The act of cultivation and the act of administration are part and parcel of the same landscape. It is the conduit on the landscape which allows the act of administering to take place. Positional plot lines are lived out on the landscape through the conduit metaphor and expressed to and by others through sacred, secret, and cover stories. The positioning of the conduit on the
landscape determines the role of each individual player and allows for competing stories.

**Competing Stories**

The organizational narrative is one where designated persons on the landscape see themselves (and are seen by others) as planting the seeds to cultivate education by showing teachers new methods of teaching or adding policy which forms alternate or new practices for teachers. Teachers are awakened to these new ideas through workshops, professional development days, and the expectation that these practices will take place in their classrooms. This, in turn, transforms the teaching practice into what has been funneled down via the consultants, superintendents, and director.

The conduit metaphor is a visual way of re-presenting the sacred story of district office. Competing stories may exist within that sacred story and, for all intents and purposes, the idea that multiple realities indicate the humanness of organizations naturally assumes that indeed this is the case. The conduit metaphor extends the sacred story of the organization deeper. Not only are administrators living out plot lines where it is their responsibility to act on others, but they are also living out plot lines which are placed higher up on the conduit than teachers. They view themselves, and are viewed by others, as being responsible for ensuring that the sacred story of the organization is played out by
those living on the professional knowledge landscape. Hence, it is easy to see why courts, as mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, see the relationship on the landscape as being master-servant. The notion of a conduit and positional roles dictate a subordinate-superordinate relationship. This relationship lies at the very core of an institution's sacred story.

Having said that brings me to the point of the director's story. It is not completely clear why the director writes the story the way he does. It is very personalized and emotional, so much so that his messages are multiple. His story is not clear and neither is mine in the earlier section as I tried to unravel what it is that he is trying to say. However, there are some key points about which I can speculate if I continue using my metaphorical map of landscapes, conduits, positional roles, and competing and conflicting stories. I will use the arbitration event as my example.

Arbitration becomes part of the professional knowledge landscape. It is a procedure which is placed into action when institutionalized transformation does not happen. By that I mean, when we live on the organizational landscape there are certain things expected of us in the roles we play as teachers, administrators, directors, and so forth. When we are seen by others as living a competing story, one that conflicts with the sacred story of district office, others intervene in our story by creating new plot lines.

In the arbitration case referred to in this chapter,
there had been complaints from dissatisfied parents, school was not working for their children the way they had hoped and this was communicated to district office (Steve, 1994). District office intended to sow new seeds and awaken the staff and principal to an alternate way of running the school as a means of acting on those complaints. In other words, a new story was not only needed but expected. The principal and staff, however, were of a different opinion, making conflict unavoidable. The director determined that the transformation expected through the directives given to the principal by district office did not take place. The school's story had not changed so a new story was created, the principal was reassigned. It may have been through this kind of consequential action that the director hoped to reawaken the principal and his staff to the idea of a need for change. A new story needed to be told.

One issue which came out in the interviews with the administrators and was insinuated by the grievors is that a sacred story may be projected as a cover for something else. In arbitration, for example, an administrator may have to decide what story he or she will use in order to help win a case. In other words the "real reason" may not be used. Let's suppose the administrators at district office have reason to believe that one of their staff members is incompetent. Let's also suppose that the last few incompetency cases that went to arbitration were sided in
favour of the grievor. The district would probably not use incompetency as the basis of their story. It is more likely that they would look for another story, one in which they would have a chance of winning.

The director had stories of R. Chant Memorial High that he wanted retold and he wanted them retold more in line with the story being told by district office. He expected the principal to introduce the new story to the school and cultivate the staff into that telling. When the staff did not buy into the story and the school was not awakened to any new possible transformations, the director awakened the principal to disciplinary action which transformed into an arbitration story.

It is clear that when we try to move on the landscape to a position that is not expected or accepted by significant others living there with us, something happens which either constrains us to the expectations of the others or pushes us towards a position which threatens our existence within the organization. In Mr. Kao's case, management had given him a series of tasks to perform. He believed that he had lived up to that expectation. However, those in management at district office felt that they had "given certain instructions and directions . . . which he had not carried out. In this regard, the Employer alleged that Mr. Kao had neglected his duty and had been insubordinate with respect to directives from management" (Union vs Employer). When the employers did
not get what they wanted and expected, they acted upon the employee by demoting him. That demotion, in turn, led Mr. Kao to grieve.

This may be what Connelly and Clandinin (1994) refer to as "an awakening" for Mr. Kao. By that I mean, Mr. Kao was already living a plot line in his position as principal at R. Chant Memorial School. He had worked with most of this staff for seventeen years. I believe he felt that he was established in the school and in the community and he probably thought that he knew what his role was. A new school district took the school and community under its jurisdiction and was living a different story on the landscape, one that conflicted with the existing one at the school. They presented this story to the principal and informed him that changes had to be made. Mr. Kao started what he saw as the process of change but again those at district office did not see the change they expected. The seriousness of what district personnel expected had either not been recognized by Mr. Kao or was recognized but so outside of Mr. Kao's story and the school's story that he felt there could not be change. The impact of what was expected of him did not seem to grip him until he got his letter of reassignment. It was probably like a reality shock to see in print (Exhibit #2 [Union vs Employer]):

I am led to believe that either you do not comprehend or you do not wish to conform to our directions. Therefore, I have concluded that I must take measures to ensure that the directions established for R. Chant Memorial by my office are followed.

As discussed and conveyed through the [Union]
representative, I hereby advise you of my intention to reassign you as of July 1, 1984, to one of the following positions. . . .

You may advise me prior to June 23, 1984 of your preference and acceptance of one of the above-noted positions.

With this letter Mr. Kao awakened to the reality of what was happening to him. It was a confirmation of a change to his landscape. His identity and position on the landscape had changed. He was no longer principal of R. Chant Memorial High. His need to re-establish his identity positioned him on the arbitration landscape.

As participant Janet (1994) put it, "Arbitration is the kind of end product of a disciplinary process and the administrators are obviously the ones who are involved in that process." Janet goes on to say that when disciplinary measures are put into place you have to ask what it is that the administrator is trying to accomplish. "There are times when administrators begin and decide that they are only going to go so far." In other words, their intent is to deliver a message, improve or else. If the individual gets the message, learns the lesson, "the process stops itself." In Connelly and Clandinin's (1994) terms, the seeds had been planted, the teacher had been awakened, transformation would likely follow. When that did not happen, a new transformation, one that was forced, followed and demotion occurred. The cultivation process now becomes something different from the directives previously given.

This placed both players onto a new plot line on the
organizational landscape, one that shifted the conduit. The sacred story now becomes a legal one and the sacred story of the institution (district office) gets placed below the arbitration story on the conduit. It is relegated to one of the conflicting stories, one that conflicts with the principal's and the union's (collective agreement). Which ever way that plot line gets played out leads to a reshaping of the institutional story and new stories will evolve. This puts the institutional story at risk. This is very evident, I think, in the fact that the director's report is not clear.

One has to remember that what the report tells us is that the principal was not found to be insubordinate. He was to be reimbursed and reinstated as principal of R. Chant Memorial High. If behind the story line (as participant Janet indicated, 1994) of the director is the protection of children, the protection of public education and the deliverance of quality education, the living out of the sacred story for the director and district office has been denied. By the time the director writes his report he has lost his sacred story. It has been transformed into an arbitrary decision in support of the union's sacred story. It is evident from the union report that this case was being used to publicly and legally strengthen the collective agreement.

In looking at it through a Hodgkinson (1978) or a Greenfield (1993) lens, administration is a moral act. Those in management are defenders of the organization's values.
They are the interpreters of the values. It is the organizational narrative. They are the ones who mediate between the larger values of the organization and those of the individual. Yet, the force that administrators apply is their own not the organization's. The amount and kind of force in the arbitration case was a conscious decision made by the director. It was a decision which was value-laden and dilemma-laden. As Janet (1994) said in the interview:

You have to deal with that person on major issues that he or she feels are not there. Then, you have a staff who do not want to work with you because you have proven beyond a doubt that you cannot be trusted. So, they will not talk to you, will not even tolerate you. And, this is all going on in the school. How do you go in and start trying to patch it up and get the school moving again, give the staff some steam? When you go in and sit in front of 20 or 25 teachers who have thorns sticking out from repercussions of an arbitration, it is a heavy responsibility.

This is a moral issue which will be elaborated upon in Chapter 8. For now I pose the following statements and questions: If one has the discretionary scope for the use of authority, there arises the responsibility for the use of that authority, how does one know one has used that authority rightfully? As previously stated, it is a question of values. Responsibility is used rightfully if it aims towards right ends, but what are the right ends? If I make the assumption that people have different views about what is right, and not only about what is right but also about what is happening, how can one determine what is right? Greenfield (1980, p. 33) says, "Because it lies within people, the moral order is not
everywhere the same, and people will disagree as to what it is and as to what it ought to be." Conflict is inevitable and as an administrator you have to deal with that. Janet (1994) asserted:

[S]ometimes with administrators there is a feeling that they will never get to arbitration because the process is so intense that the individual will not be able to withstand the pressures or the stress of the process. This means that the individual probably leaves and again the arbitration is halted.

There is one thing you have to remember about arbitration, you only have one chance, and once you shoot your bow, once you proceed, if you do not accomplish what you set out to do, you do not get the chance to go back and do it again. So, you either take the time to build a good case with the hope that you will have a decent chance of winning, or jump too early and increase the chances of losing. That is the risk that is always present. . . .

The helping process has to be accounted for: Did I sit down with that individual and identify the goals for that position? Did I tell this person what it was I wanted him or her to do? How many times did we meet? Was there follow-up to each meeting? Were the meetings consistent? As an administrator I have to ask myself: What do I need to do with that individual to bring him or her up to standard? How much time have I taken? Have I gone back, sat down, and talked with him or her again? Have I said this is where you are, this is where I want you to be? Have I asked what it is he or she needs to get him or her where I want him or her to be? This is a building process. And I think, only after building that process of helping, if the end product still is not where you want it, that you have the foundation to go the next step which would be a disciplinary route. . . .

What is obvious from both these conversations is that within the arbitration process, cultivation, awakening, and transformation have occurred at the administrative level of the landscape as well, by that I mean, in the organization's narrative. Whether, and to what degree, it has occurred may depend on the individuals themselves and what roles they
played. But clearly, the reassignment of the principal, the tensions of the staff and the stories which evolved from these interactions became a personal and professional reality for the administrator who had to deal with the new story of that landscape. In point of fact, it may have been a new reality for all involved.

As Greenfield (1975, p. 71) writes, "If we see organizations and individuals as inextricably intertwined, it may not be so easy to alter organizations, or to lead them, or to administer them without touching something unexpectedly human." In voicing the issues of a staff who felt they had been "done-in" by a district office, the participant as an administrator, shows the organization to be the landscape within which people ask questions, make decisions, and take actions which seem right and proper to them. It is a questioned, reflected perception by at least one individual\(^7\) of what he or she can, should, and must do in dealing with others within a particular circumstance.

The outcome awakened the administrator to a reality with which he or she had to deal in order for transformation to occur in the direction he or she wanted it to occur or in the direction significant others wanted it to occur. In that sense the administrator may have become the conduit for the

\(^{7}\) I say "at least one" because it is the Director who acts on behalf of District Office. That is not to say that more than one may be involved in a secret story of board office discussions which led the Director to ask for a new school story.
larger organization. Also in that sense, transformation has already occurred in that some of the staff communicated, or at least the administrator perceived, a sense of animosity toward district office personnel. It was clear that it is the administrator's intent to sow new seeds in the hopes of awakening the staff to an alternate transformation. One that would view district office in a more positive light and have teachers working to a level of district office expectations. Unfortunately, the story transformed into something else. Both of the previous reports were based on an arbitrator's award which follows.

Chairperson's Award

Mr. Kao was principal at R. Chant Memorial High in Baytown from 1970 until he was reassigned as vice-principal of an elementary school by the Employer in June 1984. In 1982, Mr. Kao's former Board merged with two other boards and formed the present Employer. In June 1984, Mr. Kao was reassigned as a vice-principal with the present Board. Mr. Kao felt the reassignment was a violation of the Collective Agreement.

The Employer contended that in its management capacity, it had given certain instructions and directives to the principal which he had not carried out. In this regard, the Employer alleged that Mr. Kao had neglected his duty and had been insubordinate with respect to directives from management. The issue, therefore, was one of insubordination. The dispute followed normal grievance procedures up to and including the final stage of arbitration.

Both the Employer and the Union in this case have agreed that this Arbitration is not about the competence or incompetence of the Grievor. Rather it is based solely on the Employer's allegation that Mr. Kao wilfully refused to carry out directives from his superiors. . . . It was alleged, as well, that in some cases Mr. Kao had refused to carry out his duties through neglect which amounted to insubordination. . . . The central issue for the Arbitration Board is whether or not Mr. Kao's conduct in the circumstances amounts to insubordination, that is to say, whether or not the evidence supports the allegation that Mr. Kao, an employee of the
School Board, directly refused to comply with the directives of the Director and the Superintendent. . . . The evidence before the Arbitration Board is quite extensive. However, there is one consistent strain throughout the evidence of both the Employer and the Grievor. That is that Mr. Kao was always willing to accept the criticism of his superiors and to act upon suggestions and directives of both the Director and the Superintendent. . . .

There is nothing in the evidence to show that Mr. Kao defiantly disobeyed directives of his superiors, and in the absence of evidence that Mr. Kao either through wilful neglect or wilful defiance refused to obey directives of his superiors, the Board of Arbitration cannot find that he was insubordinate. . . . Therefore, it is the order of the Board that Mr. Kao be reinstated as Principal of R. Chant Memorial High and that all adjustments be made for salary and benefits for the period of time for which he was not Principal.

_Arbitrium Est Judicium Boni Veri_ 75

This version is the legal narrative as relayed through the eyes of an arbitrator. He is the chair, the unbiased third party selected by the union and the employer. The legal style is of a standard which is common to arbitration awards. It opens with some background information and is followed by the grievor's contention that the reassignment is in violation of his collective agreement, what the employer contends, what both parties agree that the dispute is not (i.e., it is not about competence or incompetence), what the issue is for the arbitration board, what the evidence is, and what the final decision is based on the evidence given.

The report, however, gives some new information that the other reports did not. Mr. Kao had been principal of R. Chant Memorial High for twelve years with a different school

---

75See Chapter 2, page 32 of this thesis.
district. Two years previous to the arbitration the school had been placed under the jurisdiction of another school board. Whether this was an indication that these were problems which the new board inherited is not known. No other mention is made about the former board and no witnesses were called at the grievance hearing as previous board employees.

The issue was stated as insubordination. It was also stated that both parties agreed that it was not about the competence or incompetence of the grievor. Why this was even brought up is not explained. As discussed earlier in this chapter, from a legal point of view there is a difference between what constitutes incompetency and what is considered to be insubordination. In collective agreements they are normally two separate articles. Insubordination refers to "the state of being insubordinate; disobedience to constituted authority, refusal to obey some order which a superior officer is entitled to give and have obeyed. The term imports a wilful or intentional disregard of the lawful and reasonable instructions of the employer" (Black, 1990). Incompetence is a "lack of ability, knowledge, legal qualification, or fitness to discharge the required duty or professional obligation" (Black, 1990). Whether insubordination carries with it an underlying meaning of incompetence is another matter. If insubordination was the allegation, and indeed that was the case, then why was competency and incompetency even mentioned? The director, in his report, made reference to the fact that,
according to the arbitration board, Mr. Kao's actions precluded any connotation of insubordination. As I queried earlier, are they implying that the evidence before them constituted something other than insubordination? In other words, there was something going on, it just was not insubordination. Was district office saying they thought the principal was incompetent but could not prove it and therefore used insubordination as their reason for disciplinary action?

Resolution of Competing Stories

An arbitration is a quasi-judicial process, that is to say, it is "the case-deciding function of an administrative agency following its own procedures and rules of natural justice as distinct from a judicial decision of the courts following strict legal procedure" (Proudfoot & Hutchings, 1988, p. 376). However, in perusing several arbitration cases one can see that legal procedure is used and most cases are outlined with similar modus operandi. As such, arbitration can be described as an adversarial system, a system of competing and conflicting stories.

Just as Clandinin and Connelly (1995) see teachers in two places, the in-classroom and out-of-classroom, on the professional knowledge landscape, one can see principals as also being in two places, the in-school and the out-of-school. If they are teaching principals, and many are, they can then find themselves in three places, the in-classroom, in-
school/in-office, and the out-of-school. The out-of-school which, for a teacher is out-of-classroom, is still one of abstract talk of administrative policies and prescriptions funnelled down from district offices and departments of education. The competing story process has already begun simply by way of how one positions oneself on the landscape. This will be elaborated on in Chapter 8. For now I just want to set the stage for the arbitrator who knows before entering the process that there will be competing, and for the most part, conflicting stories.

For this particular arbitration, these competing stories are set up front in the written award under the heading of "The grievance" and is presented as the first two paragraphs of the arbitration summary. This is followed by 111 pages of testimony through examination and cross-examination. These again are competing stories whose competing value may be strengthened through examination and cross-examination to the point of being reshaped, in particular by the lawyers, into conflicting stories. This is indicated in the arbitrator's award when he (Union vs School Board, 1991, p. 115) wrote:

> The evidence before the Arbitration Board in this matter is quite extensive. However, with the exception of some minor inconsistencies, the thrust of the evidence from both parties for purposes of this Arbitration is consistent.

That competing stories turn into conflicting stories may be demonstrated by what the arbitrator referred to as "minor inconsistencies." Inconsistency, as defined in Webster's
Dictionary (1966) means "(a) lacking agreement in kind, nature, form, etc.; not in harmony or accord; (b) not uniform; self-contradictory as an inconsistent narrative; (c) not holding to the same principles or practice; changeable as inconsistent behavior." Also, since there will be no tie, the grievance will be either upheld or denied, both parties cannot come out believing they have won.

Once a grievance has been upheld or denied, and both happen simultaneously, the arbitrator may be seen as having taken sides. If the arbitration is denied the conflicting story becomes that of the grievor. If the grievance is upheld the conflicting story becomes that of district office. Which ever decision is made, a dilemma is created for one party or the other. Cuban (1992, p. 6) says that "dilemmas are conflict-filled situations that require choices because competing, highly prized values cannot be fully satisfied."

Whether this causes a dilemma for the arbitrator may be worth pursuing in a future study. I have wondered if the extensive lapse of time between the end of the hearings and the presentation of the written award in some cases is due to dealing with the arbitrator's conflicting stories and their outcome. Dennis (1993) describes it this way:

As an arbitrator I am an independent, impartial individual with a wide range of power. As chair I must be impartial to both sides while the other two nominees represent their particular party. There are no hard and fast rules laid down. There is a lot of judgement which depends on your own perspective and background. It is important to know how arbitrators fit into the labour relations structure. We have to recognize both the right
to union security and management rights. . . . Most cases will have a spillover effect in that they serve as precedents for the future when similar circumstances arise and the same articles of the Collective Agreement are applied.

In this grievance the arbitrator did not use other teacher union awards to justify his decision, but rather went outside of the teaching profession to other cases dealing with insubordination. For me this indicates that this case was to be of major significance for future cases of this nature between teachers' unions and school boards. In other words, it would become part of the sacred story for one of the organizations, either the union and its collective agreement or the director for school board policy. In that sense, it strengthens a position on the professional knowledge landscape making for conflicting stories. According to Clandinin and Connelly (1995) competing stories can exist and, indeed, do exist on the professional knowledge landscape but once they become conflicting stories it is likely that only one will survive. In this case the seeds of survival are cultivated through an arbitrator's decision. Even then one's position on the landscape may determine to what extent a conflicting story survives.

Clandinin and Connelly (1995, p. 68) use the term "passed down the conduit" in their discussion of teacher education as it exists on the landscape. "Passed down" becomes an interesting term in the sense that it implies, as many teachers believe, that their position on the professional
knowledge landscape is lower than that of an administrator both in terms of expertise and positional boundaries. In other words, their position helps determine whether or not they are "authorized by the sacred story to prepare and funnel things down the conduit" (p. 74).

In the arbitration discussed in this chapter the union had positioned an alternative story of teachers' rights within the conduit. The director was expected to live this story, a story which was contradictory to the sacred story of district office. Although the alternative story may have evolved as the director dealt with other principals, the fact that he is in an authorized position on the conduit may have determined whether or not the alternative story became a reality.

Czuboka (1985) expresses the opinion that once a school board and a teacher go through the arbitration plot line, "it is only a matter of time and salary before they separate" even if the teacher has been vindicated. This links with the point that Clandinin and Connelly (1995, p. 74) make when they write, "Positioning an alternative story of teacher education within the conduit means that extended negotiations are needed to keep it alive and to continually evolve new aspects of the plot." They go on to say, "[T]hese aspects of a new plot must be worked out by . . . [those] authorized by the sacred story to prepare and funnel things down the conduit." The sacred story in which a school system is embedded may mean the demise of the alternative story even when it has been legally
determined that the sacred story of district office has become the conflicting story.

Arbitrators have no control over this outcome. Their responsibility rests with hearing the grievance of the employee and then upholding or denying the complaint. Hence, the award is written as two competing stories as presented via evidence, and a decision based on that evidence. From this perspective arbitrators become the conduit for the legal system. Their position on the conduit allow them to live out a plot line of a sacred story of justice. According to Schon (1983) the plot line tends to follow the outline of technical-rationalism, a model which is "embedded in the institutional context of professional life" (p. 26) and thus embedded in the sacred story of theory and practice. How that gets lived out depends very much on the players left to play out the plot line of the award.

The Identities We Live

The conduited organizational landscape establishes who we are and determines where we stand. That is to say, it is our organizational stories which create our identities. These are the stories we live by. Some tell them through the sacred story of their organizations, others tell them through their personal story.

In the union story the representative identifies himself as a protector of the collective agreement. His role is to
argue violations of articles for teachers. His identity is only shown through the union's narrative.

In the award of the chair again the sense of identity remains within the positional role as arbitrator. He is identified as that, a person with judicial authority selected by both parties to hear and resolve a dispute between an employee and his employer. In the award he plays out his role naming the facts, discussing the arguments made by both parties, and then deciding in favour of one of them. His identity has been established as part of the judicial narrative.

The director, on the other hand, has more of a personal identity. He walks away as more than a school district director. He is now a school district director who has lost an important case. Who is he now? How will others see him? How does he see himself? As indicated earlier, I can only speculate as he never responded to my requests for an interview. However, the underlying message I take from the summary is that there is an identity issue here. I have assumed that, as director, he probably saw himself as protector of the larger institutional values. Those who lived those values saw the grievor as someone who was not doing what he was supposed to do. The director, as the one responsible for ensuring that principals do their job, took action to change the school story. This is expected of him because of his position on the organizational landscape. If his story
line was the protection of a school he may have decided that it was better to remove one person, as say the principal, for the overall good of both the smaller and the larger institutions, R. Chant Memorial High and the district.

The Director also may have believed that sacrificing one could save many. The saving of the principal could have sacrificed something much bigger - the larger narrative of the school and the community. His identity is established as the director, the person who fights for the common good, reaps the greatest possible benefits for the groups' constituencies. To win would help entrench his identity as director, to lose would create uncertainty and weaken the sacred story of the organization. For the director he has to write a losing plot line, or one with which he does not want to be identified. His summary is not his story, it is the grievor's story told through the union.

He is no longer the person funnelling the information down the conduit; it is the arbitrator with the award who plays the positional conduit. It is the director who is told he has to take the principal back. This creates a discrepancy or conflicting story in what may be expected of him in his role as director of the district. Connelly and Clandinin (WIP, p. 115) in reference to teachers' working lives say the working lives are shaped by stories. . . . "These stories may be held with conviction and tenacity and modifications of them, implied or required by institutional life, can result in
intensely felt dilemmas."

In this chapter the director showed that his identity is very much at stake for his own story. This may explain why he was so very personal in his write-up of the grievance report. He must have been asking himself how others perceived him once the arbitration was upheld in favour of the grievor. He must have known that any other principals who may have been watching from the side lines should have realized a message: "He cannot do it to us." The sacred story of the organization was shown to have some flaws. They lost their case, a case which would have set a precedent for future district office action. All districts in the province may have been awaiting the results. For the director there had been a real challenge to his sense of identity. He was the boss and in losing this case he stood to be publicly ridiculed. The very personal representation of the arbitration decision indicates to me that the director had mixed feelings about the result and therefore took issue with it. The identity he wanted and expected to live by is not what he had to live by. The stability of the institution was placed in jeopardy and so was his identity.

**Conclusion**

There is much left to be unpacked in these three reports of one case. For the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on the sense of competing stories, the function of the conduit,
and identity as it relates to the organizational landscape. Whereas the union generically focused its summary on how the case applied to the collective agreement, the director sent a personal message, while the arbitrator focused on the facts as presented at the hearing.

One place where identity seems to be less of an issue is with the union. Members knew what their story was and they played it out through the grievor. The up-holding of the arbitration only strengthened the union's identity as a supporter of teachers, the protector of the collective agreement. Members of the union staff seem to be almost fictional characters, players in the union's sacred story without one of their own. Their identity was only played out through the sacred story of the union.

There is no mistaking the union's position but there are very clearly multiple messages in what the director is writing. He shows a humanness which is normally not expected of a person in his position, publicly showing how he feels about the outcome of the arbitration. I believe his sacred story has been shaken to the core. There may even have been some shifting in the sense of who he was as a director.

In terms of the organizational narrative the director had a lot riding on this arbitration. It was more than a question of just this one principal, it was a question of setting a precedent for other principals. It may even have been a question of re-establishing his identity as a director of a
school district. Hence, it was high stakes from an organizational point of view and he lost. The transformation created by the tribunal decision forced the director to relive his story with changed actions in his life and as Connelly and Clandinin (1993, p. 41) explain, it is difficult to live out a new way of seeing in our stories. When there are conflicting stories and they run legally counter to the sacred story, they send considerable ripples through the organizational story. The sacredness of the master narrative is weakened. I believe the director's story is evidence of that.

The concept of a positional conduited landscape with sacred, secret, and cover stories, and I am focusing mainly on the sacred, has another significance. We all live on a landscape with others but we do not all have the same positional roles. Therefore, nor are we all positioned alike. Some are higher in the conduit than others. In playing baseball, for example, the players are all on the same field but the batter is not positioned in the same way as an umpire. The umpire makes the call for the batter's hits, whether it is a ball or strike, or whether the batter runs or is out. Hence, position and positioning are primary elements in the conduit metaphor and both are principal components of the organizational landscape.

Together they help shape identities of hierarchy (Connelly & Clandinin, WIP). Those who are hired to live the plot lines of those positions are expected to live out and to
ensure that others live out their plot lines within the boundaries of the sacred story. In the case of the director in this chapter, his hierarchal identity came into question as he was forced to live out the story handed down by the arbitration tribunal. The director was no longer in control of that story.

One can assume that this will not happen too often before significant others begin questioning what is best for the organization, probably in the same terms as did the director with regards to the conflicting story which existed at R. Chant Memorial. His position on the landscape stands to be threatened to ensure that the sacred story is not weakened any more than it already is.

Another point, not only do participants, like those in an arbitration, live out institutionalized stories, but the shaping of their stories is determined by their role and roles are played out from different positions on the landscape. That is to say, institutions are seen and played out within positioned conduits which allow narratives to be told from different view points. Thus a story from an administrative point of view is heard and seen in different light than a story of the same event from a teacher's point of view. Each of the three reports given in Chapter 5 is an example of how one event can become a multiple reality. The three writers responded differently to the same arbitration in that they each focused from their position on the landscape.
In arbitration both professional officiators and employers, who work at grievances and can be expected to perform it many times, play a different role and are seen as being in a different position on the landscape than grievors. Grievors, from their position, have the right and duty to only participate a few times at the most and, in all likelihood, participate only once in their lifetime. This allows for a situation in which those who have already lived stories of arbitration take on someone who is just beginning a story. Those in charge of enacting the procedures have played out the arbitration event in different ways many times. Their positions may be strengthened or appear as being privileged by their presence on someone else’s landscape as they are seen as the experts. In that sense, a grievor’s position on the arbitration landscape weakens as he or she feels the inexperience of a new story.

One example is union representatives who position themselves on a grievor’s landscape. They have learned the techniques of what to do and what not to do at grievances through practice. The union story is a clear example of a narrative of practice, a procedural story. Employers, as well, in playing out their role in an arbitration, find themselves on a landscape which they know fairly well. Unless they are new to district office, they have experienced arbitration simply because of the role they are expected to play as the employer. Not only are they expected to be
involved in arbitration because of their position on the landscape but they are sometimes invited to observe as part of their training/learning/exposure process. Employees find themselves in a different position on the landscape. Chapter 6 deals with that experience. Like the grievor in the three reports of this chapter, the grievor in Chapter 6 wins his grievance but he still has stories he has to live by.
Chapter 6
Prying Through the Key Hole
Individuals and Their Narratives

Just as no man [sic] lives or dies to himself [sic], no experience lives or dies to itself. . . . Every experience lives on in further experiences.

(Dewey, 1938)

Introduction

Listening to or reading a conduited landscape story is not just a reporting of past events but rather the recounting of a personal and professional experience, a story that is lived. Hence, throughout the thesis I made reference to the idea that multiple realities of the world that people live are revealed through language and are connected through competing and conflicting stories as defined by Clandinin and Connelly (1995). It was also stated that we live in an institutionalized world which forms the landscape on which we live our plot lines. The landscape metaphor carries with it the conduit or funnel metaphor. What happens in life gets played out within those metaphors and tells us who we are, identifies us on the living landscape.

In events which are lived each person represents and epitomizes social roles in a larger, ongoing story. The grievor's narrative in this chapter is the awakening of a new experience, one that is practised on a one-time basis, cultivated from multiple tellings and retellings through storying the event. What I see in the story which follows is
a narrative of experience, one that echoes the personal and professional knowledge of a newly found position on the landscape of a principal.

The story is told by an educator who, up to the time of his grievance, had been a teacher for 27 years, 17 of which had been as the principal of a high school. To summarize, there were two school improvement evaluations given to the staff and principal by district office. One was initiated and guided by the district director and a second one was completed by a superintendent. Out of those evaluations the director and superintendent specified five areas in which the school had to improve: how budgeting was done, how the chaplaincy service was functioning, how both students and teachers were being evaluated, the number of staff and department head meetings which were taking place, and how school courses were being scheduled. The principal was given a set time to make the necessary changes or be re-assigned. At the end of the year he was re-assigned at which point he grieved through his collective agreement. During the arbitration the employer's lawyer used the two surveys and the five issues as evidence of non-compliance. The principal's story follows.

Hearing the Grievor's Side: (Principal, Feb.94)

I ran into some problems when I started school in September. I found myself, just prior to school opening, without the services of a home economics teacher. There had been one hired but she had quit before school actually began. The Director called me in August to say that District Office didn't have a home economics teacher and they couldn't get
one. However, there was a teacher (Teacher G) on staff who could take on this role even though she wasn't trained in that subject area. G was interested in the area of home economics and showed some practical talents. If G would take on the home economics courses, District Office could hire a science teacher. I discussed this with G and she agreed to take on the added responsibility. So then I was expecting District Office to hire a science teacher to replace G who had been teaching Biology and chemistry. However, that didn't happen and from there on started a whole chain of events so that things did not go right in our school.

The teacher that District Office hired to teach the sciences was a maths teacher. She had no biology, did not even study biology in high school. So she was not qualified. I still do not understand why. It really puzzles me. The teacher she replaced also did typing. The new teacher had no training in typing so I had to take out that course and replace it with a maths course in statistics. This was a disappointment to students and they became upset as they had already had their year's program of studies planned. They became very unhappy as they had wanted to do typing in their final year, and I didn't blame them.

It wasn't far along into October that the new teacher began having a lot of problems. Biology became an issue so I gave that course to another teacher and gave a less challenging science course to the new teacher. Then, she couldn't teach chemistry so I had to make a switch with another teacher there.

The whole situation got to the point where the new teacher really had more difficulties than she could cope with so I spent a lot of time in the classroom with her. Other teachers offered help but it was of no use. At this point she became very frustrated and by the end of October was ready to give it up. District Office released her without prejudice. They released her and then, here I was, with no supply teacher to cover that position until a replacement could be found.

I called everywhere within a 250km range for a supply teacher but couldn't get anyone. There was one in our community but District Office would not give me permission to hire her temporarily because she wasn't qualified even though she had filled in on occasions when the new teacher had been sick. This became an issue with the teachers on staff as they had to use their preparation periods to cover the courses the new teacher had left behind. When I discussed this with the Director he said he would meet with the teachers.

As far as the staff and I were concerned, the Director came to the school for a meeting to discuss the lack of personnel to teach science in our school but he ended up doing a questionnaire. I just assumed that the reason he was coming to meet with us was because we had some problems with home
economics teachers in that not many of them stayed around. They are fairly scarce people anyway and not many of them stay around the smaller communities. But, he came to talk about the characteristics of a good school and a bad school and had teachers do a questionnaire to determine how teachers perceived our school, our strengths and weaknesses.

We were hoodwinked there. We thought, in all sincerity, I mean, teachers believed that we were simply doing an exercise to determine our weaknesses and work out a plan to address them in the school, and didn't realize that later on this would be used against me in particular.

All [the information] came back to the school and pointed out the strengths and weaknesses in this school. Then, the Director got the superintendent involved.

At mid-year the Superintendent came to the school and did an evaluation of the school which he later used to point out certain weaknesses in the school. I believe he had teachers fill out a questionnaire [from which] he just drew certain conclusions. [He listed] the things that we were lacking. This became a case building exercise through which both the Director and the Superintendent were saying to me: "Here are the things that are wrong in this school, and we want you to fix them." I can remember the issues they held me responsible for.

One of the things they said was wrong was the instructional budget. By the time the case got to arbitration neither the Director nor the Superintendent could identify exactly what the problem had been.

Another issue was that the chaplaincy service was not working well in our school. Since we are a religious school we were expected to have the clergy play an active role counselling students and taking part in school assemblies. We had had a successful chaplaincy service for years. But, the program is only as good as the person who comes in to take on that responsibility. And, this time it didn't work and the reason it didn't work was because of the Chaplain who was in our community at the time. I had followed through on the instructions from District Office. For example, I had met with the student body to explain the role of Chaplain, sent a letter home to parents, set the Chaplain up with an office, a computer, and a telephone, and had agreed upon a time for the Chaplain to come into the school. And, nothing happened. The Chaplain could not find time to spend in the school. However, District Office continued to put pressure on me, saying that it was my responsibility to make it work. I was an Elder in the local Church and every chance I got I made a plea to the Chaplain to come to the school. I didn't see it as an extra-curricular activity for the Clergy. I thought it was part of his duties. I wrote letters to him and called on occasion to remind him but it still never got off the ground. However, when I realized I was going to have to go through arbitration I phoned the Clergy and he wrote a letter (June
24, 1990) confirming why he did not work at the school and I quote: "I never had time to be in the school to do it. I had other areas that were more pressing and there was more need, and therefore, I could not get to the school." It was good of the Clergy to do that because it was used as evidence at my arbitration hearing.

By this time I was suspecting that they were kind of mounting a case against me. When they came to the school that year and did those two little surveys . . . they indicated to me things needed to be done. But, I couldn't get those things to work. In October of the next year I received a letter from the Director in which he spelled out what he wanted done by April. I must say, they did not come back to follow up that much. I believe I had one piece of correspondence from the superintendent about some of the things that needed to be addressed in the school. . . . I was still struggling, trying to do the things I could. I had 6 months to fulfil his directives, specific things that he wanted done in the school, or be reassigned. I knew then that they were building a case. The staff were not aware that these conversations were taking place between the Director, the Superintendent, and myself. I didn't tell teachers that if we didn't straighten up this school, I was going to be reassigned. I did not go to them with the letter saying that . . . this is what we have to do. I had no particular reason for not telling them. I just worked on trying to improve the things that I could. Teachers knew I was working towards school improvement. Teacher evaluation became an issue as well.

I spent a lot of time that year, at least 5 months, addressing every issue that District Office had. But, it was not enough. They were still not satisfied with what had been done. But, I believe they had their minds made up. I really believe at the beginning of that school year that I could not do enough to get those things done because the decision had already been made. I believe that, even though I really felt good about the work the staff and I had done.

I had very few visits from the time that they gave me the ultimatum. . . . I'm safe on saying there were no more than three. During those visits I felt that they had an animosity towards me, especially the Superintendent. It seemed to me that the Director had started something and then it was more or less passed to the Superintendent. When he visited he wanted to know what had been done in the school with respect to improving the school. I told him about our inservice and I showed him all the things that the teachers and I had done. During the inservice I had given the teachers the 5 different areas which, according to District Office, needed to be worked on. Teachers, in small groups, made recommendations that we shared with everyone.

When I went to show the Superintendent the 5 reports I could only find 4. I can remember sitting behind my desk, and he was almost into my office [standing in the doorway].
When I told him I must have misplaced one he looked at me and said "are you losing your mind?" I saw red at this time because it was serious stuff anyway. I became very upset. I could have almost jumped over the desk after him that day. I brought that up at the arbitration because that was a very, very crude way of putting things. But, he denied ever having said those kinds of things.

The call [to begin the grievance procedure] came in early June. The Director wanted to meet with me and a Union representative. At that meeting we covered all the issues listed in the document that the Director had written. I indicated all the things I had done but there was nothing good enough. No issue was covered to his satisfaction. At that point the Union representative said that we might as well leave because the [Director] was not going to listen. But then the [Union representative] tried to work out some kind of arrangement. I wasn't party to that conversation. After that conversation the reassignment choices were verbally listed for me: I could be assigned to (a) an English position in my school; (b) an English position in another school outside this community; (c) a classroom position in the elementary school in our community; (d) or, I could stay on in my present position from September until December and be re-evaluated. But, if I didn't measure up they would have to let me go because all positions would have been filled at that time. I can remember what the Director said: "If we have to let you go, I can't place you anywhere else in this district. You'll be out on a limb, I got the axe, and there will be no safety net underneath." That's the way he described it and that's the way I said it in my testimony at the arbitration hearing. The Union Representative thought the Director's comment was rather rude, inappropriate, and there was no place for it really.

The day finished with the Union Representative, my spouse, and I having a meeting to discuss the day's events. I came back from the meeting and I had no correspondence with the Director for about a week. Then he called and asked me what I was going to do as I had four options. I told him that I was going to stay on, I was not resigning. I told him I would take my chances. His response was that he would get back to me. That was all he said.

A couple of days later I got a fax from him, a letter that stated only three options. The one giving me the choice to stay on for 4 months was gone. I called him on the phone and asked what had happened to the fourth option, the one I was going to take. He said that he had dropped that option. I was very upset. He had told me that I had four options, in front of a witness, and then when I decided to take the fourth option, it wasn't there. I had chosen the wrong answer from the Director's point of view.

I think it was a very political move because he could have gone to the School Board had I chosen one of the other
three options and said "Well, you know, I gave him the opportunity to stay on in the high school and he didn't take it." At this point I was advised by my Union Representative to choose one of the three options left. I took the elementary position in my own community on the condition that they would not take away my right to grieve.

I called a staff meeting. In the new business I told the teachers that I wouldn't be back in that position in September. After all, I had to do that. The teachers must have known. They knew about the issues because I spent a lot of time on school improvement. But, they didn't know that it had reached a point that the Board would be reassigning me. They could not believe it. When I told them the staff meeting was over no one moved, it was just like a bomb shell dropped and no one could believe it. When they didn't move, I got up and left, leaving them just sitting there.

The next day teachers were asking me what I wanted them to do. I was to that point where I really couldn't direct them to do anything. Teachers were unhappy with what was going on, what had happened. They felt that this was unjustified. I knew I had the support of the teachers and I really felt good about that. I felt bitter about the treatment I had received from District Office. It wasn't fair. At first I got mixed emotions. My immediate reaction, when I was first confronted with it really, was to say, "The hell with this. I don't need this in my life. I'll just quit." The Director and the Superintendent had been hounding me and really putting a lot of pressure on me. One meeting they had with me started early morning, around 8:00 a.m. and lasted until 9:00 p.m. that evening. I went home that evening very unhappy with the whole situation. I was frustrated, I was angry, and I wasn't thinking straight. So I decided I would get out of it, take another position because I didn't want the hassle.

My spouse's first reaction was that I couldn't have been doing my job. I "must have been slack" were the words which were used. But after I sat down and showed the things that I had done at the school my spouse felt that what was being done was wrong. I then discussed it with a few other people, and since I felt that I had staff support, I decided I was going to fight it, I would go to arbitration.

I applied for the grievance in July and the first meeting was set for December. But, just before that date District Office contacted the Union lawyer and asked for more time and a date was set for February. In between December and February the Union lawyer called to tell me that he was convinced we could work out a deal. If I was prepared to stay on in the position I chose while going through the arbitration process, District Office would continue to pay me my principal's bonus. I asked if he meant the same monetary bonus and he said yes. But I made it very clear that I was not in this for the money.
I had already gone through two stages of the grievance procedure and I was not prepared to bargain.

The lawyer said that he understood but felt that he had to let me know my options. He wouldn't tell me who initiated the deal or whether or not he agreed with it. And, he said that if I ever brought it up again it would not be open for discussion. In other words, this conversation had never taken place. I was starting to doubt whose side he was on but, at this late date, what choice did I have if I wanted the grievance to continue.

Then, one of the Union representatives suggested that I should think about the settlement. He said, if I did win I would still have to go back and work with the same Director in the same situation, that is to say, "He'll be on your back all the time." I told the representative I didn't care. If the Director harassed me I'd get the Union to help me again. The Union representative's reaction was, "We can't be bailing you out all the time." I didn't need that at this stage of the game. I was going to arbitration in a very short while, I didn't want somebody telling me that we should accept this deal. But, anyway, I said no to both the representative and the lawyer. The hell with it. I was prepared to go for it. Once the lawyer realized this he said there was no problem, he was prepared to go.

The day before the set date the Union lawyer called again to say that District Office was not ready, their nominee for the tribunal could not make it for that date. By this time I was not prepared to wait any longer. According to the collective agreement this case should have been up and running long before this.

So, we went. [The first] two days of hearings took place during which time the rules were agreed upon and the Superintendent was examined and cross-examined. It was funny, I mean, if you look back at parts of this now you can laugh. The Union lawyer told the Arbitration Board and the Employer that before the hearing began everything being presented had to be put on the table, upfront. He asked how many witnesses the Employer had and they answered two, the Director and the Superintendent. Once the legal stuff was over we got down to business. The rest of the day was spent listening to the Superintendent give his evidence, and that was fine. The next day the Union Lawyer cross-examined and tore the Employer's case apart. He counter-argued and questioned until there was nothing left. Their case was very weak to begin with. And then, there were parts of his testimony where I honestly believed that the Superintendent lied. And I said to the Union Lawyer, "Look, put me on the stand because that man is lying." But, the Lawyer said, "No, you're not getting on the stand, yet. You'll get your chance later on." The Employer's lawyer then said there were no further witnesses.

I was really disappointed because during the preliminary
stages of the grievance the Director gave me a hard time. Every time we met he tried to pick holes in what I was saying. But, when it came down to the arbitration and the chance to get on the stand to give his arguments before a Board, he refused to do it. And, that's unfortunate because we were prepared for him. He would have had some tough questions to answer. If the Director had taken the stand one of the questions he would have had to answer was why he hired a maths teacher to teach biology, chemistry, and typing. It was a very key point [as] he was responsible for hiring.

In March we met again for another two days at which time I gave evidence. Towards the end of the second day the chair asked the Employer's lawyer if he would like to cross-examine. The lawyer declined by saying something like, "I don't think I'll begin the cross-examination because we won't finish it today and I have a lot of questions to ask." So, at that point they finished and we began again in April.

I went through cross-examination and I felt good about it. Of course, I had to be very careful in answering questions. My lawyer knew how to handle this kind of thing. At one point I must have been giving too much evidence (I think I was using teachers' names or something they could check out and if I didn't have it exactly right I would have been in trouble), giving the lawyer opportunities that could have been picked up on and used against me, because my lawyer kicked my foot underneath the table. It told me I should stop even though the employer's lawyer was very anxious that I answer, or that I continue, and that caused a little bit of excitement. But, I didn't continue with that, I just stopped at that point. I suppose if I had continued, it could have started a whole new line of questioning. Anyway, when I stopped talking, it all ended. The cross-examination stopped. And then the witness testified and did a very good job of answering the lawyer's questions. I really appreciated that. All was left after the lawyers' summations was for me to return home and wait.

During the whole arbitration I felt like I didn't understand why we were going through all of this anyway. It seemed like a useless effort. It was wrong. I was hurt with it and I was frustrated because I didn't see the point. But, I had a feeling I was going to win and people, like other principals, kept telling me I had nothing to worry about. So, I waited: April, May, June, July, I was anxiously waiting.

Right up to the last part of August things weren't going right. I contacted the Union but I got answers like, "During the summer everyone is off on leave." I felt very frustrated because I wasn't getting anywhere. I wanted to know what was happening. What was I going to be doing in September? If I didn't win I needed to rethink: was I going to apply somewhere else? As a matter of fact I did make out some applications for other jobs.
But, you couldn't rush this Board. At one point the Union told me they wouldn't be able to get a decision ready before the opening of school in September. When I complained, the Union began to place pressure on the Arbitrators to get this case decided and I got my answer three days before school opened. All parties were contacted by telephone, my grievance had been unanimously upheld. But, the Director of the School District wouldn't act on the telephone call. He wanted the written report. So, here I was, on the holiday weekend before the opening of school, the decision made, report written, and the Director not wanting to act on it. I had to go back to my reassignment and wait. I had to stay there a full week. At the end of the week I got a phone call from the Director asking me if I was ready to go back to my former position. Ready. I asked? I had been ready for a week! But, he would not let me go back until he had the written arbitration award.

I was elated that I had won. I mean, I was on just a natural high. But, things were never the same. I never had the same rapport with District Office, especially with the Director, and I never will. For example, the day I went back to work the Director came into the school to more or less hand over the reins of authority and to tell me what I needed to be doing in the school. I had been in that school for several years and didn't need the Director telling me how to be a principal. I knew what I had to do in the school. When I told the Director that, he got kind of excited so I told him the arbitration case was over, it was finished, it was done with.

Then, he met with both the teaching and support staff, said that it was not a meeting open for discussion, thanked those who had helped out over the year that the arbitration was in progress and left. He just came to the school and made an appearance. I don't even know the purpose of the meeting really. It served none except maybe a bit of a power trip. He left me with the impression that he wasn't very happy. I mean, he didn't come to visit the school at all for the remainder of that year. He never answered some of my letters requesting information for the staff. He didn't acknowledge some of my requests. When we met in public, like at meetings, he talked to me, but privately he just ignored me.

What I expected the Director to do was to talk to me as a person. I was willing to put this aside. I wanted to get on with a new life. I wanted to re-start in this school with the Director accepting me. He should have come to the school, sat down with me and established some kind of positive rapport. I would have worked toward that end. But that never happened. I'm not prepared to work towards it now. And I never will. The Director has never made any attempt to put anything aside. Of course, I still talk to him in my role as principal, and I'm not unfriendly, after all, he is my Director. But, what
I'm saying is that there should be more there. He should have come to the school and worked towards establishing some kind of a good working relationship. He should have sat down with me and talked about this stuff and made plans, worked with me because he never ever did work with me [with regards] to improving the school. Neither he nor the superintendent gave me any help to try and address these things. Whatever was done I did myself. But obviously what I did myself was not to his satisfaction. [The Director] should have pointed out things that he thought were wrong with the school. Not only with me, but with the teachers as well. That hasn't been done so there is a void there.

If this arbitration took place because the Director felt it was going to improve the school, nothing has changed. I wish this whole thing had never happened. Obviously it leaves a dirty taste in your mouth, a bitter taste. I didn't do anything wrong. I had nothing to feel guilty about. I had reasons to feel good. I got no pressures from the Director after that initial back to school meeting. He just ignored me. We agreed to ignore each other.

When we met in public such as at principals' meetings he tried to make talk with me. I mean, he made an effort in public. But privately he just ignored me. He never ever worked on trying to establish any kind of working relationship after that. I guess he never will. But I can live with that.

I have no regrets. I'm very happy that I went through it. The only thing is, if this had been earlier in my career I would really have needed to think a lot about going to arbitration. Because, if I had had to leave this community to get a new start in education I would have needed the Director's recommendation. I know I wouldn't have received one, at least not a positive one.

The Director is someone to fear. I mean, he is your employer. He has given you a job. Once you've gone to arbitration or complained, he can be on your back all the time. And the chances of getting advanced would be nil. They own the power and they'll swing it the way they want. There's no doubt in my mind about that. We're only employees, just like puppets, and they just pull the strings which ever way they want to go. It is hard to survive arbitration even though it may be the best of two evils.

Once you've ended up in an arbitration situation it is difficult. You are almost like you're in a no win situation. Everyone has an opinion as to whether you are guilty or innocent. If the public believes you are guilty, then they have a tendency to guard that opinion even if you win. So, they say something like, "Gee, there must have been something wrong. He just got off on a technicality, that's all." So you feel like there's probably still people in the community who doubt you. I knew the teachers believed me, as did my closest friends, but public perception can be
Yet, I would definitely encourage any teacher to exercise his or her right to arbitration. Looking back now, I would have kicked myself for the rest of my life if I had not gone. I would have retired and to know that that man could have forced me out of a position, I would have been very, very unhappy, very bitter, more bitter than I am now.

I believe that teachers have to challenge things that are wrong. You have to stand up for your rights. You have to fight even though a lot of times that really hurts to do. You have to be able to live with yourself and that's why you have to fight these people.

I think the Director wished afterward that he had not become involved into it. The issues they had were nothing. He thought he had something. He was going to go as a witness but when the Superintendent went on the stand, the Director saw the writing on the wall. I just felt he was powerful and stubborn so once it began he wouldn't back down. I believe he was still expecting, or at least hoping, that I would back off. So he pushed all the way and that was unfortunate.

I can tell you one thing, I'm really glad I had the Union. That arbitration cost a lot of money and I felt so good that they were supporting me. Other than that I would never had been able to do it financially. How could I have been able to get money to spend on something like that. I would have had to take a different route out or accept what the Director was offering and count my blessings.

The Grievor's Story: Competing and Conflicting Stories

The grievor begins his story with a competing story of what it is like to be placed in a role for which one does not have a comfortable story. District office was suppose to hire a science teacher but instead hired a teacher who had been trained in maths to teach biology, chemistry, and typing for which she had no training. The teacher soon found that she could not play that role. The story she was trying to live was not hers but rather one that district office assumed that she could live. Her competing story of experience and training became a conflicting story for the students as well.
as for the remaining staff and principal as students demonstrated their conflict through behaviour misconduct and teachers became frustrated with having to live the teacher's story for her by having to assist her in her teaching and classroom management. As the principal (1994) stated, "[F]rom there on started a whole chain of events so that things did not go right in our school."

The stage had been set for a conflicting story between district office personnel and school personnel. It is obvious from the principal's story that the stories of school which were surfacing at district office were not the stories district office wanted to hear. Nor were they the same stories that school personnel were living. First of all, one teacher backed out of a contract to teach home economics before the school year began. Another home economics teacher could not be found for the opening of school in September. A teacher on staff who had an interest and talent in crafts and was trained in science agreed to take on the job as district office thought it might be easier to find a science teacher than a home economics teacher. They could not find a science teacher and therefore hired an inexperienced maths teacher with no science background. Another problem emerged.

The teacher she replaced had also taught typing. The replacement had no typing experience. The new teacher tried the position but it did not work for her so she left. Then, a qualified replacement could not be found and district office
would not allow an unqualified local substitute teacher to fill the position until a qualified person could take over the classes. The staff, who already had their teaching assignments for the year, had to cover by giving up their preparation time. Hence, one message had surfaced up the conduit, teachers are upset, while another circulated back, no substitute.

The teachers did not like the story they were getting from district office and asked for a meeting with the director to try and reshape the story. According to two participants (Betty, 1994; Steve, 1994) their intent for requesting the meeting was to try to reshape the director's story, in other words, convince him to bring in a substitute. The principal found himself in a position on the landscape which was suspended between the staff and district office, sending messages up the conduit and receiving and relaying messages back. In each case one can assume that he found himself between a rock and a hard place as he listened and tried to live the stories of both groups as they competed against each other. Betty (1994) described him as having the teachers in his face and the director at his heels.

A second competing story layered the first when the director came for a staff meeting. As one teacher (1994) portrayed it, "He turned up with a box of Tim Horton donuts." This is an image which is still recalled by the staff and is often the brunt of staffroom joking. According to the
principal (1994), the staff was under the impression that the
director was coming to the school to talk about the vacant
teaching position that teachers were using their preparation
time to cover, in other words, their story. Instead, the
director had the staff talk about the characteristics of a
good and bad school which must have been the story of district
office. Considering the fact that the director's position was
much higher on the landscape than was the teachers, they knew
that they had to do as they were told even though they might
not have wanted to. Very few teachers want to put themselves
in a position where they feel their jobs are in jeopardy. As
I wrote in Chapter 1, insubordination is part of both a
teacher's and union's vocabulary. Hence, according to Betty
(1994) they enacted a conflicting story, filling out
questionnaires which they had not wanted to fill out. To them
their issue had to do with getting a replacement teacher or
substitute so that they would not lose their preparation
periods (Steve, 1993).

The principal (1994) said, "We were hoodwinked there. We
thought in all sincerity, I mean, teachers believed that we
were simply doing an exercise to determine our weaknesses and
work out a plan to address them in the school." According to
the principal's story, the information compiled from the
questionnaire was later used against him as evidence for
disciplinary action. In short, the story was no longer
teachers' stories about how they had no substitute, but an
administrator's story of a school gone awry, a school that needed to take a look at itself and begin a new story, or at least reshape the one which was already there.

This was the beginning of a new story for the principal. The information the teachers gave at that time was coupled with a second evaluation done by one of the superintendents. Both of these pointed out specific areas of weakness that district office wanted changed: the instructional budget for the school, the lack of a chaplaincy service as it was a denominational school, the timetable for the next school year, the evaluation of teachers, and the number of staff and department head meetings being held. The director's and superintendent's evaluation of the principal hinged on whether the weaknesses they discovered in their questionnaires to the staff had been corrected by the principal and these became the key evidence for district office once the demotion issue went to grievance.

At this point of the story the principal believed the director's and superintendent's staff meeting visits were a cover story for another plot, one that would remove him as principal. This plot was verified when he was told by district office that he had 6 months to reshape the school story or be reassigned. This led to a secret story for the principal as he did not tell the staff of the directives he had received from district office. Instead he lived a cover story of going about his job as if nothing out of the ordinary
was happening while trying to make the changes demanded of him. Meanwhile, the teachers were living their story of animosity towards district office for trying to force them to reshape their story of school. As an example, the director was not invited to the graduation ceremonies that year (Steve, 1993). Past practise indicated that the director or a representative had always been invited. Staff resisted and openly complained about the changes which were coming down the conduit (Betty, 1995).

District office was chipping away the principal's sacred story. One where he saw himself as a successful teacher for 27 years, 17 of which had been as principal. In reference to the reassignment, his spouse (1993) said something to the effect that her husband had spent 17 years working as a principal for the school board and "and this is what they do to him." She referred to it as a "slap in the face." The principal saw himself as having done nothing wrong but yet was being reassigned. In being reassigned he must have felt that something was still wrong either with him or with district office. From listening to his story I believe he felt that only a verdict of an arbitration award would show how wrong the director was or how wrong he was and he felt confident that it was the director who was at fault.

This story conflicted with the story district office was telling, one they wanted to reshape. The story it was building was one of school improvement while the principal saw
that as a cover story for getting rid of him. "I believe they
had their minds made up," he said (1994). In other words, it
is possible that the sacred story of district office went
deeper than just the events that were taking place. In a
conversation I had with one of the school custodians (Sept.,
1993), she said that during the summer in which the principal
was given his reassignment the director visited the school and
cleaned out the principal's office. The principal was not
present. In reference to the principal he said, "He will not
be back" as he proceeded to put all of the principal's
personal belongings in a box. There was no other explanation
offered. Neither was anything suggested by the principal in
his story other than there seemed to be a prior plot as
previously indicated. He said, "[I]t was not enough. They
were still not satisfied with what had been done."

This surfaces another conflicting story, one that shows a
story of contempt and mistrust towards district office and in
particular, towards the director. "We're only employees," the
principal said, "just like puppets, and they just pull the
strings which ever way they want to go." Earlier in the
interview he said that during the re-instatement meeting the
director left him "with the impression that he [the director]
wasn't very happy. . . . He didn't come to visit the school at
all for the remainder of that year. He never answered some of
my letters. . . . He didn't acknowledge some of my requests."
district office were mounting a case against him. "I could not do enough to get those things done because the decision had already been made." On the surface the principal saw the director and superintendent as giving him duties to carry out. Underneath he believed they were trying to get rid of him. It was a conflicting story which almost made him leave without putting up a fight. It was only after his own story of wanting to be seen as a competent person who had done nothing wrong that we see the reverse decision, the decision to grieve the reassignment.

The principal was following a plot line that convinced him district office had its own secret story before it entered the school and that it had already been decided at the administrative level that the school story was going to be reshaped. The principal obviously believed that district office did not see him as being part of that new story.

The seeds were planted for another story in June of that same year when the principal was given his ultimatum of reassignment choices. The arbitration story was about to begin. The principal would now have to divulge his secret story to the staff, alerting them that they had been living a cover story of change for what may have been intended to be a more sacred story of change. The sacred story was to be the one directed by district office, one that said the school story was being changed either willingly or through administrative will.
The principal clearly described the effects of his reassignment when towards the end of the final staff meeting for the year, in new business, he told the staff he would not be back in September, "[I]t was just like a bomb shell dropped and no one could believe it." A new story had been plotted, funnelled down the conduit and planted on the staff. What message was this new story sending to them, that the story they had been living was the wrong story? Or, that district office was going to force feed them a new story that they felt was not their story and therefore they were not going to live it? Since the principal told a story of staff support, I see the latter as being the more probable.

I should point out that my interpretation here is based on the principal's story as I did not interview the staff. The principal could have misinterpreted the staff's reaction. It is possible that some staff members did not much care what was happening between the principal and district office and a few might even have been valuing the director's story. However, the principal made it clear in his story that he decided to go through with the grievance only after he felt out the staff in a meeting and gained a sense of teacher support.

There is a story of resentment told by the principal with regard to the actions of district office. He felt bitter about the treatment he had received from district office to the point that he had considered quitting. He felt like he
had been hounded by the director and superintendent. The message he was getting was that they wanted him out and he was going to go. He was, he said, completely unhappy. Even the principal's spouse was questioning how he had been doing his job. The story he is living is probably one of incompetency, a story which penetrates right through the working bone and tells people they are no good, that they have no purpose in the organization, they are not living up to their positional roles as professionals.

This story again shifted when the principal was reassured by his spouse and by his staff that his story as principal was okay. In other words, there was something wrong with the story coming from district office. The principal awakened to the idea of fighting back through a new position on the landscape, arbitration. At this point, he had not only reshaped his own story, one that would conflict with district office, but he had taken on a different role to do so.

He became a grievor in an arbitrary process. His position on the landscape changed as a new experience was about to begin. This story was not his to shape alone: he was guided by his lawyer, his union representative, and by the arbitration process itself. Therefore, competing stories again emerged as he tried to adjust to a new plot line. The new plot line began to conflict when his lawyer and union representative started plea bargaining with district office and offering the principal other options rather than going to
arbitration. At one point in the interview, in reference to his lawyer, he said, "I was starting to doubt whose side he was on but, at this late date, what choice did I have if I wanted the grievance to continue?" The stage was set, the arbitration story had begun, the principal did not want it reshaped into a different story.

When the union representative wanted him to plea bargain his response was, "I didn't want somebody telling me that we should accept this deal. I wasn't in it for the money." In a later conversation (1995) the principal told me that he was very upset over the conversation which had taken place between the union representative and himself. When the representative told him that even if he won he would lose and that he could not keep coming back to them for help if district office put pressure on him, he asked for a new representative from the union. I believe that it had become clear to the principal that he and that particular union representative were living conflicting stories. Therefore, someone else from union office was needed, someone who was willing to help shape the principal's story and give him his day in court. At that point in time, even though he was hearing a conflicting story from his union, he must have felt the need to tell his story. This exposes another tension in his story.

When he talked about the union he said that he was very thankful for what they had done. Yet, as it turned out, they were negotiating behind his back and offering him alternate
plot lines which he did not want to live. One of those was to take a lower position in the school and keep his principal's salary. And then, when he asked about it he was brushed aside. I believe that the union representatives were playing their own game and the principal, to some extent, did not seem to resent that. He certainly indicated frustration, however, as he asked for someone else in the union to represent him. When I asked him about this (1995) his response was that he had no other choice. He knew he could not fight district office without the union's support and so he had to put up with the competing story in order to get his day in court and the union did stand by him once it was decided that they were going to arbitration.

The union's response for behind-the-scenes negotiating was that it had to explore every possible option and present those to the grievor. As one can see, the stories begin competing not only between the employee and the employer but also between the employee and his union. That kind of behind-the-scenes bargaining stopped when the grievor said he was not taking any deals. However, throughout the arbitration, strategy meetings between the lawyer and union representative continued to be in closed sessions, which is considered to be normal practice.

Another story which the grievor told was one of wanting to be accepted by the director. The principal was elated to have won but things were never the same with district office.
He said that he expected the director to talk to him as a person. He wanted to begin a new life in the school with the director's support. In other words, he was seeking acceptance, some sign of an effort to establish a good working relationship with district office personnel. In Connelly and Clandinin's (WIP) terms, he wanted back an identity as a competent person and be storied as a good principal.

It is interesting that he seemed to get that from the director. Taylor (1991, p. 34) describes identity as the "background against which our tastes and desires and opinions and aspirations make sense." From my view of the organizational landscape, our religion, language, customs, social structures, and so forth, determine who we are, and how we interact with others, determines who we will become. This may explain why the principal wanted his identity restored by the director. If some of the things a human being values are accessible only in relation to others, the others become internally and intrinsically relational to the identity of the human being. Taylor (p. 49) says that "individuals are vulnerable to the recognition given or withheld by significant others." Through the principal's story I make the assumption that he believed that his identity was being withheld by the director.

The principal saw his sacred story of school as being one of having a good rapport with district office. A positive connection to the people in district office seemed imperative
to the successful operation of the school. Budgeting, staffing, and professional development were all managed from district office. It was difficult to deal with personnel if you had a "dirty taste in your mouth, a bitter taste" which is how the principal described his relationship with district office. The tension of school-district office relationship made it difficult to live anything but a cover story. According to the principal the director and he were civil to each other at public meetings but away from the public eye they "agreed to ignore each other." Another conflicting story has been exposed, one that made the principal realize that he was going to have a difficult time living his story as principal.

The Researcher's Point of View

The principal's story brings out several issues one could be concerned with in living on a personal and professional knowledge landscape. For one thing, grievors, more than anyone else involved, other than maybe the witness for the grievor, choose to go to arbitration because they believe they have been wronged. They have been seen by significant others as having over-stepped the organizational boundary and in doing so threaten other positions on the landscape. District office may perceive them as not being committed to the expectations of the organization, as not living the sacred story of the institution, and therefore needing to be removed.
This, according to Clandinin and Connelly (1995), is one of the fallouts of the conduit metaphor.

What it implies is that the landscape is lived out in positional roles with the top (administrators and government bureaucrats) funnelling ideas to the bottom line (the workers). This leaves the failure of school reform as the responsibility of teachers and the principal. In other words, the conduit scenario makes whatever happens a "people" problem.

In a school the principal is seen as the one solely responsible for ensuring that reform is carried out by the staff. My use of the word "solely" is intentional as it takes the onus off of other educators and places it squarely on the shoulders of the principal. It has been my experience, as principal, that principals see themselves and are seen by others, in particular staffs, as having to answer for what happens in a school.

A couple of years ago I took part in a principals' meeting called to discuss some of the recommendations which had come from the William's Report. Recommendation 59 (p.269) called for "all positions in education having administrative responsibilities [to] be term appointments." In the discussion to which I was party, the concern of term

---

76 The Williams' Report (1992) was a study conducted by Dr. Len Williams for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. In it Williams made 211 recommendations for the restructuring of education in that province.
appointments centred around the possibility of terms not being renewed. The metaphor which was used by several principals around the table was that of coach; when the team does not work up to employer's expectations one fires the coach. This principal-as-coach story suggests that school reform within the conduit metaphor lies at the feet of the principal. If the expected change/directive does not happen to the satisfaction of those positioned on the upper levels of the conduit, changes may happen to the principal.

Principals, seeing themselves in this kind of conflictive situation, have two options open to them, leave or question the rights of management. The latter is the grievor's pathway to arbitration, another plot line to be lived out, a different role to play. The stories the grievor told at the hearing took him back to the professional stories he had lived by. The stories were not new. They were old stories being examined and cross-examined, being restoried.

Secondly, all of the examination and cross-examination in the principal's story evolved from the weaknesses in the school which were determined through the data collection of the director and the superintendent. These were presented at the arbitration as evidence that this was what the surveys showed and each frame of questions from the employer's lawyer focused on these areas. As a matter of fact, in the binder of information given to me by the grievor to use in this thesis, the sections were divided and titled by the five weaknesses
indicated by district office. In other words, when the employer argued that there were directives which the principal had not carried out, it was the weaknesses of the school to which he was referring.

Hence, from the principal's point of view the school improvement surveys had a hidden agenda. They were being used specifically against him even though there are indications that some of the directives had to be lived by an out-of-school story. At least two of the issues were created from the outside, one from the lack of supplying a qualified teacher at district office and the other from the chaplain who said that he was not able to do his job (Exhibit #5, Union vs School District). Clearly, the principal was not the only one who had to live his story and that of district office. This shows that we live stories interdependently on others (Barter & DeCarion, 1997) as we move back and forth on the same landscape.

Thirdly, insecurity in maintaining one's identity depends significantly on the stories one lives by and also on the stories others live by if a mutual plot line is being played out. In the case of the lawyer refusing to give the grievor the details of what was going on during the behind the scenes negotiating, he called the grievor's bluff with regard to whether or not he would be willing to make a deal with the employer and call off the arbitration. It was a story the grievor was not prepared to live out. His story plotted a
path that led him to his day in court. It is obvious that he needed the chance to tell his story. He could not live out a story that put him in a position of backing down from the administrative story. He was willing to live out a competing story of arbitration even though he had little knowledge of how that story would be shaped.

Individuals living such a blurred plot line may become doubtful because they are not sure about what is happening to them. They probably decide to go to arbitration because they have an image in their mind of what it should be like only to find out that their definition of the situation is different from what they had previously anticipated. The principal's conflict with the union attests to that. Since they are already engaged in the event their ambiguity will be translated into uncertainty and doubt. The question as to who they are in this process becomes a significant factor as they are taken through this process. It is dilemma-laden. They then look towards the expert, in this case the lawyer and/or union representative, to clear up the ambiguity, to help position them on the arbitration landscape.

If those invested with that task do not accomplish setting a consistent plot line, more mistrust occurs in that more competing, even conflicting, stories occur. In the case of this grievor, when doubt occurred because he was asked to settle out of arbitration, he asked for another union representative. Doubt had set in. He had lost his sense of
identity and he needed to interact with someone else in order to re-establish who he was, a person who wanted to fight the decision of district office. The only way he could legally fight was through a grievance process and the collective agreement.

We did not hear much about the counselling he would have received from the lawyer and/or the union representative. My guess is that he received an endless amount because he knew what the kick under the table meant. What this means is that events such as grievance hearings have a narrative structure. They have players and these characters lay out certain stories which are part of the bargaining process. It seems to go by a fixed plot line and the significant players know what the structure of the plot is. Like actors, grievors are being directed in their play and there does not appear to be much room for interpretation. The better one is at playing out the understood plot line the better chance one has of a tribunal siding in one's favour. But, in the playing out of that process there evolves a tension between the narrative structure being followed and the emotions which, although a part of developing the characters and the plot lines, in fact, appear to be ignored. It is very clear that those in positions to write arbitration plot lines have tried to take emotions away simply by insisting that events such as arbitration be kept formal and technical, cleansed of the lived story.
According to the participants I interviewed, teachers cannot file a grievance against an employer on their own volition. It has to be done through their union. In a sense, the conflicting story of the grievor becomes a new story, one which is connected to articles in a collective agreement and becomes part of a more generic version of the organizational narrative. This is the only way the grievor's story can be heard. The grievor is bound by his or her professional position on the landscape as teacher. But, it is a competing story many are willing to share to ensure their stories are heard. As the participant (1993) in this chapter said, "I believe that teachers have to challenge things that are wrong. You have to stand up for your rights."

BethAnn (1994) said, "If it was me I would do it again. But, for somebody else I would say 'Don't do it if you really want a job afterwards'." Gala (1994) responded to my question of "Would you advise anyone else to go through arbitration?" by saying:

I think I would only advise them if I felt they were a strong person. . . . I was fortunate . . . I was so attuned to what was going on at that time because it was such an important resolution in my life, like to stand up for something I truly believed in . . . to face my accusers, . . . to face the enemy and to do battle . . . because that's what I felt happened.

The grievors, interviewed for this study, agreed that they needed their unions even when they had to share conflicting stories with them.
Under normal circumstances if someone hired a lawyer and then felt that the lawyer was not playing fair ball, he or she was negotiating behind the scenes, the lawyer would probably be fired. In an arbitration situation the lawyer acts on behalf of the union who, in turn, represents the grievor. It makes for an interesting twist for, just as the grievor is between his own story and that of the union's, so is the lawyer triangulated between the grievor's story, the union's story, and what he or she can argue through the collective agreement. The problem is that the lawyer is not employed by the grievor but rather by the union. However, the grievor in this chapter did not see it as a problem because he needed the union and their lawyer to get to arbitration. This points to a more complex issue than may be experienced in the arbitration itself, that of the organizational narrative of the union.

Its role is part of a larger policy which portrays unions as playing their cards out only so far with its own membership. In other words, unions have other things at stake and sometimes do not involve their members in that part of the game playing, hence, the behind the scenes negotiating. On the other hand, the game they are playing up front is arguing employer decisions based on one grievor's story to strengthen the collective rights of all teachers. The grievor's story becomes a violation of the collective agreement rather than a violation of the grievor as a person. As I said in Chapter 5,
this may explain why the statements made by the union representatives are so general and depersonalized, because they are not arguing on behalf of the grievor. It is clear that there are things at stake as an institution that transcend the individual interest of the members. The grievor's story becomes a cover story for a more sacred story, that of the organization. The question becomes: Who is the grievor in the union's story?

One possibility is that grievors become multiple characters in the arbitration story. They are the collective agreement strengtheners if the grievance is upheld, or the collective agreement destroyers if the grievance is not upheld. They are the school district's strengtheners for future disciplinary action if the arbitration sides with the school district, or the destroyers of future disciplinary action if the district's decision is not upheld.

At one point in the grievor's story he felt that, once the director saw how things were going, he might have liked to have been let off the hook from this grievance and not carried it forward. If that had been the case the grievor's story may have been different. Once the sacred story was challenged the director was forced to act in order to re-institutionalize or re-centre the sacred story. However, this was not the sacred story of the grievor, but rather of the institution.

The grievor wanted to re-centre his own sacred story by hearing the story of the director, a story he never got a
chance to hear because the director declined testifying. That left the grievor to re-centre his own story which he was unable to do successfully because of the missing pieces. This caused him to be a mixed-up character in his own story as he realized that things would not work in the school if they were not working well with the central administration.

Positional Roles and Landscapes: Source of Identity

The main issue which arises from the notion of living out storied lives on conduited landscapes is one of identity. Connelly and Clandinin (WIP, p. 5) refer to it as "stories to live by . . . given meaning by the narrative understandings of knowledge and context." In other words, from a narrative point of view, people's identities are wrapped up in their stories. It is who they are. Throughout the grievor's retelling of his competing and conflicting stories one can see the shift in identity which accompanies the shifting of roles on the positional landscape.

At the beginning of the story the grievor was a principal without a home economics teacher, then he was a principal with a maths teacher who was supposed to teach chemistry and biology. His role as principal was continuously called into question as he found himself caught between the stories of his staff and those of district office. It finally came down to the blame being placed on the principal as principalship is a role which places one in a position where one is expected to
work on behalf of district office. In other words, a principal is expected to live the sacred story of the institution.

In the story recounted by the principal, he is presented as living the sacred story until he was reassigned as he makes reference to not understanding why district office personnel were behaving the way they were. He believed he was doing his job and therefore should have been accepted by district office. In that sense, I make the assumption that he sees himself as living the sacred story of the organization as he believes that he is doing his job as principal, at least in the way that he thinks it should be done.

In being reassigned he had to face at least two possible stories, either he was not doing his job, as district office claimed, or district office was wrong. The one thing he was certain of was that he was no longer principal. His identity of 17 years had been taken away from him via reassignment, a reassignment to a teaching position which portrayed him as being demoted and would allow others to story that he had been unable to do his job or did not do it.

In short, the grievor in this chapter may have had his identity shattered. He went through a stage when he did not even want to go forward with the grievance, when he felt he was being told that he was not capable of doing the job. It had become obvious that those at district office did not want him as a principal. The director had already made it clear
that he did not want him back in that school. He even went in and packed up his personal belongings. According to the principal, district office personnel did not answer his letters or return his calls. They did not even visit the school. This meant that he was not a member of the administrative team as a principal. He had been set adrift to live a plot line where he had to fend for himself. In his interview he said that, at one point he had been asked by a superintendent if he was losing his mind.

District office was telling him he was not a good principal. He was not living the sacred story of the organization and it was time for him to leave. According to the principal he had been given four options, when he decided to take the one that allowed him to stay on for another 6 months it was taken away from him. These messages sent ripples through his sacred story. He had been a teacher for 27 years, 17 of those had been as a principal. He saw himself as a just, honest man with no malicious intent against anyone at district office. As far as he could see he was doing his job. All of these dialogical plot lines were serious to him. They affected how he was living his story and made him upset. Therefore, to maintain some semblance of his former identity he had to re-establish himself and the only way he could do that was through arbitration.

Once he received a message from his spouse, the staff, and significant others, that he was not at fault he went to
arbitration to prove to others that he was not who district office saw him as. He said, "I have to live with myself." He had to prove who he was as he felt that his sense of himself, his sense of identity as teacher, principal, husband, and community member was being chipped away.

There is irony in using arbitration as his means of re-establishing his identity in that once the arbitration began, his identity became something other than what it was before when he had been established as a principal. I suspect that he still did not see himself as principal, as he was now playing the role of a grievor.

It is accepted by writers such as Elbaz (1983) and Clandinin and Connelly (1984) that in real life people bring a whole wealth of personal knowledge to any event in which they participate. And in light of that knowledge they may even attend differently to details in the same event and remain unaware that other details could be made available to them. We see through our own lens of experience so to speak. We live our own plot lines. In such an unknown situation as arbitration the grievor, probably because he or she sees so little due to their inexperience, will rely on his or her lawyer and union representative and hence, as mentioned earlier, become multiple characters in his or her own story. But, becoming multiple characters creates multiple identities which shift and compete and conflict with each other.

This idea of character identity and created plot lines is
comparable to what happens in plays where as Goffman (1974, p. 149) explains, the "audience assumes that what the writer chooses to inform them about up to any one point is all that they need in order to place themselves properly in regard to the unfolding events." This is what grievors experience upon entering into an arbitration event - the lawyer only tells them so much, as much as the lawyer thinks they need to know and union representatives plea bargain behind the scenes.

From my perspective, for the grievor this becomes an undermining of identity. Who is he during this process? And, who will he become once he has lived out that process? He is no longer a principal. He is someone else, someone who has to seek out an identity through an article in the collective agreement. Once the hearings are finished he is no longer a grievor, so who is he? There may be no better way to strip a person of their identity than to take away their job or force them into something new.

What is lacking in the union story is the acknowledgement that whenever people engage in an activity they situate themselves with regard to it and over a period of exposure will acquire direct observations. In other words, they seek meaning by auditing, interpreting, and drawing conclusions. When not told all, or at least as much as possible, the grievors' checking and understanding capacities may take them beyond the point where they can determine what is happening, causing barriers to their perception creating a tensioned
story. Everything beyond these boundaries will be concealed from them, leaving an opening for tension and stress and loss of identity.

In the grievor's story of this chapter, when the union representatives suggested that he should take a settlement rather than go to arbitration and the lawyer seemed to agree with the settlement, the message re-affirmed the story of district office. The principal must have felt that he was insubordinate, even the union was trying to get him to take one of the options. Since the lawyer refused to tell who had initiated the deal he had no way of knowing who it was that wanted to negotiate. But he was not prepared to leave his identity or the re-shaping of it in any less of a position than he had before, that of principal. He said that it was not the money. I think it was how he thought others might see him and how he would see himself. "The hell with it," he said. "I was prepared to go for it." There was a need to fight for being able to live his own story.

In a later interview the grievor told me that he questioned the lawyer as to who initiated the settlement. The lawyer's response went something like "Never mind. I am prepared to go to arbitration with this. As far as I'm concerned this conversation never happened." Was the grievor thinking the union initiated the deal? If he did then he also believed the union representatives thought him to be guilty. Why else would a union try to negotiate a deal? If the deal
had originated from the employer, that may have shown signs that the grievor was not insubordinate and the employer wanted to back off for fear of losing. Either way indicates to me that the grievor was again seeking an identity. Was he guilty or innocent? In a sense, the grievor found himself positioned on the edge of a landscape, a position for which he had no experience, a place where he had no identity as a professional person.

For the time being, at least, his identity would be created by others. That is, in order to shape a story for himself he had to live someone else's. The lawyer was telling the grievor his story and in doing so creating a barrier at the same time because it was a story the grievor did not know, or only partially knew. From my point of view, considering the conduited boundaries which are created, it is also easy to appreciate how feelings of doubt and suspicion as to who one is can surface.

Besides that, the director had already taken away his identity by re-assigning him to a teaching position. To him and to others, it would have been seen as a demotion. He wanted to hear why the director did that and was very disappointed when the director did not testify. "We were prepared for him," he said. "He would have had some tough questions to answer." The director's testimony or the union lawyer's cross-examination of it, to the principal, was key to his finding out why he had been stripped of who he was.
Testifying would have forced the director to tell his story or at least the story of district office. Why he chose not to is unknown but my speculation is that he knew his story would not meet with tribunal approval. Rather than make the sacred story of the institution any weaker than it already was, he chose to keep a silent story.

The principal also felt that the director had power in his position to shape the grievor's identity any way he wanted to. "We're only employees, just like puppets, and they just pull the strings which ever way they want to go." BethAnn (1994) said, "You may win the battle but you lose the war. If you really want a job afterwards, [don't grieve]. . . . They have a lot of power and they can hurt you." To the grievor in this chapter, the director could make or break his identity simply by shifting his position on the landscape. His re-assignment was seen as such a shift. If he won his grievance some would still say that he must have done something wrong. "Public perception can be misconstrued," he said (1993). Which ever way things went he knew he would have to rebuild a new story to re-centre his identity. As the union representative (1993) and the representative from the department of labour (1993) said, even when he won, he lost.

For the principal and staff of this school, identity issues played a critical role. It was believed by the teachers that if the principal had lost his grievance the identity of the teachers would have also been at stake. As
Betty (1993) described the feelings of the staff, "If [District Office] wins their case, look out." In other words, someone on staff would be next. Educators at the school, in particular the principal and staff, were being called into question. If the arbitration board had sided with district office, one can make the assumption that other changes would have occurred in the school. All the staff would have been complying for fear of their jobs being placed on the line or the union may have been expecting more grievances as district office took action. And as Connelly and Clandinin (WIP, p. 162) ascertain, "[T]here is also the unease, not clearly articulated, dimly understood, that things will never be the same, that we will have to become new people, professionals with a different identity on a changed landscape." The issue then becomes how well one can live with that identity.

Summary

The plot lines with competing and conflicting stories of the different individuals for me is of major significance as is the conduit which forms the basis for identity on the organizational landscape. The sacred story creates the boundaries by which people have to live on the landscape. In this thesis I work from the premise that one can live with plot lines which compete with one another. But, if they conflict both cannot survive, an identity clash occurs which forces stories to be reshaped.
In the case of the principal he may have wanted to change the stories of the school as district office expected him to, but if he did not, he was clearly told to change the stories as part of a conduit. The conduit story was clear: change or else. The staff were seeing things from a different point of view, one of ongoing stories of the school as it already was, so conflicts developed.

The grievor's story, like the official stories in Chapter 5, flowed from conflicting plot lines. First, the principal had to follow the director's plot line who insisted that the organizational story was not being followed or lived out as it should be and therefore there existed a wilful act of insubordination. Second, the grievor had the union plot line to follow as the union outlined the procedural narrative of arbitration. Third, one can speculate that the principal was also living the staff's plot lines which conflicted with the director's.

Even after the principal's grievance was upheld he could not live out his plot line as a principal because the director and he remained in conflict. He felt that he was ignored at district office which severed him and his school from administrative support. Hence, there was a loss of identity on the personal and professional knowledge landscape. He was unable to include himself with the administrative story which develops among principals because principals' meetings are directed by district office.
Another point which is key in this thesis is that different plot lines create different points of view. Things look differently from different positions on the landscape. We see through our own personal and professional lens, so to speak. When both parties go into a grievance hearing, both believe they have the right point of view and others will take sides depending upon in which position they see themselves.

The story of the director and superintendent in this chapter look quite malicious from the principal's point of view. As indicated by the story in Chapter 5, from an institutional point of view, it takes on a different picture. It is not for me to decide, and this thesis is not about determining whether or not maliciousness existed.

According to the principal's story maliciousness existed. It is quite possible that it did. From an arbitration point of view the evidence does not seem to be there to support the institutional story. From the principal's point of view and from the unanimous decision which upheld the principal's grievance, it appears as if there was arbitrary behaviour on the part of the employer. But, the point also needs to be made here that, seen from an employer's position, the reassignment may appear to be quite reasonable, so reasonable that the director and superintendent bought into it and was willing to argue their point at a grievance hearing.

The evidence of some of the conflicting stories in this chapter are as follows. First of all, the arbitration
decision was counter to the sacred story. By the time the principal finished his story at the arbitration the sacredness of the institutional story looked very weak. This is verified by the tribunal's unanimous decision. The principal was seen by district office as having won the battle. As stated in Chapter 5, a principal's or a teacher's winning sends considerable ripples through the institutional story. Secondly, the visit of the director on the day of the principal's reassignment may have been a way to re-affirm the institutional story because the institutional story had been undermined. The principal saw the director's re-instatement visit as "a power trip." From the point of view of an organizational landscape I see it meaning more in terms of the institutional narrative. It meant a reclaiming of a central story which had been placed in doubt. It meant a re-acclamation of the institutional plot line. In that sense maybe it was "a power trip."

It is clear that the director believed that the story being lived in this school was not an acceptable story. This dispute is a clear example of competing and conflicting stories from different positions on the landscape and the establishment of identity plays a major role in how the stories are lived out. In using landscape as an organizational metaphor it seems only natural to create positions on the landscape and employ the conduit or funnel metaphor. Positions on the landscape are cultivated through
the conduit, that is, "someone acts intentionally upon someone else in order to change them, to prepare them for something" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1995, p. 24). The conduit metaphor helps construct the plot line. Connelly and Clandinin's cultivation and the conduit metaphor is a narrative way to look at what Greenfield (1993) and Hodgkinson (1978) refer to in administration as authority or administrative power. In their most recent book, Connelly and Clandinin (WIP) refer to it as identities of hierarchy.

Using these writers, as suggested in Chapter 1, helps me connect administrators' stories and stories of district office to teachers' stories and stories of school. The idea of cultivation and the handing down of theory through a funnel bring with them the image of significant others playing out roles on an administrative position of the landscape, living administrative plot lines which create plot lines for others in position to receive the sacred story of the institution in lower positions of the funnel. It is quite clear from the grievor's story in this chapter that he was being forced to live out a plot line which had been set as the sacred story of district office. When he did not play out that plot line a new plot line was created for him, he was reassigned, a reshaping of his identity was being forced upon him.

I reflect on my own life and why I became so interested in arbitration and see myself in a similar position as my participants. Living on a conduited landscape historically,
socially, and culturally positioned in roles where I have been in continuous search of my own identity has created the competing and conflicting stories of my life. Chapter 7 is a retelling of that reflection.
Chapter 7

Positioning Oneself on the Landscape

Men [sic] in general judge more by the eyes than by the hands, for everyone can see, but very few have to feel. Everybody sees what you appear to be, few feel what you are. . . .

(Machiavelli, 1981 ed.)

Personal Concerns

Since I am positioned within the organized landscape, my life has been an issue in the writing of the thesis. Having to write myself in, makes the writing difficult. It is unfortunate that I do not have documented minutes\(^7\) of my life to which I can refer. What good it would do I am not certain for within the documentation of life lies pages of interpretation based upon memory\(^8\) and imagination\(^9\), neither of which is reliable but both of which I must cling to as my anchor for the stories that I live by. Hence, I rely on what I have at my disposal in order to write myself into this thesis. Photographs, memory (imagined and otherwise), stories of others, beliefs I hold, how I react to different people and

\(^7\)Anyone who has been the member of a registered organization will have experienced having points verified by referring back to the minutes of a meeting.

\(^8\)Whether it is the actual memory or an interpretation of how the memory is felt, is not really relevant in this thesis. Maybe the significance lies, not in the accuracy of the memory but rather in how I live it. Connelly (1987) says that regardless of how a person brings a memory forward it is the significance of the memory that needs interpretation in narrative.
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things, are crucial to the crafting of the study.

Basically, how I write and what I choose to put in is determined by more than the field texts I have gathered through interviews. It is also who I am, or at least, who I think I am, for as I observe, interpret, and write, I also analyze, deduce and conclude. As Goffman (1974) explains:

If every strip of activity is enmeshed and anchored in its environing world so that it necessarily becomes the marks of what produced it, then surely it is reasonable to say that each utterance or physical doing that the individual contributes to a current situation will be rooted in his biographical, personal identity. (p. 293)

During the arbitration of which I was an integral part, I recall observing people's reactions, making mental notes, questioning (prying) the union lawyer over dinner, and making assessments (judgements) as to what was going on in the arbitration room. As mentioned earlier, these evaluational activities raise the distinct possibility that the arbitration process itself does not constitute the entire ground work for the thesis but rather the thesis springs from a complex system through and in which I have simultaneously peered and lived.

In search of my own identity as a person, I think back to my behaviour as I lived through childhood. Those who tried to lead me, met with extensive resistance. As my mother and some of her cohorts recall, I progressed through life kicking and screaming all the way. As I see it now I was bent on questioning the organized landscape and my place in it.
I have seen myself (and still see myself) as a resister to some of the constructs of the institutionalized world, especially those from which I experience emerging inequitable social arrangements.

In the research work I have completed thus far, inequality, especially positional inequality, has been an issue for both male and female participants. Since the question of justice or injustice is rooted in equality, for women it may mean that they feel inferior for being a woman living on a patriarchal landscape and for their position within the normative world. Hence, from my positions on the landscape, I have felt the world as not only being normative but also as being normative in maleness. Both story inequitable historical, social, and cultural plot lines. To make the connections I will attempt to separate my reconstructions of childhood and adulthood in order to look at my position on the conduited organizational landscape.

A Recollection of Childhood Self

I attribute my childhood feelings and memories to a variety of sources such as exposure to television (I remember Leave it to Beaver and Father Knows Best) and living in a socially divided city. Percy Janes (1976) gave this

---

*By resister I mean that I am questioning rather than accepting. I am seeking understanding, maybe so that I can fit in, and therefore resist arbitration for example, even if it is only until I understand it as it presently exists.*
description of my home town in his novel:

The town itself was divided into three parts. There was the central residential area or town site, built on the only level ground available and running right back through the east and west valleys until the newer homes butted up against the mountains. Then there was the West Side, a ragged hilly area flanking the town site from that direction as our own Humber Heights flanked and overlooked it from the east. . . . The focal point of all these divisions was the mill. (p. 33)

I was raised on the West Side. Other sources included being raised in a patriarchal family\(^1\), and tensions that I have experienced both as a female and as a teacher\(^2\).

However, as an adult I often use my grade one reading series to symbolize the contradictions I recall feeling as a child and which resurface in my adult life. In recent years the Dick and Jane story has become my metaphor for many things of which ideological biases, ambiguities of reality, social hegemony, and administrative hegemony are just a few examples. In other words, it is the metaphor for the competing and conflicting stories of my life. It is a starting point for restorying my identity.

As I remember it, and now I have the pictorial verification, Dick and Jane lived in a nice house with a picket fence and a backyard. Father wore a suit and went to

---

\(^1\)Morgan (1986, p. 211) says, "[I]n the view of many writers on the relationship between gender and organization, the dominant influence of the male is rooted in the hierarchical relations found in the patriarchal family . . . which serves as a factory for authoritarian ideologies."

\(^2\)Morgan (p. 211) writes, "In many formal organizations one person defers to the authority of another exactly as the child defers to parental rule."
work. Mother stayed at home with three children, a cat, and a
dog. Everything appeared clean, quiet, and simple. Their
worst family dilemma was baby Sally losing her ice cream and
Spot, the dog, licking it up as she cried. I saw life for
them as being picture perfect, too glossed to be real. The
positions on the landscape might have been socially correct,
some men did carry a briefcase, wear a suit, and smoke a pipe.
But there were none I knew. The only men I knew carried lunch
baskets. And the plot line was not reality for me. From a
fictional point of view, if they lived life behind the pages
like I was experiencing life, the book was a cover story.

The Dick and Jane reading series is the only school
reader I recall from my primary and elementary schooling, a
soft covered book with cloth binding. The story has become a
part of a reinvention of my early years which I use to explain
some of the tensions I have experienced as an adult. In 1996
I received on temporary loan, two copies of the reader. Once
I had the books in my possession I moved from page to page in
search of the images I held in my mind and I had already
written about in my thesis. Perusing the books was like
taking a walk down memory lane. The stories were as
I remembered them. The only thing which was different was
that the cover was hard bound rather than soft with cloth

---

I do not know why I remember the Dick and Jane reading series
so clearly. Connelly (in Connelly and Clandinin, 1993) says, in
trying to explain why his mother's death was educational for him,
"If one remembered something with passion, then it was important to
one's education though one might not know the reasons why."
This story recalled somewhere from the past as a reconstruction of my world, is a part of how I validate my life, tells me who I am. Dick and Jane are memories of how I know a piece of my childhood. They are not the "remembrance of other people's thoughts [or] things I've read or been told, metamemories" (Thomas, 1987, p. 128). Crites (1986, p. 156) maintains that memory "gives access to a past that the one who remembers claims as his [or her] own, an identity through many metamorphoses." And that presence of memory "contributes powerfully to my sense" of who I am. How much is artifice or how much of it is based on feelings that I have as an adult, I cannot say. I only know that it feels true. And, in my adult life this story has become one of my analytical tools for many things. In particular, it may have been the beginning of my awareness that not all people live up to set standards and Dick and Jane were the hegemonic benchmarks and I felt as if I was below that benchmark. I felt that there were and are competing and conflicting stories between what others expected of me and what I expected of myself. I came from the working class side of town, often wore older sister hand-me-downs, and stared over to the other side of town from the railing of our bridge. It was like trying to peer over the wall of Buckingham Palace.

Since Dick and Jane were fictional characters I really could have no idea what their lives were like. In point of
fact it was not their lives I was concerned about, it was my own. I allowed myself to imagine how their lives were lived to the extent that they became a metaphor for my life story. I make the assumption that the story is a representation of what others were telling me life ought to be.

Dick and Jane symbolized the class division of my town. I saw myself as being inferior to the Dick and Jane characters and the lives they led. I learned that I was presumed inferior. No one told me anything. No one pointed it out specifically. But where I lived, how I lived, how I dressed, how I talked, how others related and reacted to me, told me how I felt. It told me what position I was to live on the landscape. It never ever felt like a privileged position.

If as a child I looked for representations of Dick and Jane, they probably lived on the other side of town in the big well-kept homes. Maybe I did not like what I thought I saw in myself or what I thought people might be telling me I was, an average child from a working class family who would probably leave school to do housework in order to make a living. That story was given to my father by my elementary school principal as I sat in his office after throwing a bottle of ink over a guy. But, that is another story. I knew I was not Jane. I was someone lesser then Jane.

Part of the significance of the story points out the secret stories that people live by. In the reader, neither Dick, Jane, or the family had a flaw, there were no competing
or conflicting stories. That is how we role played our story outside of the home, free of competing and conflicting stories. They form the secret stories of family life. Metaphorically, for me Dick and Jane represent the fanciful image of organizations which places it in the fictional realm. It is the deified sacred story of the organization being value neutral, cleansed of being human in the sense of being free from competing and conflicting stories, free of tensions, living on the ideal landscape, playing out fixed, chimerical plot lines. It is the illusory story put forth to the members of the organization as the story to live by. When members do not live up to this story, they are informed there is something wrong with their story. It is not the organizational story which is at fault. This is the Dick and Jane story. If there was something wrong with what I saw in the Dick and Jane reader, the fault was mine. It could not be Dick and Jane's because they were fictional characters positioned on a sanitized landscape. It could not be the authors, they were writing a generic reader.

It confirmed for me that there was something wrong with the life I was living. Therefore, if the pictures and stories were being funnelled into me with the intent of my learning how to read they did more than that. As Hodgkinson (1991, p. 25) explains, "[I]t is well established that schools operate according to a hidden as well as an overt curriculum and these curricula reinforce each other in the perpetuation of an ethos
or system of cultured values." The visual presentations of
community and family became very much a part of my learning
landscape (Greene, 1978; Connelly & Clandinin, 1995), one
that was conflicting with how I storied my life and sometimes
made me ashamed of who I was.

I was not satisfied with my position on the landscape or
the role I played. It may have been because I felt
subservient for being female. It could also have been
because I felt our family may not have been viewed as middle
class by significant others. Deep down I could have
recognized that we were not middle class but were striving to
reach that position. I remember my parents as always being
very conscious of what the neighbours might say or think, if
something leaked out from our secret stories of living. Life
must be more transparent for children, as the commonly used
phrase expresses it, words from the innocent mouths of babes.

I asked too many "why's" and said what others considered
to be the wrong thing at the wrong time. I was supposed to
learn my place on the landscape, but I could not figure out
where that was. As a child I must have thought that the
landscape was wide open, free of boundaries and borders. If
there were invisible barriers I did not acknowledge them and

84If I rebelled because I was female I probably did not know
it at the time. It is only in recent years that gender issues have
become public debate. I do know that as a teenager I argued
against my younger brother being allowed to stay out later than I,
or being able to go out on school nights when I was not permitted,
or my having to get up on Saturday mornings to do house chores
while he stayed in bed.
when I ran into one I became very frustrated. What I saw were conflicting rules governing my life. I felt constrained by my inability to follow the constructs expected of me by others. As Hodgkinson (1978, p. 81) explains, "One [person's] power is another [person's] impotence if the latter must forgo his [or her] will on behalf of the former." I could never understand why boys could stay out socializing later than girls, why adults could smoke and children could not, or why women seem to have to work extra hard to get into what are commonly referred to as male positioned jobs.

As I matured I got into more trouble as I tried to resist the control of my parents and spent a fair amount of time being grounded. Judgements of my teachers, as I served many detentions, and the opinions of other adults helped to confirm my belief that I was not a well-behaved child. I had a negative sense of self. I felt that everyone else knew what was best for me and was permitted to say so without my rebuttal. I had no right to a voice. I had few rights in establishing my identity and defining where and how I lived on the landscape. Needless to say, I often felt like I was some adult's nightmare straight through to high school graduation as I continually demanded to know why I could not do certain things or worse still, would do them anyway.

It was only a few summers ago, 1992, that I had my grounded, in the context of this paper, is a form of parental punishment and refers to not being permitted to go out doors with the other children.
impressions of growing up re-affirmed. My husband and I attended my class of '67 high school reunion. Twenty-five years had passed since I graduated from high school but the keynote speaker was a person who had progressed from grade 1 to grade 11 with me. We were not what one would call close friends. She was the top student and I hung around the middle and sometimes lower. But, we knew of each other. In her reunion speech she said something to the effect that if mischief was brewing the principal always went looking for either me or another student. And, I do not recall the name of the other student. It did not surprise me that my name was used as the possible candidate for some mischief which may arise as that seemed to be the story of my life. But, upon reflection I realized that out of my three years in high school, I can remember being called to the office only twice. I wondered which occasions the speaker remembered or if what she remembered was someone openly trying to establish a position on the landscape in search of a livable identity.

Is it that I was a poorly behaved child? Or, is it that I experienced, and may still be experiencing living in a world whose norms I have difficulty dealing with? According to Morgan (1986, p. 212), "Critics of patriarchy suggest that . . . the psychic structure of the male-dominated family tends to create a feeling of impotence accompanied by a fear of and dependence on authority." Do I challenge the standards in order to establish my own identity within the conduited
organizational landscape? Am I demanding enough to insist that I will not be hegemonically herded into whatever I believe society expects of me as a woman?

I was naive enough to think that the domination and conformity, the barriers and borders of landscape living I felt in my youth, would all end once I went to university, got a job, and set sail on my own voyage. That, of course, is a very common assumption. How many teenagers, especially girls, have I heard say that they cannot wait to get away "on their own." Little do they know that reality is constraining, and more constraining for some than others, depending on one's positional role on the landscape, how one tells and retells one's story and how those stories get told and retold by others.

Changing the Landscape

I left "a student's life" after one year of university and went into teaching. I soon discovered that I had to socialize myself into the community (one which was more traditional than the town I left), follow the rules of the church and school, find acceptance among teachers already living a staffroom and community reality, and be initiated into the classroom by the students. What I had learned in university had prepared me for none of that. I wasn't even

---

Morgan (1986) refers to organizations as the "unconscious extensions of family relations."
warned! No teacher is. And if they are warned it is probably by a staff who has already positioned themselves on the landscape where the new teacher has to become positioned. In some cases the warning is heeded, in others it is not as an attempt is made to independently establish one's own story.

How many new teachers have I heard over the years trying to figure out why something has to be done in a "certain way?" How many times have I heard them answered with, "That is the way we do it here?" School board policies and staff socialization merge to become the culture of a school. The landscape has been formed and in constant change long before the arrival of the new teacher. In other words, new teachers enter a story in progress. Their script has to fit an already existing plot line. The experience of establishing oneself on a living landscape is one that either makes or breaks a new teacher. Some stay and adapt, others leave. When they arrive they are just on the verge.

Upon arriving at my first teaching post I was on the verge. I was the sperm penetrating the womb and in order to arrive and be part of the fertilization process I had to swim the canal. The town was never to be the same again and neither was I. Experiences transform into a continuous process of ambiguous insemination pushed and pulled from the

---

87I use insemination here in the sense of sowing seeds, cultivation. Experiences are the seeds which often create tensions within us as we struggle to find meaning from the seeds we sow.
tensions within\textsuperscript{88} and the tensions without\textsuperscript{89}. Like Morgan (1986) I believe that organizations are dominated by patriarchal plot lines, as is life and that is part of the competing and conflicting story. The possibility exists that my role was and is being played out in "male terms." Maybe that is what I am resisting. It is possible that I am not experiencing resistance at all but rather I am positioning myself as a countervailing authority. Being such provides me with a means of influencing a landscape where I feel I am not a part of the established privileged position. Just like I thought I was not an accepted part of the Dick and Jane story.

From childhood to adolescence to adulthood my tensions of living in an institutionalized world have become me. All of those with whom I have interacted have become part of that image. They are the sources of my identity. They are the sources of my competing and conflicting stories.

The narrative of the normative world is part of the fiction of our lives. It is a world of ought-to-be's. It is the sacred story of living. The fact that the way we live never reaches the ought-to-be makes our representation of the world fictitious, in a sense. Sometimes I feel as if we continue to strive for imaginary measurements, sacred stories

\textsuperscript{88}The tensions within are the perceptions and experiences of each individual, our morals, values, and beliefs.

\textsuperscript{89}The tensions without form the structured perceptions upon which society is built: legal systems, religious and other institutions often perceived as being independent of humans.
embedded so deeply that it is hard to determine how they ever got there. Dick and Jane are fictions of our lives, our lives made generic. And yet, within its implied fiction lie hidden truths. The pictures and the characters are all plausible. The togetherness of family, the rightness of how they lived, their social status are ideals people strive for. The text was written from a white, male, middle class point of view. A generic composition for a generic world.

The legal system, and I include arbitration, is also representative of that deified world. We sometimes envision it as having no flaws. It represents our image of justice, of what ought to be. It can be, and often is, a fiction of reality, if reality is defined as that which we experience. Arbitration is not what it ought to be any more than family life is a Dick and Jane story. It is something which we create normatively, view as an ought to be, and live as is.

The irony of it all is that while we live as is, we strive for what ought to be. Not only do we strive for it ourselves but we expect it in others. We live the institutionalized story as part of our own. We compete to identify ourselves with some form of institutionalized story. It is a living which is tension layered.

Establishing My Position on the Landscape

As I related the story of this chapter I struggled with why I have such a passion for researching arbitration. I
found it, I believe, in the thesis of Laura Weintraub (1993). Although her dominant theme is insubordination, one of the principal threads deals with the idea that white male supremists are responsible for the language of power which exists. In other words, the landscape on which we live has been shaped in its master narrative by one dominant story, that of white heterosexual males. This is the story we live by which shapes the identities of the landscape and confines or allows us the freedom to position ourselves in our stories accordingly.

I imagined myself as having entered the world through a patriarchal embryo. I came from the male and nestled myself into a female womb. In my detachment at birth I pushed myself into a male world. It is a world I have accepted begrudgingly and as I swim the canal of my own experiences I carry with me this foreign language; a language with which I am trying to come to terms as I establish myself in the stories I live by. One of those is a story of perceived dominance, identities of hierarchy which have interwoven into my own story of identity. The Dick and Jane reader is a metaphor for that story.

As a child I was so concerned over the impositions of others that many of the adults with whom I interacted often called me rebellious. According to my parents, I was famous for questioning them as to why they could do certain things and I could not. I was continuously trying to do more than any one else said I could. As I reclaim ideas to interpret my
experiences, the stories I have lived, I feel these form my intent and shape my actions. Part of this journey is the writing of this thesis, my erlebnis, a German word that carries the notion of an event or experience as something that one lives through.

In placing myself on the organizational landscape I feel boundaries of other humans living out their stories in conjunction with mine. However, from my position I always saw other humans, often males, in control of the sacred story, other humans in positions of authority who dictated to me what my story was to be, established my identity. It was a fixed plot which allowed for no improvisation.

I said earlier that I saw and see myself as a resister, at least that is how many others story my life. Resisting, to me, means that I have another plot line in mind for shaping my own narrative. It means I may not do the expected or live the fixed plot line of what others story and expect me to story. Here are some examples.

In my childhood story, when the principal fixed a plot line that placed me in a position of having no education and working as a housekeeper, I was furious. As a child I did not respond in front of the principal, that would have gotten me expelled, but I resented it enough that I have never forgotten it, neither have my parents.

About six years ago my mother was talking to the principal who has long since retired and he asked what ever
had become of me. My mother proudly answered that I had been teaching for over twenty-five years and had just recently entered a doctorate program. My mother did not think it was the answer he was expecting as she watched his reaction and listened to his response. As a principal, he had placed me on a fixed plot line that he was storying for me and I was always determined that I was not living that position. I did not want to be identified as a housekeeper.

As I have watched from within how I have lived my life and am still living it, I believe that I resist other people placing me on pre-determined plot lines. They do it anyway, of course, because significant others live in positions on which I move back and forth and others are always writing my story with me. But, the normative plot line of being a woman and doing only "woman things" has not been a plot line that I have lived to the satisfaction of others.

I have a tendency to live the positions I enjoy living even if it means criticism or restorying from others. For example, I am the only female in our family, except my aunt, who has gone to university. My husband and I were one of the first couples in our community to get married without community notice. That is to say, we asked that our wedding commitment to each other not be announced in church and we did not plan a wedding service followed by the typical community celebration of dinner and dance. It might not be noticed today but, in 1971, one can assume that we were pushing the
limits of the community sacred story.

I was the first woman in our village to drive a car. My first customer, as I was driving a taxi, said something like "I'm not getting in with you, you're a woman!" So I left her at the grocery store.

My husband gave me a salmon rod for our first anniversary and a 16 gauge shot gun for my first Christmas gift. When we hunt together both of us carry firearms. I went through my first couple of years hunting with my father-in-law asking me "Have you got that safety on?" I was one of the first women in our area to do a government firearms safety course and pass it. As I stood on the firing range with my 30-30 calibre rifle all the men standing by watched closely. I was allowed three shots, two of those had to be in the designated target area. Each time I fired one man said "Missed" while a second said "No, she hit it." I had placed all three in the designated area. It was interesting how one person could see the marks on the target while the other could not. They were both using binoculars.

When we put new clapboard on our house a few years ago many heads turned as they watched my husband and I holding up the board and nailing at the same time. One man said, in our community dialect, "Oh man, can't you do any better than that for a helper?" My husband's response went something like "Why should I pay someone twelve dollars an hour when I have Barb?" That was enough for the observer to understand or at least
tolerate our story. We built our own cabin together. We both drive 4 x 4 all terrain vehicles. Again, I am the only woman who drives one in our area even though they are fairly popular machines. In my view, driving a 4 x 4 is not a male plot line. The story that women should not drive one is the plot line which is identified as the male story.

It is not that I see my plot line as being any better than anyone else's or that I want to be male, but rather I see myself living out stories that I want to live. That was the problem I had with the Dick and Jane metaphor. The plot line was fixed and so was mine as a woman. The male plot line appeared to be less fixed or at least was tolerated more. I had very little choice in the positions I had or the plot lines I played. I could not move freely on the landscape, or at least as freely as I wanted and I believe I felt vulnerable to other people's stories of me.

This is mainly what I had difficulty with in the arbitration I experienced. The plot line was one that was fixed by others, all males, in higher positions on the landscape. Neither the grievor nor the witness had any part in shaping the events that were about to happen. The procedures and the lived reality of, "This is how we do it here," forced the new players into already-formed, prescribed roles. They were not to live their own story but rather they were to live the story of the tribunal, the union, and the employer. When they got a chance to shape their own story in
examination, the story was torn down in cross-examination. About the best the lawyer could do was patch it up in re-examination. In actual fact the minor characters of the bigger picture got stripped of their identities, the stories they lived by.

Since part of the premise in this thesis is that we live multi-dimensional lives, no one is free to write his or her own story. When we write our own we are simultaneously writing others and use our positional roles to do so. Hence, we are all in the conduit tensioned against each other as we live out our daily lives.

In order to feel some sense of ownership, of belonging, of having an identity, the difference lies in being able to have a voice in writing that story. I did not have a voice. I always felt like I was silenced by someone else's plot line. As one of my participants (BethAnn, 1993) said in her arbitration story, "I was very hesitant about the [grievance] and I really didn't want to cause a lot of uproar, I wanted the [grievance] to stay within my [division] if possible. And I wanted some kind of a conversation, some kind of an exchange, some kind of a meeting ground." BethAnn wanted to be permitted a voice to air her conflicting story. She wanted to be a part of the plot line but two meetings on the grievance issue had been held by the administration in her division with no representation from her. She had not been invited to the meetings. Grievors are not invited to all the
arbitration discussions, nor do they always get a chance to shape the arbitration plot line.

If one is silenced, the story becomes a bounded plot line that one may not want to live. When that happens the hierarchal identity of some significant others appears as a threat to the story one wants to live. They become conflicting stories to your story. BethAnn (1993) describes the effect a silenced story can have on a person. She said:

The other part of the whole procedure that struck me was the absolute silence in [my division], as well. Some of the students spoke to me, but none of the professors. Nobody that was on the arbitration committee spoke to me. They [had] all they could do to make eye contact, to say good morning and greet me as a person. I was a nonperson. The silence was definite. I walked into that [division] and they would go out of their way to avoid me. It was just unbelievable.

When that happens one becomes marginalized on the landscape.

I felt marginalized through the Dick and Jane story. Dick, Jane, and their family were socially correct. I was caught in the undercurrents of other positions on the landscape. My story was conduited from above. I was marginalized in my own story. And, that is what happens to grievors. They hold the lowest position on the arbitration landscape. They tread water beneath the procedural surface and become marginalized by the arbitration story. It is a plot line not of their own choosing.

In Chapter 2, I began by writing the procedural story of arbitration. It is the normative story. Part of BethAnn's (1993) story describes the procedures as she explained how the
hearing started. There was "no concern for the individual. We had no idea who was in [the room]. . . . And, you know, to be told to sit outside in the hall and wait to be called . . . it was like a prisoner in a box, like you bring the prisoner in. . . . I felt like I . . . should have been shackled, like I should've had leg irons. . . . The whole procedure was just awful." The procedure is the story that is written in the literature and policy documents of organizations and becomes the sacred story. That story gets unpacked by those living in positions to act out the procedural story. The procedural story then becomes a personal and professional story of procedure as it gets lived out through people. Once normative stories come to life, competing and conflicting stories begin to surface showing the procedures to be more complex than they look in written form.

There is indication of this in Brown and Beatty (1988, 1997) when they consistently use words like "normally" and "commonly" throughout their legal explanations. As an example, when they explain that courts expect arbitrators to be impartial they write, "In grievance arbitration, where commonly each party nominates one arbitrator who in turn select a third arbitrator to be chair[person], the requirement of impartiality has given rise to certain unique considerations" (p. 1-27). Another is, "There is a difference of opinion among arbitrators as to their power to order production of documents" (p. 3-14). One final example reads
Arbitration hearings are in one sense simply a specific example of the adjudicative process. Normally, they parallel the judicial process in most respects apart from the legal formalities that may attend a civil lawsuit, although the parties are free to alter or change the arbitration procedure by agreement as they wish. (p. 3-18)

Obviously, from the language they use to establish the fixed plot line of arbitration, they recognize the complexity of living out the procedural story which changes through legal rhetoric and decisions made at arbitration hearings. The story is never what we say it is just like life is never like we say it is. It becomes something else through the stories we live. How can one fix a plot line by the stories we live? Whatever is case law today may become something else tomorrow. Therefore, fixed plot lines are a fleeting reality, a generic fiction.

The sacred societal plot line that we strive to live up to appears as a fiction. It is like the war that was to end all wars. I see sacred organizational plot lines as hegemonic expectations which no one ever reaches. Here are some examples written in question form. How do you tell a royal person from a common person? Are their blood cells different? How do you tell a good sacred story from a bad sacred story, or are all sacred stories good? Was Nazism a sacred story? Can we ignore our own stories in the hope that the story of the organization is going to do what is best for us? Who decides that? Who decides that the Dick and Jane story is the
best way or the right way for anyone to learn how to read?

During one grievance meeting (Neil, 1993), a superintendent told the spouse of a grievor that she should smile and be happy because they [district office] were doing what was best for the teacher by placing him in another school. Who decides that this is what is best for that teacher when the teacher is saying it is not the best? Those are moral issues that we have to live and deal with as we write our storied lives. These are issues which become part of the fallout of conduited, organizational living. It is a fallout of the institutional story, one where we transcend the human story in order to continue the organizational story. It is like polluting the world to save the industry. I will finish this section with an example.

A few years ago one of my friends (Elizabeth, 1992) visited a dentist to have her bridge plate replaced. The dentist took the plate out of her mouth, did the required measurements, had her make an imprint in a mould and set the next appointment. She returned to his office a few days later, took out her old bridge plate and put in the new but, the new did not fit properly. The dentist, in all his expertise, took the new bridge plate out of her mouth and proceeded to file down her teeth. "What are you doing," she asked alarmingly? She was very particular over her teeth. "I'm filing them down to make the bridge plate fit," was his reply. He wanted to change the person rather than the plate.
My concern in my own autobiography, in writing about arbitration, and about other societal events in general, is that we story the people, who already have a story of their own, to fit the organization. "This is how we do it here" becomes the mould to establishing or shattering someone's identity as a human being. We focus on changing the story of the person rather than reshaping the story of the organization. In other words, we fix the people, a process which becomes conflicting as positional roles clash through identities of hierarchy.

From Self to Others

Teachers in general, I think, experience similar existences, similar tensions. They find themselves on professional and personal knowledge landscapes (Connelly & Clandinin, 1994) where they are continuously trying to establish their own identities, to write their own sacred stories and to position themselves on an already established landscape, someone else's institutionalized narrative.

Students have certain expectations of teachers as do parents, colleagues, administrators, and the community at large, which write the stories of teachers' lives while teachers are writing their own. It is not unusual for a teacher to hear something like, "You can't do that, you're a

---

teacher." It is a multi-faceted, polycentred reality in which teachers experience a continual negotiation and re-negotiation as they move from one part of their landscape to another in order to meet the expectations of others and gain acceptance both as people and professionals, all the while creating an identity for themselves.

It is a world in which teachers find themselves constantly being evaluated, tested for acceptance on multiple levels, and living tensioned lives. People live both their personal and professional lives establishing themselves in multiple positions on their landscape, taking with them their competing stories of how they think others see them and how they think they see themselves. I believe teachers want to measure up to the organizational story. They want an accepted identity and, failing to fit the mould or live up to the role, means consequences. Suspension, demotion, resignation, expulsion, and condemnation are examples. In short, a loss of personal and professional identity occurs and, the rebuttal alternatives in the procedural story, which look safe enough, simply create another place for a conflicting story on the landscape.

Arbitration as one example, creates the same kind of tensions one experiences while teaching. One has to fit the arbitration mould. As Czuboka (1985, p. 6) explains,

---

Delamont (1978) maintains that few negotiations are between equal partners so both parties come to the landscape in very different bargaining positions.
"Dismissals are damaging to the morale of an organization, even if they are totally justified. Even very good teachers may begin asking 'Who is next'? There is always sympathy for the 'underdog', that is, for a teacher being fired by a powerful administrative hierarchy." However, both teachers and employers are examined and cross-examined through a procedure where visual and verbal presentation plays a major role.

Witnesses have to measure up. Grievors have to be storied by the employer and evidence to show why the action has been taken is placed before a tribunal. Employees who find themselves in a grievance procedure are given a new identity, one which bounds them to an insecure landscape, files away their identity, and exposes them as people who are insubordinate, incompetent, or inept. It creates stories people do not want to live by just like I did not want to live by my family's story.

The employer is accused of violating the grievor's collective agreement and testimony is placed before the arbitration panel to show how that has happened. He or she, as well, is given a new identity, one that stories him or her as someone who has reassigned an employee without reasonable cause or without due process. Each in turn tries to show the opposition as not having met the expected standards, as not

---

92 Cross-examination, by its very nature, is an oppressive probing of a witness by an opponent's lawyer.
having lived up to the sacred story of the institution. The identities of those who give testimony are examined, re-examined, cross-examined, and rebutted until both parties reach the end of their proofs. Opposing facts intermingle to colour the stories of each participant. Czuboka (1985) claims that arbitration cases are like divorce proceedings, inasmuch as everyone's identity gets negatively reshaped into stories other than what they might have been before they went through the legal process. He refers to it as "everyone's dirty laundry is washed in public" (p. 10), in other words, secret stories become public.

The story I used in Chapter 2 maintains that arbitration does not become public. Many writers, as indicated in Chapters 1 and 2, refer to the process as a private affair. Hence, there is a conflicting story. The theoretical story is that arbitrations do not become public, but in practice they do. One reason for this may be that the arbitrator "is master of his [or her] own hearing and, subject to the general

---

93 One example of finding weaknesses is referenced by English (1972, p. 364) as "dredging." School administrators who find themselves without sufficient substantiating data for a personnel decision may "'dredge' up facts, rumours, past incidents, hearsay, dateless or vague references to previous behaviour in order to 'back up' the decision." English also uses the term "sandbagging" meaning "finding oneself without substantiating data for a decision, or corroborating evidence and then in a short period of time calling in every type of supervisory personnel available to converge on the (accused) person to substantiate your decision." According to Czuboka (1985) sandbagging sometimes occurs after a school district realizes that the complaint is going to arbitration, at which time they would have to justify their action against the accused.
requirements that the hearing must be conducted fairly, in the legal sense of the word, the arbitrator is free to establish his [or her] own rules of procedure" (Sanderson, 1976, p. 55).

In that sense, the question as to whether an arbitration hearing is public or private depends on the parties involved and the acceptance of the chair to make it public or private. However, I believe that 'public' in Czuboka's terms goes beyond the idea of public as being open for other's viewing as happens in a common law court. The kind of public he refers to deals with the private stories of one's life which get revealed to others. Even if the hearing is not open, stories still surface about what has gone on. There is more than one person in that room and people tell stories of arbitration. Even the telling of a story to an arbitrator makes it public. To give one example, at one grievance hearing (Neil, 1993) the staff was described as being a "bunch of bitchers and complainers." That description did not get written in the arbitration award but it did get back to the staff. Therefore, how private is private? According to BethAnn (1994) no one comes out of it unscathed. Even the 'winning' side loses something in the process. Besides that, the process of recounting a story to anyone makes it public. It will either be written in an award or passed on in some other kind of restorying. In this sense as well, arbitrations are not private.

To return to the arbitration procedure then, it is left
to the arbitration committee to re-evaluate both sides and decide in favour of one. There are no ties, a winner must emerge. One party has to be seen in a worse light than the other. Stories take over the actions which have become a part of the past. What each sees themselves as being may be tensioned against how they are seen by others, or at least how they think they are perceived by others.

The completed process becomes another place on the lived landscape, an identity shaking experience which is carried back and forth as part of a person's narrative. The perceptions with which the grievance procedure is started become tensioned against what people perceive themselves as having experienced by the time the arbitration is over.

What became an issue for me was that the arbitration I was invited to experience was contradictory to the one I perceived as being real in my narrative which is similar to the Dick and Jane story. In listening to and observing participants (arbitrators, lawyers, witnesses, and observers) at work, and reflecting upon my own experience as a teacher, a witness, and an assistant probation officer for adult offenders, I felt caught between the ambiguous expectations of

---

94 In legal terms the word is subpoena or an order or writ requiring a person to appear at a hearing to give testimony.

95 This is another experience which brought me closer to the judicial system and gave me the opportunity to hear probationers' stories in relation to the story of justice.
others and those I had for myself\textsuperscript{96}. It is clear that although arbitration was new to me, the experience was not. I found that the master-servant relationship, the positional conduit which is very much a part of the institutionalized story I have experienced in education has been with me in some form all my life.

In my personal narrative written shortly after the arbitration award I had experienced, I stated that it was difficult to find a starting point for the story. I (Journal entry, Feb/93) wrote:

\begin{quote}
It's like suicide, no one recognizes the signs until after the death and then we interpret what we perceive as having been signs or symptoms of an already terminated life. That's the point at which we say 'if only I had known' . . . .
\end{quote}

In the aftermath I began to ponder over actions done, words said, and messages (both silent and verbal) interpreted. I began questioning myself and others (in particular lawyers and union representatives) much like I questioned as a child: What is arbitration? What purpose does arbitration serve? Why is it that arbitration is considered by some (Cover & Fiss, 1979; Getman, 1988) to be a private adjudicatory affair?\textsuperscript{97} If it is

\textsuperscript{96}Block (1987, p. 19) writes, "Almost every important learning experience we have ever had has been stressful. Those issues that create stress for us give us clues about the uncooked seeds within us that need our attention. Stress and anxiety are an indication that we are living our lives and making choices."

\textsuperscript{97}Czuboka (1985, p. 2) writes an inversion of that. He says:

Many normally confidential details are revealed in these reported arbitration hearings and court cases because they are considered to be 'public domain documents'. As a result,
considered to be an alternate mechanism (Sanderson, 1978; Zuker, 1988) for settling disputes, how does it differ from the regular court system? Whose rights does arbitration protect, those of school board policies, articles of union collective agreements, or individuals? What are the consequences for both school board personnel and teachers? Are people's emotions and emotional well-being taken into consideration? How does one control or can one control what happens in the aftermath of an award?

About the only thing I was certain of, once the arbitration in which I had been involved had drawn to a close was that, since arbitration procedures are now mandated as part of teachers' collective agreements in much the same way as class size and work load, it has become a part of the organizational life which teachers experience. As a teacher I can say with some certainty that teachers are very much aware of the consequences of employer-employee relations and that may be part of the reason why teachers are characterized by some (Ben-Peretz, 1990) as being passive accepters of the authority of professional expertise and by others (Connelly & Clandinin, 1995) as living in moral and epistemological members of the public are able to study all of the inner workings of school systems during periods of crisis that involve the dismissals of teachers.

I find his second statement a bit presumptuous. To assume that an arbitration award reveals "all the inner workings of school systems" may be a myth. Part of the intent of my thesis is to show that an award itself is only one of many stories of which school systems comprise.
dilemmas. Again there arise conflicting stories of teachers. When they do as they are told they are perceived to be passive and when they offer their expertise or question they are known as resisters. Terms such as evaluation and disciplinary action are part of what teachers have to live as story.

These terms were similar for me as a child except that I was on a different position on the landscape. In the organized family our younger brother was positioned first so out of five family members it was a toss-up as to whether I was fourth or fifth. My sister and I have competing stories. When I went to school I was positioned below the teachers and the principal. As a teacher I was positioned below the principal and district office. I have never felt that I have been in a position to shape the sacred story as much as I was shaped by it.

That was how I felt about the arbitration experience as I listened to the grievors' stories. They were marginalized to a point where they felt they did not belong to the plot line. They lost control of their stories through the arbitration story.

This chapter and Chapter 3 are reminders that as researcher I am written into this thesis. Through my journal writing and conversations, I find myself drawing on my past in order to talk about the present in search of new meanings for the experiences. This multi-dimensional reflection has had much to do with the critical questioning which has been put
forth thus far. These moral\textsuperscript{98} issues, which helped shape my life experiences have played a significant role in the study and have been interwoven into the thesis as it progressed. My intent was not to write a "how to" process for arbitration but rather to reflect and to encourage others to reflect on how arbitration is lived. In Chapter 8 I summarize the more dominant plot lines and point out some possibilities for redirecting the play.

\textsuperscript{98}Johnson (1993, p. 1) writes, "... such problems with our traditional conception of ethics often result in the deep tensions many people encounter between their inherited view of their moral task, on the one hand, and the way they actually experience their moral dilemmas, on the other."
Chapter 8
Landscapes, Positions, and Sources of Identity

The wheels of justice turn . . . behind the scenes for the most part, and behind the scenes jurisdictional authorities that seem so clearly defined to the outside world become blurred, roles are exchanged or divided up differently, conversations occur between people who appear in public as irreconcilable enemies - on the whole, a different tone is predominant. Not everything gets put down in black and white and added to the records. Information is handed on or suppressed. 
(Durrenmatt, 1989)

Introduction
This thesis has been an exploration into new meaning of the effects, perceptions, and questions which people associate with arbitration. It contains stories, reports, and descriptions of arbitrations as they have been interpreted by participants. Informal interviews, legal arbitration reports, and a variety of other sources were used to allow participants to tell their stories. Each participant was asked to tell about his or her experience of arbitration. I, as researcher, told episodes of my life story as I tried to unravel the experiences which I now see as being central to understanding why I story my life the way I do.

Throughout the thesis field texts were presented through metaphors adapted from Connelly and Clandinin's (1990, 1992, 1994, 1995, WIP) work to guide me through the writing. Within this framework I made the assumption that we live conduited, organized lives which are storied through the positional roles we play out on the landscape. Our identities are established
by these positioned, storied plot lines. This interdependent living of stories forms identities of hierarchy. It is a multi-faceted experience which creates competing and conflicting stories and makes living dilemma-laden. In the remainder of this chapter I tie together the metaphorical loose ends which form the basis of the study.

**Stories and Landscapes: Livingscapes**

Seeing our lives as landscapes (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995) has helped me, metaphorically, to explain how we come to understand ourselves and others as we interweave the stories which hold us together. The stories are the bridges for interpreting and understanding what happens when a written procedure becomes lived out through human action. Policies and procedures are not things which are somewhere out there, outside of our lives. They are intertwined into the day-to-day living of people to shape our livingscapes. Hence, the plot lines of living overlap in the stories we live.

Looked at from this perspective, I make the assumption that even when one story is perceived to be separated from the other stories which we live, it is inevitably bound to them. To keep some sort of workable distance, borders are exposed. These borders or boundaries, like invisible frames are neither specifically part of the exterior of the story or the interior but rather are related to both. In an attempt to make it clear, I have referred to it throughout the thesis as the
tensions of living on and in a conduited landscape (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995).

In this study I have focused on arbitration as an event which takes place within the institutionalized story or conduited landscape. When storied, this event portrays competing and conflicting realities for those living on the landscape. I will use Chapters 5, 6, and 7 to sum up this point.

Being called grievor or witness, having to answer questions before a panel of three during examination, cross-examination, and re-examination clearly mark the enacted story of arbitration which begins with opening remarks and closes with adjournment. But, while this plot line is being played out other plot lines of living are taking place. The plot lines themselves create borders which guide people's stories. These borders or boundaries sometime help and at other times hinder the shaping of a person's story as it gets acted out with the stories of others. Those that hinder create competing and conflicting stories, making a person feel the limitations which exist on the organizational landscape. Differing roles and positions on the landscape often lead us into constructing and living competing and conflicting stories.

These stories evolve from different positions on the landscape. As an example, in Chapter 5, the plot line the director had to write in his report was not the one he wanted
to live. The one he had to follow had been plotted by the arbitration tribunal and the union.

The conflicting plot lines may be part of the reason for the tensioned story from the director. The story he was expected to tell funnelled from significant others living in positions on his organizational landscape and became an identity of hierarchy for him. According to Connelly and Clandinin (1995, p. 3), "[T]eachers do not work in isolation, nor do they work in environments solely of their own choosing." The same can be said of directors. In Chapter 5 the director was not writing his own plot line, rather he was writing a union story. It might have been a cover story for what he could not say. That is one possibility in explaining why his writing was so personal: he was writing a plot line for the grievor, telling everyone the employee's case was upheld and therefore he had to be reinstated. In all probability he felt that he had lost his own sacred story and his plot line, his own source of identity, to the arbitration board decision. For the director, his livingscape has become a union plot line fixed by the collective agreement and storied through the arbitrator's award.

The union's sacred story remained intact. Their plot line has not been affected by the arbitration story other than to be strengthened by it. Hence, the story is not personal. It is legal, specific, speaks to the collective group, and is maintained in the plot line of legal abstract rhetoric.
Before moving on to the next section, two other points need to be made with regard to the use of legal documents as stories of rhetoric on the arbitration landscape.

First of all, as an objectified story, legal documents reveal how some write their plot lines within organizations: regular, ordered, coherent, clearly void of human emotion. Such an impression masks our stories and represents an impenetrable image of power and control that many subservients believe exists as they try to live someone else's narrative.

Secondly, legal documents, such as awards, are stories written from the notes of arbitrators who hear the case. There are no tape recordings made. Whether that raises a question of validity and authenticity remains to be seen. It competes with the point I raised in Chapter 4 with regards to the authenticity of staff meeting minutes. If these do raise questions of validity then one can assume that they also raise questions about the validity of arbitration in general and record keeping and usage in particular.

Identifying the Landscape: Identifying the Self

Landscapes are very complex places to live. Our stories overlap with competing stories of our own and those of others. One story which became dominant in the telling of the stories of my participants is that to establish ourselves on the livingscape we have to determine who we are, what our roles are, how we are positioned as characters in our life stories.
That source of identity evolves from our interaction with others. In other words, we have to story with a community to validate our own lives, making establishing an identity very complex. This complexity surfaces in the stories told by some of my participants as they tried to establish who they were after the grievance hearing.

As an example, the participant in Chapter 6 clearly never did experience a positive relationship with the administration even though he had won his grievance. He saw having a positive relationship with district office as being essential for the successful running of the school. He wanted the director to come to the school and reconcile but that did not happen.

From a narrative point of view one can say that, in that kind of interdependent relationship between two people, it is their identities which are in conflict. The principal felt that truth and justice had to be served and part of that truth and justice rested with re-establishing his identity as a principal. But, there was no reconciliation. As indicated in that story, there remained an animosity between the director and himself. What happened was that truth and justice were served from a collective bargaining point of view but nothing was done to help the relationship between the director and the principal. Therefore, the conflicting issue of clashing identities still remained, the conflict still unresolved. It was not enough that the principal had his job back because
reconciliation had not occurred. Nothing that was written in the award helped that situation.

An arbitration event and the award take place within a sacred story of abstraction. Its language is abstract and prescribed. It is "propositional, relational, among concepts, impersonal, situation-independent, objective, non-temporal, aistorical, and generic" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p. 14). At the same time, the examination, cross-examination, and re-examination by lawyers becomes personal, its language lived, situation-dependent, "subjective, temporal, historical, specific," (p. 14) and cuts to the core of the person trying to tell his or her story through the questions of the lawyer.

By and large this event is not a hospitable place for telling stories, it is just safer than living the story of not having a job. When Clandinin and Connelly (p. 13) talk about the classroom as a safe, secret place, I take it to mean that it is "a place where teachers were partially insulated from the conduit." Being insulated from the conduit allows for the belief that we can be independent of significant others, be our own person, so to speak.

Arbitration rooms conflict with the classroom image in that the only insulation grievors have is their lawyer and union representative. And, from time to time that bit of insulation gets torn away as they live out their union story. Basically, what grievors experience is coming face-to-face with their conduit. They live a retelling of their story
through the stories of their superiors who apply the abstract language flowing from the institutionalized narrative to the assessment of the grievor's school performance. The plot lines appear as inflexible scripts.

In being given their plot lines, participants do not have to think, they have a role to play. People basically live out stories and the stories are more or less institutionally, contextually defined. Out of the 21 participant stories the lawyer and union representatives are probably the clearest in the telling of their organizational stories and they retold their stories to others. In other words, their identities as protectors of the collective agreement were clearly set forth and appeared as a fixed plot line.

From the interviews it became clear that both the union representative and the lawyer told grievors and witnesses what their stories were. I believe that being given a prescriptive plot line changes people's perceptions of themselves, in other words, reshapes their identities. The difference between the two, union representative/lawyer vs grievors, is that the identity of the former is not reshaped. They live a more consistent plot line of being protectors of the collective union membership which is lived out through the collective agreement. Grievors have to be storied through the arbitration process, playing a foreign role on a foreign plot line where normal, everyday tensions can escalate to something else.
In the grievance hearing to which I was party, I relied on the lawyer to tell me how I was to play my role. But, I believe that I helped to reshape the story by questioning and discussing. In the overall scheme, however, in order to be a good witness, I knew I had to live up to the lawyer's story. Not to have lived up to the lawyer's story would have made me a bad witness. In a sense, my participants and I inevitably were visitors screened from the ongoing process of arbitration. When one cannot speak the language of the conduit with authority, one is silenced and speaks only when told to by someone who knows the language and lives that position on the landscape. But, even when that happens the plot line gets played out and one walks away with an understanding of what arbitration is.

District offices, like classrooms, are special places on the landscape made up of consultants, superintendents, and directors. Board offices, like classrooms, are practical places where curriculum and policy are made. Just as practices of teaching are expressions of teachers' knowledge, administering is an expression of administrators' knowledge. They author their own stories.

In telling why each of these exist I am at the same time fixing them in a position on a personal and professional landscape. In other words, I am giving them an identity, a purpose for being. The notion of position and identity is of major importance to how we place ourselves or see ourselves
placed on the personal and professional landscape because landscaping, the telling of our stories, is synonymous with life and becomes lifescaping. Hence, our position helps determine who we are and, who we are, how we see ourselves, and how we see others as seeing us, pushes us to seek multiple positions. These are the tacks which hold us on the landscape with others and create the tensions of living, the competing and conflicting stories.

In getting back to the terrain, the union stands at the interface between board policy and teacher function. Their identity appears to be protected under the guise of negotiators between school board/government and teachers. Hence as mentioned earlier, their story is not personal, it rests on the collective agreement and is clearly an organizational narrative. It is one which does not tell who they are as much as it identifies them for what they do in their role as union representatives.

What comes through in the thesis, as indicated in Chapter 5, is that the fallout of living the identity of union representatives is that it dehumanizes a grievor's story, shakes or even shatters an identity. The grievor's story becomes something more than his or her story, it becomes an article in the collective agreement, one that can be storied by every member if the case is upheld, or one that is dropped if the case is denied.

The union maintains its organizational role while
grievors are playing multiple characters as they watch their plot line being reshaped into a collective agreement article. Their identity stands to be reshaped on a personal level while the union representative's is reshaped at an organizational level. The teacher's sacred story of having his or her position and identity placed in question becomes a cover story for a much bigger story, that of the union being a provider and protector of the teachers' collective agreement. There is a difference in the teacher's position and the union's. The union representative still walks away as a union representative with an identity intact, waiting to argue the next grievance. The teacher may not walk away as a teacher; there will be a re-establishing or a reclaiming of identity. It is like the person who has been away from home and returns after 17 years of living on another landscape. A song written by one of the Burgeo locals comes to my mind as the traveller returning home asks one of the older locals about his childhood landmarks and he sings:

What happened to our town, was all I could ask,  
The old town I'd known long ago,  
Time and tide waits for no one, was their only reply,  
While you were away in TO [Toronto].

The whole song tells of remembered landscapes which have shifted and changed to something other than what the traveller had experienced. Nothing had remained the same so he no longer knew who he was on that landscape. Hence, he returned to Toronto to a less foreign landscape.

For the grievors in this study, at the end of their
hearings they did not know who they were. They knew who they were not. They were not the same people who went into the hearing and when they come out they can expect to find that the landscape they left has changed as well. They may become trapped in their plot line between two storied positions, neither of which establishes an identity for them.

The Vulnerabilities of Experience

An experience is something that we live through and becomes meaningful in the telling and retelling of life stories. This way of looking at the world rests on the assumption that knowledge is personal and is coloured by the interests, experiences, and ideas of individuals playing out the plot lines of their positions in life. From the stories the participants told, I believe that when they entered the grievance hearing they did so with the understanding that it was a right for protecting themselves. By the time they had been taken through the process they perceived it as a consequence or a last resort for protecting themselves and were hesitant to advise anyone else to go through it. They approached it with suspicion and talked about it with a tension that appears to be much deeper than just a story of arbitration. The principal in Chapter 6 would not recommend it to anyone just beginning their teaching career. BethAnn (1994) would tell people not to do it if they wanted a job and Gala (1994) said she would only advise someone to go to
grievance if he or she was strong. It is evident from participant stories that they felt vulnerable as they played out the arbitration story. Whether or not this was the reason why the director did not testify in Chapter 6 has been left as a pondering thought. It is possible that by not testifying his identity would be less at risk.

In discussing the Dick and Jane metaphor of Chapter 7, I noted that the book was more than a series of words put into sentences to teach me how to read. It showed me who I was not. It described a world for me of which I felt I was not a part. Such a process seemed to help reinforce the tensions found in shaping my identity. When employees and employers place themselves in situations which cause them to go to arbitration they are simultaneously questioning what is portrayed as being the sacred story of the organization, how they are living that story, and how that story is being told. This creates conflicting stories for both parties. Teachers get messages which indicate to them that they are not wanted as employees. The story is presented to them through the actions of district office, the lawyer examination of district office personnel, and school board lawyer's cross-examination of the employee's testimony during the arbitration hearing. By the time the story is told, one story or the other will no longer fit in the organizational plot line. Administrators get the message that they have not lived up to the requirements of the collective agreement or have not followed
due process, the sacred story of the organization is not being lived out as it should be. The identity of the director as being the teller of that story may be in jeopardy and may shift to a personal story especially if the arbitration is upheld in favour of the grievor and the sacred story of the organization has been placed into question. This happened, I believe, in the director's story written in Chapter 5.

One can only assume that if the grievor's case had been denied, the director's story would have shifted back as the sacred story of the organization. However, with the participants I interviewed that was not the case as the grievors won their grievances. Hence, in the four grievor stories both the employee and the employer stories became personal.

If a teacher was incompetent or insubordinate before the arbitration, the arbitration event is probably not going to change that. Therefore, the conflict remains even though the grievance has been settled. This makes one thing clear, school system disputes are personal. Using such a mechanism as arbitration to resolve the controversies often simply exacerbates the conflict and has the potential to profoundly affect people's lives. The arbitration procedure is clearly a fixed plot line in the sense that a complaint is heard and a decision is made based on the facts of the argument presented. However, that fixed plot line and the writing of it in the award become something other than what was lived out by those
involved which makes experience and the storytelling of it very vulnerable.

Because of its adversarial nature, some see stories of arbitration as a game of zero-sum strategy, assessment games which can also make experience very vulnerable. There is an overriding purpose to outwit the opposition by restorying the stories of both parties, which thrusts the participants into fully interdependent but conflicting plot lines. Because there is interdependency (Barter & DeCarion, 1997) among players one person's story can have pivotal consequences for him or her and for the other players and their stories.

This is a crucial element in how evidence is presented at an arbitration hearing as lawyers and union representatives determine which witnesses are introduced and how the procedure of examination, cross-examination, and re-examination is to be carried out. Some elements of the playing become very clearly defined and therefore fixed while others become concealed, tactical, and indeterminant, and depend on the story telling ability of the players. As is the case with most games, in arbitration each party tries to contain the other through competing plot lines. Goffman (1974, p. 457) refers to it as a "competition of containment." Looked at from the point of view of this thesis, it is the storytelling of positional roles within the conduited landscape of an arbitration event. It is the living out of a plot line which can place people's stories at risk and create a vulnerable experience.
The Conduited Landscape: Identities of Hierarchy

Administrators are written into the landscape story as chief executive officers for the organization. They are positioned in plot lines which interpret the sacred story of the organization. They are responsible for telling others how to live the organizational story. Hence, the conduit metaphor is used to live out the administrative plot line.

Administrators play the role of being the representatives of those greater values, the institutionalized narrative. They are seen by others as having responsibility for the group and in order to apply that responsibility they are given more scope for living out their story than those in other positions. They become the directors of the plays as opposed to the characters and as such are perceived as living privileged positions on the landscape.

According to some of my participants this positioning gives administrators a leading edge when it comes to arbitration events. In other words, they have been given identities of hierarchy. First of all, they are seen as the employers who, even when they lose, grievors still story as being bosses and expect that consequences may still be applied. In other words, tensioned stories will be lived. Many participants in this study, believed that their win was lived out as stories of consequence. BethAnn's story (1994) in Chapter 7, the grievor's (1993) story in Chapter 6, and

99Adapted from Connelly and Clandinin (WIP).
Fred's (1994) in Chapter 2 are three examples of how some story the administrator's position on the landscape.

When one loses, one expects negative consequential stories to be lived. This is a fallout of living on a conduited landscape. What one often does not expect is the consequential fallout when one wins. The experiences of the four grievors interviewed were similar. They each lived a story of consequence either through the stories conduited from district office or from the sacred story of organizational living in general as in "one does not story differently from one's employer," or had no story at all, just silence. These examples allow for a story of hierarchy to take place.

As I watched the arbitration proceedings being lived out, I experienced a plot line that was more than just a fixed procedure. The room arrangement, where people sat, who attended, who gathered with whom for coffee during the breaks, became reflections of interwoven relationships. But more than that, within that interweaving there emerged an implicit realization that one's position on the landscape helped determine what barriers one would be exposed to. For example, a grievor would not invite someone to the hearing but a director might. In point of fact, one director did. Board office personnel would be more likely to feel that it is okay for them to attend hearings while teachers or relatives of grievors would not.

Another significant story of hierarchy for this thesis
has been in determining whether arbitration affairs are private or public. It remains an arbitration tension and hence a thesis tension as well. For all intents and purposes a conflicting story remains as both the stories of participants and the legal literature make it quite clear that the story is unclear and seems to depend on the parties involved.

With BethAnn (1994), when she discovered that the employer was going to have an observer, she asked if observers were allowed and was told "no". When she pointed out that the employer was having at least one observer, she was told "yes", that she could bring someone, too. Neil (1993) was not asked whether or not he wanted observers, but there were observers present. When it was pointed out to the lawyer he said it was irrelevant. From a legal point of view the presence of observers was probably irrelevant to the due process. But, from a grievor's point of view it may not be irrelevant at all because it affects so much the personal story. In other words, the lawyer overlooked the story of the grievor.

The experience of listening to participant stories also re-affirmed my belief in the inequalities found within organizations and how access to those inequalities can give those living in the upper positions more leeway in shaping their stories\(^\text{100}\). Seen from this point of view, positioning

\(^{100}\) Contrary to Czuboka's (1985, p. 65) statement that "Canadian society has reached a stage where the rights of people take precedence over the rights of organizations," there are those
creates barriers for some while lifting restraints for others. The grievors in this study conveyed in their stories that administrators are privileged. In acting as the keepers of the organization they eliminate individual moral responsibility as they play out their lives under the guise of the sacred story of the organization. In other words, it places administrators in a sacred story where it is taken for granted that the positions they hold portray roles of power and authority, and will live out their plot lines in morally right ways. It creates a perception that administrators, for the most part, live out the story of the organization separate from living their own personal story. In my view, although they may live out the fixed plot line of the organization, it is not a given. Administrators live personal and professional stories like teachers do. Hence, they have stories of their own which may compete with the organizational story. Sacred stories, like secret stories, can be abusive (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) and the story can be remain intact by hiring those with similar stories.

Writers such as Gronn (1985) maintain that those living out the sacred story of the institution hire people who convey (MacKay, 1984; Hanrahan, 1989; Covert, 1993) who believe that teachers have no rights and cite court cases to back up their argument.

Tucker (1994) in a review of Greenfield's (1993) book refers to this as a mistaken view of social reality. Greenfield argues that any science which portrays itself as being value-neutral cannot possibly live up to its portrayal because "it takes the side of the status quo as right."
like stories in order to ensure that protection. Gronn used his study to point out that selection for job positions is something on which school boards place a lot of emphasis. The rationality of selection goes far beyond the open published criteria of forms and applications. In his study, the qualifications the board was looking for were not just something that was achieved by certification. The Head Master for example used her role to shape other people's opinions, and at the same time, made her decision appear to be the right one. "You get to know by some chemistry, what people are like," was her response to the hiring committee (p. 19). Gronn's interpretation was that "subtle and elusive intuitive mechanisms were called upon to justify feelings and impressions experienced by the Head," and her preference prevailed in the end.

From my point of view, the Head Master was living the institutionalized story through her own narrative. Her personal and professional narrative was being played out through the sacred story of the organization. That is how the grievor felt in Chapter 6 as he talked about the director wanting to get rid of him. He believed that it was the personal narrative of the director being played out through the organizational story. In that sense, the organization became the conduit for a personal narrative. What this indicates is that it is the interweaving of a personal and professional administrator story with the already existing
story of the organization which shapes and reshapes the institutional narrative. There is a moral danger in this in that people's stories become so intertwined with the sacred stories of the organization that the plot lines become blurred, so blurred that one can lose sight of which story is being lived out and for what reasons.

I have my own competing and conflicting stories about the way we have lived and are living the organizational story. In the arbitration to which I was party I kept asking myself how the living out of an arbitration event can be justice if justice as served means righting someone's wrong. From my position as witness I believe I saw and sensed the stress of the grievor who felt he had been wronged. I observed the micro stories which played out on, what appeared to be, an administrative flavoured plot line. It seemed as if administrators and union representatives played major roles in bending grievance procedure rules. Decisions on time delays, where the grievance was to be held, and who was allowed to observe, seemed to be controlled by the employer and the union. The grievors I interviewed talked as if they only received privileges upon demand. These were not an expected part of their stories.

Those who told grievor stories told similar stories of experiencing a systemically biased story which identified, in particular the employer, as having a more flexible plot line to play out. In narrative terms, administrators are often
seen by those in other positions, as being in positions where they can live out their stories with more tolerance if they bend the sacred story.

Arbitration is an adversarial event which is lived out through positional roles of hierarchy on personal and professional knowledge landscapes. It is a position reflective of the conduit metaphor. There are competing and conflicting stories. There is a shaping and reshaping, a telling and retelling of life stories. It is tensioned and dilemma-laden.

Positioning plays a key role in how we see ourselves and how others see us. The type of interaction which may or may not occur can be dependent on our landscape position. In June, 1997, when Queen Elizabeth visited Purity Factory in St. John's, workers were told beforehand how they were to behave in front of her Majesty. They were to speak when spoken to and not offer to shake her hand unless she extended hers are two I can remember from the CBC Regional News cast (May, 1997). If a worker in the reception line did something outside of the protocol they had been given, we can be fairly certain that they would have been whisked away and properly reprimanded. I use this as an extreme example to demonstrate that we are not all on an equal playing field, positions are varied on the landscape. Some see ourselves and are seen by others as being more privileged. Not only are we seen as being in more privileged positions, but we can also be
perceived as being in positions of threat to others, another fallout of the conduit metaphor. This does not mean that administrators, themselves, do not live threatened or vulnerable stories. Some leaders, including me, have felt that once we move to this position we are placed on the firing line and are fired at by those who might be considered to be in less privileged positions. Hence, both positions, and in all probability, all positions are vulnerable on the landscape.

Hierarchy does play a role in one's position on the landscape and is therefore a significant part of one's identity. And although the tensions created from living on the landscape are more complex than simply what position one holds, it certainly is a contributing factor. I will use the participants from chapters 5, 6, and 7 to explain further.

In Chapter 5, union representatives see themselves as defenders of the teachers' collective agreement. They do that by arguing individual cases on group principle through articles in the collective agreement. A grievance upheld is an article strengthened in the collective agreement for all members. Their position on the landscape from a hierarchal point of view is seen as being higher than teachers. They have a personal and professional knowledge on which teachers have to rely when going through grievance procedure. Besides that, they are left to the job of contract negotiations on behalf of their members, freeing teachers of that
responsibility, many of whom might not be good negotiators or want to live that story anyway.

Although unions do not appear to be in a position of threat to teachers, they are in a position which, when playing their roles, may compete and even conflict with a teacher's. And, in point of fact, according to the grievor in Chapter 6, it does. At the start of his grievance he asked for a different representative when he conflicted with the one he had. Participant Laura (1994) told me that her union had one grievor who hired his own lawyer once a conflicting story developed between the union and him.

There is a clearer hierarchal division between the teacher and district office. Immediately the organizational narrative tells a story of being the employer and whoever acts on its behalf will be defending the policies and principles of the organization. Teachers see themselves as employees even though some may perceive themselves to be professional employees, by that I mean employees with expertise. The organizational narrative brings stories of insubordination, disciplinary action, incompetency, and just cause. It is a language which depicts a linear division in the role played by both parties.

Teachers are more apt to see board office personnel as a threat to their identity, both personal and professional. It is people positioned at board office who funnel down the policies and expect them to be carried out by teachers. If
schools do not comply, someone has to take the responsibility and therefore the blame, and suffer the consequences. Reprimand, reassignment, or being fired are all forms of disciplinary action which alter a person's identity both personally and professionally. The grievors in this study felt as if their roles and positions had been discredited as part of the larger organizational narrative because of how they were storied by the administration.

The landscape is moral (Connelly & Clandinin, WIP; Greenfield, 1993); nothing enters it value neutral. "Everything comes from a moral push with which teachers are expected to do something" (Connelly & Clandinin, WIP, p. 16). Hence, we "should think of an organization as a moral order in action" (Greenfield, 1993, p. 222). Therefore, the conduit is prescriptive and prescriptions come from those living in privileged positions and playing out those roles.

Board offices exist on the landscape to administer policy and oversee the running of schools. The role of teachers' unions is to influence school board and government policy on behalf of its members. As Bascia (1992, p. 1) explains it, they are "the legal representatives of teachers' occupational interests" and are therefore "more or less accepted players in school and district policy making." Schools exist to educate in a way that complies with both board and government and union policies.

Clandinin and Connelly (1995) describe the consequences
of the conduit being positioned on the professional knowledge landscape. Although the reference is made to teachers, again the transfer to administrators is an easy enough process. For both roles certain requirements are expected with regard to knowledge, understanding, discussion, and doing something "with the knowledge poured into the landscape via the conduit" (p. 13). The message is communicated through texts, pamphlets, inservice, staff meetings, memos, directives, policy statements, collective agreement articles, and so forth. Those filling the positions and playing the roles on the landscape are expected to know what those expectations are. Anything less would be regarded as incompetency or insubordination. The living out of such a plot line allows for identity stories of hierarchy.

Summary and Possibilities

Arbitration is played out within a conduit metaphor. It is institutionally framed. What this implies is that the failure of changes not taking place in the school rests upon the shoulders of the staff and principal. Much energy, money, effort, and professional development activity take place in order to bring teachers in line with district policy. When all else fails, as was the case with Mr. Kao in Chapter 5 and the participant in Chapter 6, consequences follow which expend more energy, money, effort, and professional unionized activity. In believing that teachers are not clay to be
moulded by the wishes and will of district office, and that no one is the same person from one day to the next, attempting to force them on the side of district office, through reassignment and then arbitration, can create nothing more than a bottomless pit for energy and money leaving both parties in shaken, unresolved conflicts.

As the grievor (Interview, 1993) remarked, in Chapter 6, "in the end it was all for nothing," in other words, nothing had changed. Essentially, what the grievor had become was "a moral technician" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1993) for district office playing out its moral vision, shaping its own story. When he grieved he became a moral technician for the union playing out the collective agreement. In both instances, he acted out someone else's institutionalized narrative.

Throughout the writing of this thesis, and specifically in Chapter 2, I have queried as to whether arbitration should be the means of settling disputes with teachers. From the stories in this thesis I have come to believe that when individuals such as grievors see themselves as having suffered foul play, it is important that the playing out of this event be somehow put to rest. The one possibility for that happening is if both parties can put it to rest together. At this point in time, arbitration is the main resolution story being told. Although there has been a call from others\textsuperscript{102} to

investigate alternate means of hearing conflicting stories. Arbitration still appears to be the most common. How effective it is at handling the dispute in the best interest of both parties remains a conflicting story.

From participant interviews I have made an assumption that there is neither process presently available, with regard to how the dispute is personally put to rest, except the passing of time or the changing of a landscape. According to Czuboka (1985), in many cases the end of an arbitration results in the changing of the landscape as grievors move on. They either find a new position\textsuperscript{103} or exit that particular organization altogether. Three of my grievor participants retired, the fourth took a new position in another college.

To my knowledge, there are no arbitration intervention centres or post arbitration party mediation. There are employee Assistant programs (EAP) which Eric (1994) and Lois (1993) suggested as being a bridging source to help teachers back into their roles. But, according to Tucker (1993) these programs carry with them a symptom's story from which again emerges an identity story of something being wrong with the teacher. I have not heard tell of employer assistant programs. I make the point to reiterate the idea that a person's position and role on the organizational landscape is of significance for the stories we live by.

\textsuperscript{103}See Oughton's story entitled "Teachers as Workers: Hard Lessons of the 90's" in ACT journal, 1997.
Hence, everyone simply tries to pick up the pieces of their stories and plod on through an already existing turbulent plot line. What becomes clear throughout the interviews is that, in delicate issues such as those encountered through arbitration, unless an effective check to help the process of reconciliation has been put in place to reshape the adversarial plot line, the conflicting story remains. The underlying currents of this study linger.

The heart of this thesis rests with people and how they live out their lives on their personal and professional landscapes. The idea of conduited landscapes with stories as sources of one's identity has provided me with a way to portray the image of bounded personal and professional living. We are what we live and we are bounded in how we live by those around us. The interaction with others and with ourselves create the competing and conflicting stories which make us who we are. If the arbitration process becomes part of that plot line it becomes part of our lived story.

There is often a difference between what people say and what people do. It is a divergence between "espoused theory" and "theory in use" (Schon, 1983), between a plot line as written and a plot line as acted out, between telling a story and living it. According to Van Manen (1994, p. 161) narrative reason enters our personal and professional lives. As he explains, "It is by sharing stories . . . with one another that we reflect upon our pedagogical practice. . . .
We give account of what we have done." In coming to terms with the stories we live by (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) we may gain what Van Manen (1994, p. 161) refers to as "pedagogical thoughtfulness and tactful intuition." Maybe that is what is lacking between the stories of teachers and the stories of administrators. By not telling our stories to each other maybe we lose touch with each other's landscapes.

I have attempted to probe below the procedural surface and make visible the undercurrents of life. I believe these have as much, if not more, of an impact on human life than what one finds written in arbitration awards. My intent in writing this thesis was to raise the reader's consciousness of how arbitration is enacted, to come to understand what it means to go to arbitration. If the reading of this narrative has evoked meaning, showed some form of human truth, or brought about understandings about how we interact with others within the conduited organizational landscape, I have barely scratched the surface of the stories we live.

There are places throughout the thesis where I lose touch with the administrator's story. I believe that to be at least partly because I acquired my most intimate material from grievors. Janet (1993) was the only one to tell me an administrator's story. The other two interviews were brief and contained. When we lose touch with each other's positions on the landscape we lose touch with new stories to live by. In telling our stories we come to know.
There is an ancient Chinese legend\textsuperscript{104} which portrays a picture of heaven and hell. Hell seems to be a beautiful place full of lush green vegetables, rolling hills, and clear, deep blue skies. The fragrance of rice fills the air and dishes are plenished to capacity. There is only one problem, the chop sticks are four feet long which makes it impossible for anyone to eat from the bowls and satisfy their hunger. Heaven, too, is an identical paradise filled with dishes of rice. And again, the chop sticks are four feet long. However, the people who live here, feed each other. All we have in the world of education is what we are, we are our own stories. Education, within this context, is about understanding ourselves and each other. How rich would the landscape be if we always fed others and others fed us.

\textsuperscript{104}\textit{As cited by Yoemans (1972).}
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