

Table 1. Disruptions to the Social Order of Costen School Discussed Throughout this Dissertation

<u>Disruption</u>	<u>Time Followed Through</u>	<u>Discussed in Chapter</u>	<u>Turmoil</u>
-Mrs. Koh’s general high standards and accountability with teachers	Fall, Winter, Spring 1999/2000	3	Yes
-Mrs. Koh’s change of attendance record keeping used by teachers	Fall, Winter, Spring 1999/2000	3	Yes
-Mrs. Koh’s changes in support staff and resource periods	Fall, Winter, Spring 1999/2000	3	Yes
-Turnover in the teaching staff initiated by Mrs. Koh	Fall, Winter, Spring 1999/2000	3	Yes
-Mrs. Koh’s changes in the bilingual program used by the teachers	Fall, Winter, Spring 2000/2001	3	Yes
-Mrs. Koh’s changes in the student reward system/assemblies used by the teachers	Winter, Spring 2000/2001	4	Yes
-Mrs. Koh’s changes in copy making procedures used by the teachers	Spring 2000	4	Yes
-Mr. Carrol’s (new assistant principal) changes in copy procedures with teachers	Spring 2001	4	No
-Change in the method of principal evaluation between Mrs. Koh and the Local School Council	Winter, Spring 2000/2001	4	No

Table 1. Continued

-Frances Drew's (7 <sup>th</sup> grade language arts teacher) effort to change language arts curriculum	Fall, Winter 2000/2001	5	No
-Mrs. Koh's increasing absence from the leader team meetings with the teachers	Spring 2001	5	Yes
-Brenda Donalds' (6 <sup>th</sup> grade language arts teacher) effort to change language arts curriculum	Spring 1999, Fall, Winter 2000	5	No

Table 2. Combinations of Conditions and Outcomes of Turmoil

	Column I.	Column II.	Column III.	Column IV.	Column V.	
<u>Combination</u>	<u>Accountability Logic</u>	<u>Rational-Legal Authority of Initiator</u>	<u>Disruption of Negotiated Order</u>	<u>Lack of Symbolic Power (initiator)</u>	<u>Turmoil</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>
1	1	1	1	1	1	3
2	0	1	1	1	1	4
3	1	0	1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	0	0	1
5	1	0	1	0	0	1
6	0	0	1	0	0	2
7	1	1	0	0	0	1

(13 total cases)

Note that I have reverse coded symbolic power in Table Two and Table Three, to a lack of symbolic power. Thus a “1” indicates a lack of symbolic power by the initiator, and a “0” actually indicates that the initiator *does* have symbolic power. Reverse coding this condition does not change the analysis; it simply eases the comparison and interpretation.

Table 3. Other Possible Combinations and Predicted Turmoil Outcomes

	Column I.	Column II.	Column III.	Column IV.	Column V.
<u>Combination</u>	<u>Accountability Logic</u>	<u>Rational-Legal Authority of Initiator</u>	<u>Disruption of Negotiated Order</u>	<u>Lack of Symbolic Power (initiator)</u>	<u>Turmoil (predicted)</u>
8	0	1	1	0	(0?)
9	1	1	0	1	(0?)
10	1	0	0	0	(0?)
11	1	0	0	1	(0?)
12	0	1	0	0	(0?)
13	0	1	0	1	(0?)
14	0	0	0	0	(0?)
15	0	0	0	1	(0?)
16	0	0	1	1	(1?)

Note that I have reverse coded symbolic power in Table Three, to a lack of symbolic power. Thus a “1” indicates a lack of symbolic power by the initiator, and a “0” actually indicates that the initiator *does* have symbolic power. Reverse coding this condition does not change the analysis; it simply eases the comparison and interpretation.