The role of interpersonal communication on the socialization of student-actors in a collegiate theatrical production

by

Amy Marie Burgmaier

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Journalism and Mass Communication

Program of Study Committee:
Scott Chadwick, Major Professor
Barbara Mack
Patrick Gouran

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2003

Copyright © Amy Marie Burgmaier, 2003. All rights reserved.

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the master's thesis of

Amy Marie Burgmaier

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

DEDICATION

To Brian:

To my baby brother, best friend, and guardian angel. Although our physical relationship has ended, our spiritual connection continues to guide my earthly existence. Although the lesson was difficult to accept, I thank you for teaching me the meaning of life and the importance of living every day to its fullest despite adversary. I cherish your memory and know our love will never die. Until we meet again, a breath away is not far to where you are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ACT 1. INTRODUCTION	1
ACT 2. LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESES, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
ACT 3. METHODOLOGY	20
ACT 4. RESULTS	41
ACT 5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS, STUDY LIMITATIONS & SUGGESTED FUTURE RESEARCH, AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS & CONCLUSION	49
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIX A	76
APPENDIX B	78
APPENDIX C	81
APPENDIX D	84
APPENDIX E	86
APPENDIX F	88
APPENDIX G	89
APPENDIX H	90
APPENDIX I	91
APPENDIX J	92
APPENDIX K	94
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Van Maanen and Schein's Six Pairs of Socialization Tactics	10
Table 2	Analysis of Hypothesized Socialization Tactics during *A Christmas Carol*	42
Table 3	New and Experienced Student-actors' Translations of the Instructor-director's Socialization Attempts during *A Christmas Carol*	46
Table 4	Instructor-director's perception of Socialization Attempts during *A Christmas Carol*	47
Table 5	Instructor-director's Perception of Socialization Intensions Vs. Actual Socialization Attempts during *A Christmas Carol*	48

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the ways in which an instructor-director socialized student-actors during a collegiate theater production in order to facilitate the socialization of new student-actors into a group of existing performers. The results of this study indicated the instructor-director utilized all twelve socialization tactics during the rehearsal process as her directorial concept dictated the usage. Results of this study also revealed that the instructor-director and student-actors communicated in certain ways in particular situations and that it is unnecessary to determine a "one size fits all" socialization strategy. According to this study's findings, all tactics had value depending on the instructor-director, the actors involved in a given production, and the production itself.

This study is socially significant because it can enable future instructor-directors to better understand the effects of socialization tactics in a theater setting. Furthermore, the results of this study might provide suggestions to prospective directors about how to improve the socialization of new actors into a cast of veteran performers. Finally, this research may equip new student-actors with ammunition against expected uncertainty associated with entering an unfamiliar theater environment.

THE ROLE OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION ON THE SOCIALIZATION OF STUDENT-ACTORS IN A COLLEGIATE THEATRICAL PRODUCTION:

ACT 1

INTRODUCTION

Definition of Terms

"Organizational socialization refers to the process by which an individual acquires the attitudes, behavior and knowledge needed to participate as an organizational member" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 211). Other researchers view socialization as "an ongoing information exchange that exposes newcomers to the realities of organizational life (Cawyer & Friedrich, 1998, p. 234) or as "the process of transforming an individual from outsider to insider" (Pribble, 1990, p. 256). "Organizational socialization is often identified as the primary process by which people adapt to new jobs and organizational roles" (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein & Gardner, 1994, p. 730). Concisely, organizational socialization is "the effect the organization has on the newcomer" (Hess, 1993, p.194).

A large majority of socialization literature focuses on understanding the stages through which a newcomer develops into an organizational member: the process of socialization (Chao, et al., 1994, p. 730). According to Herold and Fedor (1998, p. 153), three distinct stages are consistent with the socialization literature: anticipatory socialization, accommodation (encounter), and role management (metamorphosis). Traditionally, scholars have centered their investigations on the effects socialization has had upon police officers (Van Maanen, 1976), newcomers (Allen & Meyer, 1990), faculty members (Cawyer & Friedrich, 1998), employees

(Anakwe & Greenhaus, 1999), students (Souza, 1999), and the way in which members of the groups adopt normative attitudes, values, and goals of a given organization during the transition through a particular environment. Although organizational socialization plays a central role in the adjustment and learning process of these groups, there has been little empirical evidence relating the concept to the fine arts.

While More's (1989) article initially appeared to sufficiently associate theater to organizational communication, the author instead used theater and drama terminology to metaphorically analyze the concept of organizational communication within businesses. Kogan (2002) also made a brief connection between the performing arts and organizational socialization as he explored the theater in relationship to creativity research (or the lack thereof). A fragment of socialization information surfaced in his article as he attributed childhood socialization experiences and motivational patterns to career choices and sustained commitments. Although these examples were useful in understanding the parameters of socialization literature, the connection between the fine arts and the literature remained incomplete.

Park-Fuller and Pelias (1995) also attempted to reinforce the link between the two disciplines when they indirectly investigated socialization strategies and the performing arts. In their examination of student-actors' personal narratives (those who are socialized by teachers) in performance studies classrooms (the organization), they discovered that performers who told tales in the classroom typically structure detailed stories as they engaged in the artistic as well as a social process (Park-Fuller & Pelias, 1995, p.128). Ultimately, performance studies

practitioners were encouraged to incorporate story making, replications of life performances, performance art, and improvisation into the classroom in order to boost student-actors' socialization processes. Although this study provided additional knowledge that linked socialization literature to the fine arts, the authors failed to discuss the way in which the director socialized student-actors.

Perhaps one of the most suitable links between performing arts literature and organizational communication (for purposes of this study) was an ethnographic account documenting the cultural world of a regional symphony. According to Ruud (2002), organizational members embraced a particular ideology that they grounded in figurative terms –an artistic or a business code within the symphony. The findings presented by the author in this piece acknowledged the communication among symphony members that included and sustained aspects of organizational culture. Also rooted in this study, was a need to further examine the socialization tactics used by instructor-directors during a theatrical production.

Although presumably abundant, articles that link socialization concepts to the fine arts are sporadic. Perspectives that are more representative of the socialization literature in contrast, have focused on the information acquisition and feed back-seeking behaviors of organizational newcomers. For example, Ostroff & Kozlowske (1992) performed a longitudinal study exploring changes in the socialization process over time by using a frequent socialization technique performed by newcomers seeking information from veterans for socialization advice. Consequently, Ostroff & Kozlowske attempted measuring the effects of the communication method between experienced employees and newcomers. Together

the researchers narrowed the research gap as they suggested alternative approaches to aid the socialization of newcomers into an organization.

Oseroff-Varnell (1998, p. 101) would later support this finding with an additional investigation of secondary socialization: the process of learning norms and roles particular to a given group in which students attempt "fitting-in" as an organizational member. This hesitation happens during the anticipatory phase of socialization when students ponder the entrance into a new environment during the first few days or weeks and can be alleviated with informative communication before and during this introductory phase (Oseroff-Varnell, 1998, p. 103). According to the author of the study, newcomers often seek experienced workers within an organization in order to learn, understand and to fit into a particular group. (Primary socialization, on the other hand, happens as an individual learns societal norms after birth). Myers (1998, p. 67) supports Oseroff-Varnell's finding as he discovered that graduate teaching assistants seek experienced personnel during the assimilation stage of socialization in order to reduce uncertainty during the transition.

According to Cawyer and Friedrich (1998, p. 234), although research exists that emphasizes socialization in academic settings, no information is available to describe the process used to socialize student-actors through social events (eg., collegiate theatrical productions). The authors' research reveals that events, such as participation in social activities, enable a swifter transition into an actual organization (p. 235). This void in the socialization literature is substantial when one considers the potential effect of socialization practices in extra-curricular activities, such as theatrical opportunities.

The Goal of This Study and Its Significance

The goal of this study is to discover meaningful information that is socially significant to directors and actors of theatrical productions, allowing for a better understanding of how to improve the socialization of new actors into a group of existing performers. This study aims to identify the ways in which the instructor-director socializes student-actors during *A Christmas Carol* in order to facilitate the socialization of future new student-actors into groups of existing performers. In order for productions offered by the Iowa State University Theater Department to thrive, new student-actors will ultimately transition into the organization first by preparing themselves for the entrance, second by joining the organization and beginning to master their roles, and third by adapting to the group.

In an effort to learn about how a particular instructor-director socializes student-actors, the purpose of this study is to gain information about how an instructor-director socialized student-actors in an academic theater production at Iowa State University. Specifically, this study focused on how the instructor-director socialized student-actors during the organizational accommodation period of *A Christmas Carol*, which debuted December 2002.

ACT 2

LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESES, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Conceptual and Theoretical Background: A Review of the Literature

This study examines the transition of new student-actors into a collegiate theatrical production (*A Christmas Carol*). The goal of this study is to provide future instructor-directors of academic theater with a better understanding of how to improve the socialization of new actors into a group of existing performers. In doing so, the researcher uses theoretical formulations from previous studies encompassing organizational socialization to examine the communication between instructor-directors and student-actors. Before concluding with hypotheses and research questions, this act contains four main sections: (1) organizational socialization vs. occupational socialization, (2) organizational assimilation and stages of socialization, (3) accommodation or encounter phase of socialization, and (4) strategies for socialization.

Organizational Socialization vs. Occupational Socialization

Fisher argues that there are differences between organizational socialization (the learning of an organization's modes of behavior) and occupational socialization (the replication of occupational values that may be simplified in the settings where an action is practiced) (1986, p.102). Although both socialization types can occur simultaneously (eg., when newcomers are required to attend formal training programs before entering into an organization), occupational training schools are themselves organizations and newcomers must be socialized in order to occupy certain roles within the group before particular actions can be replicated. In a

collegiate theatrical production, for example, new student-actors are more likely to experience organizational choice/entry rather than occupational choice/entry because the instructor-director needs to first socialize new student-actors in order for them to occupy certain roles within the theater troupe before replicating particular socialization techniques. Consequently, the current study focuses on organizational socialization patterns during the accommodation phase of collegiate theatrical production. Such distinctions, Fisher (p. 102) states, are important in order to understand the full dimension of socialization.

Organizational Assimilation and Stages of Socialization

Organizational assimilation refers to "those ongoing behavioral and cognitive processes by which individuals join, become integrated into, and exit organizations" (Jablin, 1987, p. 712). According to Lois (1999), it is more useful to view the assimilation process as involving "layered" intersecting stages of development as it engages a chain of events, activities, message exchanges, interpretations, and related processes or links of learned information that individuals use to understand new organizational situations and contexts.

Gibson and Papa (2000) investigate organizational assimilation within groups of blue-collar workers at a manufacturing company using organizational osmosis to explain the process. According to the authors, "organizational osmosis refers to the seemingly effortless adoption of ideas, values and culture of an organization on the basis of preexisting socialization experiences" (p. 68). In other words, newcomers often adopt the values and goals of a given organization by allowing their work group to control and discipline their behaviors while on the job.

In a theater setting that also involves newcomers, one may focus on how new student-actors become experienced student-actors by "learning the ropes," a process described by Schein (1968). "Learning the ropes" can be described as "ranging from a relatively quick, self-guided, trial-and-error process to a far more elaborate one requiring a lengthy preparation period of education and training followed by an equally drawn-out period of official apprenticeship" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). This term, according to Jablin and Krone (1987, p. 713), happens when a newcomer learns what is important to experienced organizational members. During the assimilation stage of a theater production the term "learning the ropes" can describe how new student-actors adjust to an unfamiliar cast as they discover personal roles within the group and interpret organizational characteristics.

Over the years, several stage models of organizational socialization have been proposed that typically divide the assimilation process into three sections or stages: (1) anticipatory socialization, (2) accommodation, entry or encounter, and (3) role management or metamorphosis phases (Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen, 1976; Fisher, 1986; Herold & Fedor, 1998;). Jablin (1985, pp. 261-262) also identifies three stages of organizational socialization in his original study, but further divides the categories into smaller segments in order to focus on the vocational phase of the anticipatory stage for students entering schools. This period, according to Jablin, is the first step of the anticipatory phase that precedes one's entry into an organization and happens only once or twice in one's lifetime. Despite slight terminology differences frequently cited within the domain of socialization literature, the stage models have commonalities as they all suggest three general phases within the socialization

process (Fisher, 1986, pp. 115-120; Herold & Fedor, 1998, p. 153), which are applicable to student-actor socialization.

Accommodation or Encounter Phase of Socialization

"Accommodation" (a term used by Feldman, 1976; Herold & Fedor (1998, p. 153), "initial confrontation" (a term used by Graen, 1976), and "encounter" (a term used by Jablin & Krone, 1987) can be described as the stages when amateurs first join an organization, begin to master their job, develop relationships with co-workers, and learn how the organization operates. The encounter phase, offered by Jablin and Krone (p. 713), is similar to the accommodation stage mentioned previously in Fisher's article (1986) as it occurs during the first few weeks of joining an organization, when the organization and its members subject newcomers to particular reinforcement practices or organizational routines. These initial experiences are necessary for the development of attitudes and behaviors, which are regular in the new environment, but are often stressful to newcomers (Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995).

Strategies for Socialization

In addition to dissecting organizational socialization according to stage models, the vast majority of literature identifies additional factors that affect newcomers' ability to socialize into existing groups (Herold & Fedor, 1998, p. 154). Although researchers notice the effect of work groups on newcomer adjustment, empirical examinations of specific tactics are relatively innovative notions (Baker & Feldman, 1990, p. 198). For example, in Van Maanen and Schein's (1979, p. 226) landmark article, the researchers propose that information learned by people in their organizational work-roles is often a direct result of how they learn based on their

individual differences. Because the authors were mainly concerned with how groups pass down responsibilities to future generations, Van Maanen and Schein conceived a typology with six characteristic features upon which organizations could base their socialization designs. The six dimensions are: (1) collective versus individual socialization; (2) formal versus informal socialization; (3) sequential versus non-sequential or random socialization; (4) fixed versus variable socialization; (5) serial versus disjunctive socialization; and (6) investiture versus divestiture socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, pp. 232-254). These socialization tactics (appearing below in Table 1) would be most influential to future researchers studying the socialization process.

Table 1
Van Maanen and Schein's Six Pairs of Socialization Tactics

Socialization Tactics	**Definition**
Collective Socialization	The practice of grouping newcomers and putting them through a common set of experiences designed to convey certain information to newcomers
*Individual Socialization	Treating each newcomer singly and in isolation from others and putting him or her through unique experiences
Formal Socialization	The practice of segregating newcomers from more experienced members and putting them through a set of tailored experiences
*Informal Socialization	Making fewer efforts to distinguish newcomers from experienced organizational members by following a rigid set of programmed experiences

Socialization Tactics	Definition
Sequential Socialization	The completion of sequential socialization steps that lead to the fulfillment of the role expectations
*Random Socialization	An ambiguous sequence of steps
Fixed Socialization	A specific length of time designated to the newcomer's socialization process
*Variable Socialization	An indefinite timetable that specifies few clues about when to expect the next transition
Serial Socialization	The practice of socializing newcomers with the aid of veteran organizational members or mentors to "show the ropes" to the newcomers
*Disjunctive Socialization	A process where a role model is not used
Investiture Socialization	The reinforcement of the newcomer's identity during the socialization process
*Divestiture Socialization	Communicating that past knowledge or behaviors are not acceptable

Note. Adapted from "Strategies of Organizational Socialization and Their Impact on Newcomer Adjustment," by E. H. Baker III & D. C. Feldman, 1990, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 2(2), 198-212.
* = Individualized socialization tactics or innovative role orientations. Individualized socialization tactics encourage newcomers to question the condition of affairs that currently exists and to develop individual approaches into their characters or innovative responses.
No * = Institutionalized socialization tactics or custodial role orientations. Institutionalized socialization tactics encourage newcomers to passively accept preset or established roles, thus maintaining or reproducing the status quo responses (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Collective vs. Individual Socialization

According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 233), collective vs. individual socialization is the practice of grouping newcomers and putting them through a

common set of experiences designed to convey certain information to the newcomers rather than treating newcomers singly and in isolation from others by putting them through unique experiences. Becker (1964) argues that an understanding of the problems faced by all group members during collective socialization experiences shape individual perspectives or interpretations. In collective socialization, socializing agents (or the instructor-director) reinforce newcomer interactions with descriptions of the situation. Individual socialization tactics can also stimulate change, but the change is likely more varied than that of collective socialization. Consequently, collective socialization tactics theoretically produce low innovation, because newcomers simply accept particular roles and their related expectations (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 233).

Accordingly, instructor-directors may employ individual socialization tactics during the accommodation phase of the rehearsal process so that newcomers have the freedom to independently fit into a group of existing performers. In addition, because the researcher expects instructor-directors to strive toward achieving innovative responses from cast members, this study suggests the following hypothesis:

H_1: The instructor-director will implement individual socialization tactics more than collective tactics while socializing new student-actors.

Formal vs. Informal Socialization

Formal vs. informal socialization, the second socialization tactic mentioned in Van Maanen and Schein's typology (1979, p. 239), is the practice of segregating newcomers from more experienced organizational members and putting them through tailored experiences, rather than making fewer efforts to distinguish them

from experienced members by following a rigid set of programmed experiences. According to Jones (1986, p. 264), Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 237), informal tactics result in more innovative orientations as a means of adjusting while formal tactics increase individuals' tendency to accept the role definition and adopt less innovative (or more custodial) role orientations as a mode of adjustment.

Accordingly, instructor-directors may employ informal socialization tactics during the accommodation phase of the rehearsal process in order to encourage the development of new student-actors' individual and creative responses during the transition. As a result it is hypothesized that:

H_2: The instructor-director will use informal socialization tactics more than formal tactics while socializing the student-actors.

Sequential vs. Non-sequential or Random Socialization

The third set of socialization tactics described by Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 241), is sequential vs. non-sequential or random socialization: the completion of sequential socialization steps that lead to the fulfillment of role expectations vs. an ambiguous sequence of steps. Sequential socialization is more likely to produce a custodial and accommodating response as a means of adjustment, whereas non-sequential socialization would result in a wider variety of views about the roles and steps that lead to it. Thus, non-sequential socialization tactics would result in a more innovative role orientation as a means of adjusting, according to Jones (1986, p. 264) and Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 243).

In a collegiate theater production, this means that instructor-directors are likely to favor the use of non-sequential socialization tactics during the

accommodation phase in order to achieve innovative role responses from the student-actors. Consequently, this argument leads to the following hypothesis:

H_3: The instructor-director will use non-sequential socialization tactics more than sequential tactics while socializing new and experienced student actors.

Fixed vs. Variable Socialization

Fixed vs. variable socialization, a specific length of time designated to the newcomer's socialization process vs. an indefinite timetable that specifies few clues about when to expect the next transition, is the fourth pair of Van Maanen and Schein's socialization tactics (1979, p. 244). Accordingly, whether the timetable from one position to another during a theatrical production is fixed or variable, it is likely that student-actors see the agenda as fixed (to some extent) during the accommodation phase of a theater production as opening night approaches. If organizations support this view using fixed socialization tactics, one could expect fixed tactics to be negatively related to role innovation (or positively related to custodial responses) if newcomers are able to clearly see the time intervals associated with future transitions. In order to discourage custodial responses from student-actors while encouraging innovative responses the researcher suggests the following hypothesis:

H_4: The instructor-director will use variable socialization tactics more than fixed tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors.

Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization

The fifth set of socialization tactics is serial vs. disjunctive socialization –the practice of socializing newcomers with the aid of veteran organizational members or

mentors to "show the ropes" to the newcomers vs. a process where a role model is not used (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979, p. 247). According to Jablin (1987), experienced organizational members understand current situations and can communicate with newcomers in a personal manner. As a result, newcomers trust and accept the information about role expectations provided by the experienced organizational member and are more comfortable in the new environment. Disjunctive socialization tactics involve situations in which there are no role models to provide newcomers with information about role expectations. Consequently, one would expect disjunctive socialization tactics to result in high role innovation moments and serial socialization tactics to result in low innovation situations (or high custodial responses).

In order to achieve innovative responses from cast members, instructor-directors should not rely wholly on veteran student-actors to acclimate newcomers into a theater troop. Because this study seeks to discover ways to ease the transition of newcomers into a group of existing performers that results in high innovation situations, it is hypothesized that:

H_5: The instructor-director will use disjunctive socialization tactics more than serial tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors.

Investiture vs. Divestiture Socialization

Finally, investiture vs. divestiture socialization– the reinforcement of the newcomer's identity during the socialization process vs. communicating that past knowledge or behaviors are not acceptable, is Van Maanen and Schein's (1979, p. 250) sixth pair of socialization tactics. Based on this comparison, divestiture socialization tactics inhibit role innovation because organizations clearly anticipate

divestiture tactics to cause newcomers to discard old attitudes and behaviors and adopt new mannerisms desired by the organization (Black, 1992, pp. 175-176).

On the contrary, investiture tactics, which reinforce peoples' beliefs in their own abilities, results in innovative role orientations, according to Jones (1986, p. 265). Unlike new hires, new student-actors understand that they were cast into a particular theater production based on individual talent levels, thus have demonstrated some level of competence. The instructor-director is ultimately responsible for the casting decision and is likely to encourage new student-actors to incorporate personal mannerisms into their character roles, thus promoting role innovation. Divestiture tactics inhibit role innovation, according to Black (1992, p. 177), because "organizations explicitly intend for divestiture socialization tactics to cause newcomers to discard old attitudes and behaviors and mold to new ones desired by the organization."

However convincing, the reinforcement phase involves a pattern of day-to-day experiences in which the socializer subjects individuals (or new student-actors) to the reinforcement practices of the organization and its members (the theater department and fellow student-actors). Each semester new student-actors face moments of uncertainty and triumph as they transition into the performance group. Based on this philosophy, it is important for directors to appropriately interact with student-actors so that a newcomer may fit comfortably into a given production, as an employee seeks to fit into a particular company (Hess, 1993). Thus, it is hypothesized that:

H_6: The instructor-director will use investiture socialization tactics more than divestiture tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors.

Although Van Maanen and Schein (1979) did not claim the six pairs of tactics were exhaustive, the tactics are the most common and visible in the domain of socialization literature (Black, 1992, p. 173). For example, Jones continued the work of Van Maanen and Schein by contending that the six socialization tactics formed a gestalt that he termed "institutionalized socialization" (Ashforth, Sacks & Lee, 1998, p. 899). According to Jones (1986, pp. 264-266), the collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and divestiture tactics encouraged newcomers to passively accept preset or established roles, and thus maintain or reproduce the status quo. Conversely, at the opposite end of the socialization continuum, the individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and investiture tactics encouraged newcomers to question the condition of affairs that currently existed and to develop "individual" approaches into their characters or innovative responses (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Jones (1986, pp. 263-264) detected insufficient support involving two of Van Maanen and Schein's socialization characteristics on newcomer responses. While Jones's work offered a theoretical explanation of how socialization tactics affected role orientations, it also empirically examined the moderating effect of an individual difference (self-efficacy) on the relationship between socialization efforts and adjustment (Black, 1992, p. 171). Because "individualized socialization" tactics produce more innovative responses, which are responses desired by instructor-directors in theater productions, the previous hypotheses gain additional purpose. By supplying or denying new student-actors with information in particular ways,

current organizational leaders can encourage newcomer to interpret and respond to situations in a predictable manner (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979).

The concept of newcomer adjustment appeared in Allen and Meyer's (1990) work, which replicated Jones's (1986) piece by longitudinally exploring relationships among social dimensions. By focusing specifically on the role orientation and organizational commitment of undergraduate and graduate students, Allen and Meyer were able to provide support for four of Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) socialization combinations as well as for Jones's correlations involving the fixed-variable and investiture-divesture aspects. The authors went on to say that organizations that want committed and innovative employees should use investiture to foster commitment (the degree to which the socialization processes confirm the incoming identity of a newcomer), according to Baker and Feldman (1990, p. 210). They argued this tactic could also encourage newcomers to develop personal coping strategies for use during the transition: a disjunctive task that forces newcomers to be original and creative. Although differentiating between the socialization stages and tactics may be an ambiguous task, this study builds upon emerging phases and themes according to the previous stage models' descriptions and Van Maanen and Schein's groundbreaking typology (1979).

Research Questions

According to Hess (1993, p. 199), if workers believe that their positions are one of the most crucial jobs in the organization, when employers sometimes overlook them, they will be frustrated. In contrast, if workers believe that their role positions are unimportant, instead of vital, they are likely to simply dismiss this as an exception to the norm. This concept applies to the socialization of newcomers

during a collegiate theatrical production, as both experienced and inexperienced student-actors welcome verbal feedback from the instructor-director in order for effective socialization to occur among performers.

In order for an organization like the Iowa State University Theater Department to thrive, new student-actors will ultimately transition into the organization first by preparing themselves for the entrance, second by joining the organization and beginning to master their roles, and third by adapting to the group. In an attempt to understand how to improve the socialization of new actors into a group of existing performers, this study poses the following research questions:

RQ_1: During the accommodation phase of *A Christmas Carol*, when does the instructor-director socialize new student-actors the same as experienced student-actors?

RQ_2: During the accommodation phase of *A Christmas Carol*, when does the instructor-director socialize new student-actors differently than experienced student-actors?

RQ_3: How do student-actors translate the instructor-director's socialization attempts once the researcher verifies socialization during the production (assuming the student-actors recognize the attempts)?

RQ_4: How do student-actors' perceptions of the instructor-director's socialization attempts differ from the instructor-director's perception of the attempts?

RQ_5: How does the instructor-director's socialization intensions differ from actual socialization attempts?

ACT 3

METHODOLOGY

This act will present the methodology in the following order: (1) selection of the participants, (2) production selections, (3) research setting, (4) survey development, (5) pilot study: *The Laramie Project*, (6) initial contact, (7) responses to self-administered surveys, (8) structured individual interviews, (9) micro-ethnographic field observations, (10) review of pilot study: responses and modification to the research design, and (11) procedures for data collection: *A Christmas Carol*.

Selection of Participants

In an effort to investigate the hypotheses and to answer the posed research questions, this study further dissects the instructor/student socialization process by focusing on the relationships between student-actors (students who participate in collegiate theatrical productions as extra-curricular activities) and instructor-directors (professors who direct student-actors in collegiate theatrical productions) during a particular collegiate theatrical show. Within this type of environment, instructor-directors cast student-actors of various class ranks and ages into particular roles based on auditions and reputations in order to encourage a swifter socialization conversion (D. Paper, personal communication, October 10, 2002). Often, instructor-directors position new student-actors adjacent to upperclassmen, who are accustomed to the particular collegiate theatrical experience.

The participants in this study included student-actors and instructor-directors associated with the theatrical plays *The Laramie Project* and *A Christmas Carol*. The

researcher operationally defined the term "experienced student-actors" as undergraduate male and female students who (during the time of the study) attended a particular Midwestern university and had previous experience in collegiate theater productions, including musicals and plays. "New student-actors" or "newcomers" differed from experienced student-actors in that they had never participated in a theatrical production at the university level before this study. The term "instructor-director" referred to the two principal participants who directed the plays and who were faculty members at the institution.

Production Selections

The production selections were intentional. The researcher purposively selected the collegiate theatrical productions in question, *A Christmas Carol* (the actual study) and *The Laramie Project* (the pilot study), for observation from six possible shows presented during the fall 2002 semester. According to Patton (1990), a purposive sample emphasizes sampling for information-rich cases. The researcher used this sampling approach to disclose information-rich productions that would illuminate the study.

The researcher based the criterion for constructing the sample upon production schedules and the quantity of both new and experienced student-actors from both productions. The researcher centered the decisive factor for the pilot study's production selection on its abbreviated rehearsal schedule, condensed cast, and position in the season. *The Laramie Project* was the first show in the season, which involved ten student-actors and one instructor-director, thus providing an adequate amount of participants. The instructor-director abbreviated the rehearsal schedule in the sense that the cast rehearsed three hours each night, six nights per

week instead of rehearsing five nights per week like most university productions. Consequently, the total hours of rehearsals for *The Laramie Project* equaled the total hours of rehearsals for *A Christmas Carol*, the second show of the season.

While the pilot study employed a cast of 10 student-actors, *A Christmas Carol* involved 32 student-actors and one instructor-director, thus providing a sufficient variety of demographic variables, credentials, and experience levels to overcome the possibility of selection bias. Although the cast sizes were uneven, the instructor-directors from both productions directed the diverse casts single-handedly. The researcher expected both instructor-directors to practice similar socialization tactics during the rehearsal processes. The particular perceptions and experiences of the instructor-directors of each show would strengthen the study based on individual perspectives of the socialization tactics offered in the literature review. In addition, both productions would involve a wide variety of students-actors from the same institution thus, the researcher applied identical methodological approaches to both *The Laramie Project* and *A Christmas Carol.*

Consequently, the researcher initially chose a research design that integrated features of case study and ethnographic research in order to investigate *The Laramie Project's* instructor-director. A qualitative case study, according to Merriam (1998, p. 27), is "an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit." Case studies are valuable tools for understanding human behavior in depth (Stake, 1995). The term ethnography is the process in which researchers spend long hours investigating a certain environment (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 128). In addition to spending long periods of time living with and observing other cultures in natural settings like anthropologists and sociologists do,

the researcher adapted a portion of this qualitative research notion into this communication study. Because the researcher was less interested in describing the way of life of an entire culture, she opted to analyze a smaller unit or subgroup of the theatrical productions using a micro-ethnographic observation technique. According to Berg, (1997) micro-ethnography is one of the most used research techniques in communication research.

Research Setting

The Midwestern university, which the researcher conveniently chose for this study's setting, is well renowned for its excellence in science and technology, as it houses some of the world's leading researchers in the biological and physical sciences. This is not necessarily the case for its theater department. Each year the institution attracts approximately 27,500 undergraduate and graduate students from 50 states and 116 countries with its designation as a university with comprehensive degree programs and a strong commitment to graduate education and outreach (2002, April 14). **Retrieved April 14, 2002, from http://www.iastate.edu/about/fact01/, 2002**

Students however, do have the opportunity to be involved in theater as the academic curriculum at the university also includes extensive liberal arts programs. Unlike an institution that specialize in performing arts education, the Midwestern university offers more than 100 undergraduate majors and nearly 200 fields of study leading to graduate and professional degrees with the traditional land-grant emphasis on teaching, research and outreach (2002, April 14). **Retrieved April 14, 2002, from http://www.iastate.edu/about/fact01/, 2002**

Because the performing arts program is not the primary emphasis of this land grant institution, as opposed to specialty schools, the survival of its theater group could depend on how it accommodates reluctant performers—especially newcomers. According to Hess, no organization can exist for a long time-period without acquiring new employees. In addition, many organizations do not know how to help new members transition into the groups (1993, p.189). This means that instructor-directors will ultimately cast new student-actors in productions involving experienced student actors thus, they should strive to provide and enforce a smooth socialization transition for newcomers entering into a group of existing performers.

Survey Development

In order to understand both newcomers' and instructor-directors' perceptions of the socialization process, the researcher included two surveys in addition to field observations, in-depth interviews, and focus groups in the initial methodological design. The two initial surveys (one for the student-actors and one for the instructor-director) were modifications of Jones' (1986, pp. 277-279) questionnaire. (Jones' questionnaire is shown in Appendix A). According to Aday, modifying a questionnaire that has already been utilized "(1) enhances the possibility for substantive comparisons with these and other studies and (2) adds to the cumulative body of methodological experience with survey items" (1989, p. 130).

The student-actor survey, which emerged from Jones' (1986) original questionnaire, required few modifications on behalf of the researcher. (The modifications are shown in Appendix B). Alternatively, the researcher customized the original statements considerably for the instructor-director survey to reflect the "socializer" (the instructor-director) instead of the "socialized" (the student-actors).

(The instructor-director survey is located in Appendix C). Sufficiently adjusting Jones' (1986) original questionnaire statements was essential to the study, as the modified documents would later serve as interview platforms during the rehearsal process of both productions.

The Pilot Study: *The Laramie Project*

Before investigating the instructor-director of *A Christmas* Carol, the researcher conducted a pilot study (*The Laramie Project*) August 27, 2002 through October 13, 2002 to enable the discovery of "whether the words and phrases used in a question [meant] the same thing to respondents as they [did] the survey designers" (Aday, 1989, p. 197). Conducting a pilot study allowed the researcher to refine both the research design and the field procedures. According to Wimmer and Dominick (2000, p. 126), "Variables that were not foreseen during the design phase can crop up during the pilot study, and problems with study logistics can also be uncovered." In addition, the pilot study permitted the researcher to try alternative data-gathering approaches and to observe director/actor interactions from several perspectives through a triangulated approach that combined data from responses to self-administered surveys, structured individual interviews, and micro-ethnographic field observations.

Initial Contact

The researcher informally established contact with *The Laramie Project's* instructor-director Rob Stone (a Pseudonym) following the first evening of auditions. After briefly explaining the research intensions, the researcher solicited the instructor-director's permission before data collection began. Consequently, the instructor-director signed the consent form that guaranteed voluntary participation

and confidential data sources. (The instructor-director consent form is located in Appendix D).

Once the instructor-director selected particular cast members, the rehearsal process began August 20, 2002. During the first rehearsal, the researcher informed the cast about the study and its proposed data collection methods. The researcher also solicited the student-actors' informed consent during the first rehearsal to further participate in the study. (The student-actors' consent form is located in Appendix E). Consequently, the student-actors agreed to the contract's stipulations outlined in the document.

Responses to Self-administered Surveys

After the researcher verified the socialization attempts, according to information provided in the literature review, the researcher administered student-actor surveys to each student-actor so that the respondents could complete the surveys before individual scheduled interviews. (The student-actor survey is shown in Appendix B) The completed surveys contained statements about the socialization tactics employed during the production from the student-actors' viewpoints. The researcher used the survey responses to devise interview platforms for individual structured interviews. (The new student-actors' interview platform is shown in Appendix F and the experienced student-actors' interview platform is shown in Appendix G).

Structured Individual Interviews

The researcher scheduled and conducted individual one-hour structured interviews with each cast member based on the respondents' survey results and Jones' (1986) original questionnaire. During structured interviews, student-actors

responded to a predetermined set of open-ended questions in their own words (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 88). In order to avoid leading statements that were subtly included in Jones' (1986) questionnaire, the researcher vaguely rephrased the statements so that respondents could generate truthful responses with the freedom to go in-depth. A leading question is one that suggests a certain response (either literally or by implication) or contains a hidden premise (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 166). Instead of asking respondents to respond to leading statements such as, "most of my training has been carried out apart from other newcomers" (Jones, 1986, p. 277), the researcher rephrased the statement to ask, "How would you describe your involvement with other cast members during rehearsals?" Open-ended questions were particularly useful during the pilot interviews, as they discouraged interviewees from structuring responses according to the researcher's questions.

Because the researcher had access to this type of information, the interview platform allowed the researcher to ask identically worded questions to assure comparable findings. According to Taylor & Bogdan (1998, p. 88), "The interviewer serves as a cheerful data collector; the role involves getting people to relax enough to answer the predefined series of questions completely." In order to warrant accurate data, the researcher audio-recorded interviews, after gaining each participant's permission. Despite possible drawbacks to recording the sessions, the researcher insisted the interviewees remain undisturbed by the tape recorder's presence.

Following the conclusion of each interview, the interviewer turned off the tape recorder to indicate the conclusion of the session. According to Krueger (1988), upcoming group discussion suggestions can result from this pre-testing procedure.

Not only did the information gained from the student-actors' interviews provide valuable socialization data, but it also allowed for a comparison between the instructor-director's and casts' socialization perceptions.

Micro-ethnographic Field Observations

The survey results also supplemented micro-ethnographic field observations of the instructor-director and student-actor interactions. Micro-ethnographic field observations continued during the entire rehearsal process. Because participant observations depend on the recording of complete and detailed field notes (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 66), the researcher recorded observations in the form of hand written field notes from the periphery of the performance space with a clipboard, paper, and an ink pen.

The researcher transcribed summary notes of conversations and interactions between the student-actors and instructor-director during each observation so that participants felt comfortable in the researcher's presence. In addition, the researcher documented specific interactions that included: (1) the manner in which the instructor-director treated newcomers, (2) the manner in which the instructor-director treated experienced student-actors, (3) the manner in which experienced student-actors interacted with newcomers.

Because this study examined the transition of new student-actors into a collegiate-level theatrical production, the researcher observed the communication between the instructor-director and student-actors during the majority of the rehearsal process. Each observation period lasted approximately 3 hours, which accumulated to nearly 60 hours of fieldwork. The researcher conducted observations

and interviews in the real-life actual theater setting at various production functions including, auditions, rehearsals, and social gatherings.

Review of Pilot Study: Responses and Modification to the Research Design

Pre-testing the data collection methods by investigating those involved with *The Laramie Project* enabled the researcher to discover subtle flaws in the research design before investigating *A Christmas Carol*. For example, the information gained from the student-actors' surveys became irrelevant because many participants failed to understand, interpret, and respond to the provided statements. As a result, the researcher decided to exclude the use of the student-actor survey during the actual study. The instructor-director survey remained in the final research design, however, as the pilot responses provided informative data about the way in which the instructor-director socialized the student-actors.

Another element in the original research design, involving structured interviews with each cast member, also proved to be inappropriate due to the time-consuming nature of each interview. Although transcribing ten interviews was achievable, the transcription of 32 interviews was not feasible due to time and cost constraints. Accordingly, the researcher decided to gather similar information via two focus groups with the cast members of *A Christmas Carol* (one with new student-actors and one with experienced student-actors).

Lastly, it became evident that other aspects of the initial triangulation approach inadequately answered the proposed research questions, as the current method revealed the student-actors' perspectives of the socialization process opposed to the instructor-director's perception. Therefore, the researcher incorporated in-depth interviews with the instructor-director into the research

design in order to support hypotheses 1-6. In-depth interviewing refers to "repeated face-to-face encounters between the researcher and informants directed toward understanding informants' perspectives on their lives, experiences, or situations as expressed in their own words" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 88). Consequently, the researcher modeled the interview sessions with the instructor-director of *A Christmas Carol* after an informal conversation rather than a formal question-and-answer exchange.

Not only did the pilot study reveal unforeseen methodological glitches that would have invalidated the findings of the actual study, it also provided validation for hypotheses and research questions as it refined both the research design and the field procedures. According to field observations during the accommodation stage of the pilot study, the instructor-director failed to implement collective socialization tactics, as Stone treated all of the student-actors (regardless of experience levels) in the same manner. The instructor-director did however apply individual socialization tactics when he asked new student-actors to repeat lines during rehearsals and to attend private one-on-one sessions. In a sense, Stone put newcomers and experienced student-actors through separate acting experiences. Furthermore, the new student-actor interviews supported the observation data, as the interviewees believed the instructor-director treated all student-actors the same during the rehearsal process (D. Strait, personal communication, October 1, 2002).

Additional field observations from the pilot study indicated that the instructor-director avoided formal socialization techniques during rehearsals as he always verbally addressed the student-actors as a group. In contrast, Stone made no efforts to separate the cast according to experience levels, thus exclusively utilized

informal socialization tactics instead of formal tactics. (August 29, 2002-October 12, 2002). For example, when speaking to the total group of student-actors about rehearsal technicalities, Stone refrained from disseminating contrasting messages to newcomers and experienced student-actors. In addition, results from individual interviews with experienced student-actors revealed that Stone was unaware of the student-actors' experience levels (based on his personal newcomer status), thus he equally addressed the actors during the accommodation phase of the rehearsal process (J. Hurst, personal communication, September 16, 2002-October 1, 2002).

Observations of the instructor-director and conversations offered by student-actors during the pilot study also indicated that Stone applied both sequential and random socialization tactics during rehearsals. For example Stone's behavior provided newcomers with few clues about rehearsal procedures, thus granting the student-actors artistic freedom to perform accordingly. Experienced student-actors validated these types of observations while specifying that Stone's directing style was unfamiliar but advantageous as it allowed actors to recognize personal artistic capabilities during the theatrical experience (L. Bestler-Wilcox, personal communication, September 30, 2002).

Besides giving ambiguous stage directions, the instructor-director seldom referred to the length of the socialization process. Although Stone implied that the student-actors needed to memorize lines by a specific day, he failed to indicate incremental deadlines leading up to the cut-off date (observation, October 14, 2002). Consequently, the instructor-director employed both variable and fixed socialization tactics during the rehearsal process, thus indicating that the tactics existed during the theater production as well.

Evidence of disjunctive, serial, investiture, and divestiture tactics also appeared during the pilot study, thus confirming that Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) socialization scheme existed during the pilot theatrical production. The pilot study demonstrated that Stone incorporated ten socialization tactics into rehearsals, thus verifying the use of the categorization method and reinforcing the continuance of the actual study.

For purposes of this study, the researcher generalized Stone's behavior to *A Christmas Carol,* another collegiate theatrical production, as revealed through observations of the instructor-director and conversations with student-actors during the pilot study. Not only did the pilot study strengthen the researcher's ability to conduct research, but it also supported the data collection methods and the study in general.

Procedures for Data Collection: *A Christmas Carol*

As mentioned previously in Act 2, Van Maanen developed one of the most useful stage models to this study as he used participant observations and structured questionnaires to investigate the way in which experienced policemen socialized new policemen (1976). His innovative research combination permitted reliable measures, statistical inferences, and provided a rich experimental base to interpret the observed correlations or differences of policemen (Fisher, 1986, p. 105). Because the researcher anticipated similar outcomes while studying the ways in which the instructor-director socialized student-actors during the organizational accommodation period of *A Christmas Carol,* this study's methodology paralleled that of Van Maanen's (1976). Triangulating data as Van Maanen did, "offer[ed] the greatest potential for meaningful future research" (Fisher, 1986, p. 105).

Consequently, the final research design applied a triangulated approach that combined data from two in-depth interviews with the instructor-director based on survey results, one self-administered instructor-director survey, micro-ethnographic field observations of director and student-actor interactions, and two focus groups with cast members.

The subsequent section presents the procedures for data collection during *A Christmas Carol* in the following order: (1) initial contact, (2) initial interview, (3) reflection on interviewing technique, (4) the rehearsal process: micro-ethnographic field observations, (5) student-actor focus groups, and data analysis, and (6) intercoder reliability.

Initial Contact

The researcher established contact with Joan (a Pseudonym), the instructor-director of *A Christmas Carol*, with the aid of gatekeeper, Paul (a Pseudonym). According to Becker (1970) and Burgess (1991), participant observers usually gain access to organizations by requesting permission from those in charge. Researchers usually refer to these kinds of people as gatekeepers. Because getting into the theater setting involved a process of managing identity and projecting an image (Kotarba, 1980), the researcher maximized the chance of gaining access to the production's director with Paul's assistance. The researcher chose Paul to make the initial contact with Joan based on his lasting relationship with her and the production cast. Once Paul mentioned the researcher's intensions to Joan, during the final week of August 2002, she informally consented to participate in the study. The researcher then conducted an unofficial meeting on September 10, 2002 with Joan and Paul to explain the study and its research methods before the data collection began.

In order to get Joan's commitment in writing, the researcher followed-up the instructor-director's informal commitment on September 30, 2002 with an email restating the verbal agreement. The message also requested Joan to schedule time for the first interview and provided directions to retrieve the informed consent document and survey from her departmental mailbox. Due to time constraints, the researcher deposited the documents in the mailbox for Joan's convenience. (The email is shown in Appendix H). Even though the auditions and rehearsals were observable and generally open to the public, the researcher solicited Joan's informed consent before the first interview, which guaranteed voluntary participation and confidentiality of data sources Remarkably, Joan responded favorably to the email message within 5 minutes. (Joan's reply is shown in Appendix I).

Initial Interview

"Personal interviews usually involve inviting a respondent to a field service or a research office. Sometimes interviews are conducted at a person's place of work" (Wimmer & Dominick, 181). The researcher interviewed the instructor-director before the first rehearsal and after verifying socialization attempts during the rehearsal process. The in-depth interviews with the instructor-director occurred in her office, based one survey of thirty statements about the expected socialization process. (The survey adapted from Jones (1986) is shown in Appendix C). The researcher also asked Joan to complete the survey before the first rehearsal and interview in order to verify responses and to structure an interview guide.

Consequently, the researcher conducted the first in-depth interview with Joan in her office on October 10, 2002, at 2:00 pm. As suggested by Taylor & Bogdan (1998, p. 105), the researcher prepared a brief interview guide based on Joan's survey

results to direct conversation during the interview. As a result, the researcher followed an unstructured interview technique that allowed further questions to emerge in order to obtain certain socialization information. "In qualitative interviewing, the researcher attempts to construct a situation that resembles those in which people naturally talk to each other about important things" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 99). The interview guide included open-ended questions based on Joan's survey responses such as; (1) How would you describe your first encounter with theater? (2) What does the term academic theater mean to you? (3) How would you describe the way in which you typically conduct auditions? (4) What do you envision the first rehearsal to be like? and, (5) What if anything will you do during the first rehearsal to socialize the actors? Based on previous interviews conducted during the pilot study, the researcher knew that asking few questions would result in a multitude of feedback. Thus, the researcher based the entire first interview on these questions.

The researcher audio-recorded the interview after gaining Joan's permission, despite possible drawbacks to recording the sessions. During the initial interview, the researcher focused conversation on scene directions and socialization tactics so that the tape recorder's presence did not disturb Joan (in the same manner as in pilot study). In preparation for participant observations, the researcher wanted to understand the way in which Joan intended to socialize the student-actors during rehearsals.

Reflection on Interviewing Technique

The advantageous in-depth interviewing technique easily lent itself to detailed questions due to the face-to-face situation. According to Taylor and Bogdan

(1998, p. 98), the interview is a form of social interaction. It involves a face-to-face encounter between two people each of whom assess the other and construct meanings of the other's expressions, and gestures. The researcher quickly developed a report with Joan by following this technique that later transferred to micro-ethnographic field observations during rehearsals.

"If we see rich potential in the language people use to describe their daily activities, then we have to take advantage of the opportunity to let them tell us what that language means" (Anderson & Jack, 1991, p. 15). The researcher responded nonchalantly to Joan's comments. Instead of nodding in constant agreement and saying the word "yeah" as Joan spoke, the researcher purposely refrained from interrupting the instructor-director's remarks by maintaining constant eye contact. The researcher refrained from redirecting the interview away from something important to the respondent because "in order to learn to listen, we need to attend more to the narrator than to our own agendas" (Anderson & Jack, 1991, p, 12). Accordingly, the researcher utilized Taylor and Bogdan's suggestion of asking open-ended, descriptive questions about general topics, while waiting for Joan to talk about meaningful socialization experiences from her point of view (1998, p. 106). The researcher gained important information about Joan and about the next step in the production process from the initial interview – the first rehearsal.

The Rehearsal Process: Micro-ethnographic Field Observations

Once Joan completed the auditions and chose cast members, the rehearsal process began. The first *A Christmas Carol* rehearsal was on October 14, 2002 in Pearson Hall 214 at 7:00 pm. All actors (with the exception of 3) attended. Before the cast members read the script, Joan gave the researcher permission to inform the

entire cast about the research intensions and data collection methods. Based on the relationship with cast members during the pilot study, the researcher viewed the introduction as an important element to the actual study because it familiarized the student-actors with the researcher and settled curiosities about the researcher's presence.

Because this study examined the transition of new student-actors into a collegiate-level theatrical production, the researcher strictly observed the communication channels and interactions between the instructor-director and student-actors during rehearsals. In order to eliminate artificial responses, the researcher conducted the observations in a real-life actual theater setting in the same manner as observed during the pilot study. According to the rehearsal schedule provided by the stage manager, the researcher designated each observation period over a time. For example, rehearsals occurred three hours per day every Monday-Thursday during the first three weeks and three hours everyday during the final two weeks of the process, as student-actors needed additional time to finalize production details. Observations continued during the rehearsal until the researcher verified socialization attempts. Totally, the researcher observed 55 hours of production rehearsals in the theater setting.

According to Prus (1980), observers should situate themselves in high-action spots in public places while in the field. Consequently, the researcher witnessed actual socialization encounters that generated rich data. The researcher recorded summary notes of conversations and interactions between the student-actors and instructor-director during each observation, thus allowing the notes to be thorough and organized. "Field notes represent[ed] an attempt to record on paper everything

that [could] possibly be recalled about the observation" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 67). Accordingly, if the researcher did not record a particular event, it never took place from a research point of view.

The researcher analyzed field notes on a daily basis for related themes by using an observation guide (Portions of the observation guide are shown in Appendix J). The observation guide included detailed descriptions of Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) twelve socialization tactics followed by blank spaces to record tactics, times and occurrence explanations during each observation. For example, when the instructor-director directed comments to the entire cast (regardless of experience levels) the researcher categorized data as an informal socialization tactic, according to Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) typology of six characteristic features for organizations. When the instructor-director used experienced student-actors as examples during rehearsals to socialize newcomers, the researcher wrote an explanation of the occurrence in the blank space provided for serial socialization tactics. This categorization allowed for a separation and classification of messages so that the researcher could efficiently manage data. In addition, this technique provided a framework for organizing data from in-depth interviews and focus groups.

Student-actor Focus Groups

After soliciting and gaining participants' consent during the rehearsal process, the researcher conducted two focus groups with student-actors after confirming socialization attempts according to information supplied in the literature review. During each focus group, the researcher asked questions that allowed for an understanding of student-actors' perceptions of the socialization process in an

attempt to answer the posed research questions and support the hypotheses. (The student-actor consent document is shown in Appendix E).

Following a triangulation approach, the researcher conducted one focus group with new student-actors and one focus group with experienced student-actors based on a purposive sampling procedure. During both focus groups, the researcher asked student-actors to expound upon their perceptions of the socialization experiences during the entrance into the theater group. In doing so, the researcher asked student-actors from each focus group questions such as, (1) How does Joan communicate with you during rehearsals? (2) How would you describe your involvement or interactions other student-actors during rehearsal? and (3) How did you learn how to fit-into the group of experienced student-actors? (The new student-actor interview platform is located in Appendix F and the experienced student-actor interview platform is located in Appendix G).

Data Analysis and Intercoder Reliability

Once the researcher collected data from 2 in-depth interviews, 14 micro-ethnographic field observations, and 2 focus groups, the researcher separated the data into 18 manageable sections. The researcher then bulleted each participant's remark and behavior with an individual notation before coding socialization occurrences according to Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) twelve socialization tactics. For example, when Joan used an experienced student-actor to teach a dance to fellow cast members, the researcher coded the statement as "serial." In total, the researcher recorded 733 bullets and 85 socialization occurrences.

In order to insure the reliability of the categorization system, the researcher trained an additional coder to reanalyze the data. According to Wimmer and

Dominick (2000), when two or more researchers judge the same phenomenon, intercoder reliability assesses the degree to which others can achieve or reproduce the results. Although the researcher had a firm grasp of Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) operational definitions and the category schemes, the second coder needed to become thoroughly familiar with the study's mechanics to ensure reliable findings.

In order to revise definitions, clarify category boundaries, and revamp coding procedures, the researcher trained the second coder using data from the pilot study. The training sessions lasted 4 hours until the coder became comfortable with coding the material. Next, the two coders separately coded eight pilot study observations before comparing socialization labels. After discussions and additional practice, the two coders separately coded five more observations in order to achieve a reliability coefficient of .75 or higher (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 154). In addition, the researcher used *Scott's Pi* to account for chance agreement. After achieving a reliability coefficient of .81 from the pilot study material, the two coders coded 10% of the actual study's total data.

The coders achieved a reliability coefficient of .84 from analyzing 10% of the actual study's data. The researcher then performed a chi-square test to analyze the data. According to Hocking, Stacks, & McDermott (2003, p. 368), the chi-square "tests for differences between the frequency of occurrence between different categories." Because the researcher wanted to compare the new student-actors', experienced student-actors', and the instructor-director's perceptions of the accommodation stage of socialization, the researcher analyzed data using chi-square tests.

ACT 4

RESULTS

This act includes results from chi-square tests for each hypothesis, relative frequencies for each research question, and a summary of the findings. Tables are located throughout this act to describe the results more effectively.

Hypotheses Results

As discussed in Act 2, theory suggests that the acclaimed 12 socialization tactics would be highly correlated in a way that supports Jones' (1986) concept termed "institutionalized socialization" (Ashforth, Sacks & Lee, 1998, p. 899). For example, researchers found that collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and divestiture tactics encouraged newcomers to passively accept preset roles and to maintain the status quo, thus correlating with custodial role orientations. Alternatively, individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and investiture socialization tactics correlated most highly with innovative responses while encouraging newcomers to develop "individual" approaches or innovative responses to their roles (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Because "individualized socialization" tactics produced more innovative responses, which instructor-directors desire in theater productions, this study's six hypotheses gained additional purpose.

The researcher performed chi-square analyses for each pair of socialization tactics in order to compare the relationships between expected or hypothesized frequencies and observed frequencies. This technique, which mass media researchers commonly use (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 150) appropriately evaluated the six hypotheses and the usage rates of socialization tactics. Table 2

presents each hypothesis's chi-squared value, degrees of freedom, p value, and significance level.

Table 2
Analysis of Hypothesized Socialization Tactics during "A Christmas Carol"

	Observations			
Hypotheses/ Socialization Tactics	x^2	*df*	**P value**	**Significance Level**
(H_1) Collective vs. individual	4.53	9	.87	
(H_2) Formal vs. informal	22.45	13	.05	*
(H_3) Sequential vs. random	11.87	10	.29	
(H_4) Fixed vs. variable	8.48	9	.49	
(H_5) Investiture vs. divestiture	23.25	11	.02	*
(H_6) Serial vs. disjunctive	14.60	11	.21	

Note. (H_1) = hypothesis 1; (H_2) = hypothesis 2; (H_3) = hypothesis 3; (H_4) = hypothesis 4; (H_5) = hypothesis 5; (H_6) = hypothesis 6
* $p \leq .05$

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the instructor-director would implement individual socialization tactics more than collective tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results testing this hypothesis show that there is no statistically significant difference between the usage rates of collective and individual socialization tactics across 14 observations as both tactics occurred 11 times. The statistical test shows $x^2_9 = 4.53$, $p = .87$. Thus, results do not support the first hypothesis because the instructor-director implemented collective and individual socialization tactics equally.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that the instructor-director would use informal socialization tactics more than formal tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the use of formal and informal socialization tactics across 14 observations as the researcher identified 15 formal socialization attempts and 84 informal tactics. The statistical test shows $x^2_{13} = 22.45$, $p = .05$. Hence, the results support the second

hypothesis as the instructor-director implemented 69 more informal socialization tactics than formal tactics.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the instructor-director would use non-sequential socialization tactics more than sequential tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the use of sequential and random socialization tactics across 14 observations. The statistical test shows $x^2_{11} = 11.87$, $p = .29$. Consequently, the results did not significantly support the third hypothesis. The researcher however observed 11 more random socialization attempts than sequential tactics, thus confirming the expected direction of the results and partially supporting the third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4 suggested that the instructor-director would use variable socialization tactics more than fixed tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the use of fixed and variable socialization tactics across 14 observations. The statistical test shows $x^2_9 = 8.48$, $p = .49$. Thus, the results do not significantly support the fourth hypothesis. The researcher however observed 5 more variable socialization attempts than fixed tactics, thus confirming the expected direction of the results and partially supporting the fourth hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the instructor-director would use disjunctive socialization tactics more than serial tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the use of serial and disjunctive socialization tactics across 14 observations in the favor of serial socialization attempts as the researcher identified 26 occurrences of serial socialization tactics and 6 disjunctive attempts. The statistical

test shows $x^2_{11} = 23.25$, $p = .02$. Accordingly, the results did not support the fifth hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6 suggested that the instructor-director would use investiture socialization tactics more than divestiture tactics while socializing new and experienced student-actors. Results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the use of sequential and random socialization tactics across 14 observations. The statistical test shows $x^2_{11} = 14.60$, $p = .21$. Therefore, the results do not significantly support the sixth hypothesis. The researcher however observed 5 more investiture socialization attempts than divestiture tactics, thus confirming the expected direction of the results and partially supporting the sixth hypothesis.

The results of this study generally supported hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, & 6 as the instructor-director used more of Jones' (1986) "institutionalized socialization tactics" (individual, informal, random, variable, and investiture) to socialize new student-actors. The present study failed to support hypothesis 5, however, as Joan implemented more serial socialization tactics than disjunctive tactics during the accommodation phase of *A Christmas Carol,*

The occurrence of "institutionalized socialization tactics" surfaced during the first six rehearsals when new student-actors first joined the cast, began to master their roles, developed relationships with fellow cast members, and learned about the instructor-director's directing style. According to Jablin and Krone (1987, p. 713), the accommodation or encounter phase of socialization occurs during the first few weeks of joining an organization, when the organization and its members subject newcomers to particular reinforcement practices or organizational routines.

Research Questions Answered

In addition, the researcher computed relative frequencies using data from two instructor-director interviews and two student-actor focus groups. This technique was appropriate because the number of observations did not meet the requisite number needed to satisfy the assumptions underlying inferential statistics. Therefore, the researcher performed an analysis of that data by observing and making sense of the relative percent of frequency of occurrences.

RQ_1: During the accommodation phase of *A Christmas Carol*, when does the instructor-director socialize new student-actors the same as experienced student-actors?

According to the experienced student-actors, the instructor-director socialized new student-actors the same as experienced student-actors 31% of the time while the new student-actors said Joan socialized them equally 36% of the time. When the researcher combined the interview data, results indicated Joan planned to socialize both groups of student-actors equally 40% of the time while observations showed Joan actually employed informal socialization tactics during 44% of the rehearsal process. The majority of the informal socialization tactics surfaced during the first six rehearsals.

RQ_2: During the accommodation phase of *A Christmas Carol*, when does the instructor-director socialize new student-actors differently than experienced student-actors?

According to the experienced student-actors, the instructor-director socialized new student-actors differently than experienced student-actors 5% of the time while the new student-actors said Joan socialized them differently 2% of the time. When the researcher combined the interview data, results indicated Joan planned to never socialize them differently 4% of the time while observations showed Joan actually

never employed formal socialization tactics during the rehearsal process. The majority of the formal socialization tactics surfaced evenly during the rehearsal process.

RQ_3: How do student-actors translate the instructor-director's socialization attempts once the researcher verifies socialization during the production (assuming the student-actors recognize the attempts)?

Data collected during the new student-actor focus group described the way in which new student-actors interpreted the instructor-director's socialization attempts while the experienced student-actor explained the socialization attempts from their perspective during a separate focus group. Both groups of student-actors responded that the instructor-director failed to incorporate collective, fixed, or variable socialization tactics. Table 3 presents each socialization tactic, its frequency, and the relative percent to the total for both the new and experienced student-actor focus groups.

Table 3
New and Experienced Student-actors' Translations of the Instructor-director's Socialization Attempts during "A Christmas Carol"

	New Student-actors		Experienced Student-actors	
Socialization Tactics	**Frequency**	**Relative % (in decimals) To Total**	**Frequency**	**Relative % (in decimals) To Total**
Collective	—	—	—	—
Individual	12	.23	10	.12
Formal	1	.02	4	.05
Informal	19	.36	25	.31
Sequential	2	.04	3	.04
Random	5	.09	16	.20
Fixed	—	—	—	—
Variable	—	—	—	—
Serial	4	.07	11	.14
Disjunctive	2	.04	3	.04
Investiture	5	.09	—	—
Divestiture	3	.06	8	—
Total	53	1.00	80	1.00

Note. Dashes indicate the data was not reported or obtained.

RQ_4: How do student-actors' perceptions of the instructor-director's socialization attempts differ from the instructor-director's perception of the attempts?

Data collected during the first instructor-director interview described the way in which the instructor-director envisioned the socialization process while information from the second interview captured Joan's retrospective data. Table 4 presents the socialization tactics then frequencies, and the relative percent to the total for both instructor-director interviews.

Table 4
Instructor-director's perception of Socialization Attempts during "A Christmas Carol"

Socialization Tactics	I-D Interview #1		I-D Interview #2	
	Frequency	Relative % (in decimals) To Total	Frequency	Relative % (in decimals) To Total
Collective	—	—	—	—
Individual	1	.04	—	—
Formal	1	.04	—	—
Informal	10	.40	10	.44
Sequential	4	.16	—	—
Random	7	.28	—	—
Fixed	—	—	—	—
Variable	—	—	—	—
Serial	2	.08	6	.26
Disjunctive	—	—	—	—
Investiture	—	—	—	—
Divestiture	—	—	7	.30
Total	25	1.00	23	1.00

Note. Dashes indicate the data was not reported or obtained.

RQ_5: How does the instructor-director's socialization intensions differ from actual socialization attempts?

Data collected during the first instructor-director interview #1 indicated the way in which the instructor-director intendeds to socialization student-actors while observation data captured Joan's actual socialization attempts. Table 5 compares the

instructor-director's socialization intensions with the actual attempts using the relative percent to the total (in decimals) for data sets.

Table 5
Instructor-director's Perception of Socialization Intensions Vs. Actual Socialization Attempts during "A Christmas Carol"

	I-D Interview #1 (Socialization intensions)		**Observations** (Actual attempts)	
Socialization Tactics	**Frequency**	**Relative % (in decimals) To Total**	**Frequency**	**Relative % (in decimals) To Total**
Collective	—	—	11	.05
Individual	1	.04	11	.05
Formal	1	.04	15	.06
Informal	10	.40	84	.36
Sequential	4	.16	9	.04
Random	7	.28	20	.09
Fixed	—	—	3	.01
Variable	—	—	8	.03
Serial	2	.08	26	.11
Disjunctive	—	—	6	.03
Investiture	—	—	22	.09
Divestiture	—	—	17	.07
Total	25	1.00	232	1.00

ACT 5

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS, STUDY LIMITATIONS & SUGGESTED FUTURE RESEARCH, AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS & CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to gain information about how an instructor-director socialized student-actors in an academic theater production at Iowa State University. Specifically, this study focused on how one instructor-director socialized student-actors during the organizational accommodation period of *A Christmas Carol*.

During 14 rehearsals of *A Christmas Carol*, the researcher observed interactions among 32 adult cast members (17 new student-actors and 15 experienced student-actors) and the instructor-director. In addition, 8 new student-actors and 8 experienced student-actors participated in two separate focus groups, while the researcher interviewed the instructor-director twice. Whereas the researcher gathered socialization data from the individual perspectives of the instructor-director and student-actors during interviews and focus groups, observations focused on actual socialization occurrences. Although the researcher collected a considerable amount of data using various methods, this study focused on one primary participant's socialization attempts: Joan, the instructor-director of *A Christmas Carol*, which debuted December 2002.

Due to the small sample size, the researcher cautions readers about generalizing. The findings, however, do open several new avenues for research as well as provide future instructor-directors of academic theater with a better understanding of how to improve the socialization of new student-actors into a group of existing performers.

Considering the above limitation, the overall results of this study suggests that it was foolish to attempt prescribing socialization tactics to future directors because they all direct differently depending on the number of actors involved in a particular production. According to one experienced actor, "Every director is different. Everybody has a different personality" (M. Wadsley, personal communication, December 3, 2002). What originally began as a study about the socialization tactics used by Joan to motivate new and experienced student-actors to collectively perform during *A Christmas Carol*, resulted in meaningful unforeseen findings. Not only did the researcher learn that Joan utilized all twelve socialization tactics during the rehearsal process, but she discovered that Joan's directorial concept dictated the use of the tactics.

Discussion of Hypothesized Results

Although a statistically significant difference appeared only in hypothesis 2, the results of this study generally supported hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, & 6 as the instructor-director used more of Jones' (1986) "institutionalized socialization tactics" (individual, informal, random, variable, and investiture) to socialize new student-actors. The researcher predicted the instructor-director would employ more informal socialization tactics during the rehearsal process than formal attempts in hypothesis 2, while expecting Joan to utilize individual, random, variable, and investiture in hypotheses 1, 3, 4, & 6. Because the researcher anticipated Joan's avoidance of socializing new student-actors with the aid of experienced student-actors in hypothesis 5, results reported no statistically significant difference in favor of disjunctive socialization tactics.

Perhaps one explanation why hypotheses 1, 3, 4, & 6 accurately depicted reality but failed to report statistically significant findings is because the observation and interview periods provided a mere snapshot of the provisional theater organization. This means that a longitudinal study of Joan's relationships and interactions with cast members in other productions would be particularly helpful in understanding her methods of socializing new student-actors into a group of existing performers. An extended rehearsal process would also allow for more socialization attempts to occur. By continuing this study using other productions, additional socialization tactics would surface, which means the researcher could conduct statistical tests that are more extensive.

Furthermore, the ratio of new student-actors to experienced student-actors may have affected the instructor-director's employment of additional socialization attempts. This means the greater the amount of new student-actors or multiple instructor-directors would likely produce additional socialization occurrences, which would directly affect the statistical evidence. (The researcher expounds upon other limitations of this study in the subsequent section entitled *Study Limitations and Suggested Future Research*.).

Joan's directing style and choice of socialization tactics depended on individual cast member's behavior within the production. At times Joan implemented socialization techniques that informally addressed the total group, despite experience levels, while at other times she focused on individual performers. For example, the instructor-director addressed the entire cast with the rehearsal schedule while stressing punctuality and the rehearsal structure according to scenes. In order to assist the socialization process, Joan also incorporated individual

socialization tactics during the accommodation phase, as she occasionally singled-out newcomers by asking them to repeat lines more often than she asked experienced student-actors. In particular, the instructor-director exemplified inexperienced student-actors who assumed the roles of narrators, as she described her own directing style:

> Well the narrators, for example Nate [veteran] (I've worked with him before) is always very interested in doing well and [I] can just absolutely say to him 'this needs to be more like this, this needs to be like that' and he will be very happy to hear that. The three other narrators are new and have not been in shows before. Shane [a pseudonym for the newcomer], for example, is very smart and very determined to be different with black fingernail polish and everything like that. I talked with him about things he is interested in and [learned that] he feels the need to break away from any kind of conformity, which encouraged him to argue about any suggestion that [I] made. So, I had a talk with him about that and he is getting better.

Although Joan practiced traditional socialization exercises during the first rehearsal in order to blend the actors together, she incorporated seemingly unexpected tactics as well. According to one newcomer, Joan spent a lot of time at the beginning of the rehearsal process letting people get to know each other, as she asked the cast to introduce themselves to each other with the aid of theater games, such as the hokey-pokey. "I think the games were a good idea. After we actually started playing [the hokey pokey] for a while, you got to know people and relax. Because you see everybody doing it and acting silly, so it's just like, you kind of relax" (S. Seibert, personal communication, November 19, 2002). The new student-

actors translated Joan's initial socialization attempts as favorable and affective. Joan also expounded upon the importance of the initial rehearsal as she described her socialization intensions when she said:

> We have many new people and many old-timers in the cast; therefore, I had them introduce themselves. Sometimes we do a few theater games or exercises where we all sit in a room and read-through the script. That rehearsal is usually not a long one, but it is usually an important one because it gets everybody thinking about what the arc of the play is, what it's trying to say, and what the whole thing is about.

Although student-actors held different attitudes about playing theater games and Joan's socialization attempts, the consensus of the newcomers welcomed her approach and thought Joan handled the transition competently. Joan revealed compassion for the newcomers in her voice tone as she described a previous cast of 10 experienced actors and two newcomers during their first rehearsals.

> Maybe there is a cast of 12, that is a typical number, and 10 of those people all know each other and 2 people do not. And it's very hard for those 2 people to break into the 'hi old buddy-buddy-buddy' and we all remember this and we're all laughing about what happened in the shows previously and they [newcomers] may not realize that in a year's time, they'll be those people if they stay around and work.

As data collection continued with several participant observations, the researcher noticed Joan's directing style reflected her intended optimistic perspective concerning theater, as she interacted with student-actors during the rehearsal process of *A Christmas Carol*. She used her power to connect with the

student-actors despite their experience levels –especially those who were unfamiliar with her directing style and had never participated in a theatrical production at the university level before this study.

Discussion of Results from Research Questions

In order to capitalize on the study's purpose, the researcher asked the following five research questions: (1) when did the instructor-director socialize new student-actors the same as experienced student-actors, (2) when did the instructor-director socialize new student-actors differently than experienced student-actors, (3) how did student-actors translate the instructor-director's socialization attempts once the researcher verified socialization occurrences during the production (assuming the student-actors recognize the attempts), (4) how did student-actors' perceptions of the instructor-director's socialization attempts differ from the instructor-director's perception of the attempts, and (5) how did the instructor-director's socialization intensions differ from actual socialization attempts? The following section practically answers the research questions by describing the meaning of the results.

According to Joan, new student-actors often experience anxiety when joining their first theater production, as highly talented students with advanced theater experience surround them. One newcomer stated that he was "intimidated as hell by anybody who had done more than one play period –high school, college or whatever" (S. Stolper, personal communication, November 19, 2002). Joan went on to state that groups or cliques of experienced actors often share a common bond through experiences that intentionally excludes new student-actors from joining the group. Experienced student-actors, who attempt to keep newcomers at a distance,

often fail to accept new student-actors. In Joan's mind, it was necessary to support both groups so that she could achieve a productive rehearsal process.

The majority of cast members involved in *A Christmas Carol* had additional acting experience, which in turn made newcomers feel less adequate than experienced student-actors during rehearsals –especially when Joan addressed new student-actors by their characters' names instead of their real names. According to one newcomer, "sometimes that bothers me because I don't think she's ever called me by my name like to my face. With the others that she knows more, she always refers to them by name" (S. Seibert, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

While this may have been the case, one experienced student-actor mentioned that this technique was quite normal in academic theater for various reasons. The experienced student-actor stated that this allows for a separation between "you as a person and your character" (S. Morehead, personal communication, November 21, 2002). The experienced student-actors also referred to the newcomers by their character names during the discussion as they described the importance of assuming the role of a particular character. According to the seasoned actors, this technique allows actors to "become the characters" and it is widely used by theater directors everywhere.

In order to aid the newcomers' adjustment and to support those who already "knew the ropes" of the organization, Joan sought to identify existing cliques or subgroups in order to give both newcomers and veteran student-actors an adequate amount of attention. As stated before, Joan strived for equality in her directing style despite her temptation to disregard those with experience. She stated:

> The temptation for me anyway is to not pay as much attention to the people that I know are going to work hard on their own. Scott for example, has been in lots of shows. [Paul]'s been in lots of shows –but even with that, I don't want them to walk away at the end of rehearsal and say well 'she didn't say anything to me good or bad and so I guess I don't matter.' I think people do feel neglected if they have not gotten any kind of comment. I think that people would rather have a negative kind of comment rather than have no comment. They want to grow as well and even though they have all this experience it is not worth their while.

From the perspective of the experienced student-actors, equal attention was nonexistent in Joan's directions due to the newest newcomers in the scene –the children. From their perspective, the children received most of Joan's attention as she centered rehearsals on the youngsters. One veteran replied, "It's nice to know I don't stand out so badly that I'm being advised, but on the other hand without any input it's difficult to improve" (A. Lorenz, personal communication, November 21, 2002). Although the experienced actors occasionally felt neglected by the director, their relationships with Joan allowed them to confront the situation and to request comments. One experienced actor stated:

> I think that Joan is open to questions. I've been in enough shows to where when I'm not the person who's got the director's attention and when I'm not always being told stuff I really genuinely like that point in time because I feel like I have more creative control over what I'm doing. That allows me to then go home and do even more homework than I would normally do for that role just on my own. I guess I learn more I think when I research the role myself as

an actor as opposed to learning more about the director as a director" (N. Zobel, personal communication, November 21, 2002).

Study Limitations and Suggested Future Research

The present findings are important because they add to the body of empirical socialization tactics by connecting the concept with a collegiate theatrical environment. Despite the relatively large body of research on socialization tactics, few if any researchers have directly applied the theory to theater. However, these findings, like those of Jones (1986), are limited in that they relied partially on self-report measures. According to Ashforth & Sacks (1996, p. 173), Jones' ambiguously directional survey statements depended exclusively on newcomers' self-report measures. "Studies relying solely on self-reported data have raised concern among organizational researchers, because common method variance may affect the magnitude of relationships between work characteristics and work outcomes" (Jones, 1986, 275). While the researcher expected newcomers to specify details describing individual involvement in a particular organization, it was possible for the inexperienced respondents to have tendencies to interpret situations in unexpected ways and to structure their replies according to provided statements.

In an effort to compensate for the reliance on the instructor-director's self-reports, the researcher consulted new and experienced student-actors about the socialization process. Although self-report measures were an appropriate means of understanding Joan's perceptions of the socialization process (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992), information gained from surveys, interviews, and focus groups supplemented the total research design. In order to compensate for the disadvantages associated with self-reported data, the instructor-director's self-reports neither supported the

study's hypotheses nor answered the proposed research questions single-handedly. This means that future researchers should collect data from various organizational members such as the instructor-director's colleagues in order to provide a broader perspective of the socialization tactics implemented by the instructor-director under investigation. Obtaining independent assessments of knowledge through supervisory reports and peers would also be encouraged.

While the use of interviews provided descriptive data of the socialization process from one instructor-director's viewpoint, the results are limited since the researcher collected data about a single instructor-director's socialization attempts. Examining the socialization tactics implemented by a single instructor-director of a particular collegiate theatrical production, at a specific university indirectly provided a conveniently (or purposively) sampled respondent. As previously mentioned in Act 3, the researcher purposively selected the production from six possible shows presented during the fall 2002 semester for observation. This sampling approach disclosed an information-rich production that would illuminate the study. As a result, this means it is impossible to determine the degree to which the results generalize to other theater troops. In particular, it would be important to determine the degree to which adjacent instructor-directors implement socialization tactics during the accommodation phase of randomly selected collegiate theatrical productions or in other theatrical organizations such as community or professional theater.

In response to this limitation, future researchers must cautiously apply specific findings from this study to other theatrical contexts and venues. Accordingly, this means researchers should evaluate the generalizability of this

study's findings by including a broader array of productions and instructor-directors. Future researchers should investigate a series of departmental instructor-directors during various collegiate theatrical productions in order to gain a more accurate representation of instructor-directors' socialization tactics and attempts during alternative collegiate theatrical productions.

Perhaps the generalizability limitation also means that future researchers interested in studying socialization tactics in performing arts organizations should study productions that have an extended rehearsal process or permanent existence. The organization's temporary existence directly influenced data collection procedures, as the accommodation period was especially brief. Organizations, typically studied in the domain of socialization research, employ a large group of organizational members in an enduring environment (Stanton-Spicer & Darling, 1986). According to Gibson and Papa (2000), it is to the organization's benefit that newcomers "learn the ropes" quickly so that existing efficiency, productivity, and cohesion levels are not negatively affected. This means that longer accommodation periods allow the socializer to implement socialization tactics slower and with added thought.

To some scholars, reproducibility of this study may seem questionable due to its lack of generalizability. According to Brott and Myers (1999), "theory that deals with social or psychological phenomenon is probably not reproducible because conditions cannot be exactly matched to the original study though many major conditions may be similar." However, given the same theoretical perspective as the original research with the same general rules for data collection and analysis with a

similar set of conditions, other investigators should be able to reproduce the same theoretical explanation about the given phenomenon.

To some scholars (Anakwe & Greenhaus, 1999, p. 326; Black, 1992), the reliability of Jones' (1986) measures of socialization tactics has been problematic especially in cases where the researcher revised or shortened the original questionnaire. The researcher, who conducted the present study, noticeably customized Jones' (1986) original questionnaire statements for the instructor-director survey to reflect the "socializer" (the instructor-director) instead of the "socialized" (the student-actors). (The instructor-director survey is located in Appendix C). Sufficiently adjusting Jones' (1986) original questionnaire statements was essential to the study, as the modified documents served as interview platforms during the rehearsal process of the production.

In an effort to compensate for the disadvantages associated with revising Jones' (1986) socialization questionnaire in the current study, the researcher compiled information gained from surveys, interviews, and focus groups to supplement the total research design. Future researchers will benefit from developing alternative ways to measure socialization tactics effectively and should strive to continue the work of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) and Jones (1986). If however, future researchers insist on adapting Jones' (1986) questionnaire to meet the needs of adjacent studies as the present study did, they should refrain from shortening the original scales unless a particular item is obviously inapplicable to the particular sample under investigation. "Researchers should avoid revising individual items unless they have a clear sense of the relevant content domain" (Ashforth & Saks, 1996).

Based on the results from focus groups and field observations, most student-actors were outspoken and extraverted (regardless of experience levels), thus the new student-actors merged into group of existing performers effortlessly. According to one experienced student-actor, "you miss so much recording this [conversation] only on tape. We are theater people and you should have a videotape for this focus group (M. Larsen, personal communication, November 21, 2002).

Consequently, the new student-actors refrained from dwelling on their lack of experience and unfamiliarity with the organization and instantaneously participated in conversations with experienced student-actors off stage and outside of rehearsal. It seemed as though the cast had been life-long companions. According to one new student-actor,

> Everyone just knows each other. I think that some [experienced student-actors] are still sometimes, not necessarily open to talking to us because we're new, but just talking to us because they don't know us very well yet. Like the people I am at rehearsal with every night of the week, I am really close with and we have a really good time (C. Koberlein, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

While the use of focus groups provided descriptive data of the socialization process from both the new and experienced student-actors' viewpoints, the results may be additionally limited because the respondents freely supplied the researcher with information. Although other researchers could view this limitation as an advantage, the student-actors seemed to exaggerate certain responses as though they were on stage in order to render the researcher speechless.

Collecting data through field observations was also useful to this study as the researcher could concentrate more on socialization descriptions and explanations than measurements and quantifications. Field observations helped the researcher to define basic background information necessary to frame hypotheses while focusing on the socialization attempts made by the instructor-director. This method of gathering data also allowed for an excellent pilot study as it identified important variables and provided useful preliminary information. Since the researcher gathered data first hand, the study did not depend totally on the instructor-director's ability to report personal behavior. Moreover, the field observations occurred in a natural theater setting, thus providing data rich in detail.

This method of collecting data, however, included slight disadvantages as experimenter biases may have encouraged the researcher to favor specific preconceptions while ignoring contrary observations. Other drawbacks of field observations included reactivity associated with its minimal reliance on field observations. According to Wimmer and Dominick, (2000, p. 113) "the very process of being observed may influence the behavior under study." Because the researcher remained in the presence of the instructor-director, particular socialization tactics could have been implemented that otherwise would have been idle. For example, the researcher later discovered Joan's implementation of theater games during initial rehearsals to be inconsistent with the directing styles of fellow departmental instructor-directors.

Consequently, the researcher triangulated and supplemented observational data with data gathered via focus groups and interviews in order to diminish the impact of reactivity. Furthermore, this means future researcher should utilize

additional observers to cross-validate the results or unobtrusive measures (naturally occurring phenomena relevant to the task) to further diminish the impact of selective perception or reactivity.

Practical Implications and Conclusion

In addition to having implications pertaining to research issues, the results of this study also provide some important implications for practice. The present findings are important to those investigating socialization processes because they expand the small body of empirical information to include a diverse organizational setting. As stated in Act 1, scholars typically focus on one occupation or organization per study (Feldman, 1994, p. 230) and traditionally rely on the socialization experiences of police officers (Van Maanen, 1976), faculty members (Cawyer & Friedrich, 1998), employees (Anakwe & Greenhaus, 1999), and students (Souza, 1999). Members of the theater production under study experienced similar applications and outcomes, as commonly studied organizational members in the domain of socialization literature. Consequently, the researcher reduced the apparent void in the socialization realm for fellow researchers considering the potential effect of socialization practices in extra-curricular activities, such as theatrical opportunities. According to Cawyer and Friedrich (1998, pp. 234-5), events, such as participation in social activities, enable a swifter transition into an actual organization.

The results of this study also point to additional practical propositions. If collegiate theater organizations seek to aid the transition of new student-actors into a group of existing performers, perhaps the best solution is to consult those who bare the brunt of the socialization attempts: the new student-actors. When asked to

provide hypothetical advice to future directors about the transition of new student-actors into a group of existing performers, one newcomer replied:

> Well, I think that it's important for a director to, like, let the actors know, like, what you've been through as an actor. Most directors have been actors. And that's, kind of a good icebreaker. Like "I know, I've been here before," and um, "I know what you're going through," and maybe that would help (J. Schlicher, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

Another new student-actor referred to the instructor-director's initial socialization tactic of positioning the cast in a circle for introductions by saying, "I hate that. It does maybe get people to talk and maybe people will get to know you better, but I hate it" (J. Cahill, personal communication, November 19, 2002). Other new student-actors generally disfavored the socialization exercise as the consensus admitted the method was slightly useful in initiating conversation. Accordingly, another newcomer advised future instructor-directors to, "spend some time at the beginning letting people get to know each other. One thing I do hate though is the 'go around in a circle and say one thing about you that no one should know'" (C. Koberlein, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

Consequently, instructor-directors may wish to be more creative when implementing initial socialization tactics during the rehearsal process. Perhaps collegiate instructor-directors should incorporate additional theater games into the first rehearsal, merging both new and experienced student-actors. By implementing theater games, such as the hokey pokey, Joan successfully allowed both groups of actors to intermingle as equals. Both groups of student-actors interpreted the instructor-director's heavy use of informal socialization favorably when asked to

reflect upon the rehearsal process. When one experienced student-actor described the initial rehearsal procedures and his association with new student-actors, he replied:

> I don't find there being any difference between the new people and us. I know that I'm friends with people that have been around as long as I've been around just because when we were at the first rehearsal we were kind of in the same boat. And that's the way it was and I wouldn't consider like moving up or anything if you like are friends with an actor or something that's been here for longer. But I know there's a lot of intimidation that goes around (S. Morehead, personal communication, November 21, 2002).

According to Baxter and Montgomery (1996), intimidation or uncertainty exists to the degree that situations are unpredictable or inadequately understood. When describing the first rehearsal, one newcomer described her internal pressure from experienced student-actors when she said, "I know the first couple of rehearsals I was intimidated a little bit because frankly I didn't really know anybody" (K. Karasch, personal communication, November 19, 2002). Another new student-actor stated, "There were some people in the cast that seemed all theatrical and didn't really talk to many people. I don't know if it's because they didn't want to or if they just keep friends that they see all the time" (C. Hubbord, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

Naturally, new student-actors sought support from experienced student-actors through communication to ease the uncertainty during the initial rehearsal. According to Berger and Calabrese (1975), when individuals communicate with each other for the first time, they seek information to reduce the anxiety surrounding

their personal behavior and about the behavior of others. Newcomers often ask experienced student-actors for advice to further adjust according to preexisting group standards (K. Oishi, personal communication, September 19, 2002). Once the ambiguity subsides, individuals are more apt to make better decisions regarding their future and to predict the reactions of their peers. As expected, new student-actors were more anxious as they approached the unfamiliar theater experience than those who already "knew the ropes" of the organization. During the first rehearsal, one newcomer noticed prearranged cliques of experienced student-actors that caused her to want to also be near fellow newcomers in order to be more comfortable. Accordingly, she said:

> I'd say there were groups. I wanted to be by people that I knew from the cast too so that it would feel like less of a new experience I guess. Oh well, I figure everyone else has been in my shoes before. You got to start somewhere I suppose (S. Seibert, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

Initial awkward experiences are necessary for the development of attitudes and behaviors, which are regular in the new environment, but are often stressful to newcomers (Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995). Although compassionate toward both groups of actors, Joan indicated that the awkward transition into a group of existing performers was an unavoidable circumstance. Her comments reflected that she too was once a newcomer and that everyone must start in the same position before advancing in the theater ranks. Although initially it may be difficult for new student-actors to adjust to new theater casts, Joan stated, the socialization period is relatively brief and necessary. In a sense, the initiation allowed newcomers the

opportunity to succeed in the organization by earning the acceptance of experienced student-actors through relentless effort and repeated talent.

The experienced actors' interpretation of the transition supported Joan's theory, as they too had to earn their seniority. According to one experienced student-actor:

> Newcomers just need to learn that that is how it is. There is no need or reason to feel intimidated, afraid, or disappointed during the rehearsal process. I just think that is a part of the process. It is kind of a part of growing and learning to be confident of yourself in your craft and willing to accept criticism in front of people. That is always a hard thing to learn (M. Wadsley, personal communication, December 3, 2002).

Even though new student-actors will ultimately transition into existing theater troops in numerous universities, never again will this particular cast ever perform the same production with the same instructor-director in the same organization. The results of this study suggest that instructor-directors and student-actors communicate in certain ways in particular situations and that it is unnecessary to determine an ideal socialization strategy because all tactics have value. Clearly, Joan's creative vision would ultimately surface despite socialization attempts with the aid of all student-actors. One newcomer said it best when he stated:

> I don't want to appear that I feel like everybody in this group is my big family and all that, but, in all reality, Joan probably did everything that was feasibly/reasonably expected to do. There really is no perfect way to take a

bunch of strangers and make them into a group like that, especially with a cast this large (S. Stolper, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

REFERENCES

Aday, L. (1989). *Designing and conducting health surveys: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 847-858.

Anakwe, U. P., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1999). Effective socialization of employees: Socialization content perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues, XI*(3), 315 329.

Anderson, K., & Jack, D. C. (1991). Learning to listen: Interview techniques and analyses. In S. Berger-Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (pp. 11-25). New York: Rutledge.

Ashforth, B. E., & Saks, A. M. (1996). Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(1), 149-178.

Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1998). Socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of organizational context. *Human Relations, 51*(7), 897-926.

Baker, E. H. III, & Feldman, D. C. (1990). Strategies of organizational socialization and their impact on newcomer adjustment. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 2*(2), 198-212.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*.New York: Guilford.

Becker, H. S. (1964). Personal change in adult life. *Sociometry, 27*, 40-53.

Becker, H. S. (1970). *Sociological work: Method and substance.* Chicago: Aldine.

Berg, B. (1997). *Qualitative research methods (2nd ed.).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1,* 99-112.

Black, J. S. (1992). Socializing American expatriate managers overseas: Tactics, tenure, and role innovation. *Group and Organizational Management, 17*(2), 171-192.

Brott, P. E., & Myers, J. E. (1999). Development of professional school counselor identity: A grounded theory. *Professional School Counseling,* 2(5), 339-348.

Burgess, R. G. (1991). Sponsors, gatekeepers, members, and friends: Access in educational settings. In W. B. Shaffir and R. A. Stebbins (Ed.), *Experiencing fieldwork: An inside view of qualitative research* (pp. 43-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cawyer, C., & Friedrich, G. (1998). Organizational socialization: Processes for new communication faculty. *Communication Education, 47,* 234-245.

Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 730-743.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 433-452.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 4,* 101-145.

Gibson, M. K., & Papa, M. J. (2000). The mud, the blood, and the beer guys: Organizational osmosis in blue-collar work groups. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*(1), 68-88.

Graen, G. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *The handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Herold, D. M., & Fedor, D. B. (1998). Individuals' interaction with their feedback environment: The role of domain-specific individual differences. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 16*, 215-254.

Hess, J. A. (1993). Assimilating newcomers into an organization: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 189-210.

Hocking, J. E., Stacks, E. W., & McDermott, S. T. (2003). *Communication Research* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Jablin, F. M. (1985). An exploratory study of vocational organizational communication socialization. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50,* 261-282.

Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and disengagement/exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putman, K. H. Roberts & L. W. Porter (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 732-818). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jablin, F. M., & Krone, K. L. (1987). Organizational assimilation. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Ed.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 711-746). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jones, Gareth R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*(2), 262 279.

Jorgensen-Earp, C. R., & Stanton, A. Q. (1993). Student metaphors for the college freshman experience. *Communication Education, 42*, 123-141.

Kogan, N. (2002). Careers in the performing arts: A psychological perspective. *Creativity Research Journal, 14*(1), 1-16.

Kotarba, J. A. (1980). Discovering amorphous social experience: The case of chronic pain. In W. B. Shaffir, R. A. Stebbins, and A. Turowetz (Ed.), *Fieldwork experience: Qualitative approaches to social research* (pp. 57-67). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Krueger, R. A. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. London: Sage Publications.

Lois, J. (1999). Socialization to heroism: Individualism and collectivism in a voluntary search and rescue group. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 62*, 117-135.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense-making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*, 226-251.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mignerey, J. T., Rubin, R. B., & Gorden, W. I. (1995). Organizational entry: An investigation of newcomer communication behavior and uncertainty. *Communication Research, 22*(1), 54-85.

Miller, V. D. (1996). An experimental study of newcomers' information seeking behaviors during organizational entry. *Communication Studies, 47*, 1-24.

More, E. (1989). Ties that bind? Links between drama, theatre, and the study of organizational communication. *Australian Journal of Communication, 15*, 62-77.

Myers, Scott A. (1998). GTAs as organizational newcomers: The association between supportive communication relationships and information seeking. *Western Journal of Communication, 60*, 54-73.

Oseroff-Varnell, D. (1998). Communication and the socialization of dance students: An analysis of the hidden curriculum in a residential arts school. *Communication Education, 47*, 101-119.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowske, S. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 849 874.

Park-Fuller, L. M., & Pelias, R. J. (1995). Charting alternative performance and evaluative practices. *Communication Education, 44*, 126-139.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pribble, P. T. (1990). Making an ethical commitment: A rhetorical case study of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly, 38*, 255-267.

Prus, R. (1980). Sociologist as hustler: The dynamics of acquiring information. In W. B. Shaffir, R. A. Stebbins, and A. Turowetz (Ed.), *Fieldwork experiences: Qualitative approaches to social research* (pp. 132-144). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ruud, G. (2002). The symphony: Organizational discourse and the symbolic tensions between artistic and business ideologies. *Journal of Applied Communication, 28*(2), 117-143.

Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review, 9*, 1-16.

Souza, T. J., (1999). Communication and alternative school student socialization. *Communication Education, 48,* 91-108.

Smith, R. C., & Turner, P. K. (1995). A social constructionist reconfiguration of metaphor analysis: An application of "SCMA" to organizational socialization theorizing. *Communication Monographs, 62,* 152-181.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanton-Spicer, A. Q. & Darling, A. L. (1986). Communication in the socialization of preservice teachers. *Communication Education, 35,* 215-230).

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Teboul, J. B. (1995). Determinants of new hire information-seeking during organizational encounter. *Western Journal of Communication, 59,* 305-325.

University Relations. (2002). Iowa State University: It's a fact. Retrieved April 14, 2002, from http://www.iastate.edu/about/fact01/

Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), Handbook of work, organization and society (pp. 67-120). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Van Maanen, J. (1976). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20,* 207-228.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 1,* 209-264.

West, M. A., Nicholson, N., & Rees, A. (1987). Transitions into newly created jobs. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60,* 97-113.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2000). *Mass media research: An introduction* (6th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

APPENDIX A

Jones' Questionnaire (1986)

Collective versus Individual:

CI 1 In the last six months, I have been extensively involved with other new recruits in common, job related training activities.

CI 2 Other newcomers have been instrumental in helping me to understand my job requirements.

CI 3 This organization puts all newcomers through the same set of learning experiences.

CI 4 Most of my training has been carried out apart from other newcomers.

CI 5 There is a sense of "being in the same boat" amongst newcomers in this organization.

Formal versus Informal:

FI 1 I have been through a set of training experiences, which are specifically designed to give newcomers a thorough knowledge of job related skills.

FI 2 During my training for this job I was normally physically apart from regular organizational members.

FI 3 I did not perform any of my normal job responsibilities until I was thoroughly familiar with departmental procedures and work methods.

FI 4 Much of my job knowledge has been acquired informally on a trial and error basis.

FI 5 I have been very aware that I am seen as "learning the ropes" in this organization.

Investiture versus Divestiture:

ID 1 I have been made to feel that my skills and abilities are very important in this organization.

ID 2 Almost all of my colleagues have been supportive of me personally.

ID 3 I have had to change my attitudes and values to be accepted in this organization.

ID 4 My colleagues have gone out of their way to help me adjust to this organization.

ID 5 I feel that experienced organizational members have held me at a distance until I conform to their expectations.

Sequential versus Random of Non-Sequential:

SR 1 There is a clear pattern in the way one role leads to another or one job assignment leads to another in this organization.

SR 2 Each stage of the training process has, and will, expand and build upon the job knowledge gained during the proceeding stages of the process.

SR 3 The movement from role to role and function to function to build up experience and a track-record is very apparent in this organization.

SR 4 This organization does not put newcomers through an identifiable sequence of learning experiences.

SR 5 the steps in the career ladder are clearly specified in this organization.

Serial versus Disjunctive:

SD 1 Experienced organizational members see advising or training newcomers as one of their main job responsibilities in this organization.

SD 2 I am gaining a clear understanding of my role in this organization from observing my senior colleagues.

SD 3 I have received little guidance from experienced organizational members as to how I should perform my job.
SD 4 I have little or no access to people who have previously performed my role in this organization.
SD 5 I have been generally left alone to discover what my role should be in this organization.

Fixed versus Variable:
FV 1 I can predict my future career path in this organization by observing other people's experiences.
FV 2 I have a good knowledge of the time it will take me to go through the various stages of the training process in this organization.
FV 3 The way in which my progress through this organization will follow a fixed timetable of events has been clearly communicated to me.
FV 4 I have little idea when to expect a new job assignment or training exercises in this organization.
FV 5 Most of my knowledge of what may happen to me in the future comes informally, through the grapevine, rather than through regular organizational channels.

APPENDIX B

Student-actor survey administered to pilot study respondents before individual interviews. This survey was adapted from Jones (1986).

The 31 following statements represent specific behaviors and messages your director may use when attempting to socialize you into this theatrical production so that rehearsals are productive. "Organizational socialization refers to the process by which an individual acquires the attitudes, behavior and knowledge needed to participate as an organizational member," according to Van Maanen and Schein (1979). In a sense, it can be viewed as an ongoing information exchange that exposes student-actors and actresses to the realities of organizational life.

There is no specific number of socialization tactics for which I am looking and there are no correct or incorrect answers. If you believe a statement represents a substantially important tactic, please tell me that, as well. The goal of my study is to discover information that is meaningful to directors and actors and actresses of theatrical productions, allowing for a better understanding of how to improve the socialization of new actors and actresses into a coherent theater troupe.

Please respond to each statement by telling me if your director uses the tactic and the extent to which the tactic does or does not apply to your rehearsals or to the directing style. Any additional information provided would be advantageous, so I can better understand how you have been socialized during the rehearsal process.

Please complete the following survey and return it to me at the time of your interview, understanding that the information will be kept strictly confidential and used solely for this study. It should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete and will be used as the interview platform. If a statement is unclear or confusing, please let me know at the time of your interview. This survey was adapted from Jones (1986).

1. Since the first rehearsal, I have been extensively involved with other cast members in common, theater-related training exercises and rehearsals.

2. I have been through a set of training experiences, which are specifically designed to give me a thorough knowledge of acting or production-related skills.

3. I am made to believe that my skills and abilities are very important to this theater production.

4. There is a clear pattern in the way theater exercises relate to the actual production.

5. I am generally left alone to discover what my role should be in this theater production.

6. I can predict my future opportunities in this university's theater department by observing other actors' experiences.

7. Fellow actors and actresses have assisted me in the understanding of my role requirements within the cast.

8. During rehearsals, I am normally physically apart from experienced actors and actresses.

9. Almost all of the other cast members are supportive of me personally.

10. Each part of the rehearsal process is built upon the knowledge gained during proceeding rehearsals.

11. I have little or no access to the actual people upon which the script was based.

12. I have a good knowledge of the time it will take me to go through the various stages of the rehearsal process during this production experience.

13. The director puts all actors and actresses through the same set of learning experiences despite our experience level.

14. I did not perform any of my normal role responsibilities until I was thoroughly familiar with organizational procedures and with the director's directing methods.

15. I have had to change my attitudes and values in order to be accepted by fellow cast members.

16. The movement from rehearsal to rehearsal, to build up experience, is very apparent in this organization.

17. I have received little guidance from experienced actors and actresses about how I should perform in the production.

18. The way in which my progress made during rehearsals will follow a fixed timetable of events has been clearly communicated to me by the director.

19. The training of the less experienced actors and actresses is set apart from other less experienced actors and actresses by the director of this production.

20. Much of my knowledge about this theater organization has been acquired informally on a trial and error basis.

21. Fellow actors and actresses go out of their way to help me adjust to this theater organization.

22. The director does not put new actors and actresses through an identifiable sequence of learning experiences.

23. I am gaining a clear understanding of my role in this production from observing fellow cast members.

24. I have little idea when to expect a new role assignment or training exercises from the director.

25. There is a sense of "being in the same boat" amongst less experienced actors and actresses in this theater production.

26. I am very aware that I am seen as "learning the ropes" in this theater organization.

27. I feel that the director has held me at a distance until I conformed to his expectations.

28. The steps in my learning curve are clearly specified by the director in this production.

29. Experienced actors and actresses see advising or training new actors and actresses as one of their main responsibilities during this production.

30. Most of my knowledge about departmental procedures and the director comes informally, through the grapevine, rather than through organizational channels.

The following question seeks to determine your acting history at this university and does not pertain to socialization techniques:

31. Have you ever been involved in other theater productions at this university previous to this production experience? If so, how many productions have you participated in?

If you believe the previous statements have not covered the tactics the director uses to socialize you and your fellow cast members, please tell me what else you would like me to know about how you are being socialized.

Thank you in advance for you cooperation!

APPENDIX C

Instructor-director survey administered to the pilot study's instructor-director before the first interview and rehearsal. This survey was adapted from Jones (1986).

The following statements pertain to tactics you may use when attempting to socialize student-actors and actresses into collegiate theatrical productions so that a spectacular performance is achievable. "Organizational socialization refers to the process by which an individual acquires the attitudes, behavior and knowledge needed to participate as an organizational member," according to Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 211). In a sense, it can be viewed as an ongoing information exchange that exposes student-actors and actresses to the realities of organizational life. The following 30 statements represent specific behaviors and messages you may use during the socialization process, but are not meant to pertain to your philosophy of directing.

There is no specific number of socialization tactics for which I am looking and are no correct or incorrect answers. If you believe a statement represents a substantially important tactic, please tell me that, as well. The goal of my study is to discover information that is meaningful to directors and actors of theatrical productions, allowing for a better understanding of how to improve the socialization of new actors into a coherent theater troupe.

Please respond to each statement by telling me if you use the tactic, the extent to which it applies to your rehearsals, or if you do not believe it applies to your directing style. Any additional information provided would be advantageous, so I can better understand how you socialize your student-actors and actresses.

Please complete the following survey and return it to me prior to the first rehearsal of the production, understanding that the information will be kept strictly confidential and used solely for this study and should take approximately 30-40 minutes to complete. This survey was adapted from Jones (1986).

1. I will use veteran student-actors to socialize new student-actors in this organization.

2. I will thoroughly familiarize new student-actors with departmental procedures and with my directing methods so they can relax and instantaneously perform their role responsibilities during rehearsals.

3. I will subject all new student-actors to the same experiences so that they will have a sense of "being in the same boat" as fellow newcomers in this theater production.

4. I will separate the training of the new student-actors apart from other new student-actors in this production.

5. I will reveal little evidence to the new student-actors about when to expect a new role or training exercise in this theater production.

6. I will put new student-actors through a set of training experiences, which are specifically designed to give them a thorough knowledge of theater in an academic setting.

7. I will put all new student-actors through the same set of learning experiences.

8. I will prevent new student-actors from receiving substantial guidance from experienced student-actors about to how they should perform their roles.

9. I will physically separate the new student-actors and veteran student-actors during socialization attempts.

10. I will permit new student-actors to predict their future opportunities in ISU theater productions by observing other people's experiences.

11. I will permit new student-actors to have a good knowledge of the time it would take them to go through the various stages of the training process in this theater production.

12. I will not put newcomers through an identifiable sequence of learning experiences.

13. I will not grant newcomers access to people who have previously performed their role in this theater cast.

14. I will make the movement from role to role and function to function (to build experience) very apparent in this theater organization.

15. I will informally relay most information to newcomers (about what could happen to them in the future) through the grapevine, rather than from me to them.

16. I will informally direct student-actors on a trial and error basis.

17. I will hold new student-actors at a distance until they conform to my expectations.

18. I will have new student-actors work in common activities outside of rehearsals (related to, but not in conjunction with rehearsals) during the span of this production.

19. I will have new student-actors assist other new student-actors in the understanding of their role requirements within the cast.

20. I will generally leave new student-actors alone to discover what their role should have been in this theater organization.

21. I will establish a clear pattern in the way each theater exercise or rehearsal leads to another.

22. I will encourage new student-actors to observe the behaviors of experienced student-actors in order to gain a clear understanding of their roles in this organization.

23. I will do things to make student-actors believe that their skills and abilities are very important to this theater production.

24. I will do things to make student-actors believe that almost all of the other student-actors are supportive of them personally.

25. I will do things to make new student-actors believe that they have to change their attitudes and values in order to be accepted into this cast.

26. I will do things to encourage veteran student-actors to go out of their way to help newcomers adjust to this theater organization.

27. I will convey to the new student-actors that their upcoming experience will enable them to "learn the ropes" of this theater organization.

28. I will clearly specify the steps in the student-actors' learning curve during rehearsals.

29. I will clearly communicate the way in which newcomers progress through this theater production according to a fixed timetable of events.

30. I will build each stage of the rehearsal process upon the student-actors' knowledge gained during the preceding stages of the production process.

✍If you believe the previous 30 questions have not covered the tactics you use to socialize students, please tell me what else you would like me to know about how you socialize your student-actors. Thank you in advance for you cooperation!

APPENDIX D

Instructor-director consent form signed by both production instructor-directors

Title of Study: Director/Actor Communication
Investigators: Amy Burgmaier and Dr. Scott Chadwick

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to gain information about how directors communicate with their student-actors. You are being invited to participate in this study because the investigators want to study theater in an academic setting at Iowa State University.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for the duration of this production. During the study, you may expect the following study procedures to be followed: I will observe your interactions with the student-actors and conduct brief individual interviews with you that will be audio taped. You will also be asked to complete one survey about how you socialize student-actors before the first rehearsal and interview (to be used as an interview platform during the 1st interview). I will NOT participate in the theater production in any way. I will take notes in general, of what you say and how you act, but will NOT attribute any statement to you. Thus, when I review my notes at the end of the production, I will NOT be able to determine what you specifically said. I will note only that either a student-actor or you made a statement or type of statement (e.g., a question, a comment, a command, etc.). I will keep my notes and the completed surveys for three years after the production is completed (as is required by university regulations) then destroy all notes and cassette tapes. Only Dr. Scott Chadwick and I will have access to the notes, tapes, and surveys during those three years.

RISKS

While participating in this study, I expect that you will encounter no risks. Although you may initially feel uncomfortable with me observing your rehearsals, my presence will not affect the rehearsal process.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study, there will be no direct benefit to you. I hope that the information gained in this study will benefit future Iowa State University theater productions.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or ask me to not include your statements in my notes at any time. If you decide not to participate or to ask me not to include your statements in my study, it will NOT result in any penalty.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the ISU Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy my records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure student confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: I will NOT attempt to come to know your name. Thus, I will not be able to connect any of your statements with a name. If your name is used in the rehearsals I will not record or use your name in my observation notes. If the results of my study are published, your identity will remain confidential.

To ensure director confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: The director of this production is aware of the methods I will use in this study. My attribution of the director's comments will be identified in my notes and in publications as coming from a director. Within the publication I will refer to the instructor-director as directing a (for example) "collegiate-level theater production at a large Midwestern university".

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study contact me, Amy Burgmaier, at (515) 250-4540 or burgmam@iastate.edu or Scott Chadwick, at 294-0486 or chadwics@iastate.edu. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, 16 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-4566; meldrem@iastate.edu or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, 2810 Beardshear Hall, (515) 294-3115; dament@iastate.edu

****

SUBJECT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the signed and dated written informed consent during the third rehearsal of this production.

Subject's Name (printed) _____

_____ _____

(Subject's Signature) (Date)

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits, and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

_____ _____

(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent) (Date)

APPENDIX E

Student-actors' consent form signed by student-actors involved in both productions

Title of Study: Director/Actor Communication
Investigators: Amy Burgmaier and Dr. Scott Chadwick
This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to gain information about how directors communicate with their student-actors. You are being invited to participate in this study because the investigators want to study theater in an academic setting at Iowa State University.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for the duration of this production. During the study, I will conduct two focus groups or individual interviews involving both experienced and inexperienced student-actors where you will be asked questions about how you have been socialized during this production by the director. Audio recordings will document the focus groups and interviews so that I can translate the conversations according to the socialization literature. I will also attend several rehearsals in order to observe the communication channels between the director and student-actors, but will NOT participate in the theater production in any way. I will take general notes of what you say, but will NOT attribute any statement to any specific student. Thus, when I review my notes at the end of the production, I will NOT be able to determine what you, or any other student, specifically said. I will note only that either a student-actor or the director made a statement or type of statement (e.g., a question, a comment, a command, etc.). I will keep the notes and audiotapes for three years after the production is completed (as is required by university regulations) then shred all notes and destroy all cassette tapes. Only Dr. Scott Chadwick and I will have access to the notes during those three years.

RISKS

While participating in this study, I expect that you will encounter no risks. Although you may initially feel uncomfortable with me observing your rehearsals, my presence will not affect your performance.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study, there will be no direct benefit to you. I hope that the information gained in this study will benefit future Iowa State University theater productions.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study nor will you be compensated for participating in this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or ask me to not include your statements in my notes at any time. If you decide not to participate or to ask me not to include your statements in my study, it will NOT result in any penalty and will NOT affect your standing in this production. I will NOT tell your director if you are or are not a participant in the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the ISU Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy my records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure student confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: I will NOT attempt to come to know your name. Thus, I will not be able to connect any of your statements with a name. If your name is used in the rehearsals I will not record or use your name in my observation notes. If the results of my study are published, your identity will remain confidential.

To ensure director confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: The director of this production is aware of the methods I will use in this study and will be studied as well. My attribution of the director's comments will be identified in my notes and in publications as coming from a director. Within the publication I will refer to them as directing a (for example) "collegiate-level theater production at a large Midwestern university".

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study contact me, Amy Burgmaier, at (515) 250-4540 or burgmam@iastate.edu or Scott Chadwick, at 294-0486 or chadwics@iastate.edu. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, 16 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-4566; meldrem@iastate.edu or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, 2810 Beardshear Hall, (515) 294-3115; dament@iastate.edu

SUBJECT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the signed and dated written informed consent during the third rehearsal of this production.

Subject's Name (printed) _____

_____ _____

(Subject's Signature) (Date)

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits, and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

_____ _____

(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent) (Date)

APPENDIX F

New student-actor focus group interview platform adapted from pilot study

(#1) Collective vs. Individual Socialization:

1. Acknowledging that you all are new to collegiate theater, how would you describe the way in which Joan communicates with you all versus those that have more experience during rehearsals?
    a. While directing the cast, does she address you all and the experienced actors with one message?
    b. On the other hand, does she isolate you from the others more experience by giving you different acting directions?

(#2) Formal vs. Informal Socialization:

2. How would you describe your involvement or interactions with the so-called "experienced actors" during rehearsal?
    a. Does she segregate you from more experienced actors by putting you through a set of tailored exercises?
    b. Alternatively, does she make few efforts to distinguish you all from experienced actors by directing you to follow a rigid set of predetermined experiences?

(#3) Sequential vs. Non-sequential or Random Socialization:

3. At what point during the rehearsal process did you feel that the total cast became one unit –if it has yet. How did you learn how to fit-into the group of experienced actors?
    a. Has Joan identified sequential socialization steps that lead to your acceptance by experienced cast members?
    b. Alternatively, has her advice been ambiguous?

(#4) Fixed vs. Variable Socialization:

4. How do you know the length of time it would take you all to fit into the cast? At what point during the rehearsal process did you feel that your presence was considered important to the production–if do yet. How did you know when that happened? How has Joan conveyed to you the length of the socialization process?
    a. Has she designated a specific length of time for the socialization process?
    b. Or, has she not told about the length of the socialization process?

(#5) Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization:

5. How do the actors, with more experience, treat you during rehearsals?
    a. Has she ever used experienced actors as role models or mentors during rehearsals to acclimate you into the group?
    b. Or, not?

(#6) Investiture vs. Divestiture Socialization:

6. How does Joan communicate with you during rehearsals?
    a. Does she reinforce your identity during the rehearsals?
    b. Or, does she reprimand you when you misbehave?

7. How would you describe the way in which you learned about Joan's directing style?

8. What advice would you give to a director in order to make the transition into collegiate theater easier?

APPENDIX G

Experienced student-actor focus group interview platform adapted from pilot study

Ice Breakers:

- If you could perform any role in any production, what would it be and why?
- Think back to the first rehearsal. Remember the way Joan communicated to you, treated you etc and how she treated those with less experience…

1. How does Joan communicate with you during rehearsals?
    a. While directing the cast, does she address all cast members with one message?
    b. On the other hand, does she isolate certain actors by giving them different acting directions?

2. How would you describe your involvement or interactions with new actors during rehearsals?
    a. Has Joan segregated you them by putting them through a set of tailored exercises?
    b. Alternatively, has she made few efforts to distinguish you all from the newcomers by having you all follow a rigid set of predetermined experiences?

3. Have any of you acted as a role model to other actors? If so why?

4. How would you describe the way new actors learn Joan's directing style?

5. What advice would you give other directors so that existing performers would readily accept new actors into their group?

6. How would you compare the dynamics of this cast to other casts you have acted in?

7. How does Joan's directing style compare to the style of other directors at the university?

APPENDIX H

Letter sent via email to Joan on September 30, 2002 at 10:27 am.

Dear Joan,

Assuming you are still willing to be involved with my thesis project during the production of *A Christmas Carol*, it is time for us to take care of some technicalities.

First, I need you to read and sign an informed consent document, which I have placed in your mailbox. This document simply explains the details of my research intensions and gains your informed consent.

Second, attached to the informed consent document is a brief survey for you to complete before the first rehearsal. The survey contains statements, which can be answered in one or two sentences. The information you provide on the survey is an essential element to my study so please elaborate when necessary.

Finally, I would like to schedule a time to interview you before the first rehearsal of *A Christmas Carol*. I have availability on October 3 or 10 (except between 12:30 and 2 pm.) if you can meet me on one of these days. If these days do not work for you, please suggest an alternative time. The interview will last approximately one hour.

Joan, I greatly appreciate you cooperation with my project despite your hectic schedule. If you have any questions please let me know either via email or during your interview.

---Amy Burgmaier

APPENDIX I

Follow up Letter sent via email to Joan on October 15, 2002 at 12:06 pm.

Joan,

I forgot to ask you about the survey during last night's rehearsal. If you have not completed it yet, please try to finish it sometime during the next three weeks and bring it to the next rehearsal.

Thanks again for your cooperation!

Amy Burgmaier

APPENDIX J

Observation Guide Sample

Rehearsal Topic or Group Involved _____ **Rehearsal #** _____ **Date** _____

(#1) Collective vs. Individual Socialization:
The practice of grouping newcomers and putting them through a common set of experiences designed to convey certain information to the newcomers
Vs.
Treating each newcomer singly and in isolation from others and putting him or her through unique experiences

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	C / I	
	C / I	
	C / I	
	C / I	
	C / I	
	C / I	

(#2) Formal vs. Informal Socialization:
The practice of segregating newcomers from more experienced members and putting them through a set of tailored experiences
Vs.
Making fewer efforts to distinguish newcomers from experienced organizational members and following a rigid set of programmed experiences

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	F / I	
	F / I	
	F / I	
	F / I	
	F / I	
	F / I	

(#3) Sequential vs. Non-sequential or Random Socialization:
The completion of sequential socialization steps that lead to the fulfillment of the role expectations
Vs.
An ambiguous sequence of steps

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	S/R	
	S/R	
	S/R	
	S/R	
	S/R	

	S/R	

(#4) Fixed vs. Variable Socialization:
A specific length of time designated to the newcomer's socialization process
Vs.
An indefinite timetable that specifies few clues about when to expect the next transition

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	F/V	
	F/V	
	F/V	
	F/V	
	F/V	
	F/V	

(#5) Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization:
The practice of socializing newcomers with the aid of veteran organizational members or mentors to "show the ropes" to the newcomers
Vs.
A process where a role model is not used

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	S/D	
	S/D	
	S/D	
	S/D	
	S/D	
	S/D	

(#6) Investiture vs. Divestiture Socialization:
The reinforcement of the newcomer's identity during the socialization process
Vs.
Communicating that past knowledge or behaviors are not acceptable

Time	Tactic	Explanation of Occurrence
	I/D	
	I/D	
	I/D	
	I/D	
	I/D	
	I/D	

APPENDIX K

Joan's email response

All this sounds great. I am free on the 3 and the 10 from 9-10 and 2:15-3:30. Just let me know what would work for you.

Thanks,
Joan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Brilliant educator, dedicated researcher, and compassionate mentor, are just a few roles assumed by Dr. Scott Chadwick, my major professor and inspiration. Although I have experienced remarkable educators during my educational journey, you remain a valuable mentor and perhaps one of the most precious forces underlying my graduate experience at Iowa State University. You not only strived to understand my strengths and weaknesses, but you also cared about me as a person. When I felt inferior to my peers in the classroom, you noticed. When I did not understand the Jacques Ellul's text, you tailor-fit the material to me in an understandable way. When I contemplated giving up on my Masters Degree, you made me realize why I should not. When I asked you to be my mentor and major professor, you accepted the role with enthusiasm.

Not only have you left lasting impressions in my mind about organizational communication and the theory of socialization, but you have also taught me how to connect those concepts with my true passion: theater. When initially approaching you with my thesis topic, you not only welcomed the proposal, but you encouraged my exploration when others classified my idea as nonsensical. Your dynamic teaching approach has challenged my mind during the exploration of complicated materials and concepts both in the classroom and in my life outside of Iowa State. I give a standing ovation to you for comprehending the initial vision for this thesis, and for giving me the confidence to accomplish this seemingly unachievable task. I sincerely thank you for your unrelenting assistance and wish you all the best in your future endeavors. Although prospective Greenlee students will not have the

opportunity to experience your wonderful gifts, I am confident your contributions will reach beyond Hamilton Hall at last.

Another remarkable faculty connection I made in the Greenlee School includes Barbara Mack. You remain one of the most dynamic, empowering, and dedicated women in my vocabulary, who I will always hold close to my heart. Although you have also played a critical role in my graduate education, I was fortunately graced with your presence during my undergraduate years in Hamilton Hall. It was then that you instigated my craving for higher education with your candid teaching approach during JL MC 460, which continues to echo in my mind. Consequently, there has never been a day during graduate school when I have not heard your voice urging me forward, building me up, counseling me, and guiding me in the right direction. When life-changing obstacles presented themselves, you were the person I trusted most with my internal conflicts. I value your opinions and expertise and celebrate your passion for the performing arts. In retrospect, deciding to attend graduate school was one of the best decisions I made as I have been connected with remarkable faculty members, like you and Scott, who have taught me how to recognize my abilities so that I can accomplish my dreams.

As I approach the end of graduate school at Iowa State, outsiders may assume my career related aspirations are related to newspaper or television reporting, and perhaps they used to be. After completing this research, however, it is my dream to work in association with Broadway Theater. Although esteemed members of academia may view this goal as unrealistic and question my pursuit of a Masters Degree, Patrick Gouran consistently pushed me toward making this dream become a reality. When I thought that connecting journalism aspects to the performing arts

in a professional manner seemed a mere fantasy, your stimulating words taught me to recognize my talents and capabilities. I am grateful for your encouraging advice and for the opportunity to have experienced your enthusiasm inside both the classroom and Fisher Theater. I wish you all the best in your retirement and to "break a leg" during your final performance of *I Never Sang for My Father*. I eagerly anticipate the production.

Perhaps one of the most meaningful aspects of this study was that I gained the confidence to audition for Iowa State's production of *Romeo and Juliet*, under the direction of Robin Stone. After being cast into the role of Lady Montague, I too was considered a new student-actor, according to my study. Not only was I able to examine actors' transitions into a group of existing performers through previous observations, focus groups, and interviews, but I also achieved an exclusive opportunity to directly experience the transition thanks to you. This connection to the performing arts served as an outlet that provided me with the motivation to continue along my predetermined scholastic path. I am particularly appreciative, however, for your initial agreement to be studied by a complete stranger with such short notice. I wonder what I would have done had you disagreed to participate in my study. I trust your experiences at Iowa State will match my cherished memories gained at the university and thank you for allowing me to satisfy my childhood dream of performing in Fisher Theater.

In retrospect, it was of no surprise that my consistent involvement in talent shows, plays and musicals silently entered into my research platform during my graduate career at Iowa State University. In fact, my theater related aspirations seemed to parallel those of Jane Cox. I was pleased to learn that she too grew up on

a small-town Iowa farm with a passion for the performing arts. According to Jane, theater was something she always wanted to be involved with –even before she saw her first theatrical production at the age of 16. She clearly remembered the details of the magical evening with her aunt during the production of *Our Town* and provided a colorful description of the event. According to Jane, the production instigated her decision to appreciate each day for the rest of her life because that was what *Our Town* stressed. She stated, "I always thought of theater in an intelligent and emotional way and I had a great opportunity to change people's way of life even, and the way they looked at things." The richness of her description was one of the driving forces behind my performance related dream and behind this study.

Jane, I am especially thankful for the great deal of time you spent sharing your directing approaches and background with me. You equipped me with valuable knowledge that I can use to conquer the world outside of Iowa State University. No longer do I categorize myself as a small-town Iowa girl incapable of succeeding in the performing arts. Instead, I uphold my modest origin and reach for the stars. Thanks for the motivational boost Jane.

I also want to thank the theater students involved in *The Laramie Project* and *A Christmas Carol* who allowed me to intrude during the rehearsal processes of both productions. I certainly enjoyed developing relationships with you during the data collection phase of my research and had an even better experience when I had the chance to share the stage with you in *Romeo and Juliet*. Thanks for the entertaining memories and do not forget me after you become famous.

On a personal note, I must extend my thanks to my family and friends who granted me support, unconditional love, and laughter, especially when I forced

myself to be unsociable. Trust me, I would have much rather spent my time doing other things instead of writing this paper. You always taught me the importance of hard work and dedication and now I understand what you meant. Completing this milestone has granted me a terrific sense of accomplishment.

Finally, I want to thank Darci Janssen and my fellow graduate students in the Greenlee School of Journalism and Mass Communication for struggling along beside me during this exhausting and seemingly endless road. I will always keep you close to my heart, knowing I was not alone in this journey.