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Abstract

This study considers fear within the educational discipline in Madagascar. The aim of the study is to examine how fear is part of teachers and principals work and what factors they fear. I address how fear is visible in their power relations and how some may be driven by it. Furthermore, the study includes a comparative aspect, as it addresses the differences and similarities between the teachers and the principals within the educational discipline.

The research design chosen for the study is a comparative case-study design. In total 23 informants (teachers and principals) were interviewed about the phenomenon of fear. As there already exists literature concerning pupil’s fear, the teachers and the principals were chosen as informants for this study. The informants all work in Malagasy Lutheran schools in the central highlands in Madagascar.

The study uses general literature concerning emotions and fear. Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory and Luhmann’s theory of power are further used as an analytical framework for the findings. They highlight the dynamics in which fear operates and clarifies sources of fear. Additionally, I have used theories reflecting ethics, norms and attitudes in the Malagasy culture. All in all, the literature functions as an overarching framework for studying and discussing the findings.

Interviews showed that what the teachers and principals fear is closely related to the power relations in which they live and work. The factors that are considered frightening seem to be linked to the hierarchy in school. Cultural values make it difficult to distinguish between fear and respect, as well as spot the original source of fear. There are similarities, as well as differences, in how teachers and principals reflect upon the phenomenon of fear. For the most part, fear seems to be more visible among teachers than among principals. It could be questioned whether this is due to their position in the school’s internal hierarchy or not.

I argue that there are several factors that teachers and principals fear in the educational discipline in Madagascar. I further argue that fear is visible in the power relations between teachers and principals in the way they relate to one another.
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1 Introduction

Traditionally, little attention has been paid to fear as a phenomenon in different sectors of society. However, in recent years the issue has gained more prominence on the public agenda. Whether this is a result of the massive media coverage of terrorism, war, humanitarian crises, and natural disasters, remains unknown. What we do know is that some authors claim that we live in a “culture of fear” and that the phenomenon of fear needs more attention (Furedi, 2006). Research by Altheide (2002) showed a 161% increase from 1985 to 1994 in the use of the word fear in headlines in Los Angeles Times and ABC News Reports. These numbers do not indicate what kind of fear this is or if it is real, but it illustrates how the phenomenon increasingly has gained more attention. As I originally stated in the proposal for this thesis: What is certain is that the focus on fear and people’s awareness of the phenomenon has increased (Schie, 2014). Robin (2004) also emphasizes this: fear “…is a problem not solely of the past but also of the present” (p.163).

According to Jackson (2010) studies examining fear within education barely exists, which alone is a reason for conducting this research. Indeed, there is a gap in literature and a clear need for more research. Moreover, the focus of existing studies of fear in education, has to a large degree been on pupils and issues they deal with, such as testing (Jackson, 2010). The discovery of pupils’ poor academic performances, led to what has been referred to as a teach-to-the-test-culture in the US. This was one of the reasons why pupils’ fear was put on the agenda (White.n.d).

In contrast to previous research, pupils’ fear will not be examined in this study. Here, the focus will be on how fear operates in the power relations among teachers and principals in Malagasy schools.

1.1 Background

Madagascar has always been a country of interest to me as I grew up there. The last year at teacher school, I returned to the African island to do my internship in a Malagasy school. It was interesting to discover the culture as a grown-up. Especially the communication and dynamics between the employees in the school caught my attention. I remember one episode in particular. Our internship was over, and we (my Norwegian peers and I) were going to give
a small, personal gift of gratitude to the teacher that had supervised us during our stay. Since it was Friday, the whole school was gathered for morning prayers, and we decided to give the gift to our supervisor before the ceremony. That way, it would not be done in front of everybody. I still remember how confused I became when our supervisor took us aside and quietly whispered that we had to give the gift again, but now to the principal. We had already planned a different gift to the school, but wanted to give our supervisor something extra since he had been our only contact during our stay. Anyhow, we did not manage to say this before we had to climb the stairs and enter the scene where the principal and the rest of the administration, which we had barely met, sat. We did as we were told, and I still remember the principal sitting in a big chair, waiting for us to make a small speech and give our gift. I also remember that I did not quite understand what the supervisor felt. There, in the great hall, in front of everybody, he looked so proud. Just minutes before, when we gave him the gift and he said thank you, he looked terrified.

This is one of the episodes that inspired me and made me curious about the topic of this study. After some research and conversations with people involved in development work in Madagascar, I realized that fear in relations could be a relevant topic. People I met shared stories which made me wonder whether fear was the source of the complications and behavior they told about.

1.2 Purpose of the study and research questions

Fear is seen as a phenomenon that maintains structures in society. It is fundamental and it permeates all disciplines in society (Jackson, 2010). However, this research will focus on fear as part of the power relations between pedagogical staff in Malagasy schools. Pedagogical staff is in this case the teachers and the principals.

Certain assumptions create the basis for this research. First of all, the research assumes that fear exists in the educational discipline. Secondly, it assumes that fear actually plays a role in the power relations and that it has some kind of impact on those who are part of these relations (Schie, 2014).

The overarching purpose of the study is to examine fear-structures and -dynamics in school, among teachers and principals, and to examine what the source of this fear is. The research tends to identify how the informants define fear and whether and how it has an impact on
Jackson (2010) refers to Martin Luther King who once said that fear “…hover quietly…” (p.19): This research will demonstrate to what extent this is true for the educational discipline.

In an attempt to explore how fear is part of the power relations in the educational sector in Madagascar, I developed these two research questions:

1) What are the factors that pedagogical staff in Lutheran Schools in Madagascar fear?

2) How is fear visible in the power relations between pedagogical staff working in Malagasy Lutheran Schools?

The first question aims at mapping what the focus of fear is centered on. The second question aims at getting a broader picture of how fear is part of the relations and how it has an impact on them. With attention to the teachers and the principals, the research includes a comparative aspect and aims to explore differences and similarities between the two respective groups as far as fear is concerned.

1.3 Further justification

Each question served a specific purpose. First of all, how people understand the expression fear may vary. Mapping the factors that teachers and principals fear gave an impression of the perceptions and the objects of fear. Further, it provided insight into the domain of their work where the phenomenon occurred.

Mapping the frightening factors further, gave an impression of how the participants viewed the term “fear”. I have experienced that what one consider a universal definition of a specific phenomenon, may not necessarily be as universal as first expected. How one understands certain words and expressions may differ, and depends to a large extent on a person’s background. In this research, it was very important for me as a researcher to gain insight into how the participants defined fear. Concentrating on what they feared would provide valuable information about the sources of fear, the focus of fear and how the phenomenon was perceived.

The purpose of the second research question was to get insight into how, in concrete terms, fear expressed itself among teachers and principals. Identifying what the teachers and the
principals feared and how fear was visible in their relationships, would give a picture of how fear affected them as a group. It would give insight in how fear “hover” among those working in the educational discipline (Jackson, 2010, p.19).

1.4 Analytical framework and literature

In my study I have applied several theoretical concepts. The context chapter outlines key cultural characteristics which surface in the discussion chapter and which are essential to understand and interpret our findings. The chapter refers to several scholars of Malagasy culture, with the extensive work of Professor Dr. Øyvind Dahl as a main source of information.

In addition to literature on Malagasy culture, I have applied literature that focuses on theories of emotions. Milley (2009) defines emotions as trans-formative forces, and this thesis looks at fear as such a transformative force. The literatures further distinguish between a sociological perspective and a psychological perspective of emotions. In this thesis, I argue that when studying fear, both these perspectives should be considered.

Secondly, Hofstede’s cultural dimensions theory have been used as a framework for analysis (Hofstede, 1992; Hofstede, 2011). Hofstede has conducted a detailed research comparing countries, studying their cultural behavior, attitudes and values. Based on his studies, he developed a way of categorizing countries in six dimensions representing a set of different values or characteristics. Five of Hofstede's dimensions are applied in this thesis and help in identifying the reasons behind the informants’ fear and add depth to the findings.

Thirdly, I have applied the parts of Niklas Luhmann’s system theory that focus on power. Luhmann addressed several phenomena in society where power is visible. As this research focus on power relations, Luhmann’s theory was examined and proved useful in analyzing of the findings. Together the theories create a solid analytical framework and a sound basis for evaluating and understanding the findings.

1.4.1 Definition of fear

As mentioned in the introduction, it may be difficult to fully understand what fear refers to. Whether it is fear that convinces you of a threat, or fear that hinders you from doing
something. I will examine the concept of fear later, as several aspects of fear will be touched upon. However as a key term in the study, it is important to have the definition in mind from the very beginning. The definition of fear applied in this thesis is: The emotion troubling someone, caused by the thought of the outcome of a real or an imagined situation; the thought of the (possible) consequences. Furthermore, it is an emotion caused by real pain, loss, threat or danger. Finally, it may be described as an emotion blended with awe (Rachman, 1990; Rachman, 1998, Schmidt, 2009; Bay & Algase, Bandura, 1977; Ylander & Larsson-Lindman, 1984). This definition is composed and compiled from an exhaustive review of literature. The background for the definition will be given in the theory chapter, Chapter 3.

### 1.5 Methodology

A qualitative approach was chosen for this research and an exploratory case-study design was chosen for studying the phenomenon of fear in its context. I wanted the participants’ experiences and thoughts concerning fear, and I tried to keep an inductive approach as I proceeded with my research. I ran semi-structured interviews with twenty-three Malagasy teachers and principals in total. They represented seven different schools, all situated in the highlands of Madagascar. A questionnaire was also made, although it did not work out as intended. This will be explained more in detail in the methodology, Chapter 3.

The participants in the study were selected both a result of criterion sampling as well as convenient sampling. One interview was even a result of snowball sampling. The interviews were transcribed and the data was coded inductively.

### 1.6 Structure of thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter 1 is the introduction chapter in which the purpose of the research, as well as research questions are presented. I present the background and significance of the study as well as a short description of the literature used, methodology and important expressions. In Chapter 2 I give a presentation of the context in which the research was conducted. This chapter provides background information about Madagascar: Both historical background as well as an explanation of certain key cultural concepts. Chapter 3 introduces the literature and analytical framework applied in the analysis of the data.
Chapter 4 presents the methodology used to conduct this study. Research design, data collection and data analysis are presented. In Chapter 5 I present the data collected. Chapter 6 provides a short summary of the research in terms of methodology and focus and the main tendencies in the findings, followed by a discussion of the findings in light of the literature and analytical framework. The last chapter, Chapter 7, contains the conclusion of the study and outlines possible paths for further research.
2 Context

This research took place in Madagascar and the following chapter will provide important background information about Madagascar. In short, as Bryman (2012) puts it, contextual knowledge characterizes high quality research. Contextual information revealed in this chapter will allow the reader to better understand the findings, analysis and discussion which follows. A historical overview of how France has influenced the Malagasy education system will be followed with a FLM-hierarchy and then specific cultural phenomena will be introduced. Throughout this chapter there are frequently references to Øyvind Dahl\(^1\), who has written several books and articles about Madagascar. His knowledge about the island is on a par with international literature and what is widely known. Some of his knowledge will be presented as well as my knowledge and experience.

2.1 History

Madagascar is a former French colony, which has influenced both the country as a whole as well as the school system in particular. The capital of Madagascar, Antananarivo, was invaded by France in 1895 and the island was declared a French colony in 1896. This was the beginning of more than 60 years of French control. Madagascar gained its independency in 1960. We will look at the island’s history, especially focusing on the use of language in school, as this mirrors the French dominance of the school system.

2.1.1 French language and structure

Before the colonial period, Malagasy had been the language of instruction in Malagasy classrooms and schools were run by different churches (Wietzke, 2011). As a consequence of becoming a French colony, public schools were established. The schools were seen as an arena where *French* language and culture was learned. This was clearly stated by Galliens, the French general whose mission was “making Madagascar French” (Dahl, 1998, p. 100). School books concerned France and it was more likely that Malagasy children learned French geography instead of Malagasy geography. From 1916 to 1926 Malagasy was not even part of

\(^1\) Øyvind Dahl has lived in Madagascar for seventeen years and finished his PhD in 1993, within the field of intercultural communication, focusing on Madagascar. Today, he is teaching subjects like social anthropology and communication at School of Mission and Theology in Stavanger. He is often seen quoted in international literature concerning Madagascar (Dahl, 1999).
the official school program (Dahl, 2011). French was supposed to be the main language and only the private church schools were allowed to use Malagasy when teaching religion.

2.1.2 Malagachization

Although independence was gained in 1960, the French school system remained (Dahl, 1998). A student riot in 1972 with the school system on the agenda started the process towards making Malagasy the language of instruction, first at higher levels in schools, then later at the lower levels (Dahl, 2011). Didier Ratsiraka became president in 1975 and one of his slogans was taken from the student riot: “Malagachization:” Everything that had been French should become Malagasy again (Razafimbelo, 2011). Malagasy was declared to be the language of instruction in the classrooms, teachers should be Malagasy, curriculum should be Malagasy and the content of the curriculum should concern Madagascar, not France. Even the exams should be in Malagasy (Dahl, 2008). To be able to fulfill these requirements, numerous of Malagasy school books were produced. Unfortunately, the quality of the content and the presentation of the books were poor. In addition, the books did not reach rural areas (Dahl, 2011). However, a lot of public schools were established in this period and universal education was an important part of the plan for national development in Madagascar (Wietzke, 2011). In this period, private schools, wishing to maintain and focus on the French language, were established (Gouleta, 2006).

2.1.3 Back to French

Malagachization politics lasted for some decades until the Malagasy economy began to decline. Overestimating the use of actual currency, while being too confident about signals from the world marked, the economy failed. The country’s debt increased in the 1980s (Dahl, 1998) and as a result of this the private market was encouraged to innovate, a liberalization of the economy started. In this period, French was made the language of instruction in Malagasy schools again (Gouleta, 2006). People believed that a return to the French language was the right way to regain position and a proper education again.

The private schools stood strong as many of them had continued to teach French language and focused on France during the Malagachization period. The return to French reform caused more problems for schools which had actively been implementing the Malagasy language. All in all, education in both languages had been very poor during the time of the malagachization-
politics and people now had neither adequately French skills nor Malagasy skills (Dahl, 2011). Since French was supposed to be the main language, Malagasy was not taught properly. Teachers had been trained during the malagachization-period and had limited French skills. This lack of language with the teachers resulted in poor language skills among the pupils. Additionally, neither the teachers nor the pupils could identify or recognize the environment described in the books used, as the books entirely concerned France. Decisions were made based on impressions and opinions as to which language would benefit the country, without thinking about the real effects - the possibilities and consequences of the choices. To sum it up, I quote the Malagasy professor in linguistics Solo Raharinjanahary: “The return to French as undertaken in 1990-91 was not only criminal but also illusory” (Raharinjanahary, 2004, p.165). Making decisions now and then, without evaluating what is actually happening on the ground often lead to unintended consequences.

2.1.4 Latest history and current time

In short, regarding language in schools in Madagascar, the history is like a pendulum going back and forth between Malagasy and French, creating gaps and limited language skills. History shows discussions concerning when to introduce French as language of instruction in the classroom. A new educational reform came in 2008, as a result of the Madagascar Action Plan (MAP), 2007. Parts of the reform included a plan for making primary school seven years instead of nine, college three years instead of two and lycée two years instead of three. Furthermore, Malagasy was again to become a larger part of pupil’s education; it was supposed to be the language of instruction until pupils reached fifth grade. A new curriculum was also to be created. However, due to the coup d’état in 2009, this reform was never really implemented and the old system with its structure, language policies and curriculum remained (UNICEF, 2013).

Today, the educational system in Madagascar is suffering. After the presidential coup in 2009 the island’s development stagnated and there have been little change in the field of education. Some international organizations froze their financial support to Madagascar as a result of the coup, which made it difficult to proceed with newly established educational projects and programs. Other international organizations, such as UNICEF and the World Bank chose to canalize their money in other ways, not directly through governmental programs, so as to make sure the money reached the intended goals and projects could proceed (Kvil, T.,personal
communication, spring 2015). Though financial support nowadays is increasing after the presidential election of January 2014, the country is far from reaching international goals and standards. The political situation is unstable, there is a lack of finance as well as administration and hopes for the future are fading. Less children are enrolled, school books are rare and teachers are discouraged due to lack of salaries and proper programs.

2.1.5 Language of power

As previously indicated, the French colonization of Madagascar has played an important role shaping Madagascar’s education. Examining the language policies shows some of the French dominance within the field of education even after the island became independent. Today, the structure of the school system is still the one adopted from France and the school books reflect French dominance. Even the pedagogy remains as it used to be in France 60 years ago. Reforms implemented in France after the 1950s have had little or no influence on Malagasy pedagogy. Children still must learn by memorization, even though they do not necessarily understand the meaning of what they read. In many schools French is still the language used by teachers although their command of French is poor. (Gouleta, 2006). French dominance is also reflected in how schools are organized. Like most countries, French schools have had a leadership built on a hierarchical model; the principal at the top, after him/her follows the teachers. The hierarchy among the teachers depends on their educational background and what position they possess at the school. This has changed and today teamwork dominates French schools. Even the principal is part of an administrative team. The idea of teamwork is familiar in Madagascar, although it is not common in practice. In Madagascar the hierarchy of teachers and professors still remains, perhaps even more rigidly, considering how hierarchy also is reflected in the culture (Dahl, 1999). As we examine fear within this hierarchy, a glance at the history is necessary to show how the education system came to be what it is.

The position of the French language is strong in Madagascar. To a large extent it continues to be the language in official administration and governance and some say it is the language of power in the island (Dahl, 2011, pp.52). Recently the attention given to the importance of a mother tongue has risen globally. Though the focus on it has increased in Madagascar persistent lack of school books written in Malagasy, makes it difficult to meet goals concerning the use of mother tongue. The French language is seen as the language of the elite: “As long as the ruling class does not support the national educational system, (...) the pattern
of dominance will continue” (Dahl, 2011, pp.64). Moreover, many complex words are only to be found in French – they do not exist in Malagasy. This strengthens the position of the French language.

2.2 School structure and leadership hierarchy

The structure of the school system in Madagascar is similar to public schools in France. Primary school is five years, lower secondary school is four years and upper-secondary school is three years. Pupils need to pass exams to be accepted for the next grade. There are three major exams which each gives a diploma: Certificat d’Études Primaire Élémentaire (CEPE) after primary school, Brevet d’Études Primaire du Premier Cycle (BEPC) after lower secondary school and finally Baccalauréat (BACC) after upper secondary school.

However, how individual schools in Madagascar are structured and administrated differs. It depends on location, number of pupils, whether a school is private or public, what resources that are available, economy and so on. One school administration may for example include a principal only, whereas another may include a secretary, an inspector and a principal. In this thesis the Responsible of Pedagogics will be mentioned frequently. The Responsible of Pedagogics is a teacher with some extra responsibility. S/he occupies a position between the teachers and the principal. If the teachers need anything, they may go to the Responsible of Pedagogics and s/he will present it for the principal. Since this thesis concerns the private schools of FLM [Fiangonana Loterana Malagasy: Malagasy Lutheran School], we will take a closer look at how they are structured. For an overview of what the amounts of different types of schools (private and public) are in Madagascar, see Appendix 2. The schools of FLM still counted roughly 300 in 2016 (Jeno, I (ND), personal communication, July 10 2015).

2.3 Schools of FLM

In the historical description I state that private schools have played an important linguistic role especially in the island’s educational history. On their arrival, Christian missionaries established arenas for education in Madagascar. First and foremost they focused on evangelization and literacy (Dahl, 1991). Despite pressure from France during the colonial period, the confessional schools kept teaching Malagasy and there is no doubt that their contribution in maintaining the Malagasy language was one of the reasons why Malagasy
could be declared national language in 1958 (Dahl, 2011). FLM was established in 1950 and over time missionaries were replaced by Malagasy teachers. The number of schools grew and today, education has its own department in FLM called Fampianarana ny Fanabeazana Loterana (FFL), The Lutheran Education Department.

### 2.3.1 Leadership

There are several branches within the FLM. The pyramid below shows the different levels in the FLM hierarchy what concerns education:

![Structure of leadership within FLM-education (developed by author).](image)

The General Synod is on the top. This is the administrative and theological direction of the Lutheran Church. Second is KMSL. This is the Executive Committee of the General Synod which meets twice a year. Third is the Department of the Lutheran Education. Forth is the Executive Committee of Lutheran Education which follows up on what is decided in the Department. The committee has an overarching responsibility for the administration and
organization of what is written in the official documents of the Lutheran Schools. Next is the National Director (ND). ND is the leader and the first responsible for the Lutheran education. S/he is chosen for four years by the General Synod or by the Executive Committee. Furthermore, s/he is the one who is in touch with each school. ND keeps an eye on the management of the schools, besides, s/he represents the Department of Lutheran Education in KSL, KMSL FFPM and in the Ministries. ND is also the head of Executive Committee of FFL. Below the national director are the Executive Regional Committees, which keep an eye on all the Lutheran Schools in the respective region. They make sure decisions made by those on top of the hierarchy are being followed. Almost at the bottom of the hierarchy is the Local Executive Committee which follows up on “their” local school: They determine the priorities governed by the rules, conduct hiring of staff and so on. The local priest is often the leader of this local committee. Lowest in the hierarchy is the principal, who however is at the top of his/her hierarchy within the school s/he manage. The principal has the main responsibility for the administration and management of the school.

As mentioned in the previous subchapter the structure of a school’s administration depends on factors such as the size of the school and its economy. In this research several schools participated, some had a school administration of just the principal while others had a school administration with several participants, for instance an observer, the principal, a responsible of pedagogics, an economist etc.

### 2.3.2 Finance

In matters of finance, every FLM school is independent; they all administer their own budget. All pupils should pay school fee and these are supposed to cover the teacher’s salaries (Dahl 1991). Finance is a challenge in times of unemployment and political crisis. At some schools teachers do not receive their salary as money, but rice, beans and produce. In addition to the school fee, FLM cooperates with different international organizations and donors. For instance: The Norwegian government support specific educational projects within FLM, through the Norwegian Mission Society (NMS). Schools which are pilot schools or part of such projects sometimes receive extra funding for carrying out the project. The FLM church supports the schools with money from the tithes once a year. In addition, where the school fee per student is lower than 800AR, schools receive 30 000AR from the government over nine months. This project, run by the national government, is called “Reduce the Parent’s Burden.”
However, this only concerns approximately 40 Lutheran schools in rural areas. The National Director of the Educational Department in FLM has however reported that it has happened that the schools have not received this money, so the finance from the national government is not consequential.

2.4 Culture

This section will briefly introduce some Malagasy ways of thinking, cultural significance and values. Sayings are used frequently in Madagascar and show cultural significance. The content of a term in Malagasy may bear more meaning than what the corresponding word in English does. This section looks into and explains some important terms and sayings. Some of them will appear in the interviews and analysis of this research, other give an insight in the Malagasy culture.

2.4.1 Useful expressions

Fihavanana [kinship]

_Fihavanana_ is a fundamental Malagasy term and commonly used speaking of relations. To understand relations is important in this study since a lot of the study concerns relations and dynamics. There are many sayings expressing the depth of this particular term, for instance: “It is better to lose your wealth, than to lose the _fihavanana_ [kinship]” (Dahl, 1998; Dahl 1999). This saying reflects some of the importance of _fihavanana_ [kinship]; it means more than your fortune! A common translation of the word _fihavanana_ is kinship, family community or cross-generational community, which indicates a biological link. Nevertheless, the word may refer to several types of relations; whether a friendship or a good relationship with someone. Equally important, the term may be used as synonym to solidarity, harmony and even the act of being helpful (Dahl, 1998; Razafindralambo, 2005). “_Fihavanana_ [kinship] is a strong consciousness of solidarity. The family community is a horizontal social structure, which equalizes for better and for worse. There is also a vertical structure, an hierarchy based on the parent-child relationship” (Dahl, 1998, p.143). In this research, both of these structures will be touched upon and what the two structures are and

---

2 [Aleo very tsikalakalan-karena toy izay very tsikalakalam-pihavanana]
mean will be explained in more detail. Communication in school flows both horizontally and vertically.

**Ray aman-dreny, being a “parent”**

As *fihavanana* [kinship], the term *ray aman-dreny* [parents] is commonly used speaking of relations. This research focuses on people having some kind of *leading* responsibility. These people are likely to be addressed, and looked upon, as so-called *ray aman-dreny* [parent]. We will take a closer look at this expression in the following paragraphs.

*Ray* means father and *reny* means mother and *ray aman-dreny* could therefore be translated father and mother - *parents*. Nevertheless, the expression is not only used for those having children, but for all kinds of people whether it is your mother, a great grandfather, your boss or a good friend (Dahl, 1998; Dahl 1999). The title is an honored title and when a person is a *ray aman-dreny* [parent], he or she is often an authority, highly valued and respected. Both genders, regardless of title, may be addressed as a parent (Dahl, 1998; Dahl, 1999). Even a person who is good with words may be titled a *ray aman-dreny* [parent]. The honored title *ray aman-dreny* [parent] is frequently given to elderly people in Madagascar. Elderly people are highly respected and seen as an authority - not to mention the one closest to the ancestors. Their word counts the most in decision-making and their influence is unquestionable. As Bloch (1971b) states, it may be said that this parent-relation is a model for all other relations (as referenced in Razafindralambo, 2005)

The meaning of the relationship between a child and a parent in Madagascar is therefore seen as something more than just the biological link between a father and/or a mother and their child. Knowing about the cultural concept of the *ray aman-dreny* [parent] principle is important to fully understand further presentation of findings and analysis in this research. Teachers and principals interviewed possess positions where they are likely to be addressed as a *ray aman-dreny* [parent] (Dahl, 1998; Dahl, 1999). A saying which reflects some of what lies in the parents- children relation is as follows: “The one who has seniors does not need to speak, the one who has juniors does not need to carry the burdens”\(^4\) (Dahl, 1999, p.84). This reflects that the roles a person plays depends on their age and position. Dahl (1998) elaborates the saying: "It is a parents' duty to speak, mediate, admonish; it is the children's duty to carry
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\(^4\) [Manan-joky, afak’olan-teny; manan-jandry afak olan’entana]
and obey and show respect. The elder is entitled to be honored and must by all means save face” (p.144). Both the elder and the younger have duties: As an elder it is expected that you help the younger when needed. The elder should guide the younger in decision-making, give advice and make the young ones accountable and conscious about what they do. The younger can claim their rights to this when being in situations when advice is needed, for instance to claim the elders’ advice when choosing education. Furthermore, they are to obey the elderly, respect them and carefully listen to their advice.

Another saying goes: “The exhortation of father and mother is like the kick of an ox, if it hits well it may kill you, if it does not hit so well, it could still make you dizzy” (Dahl, 1999). This indicates the importance of your parents’ [using the Malagasy meaning of the word] words and concerns. If you choose not to follow your parents’ recommendations and choose another direction, their words will have affected you somehow anyway. This could, in this research’ setting mean that even if a teacher chose to do something other than that recommended by the principal, s/he might be filled with fear for the consequences of having done so.

Foreigners, like workers representing a charity organization, may often be titled ray amandreny [parent] (Dahl, 1998). If a foreign worker is unfamiliar to the meaning of this word, they may behave inappropriately without being aware of their disrespectful behavior. Norwegian missionaries have worked in Madagascar since 1867 and due to their position and long involvement at the island, many Malagasies automatically associate Norwegians with missionaries and call them ray amandreny [parents]. Malagasies are quick to tell stories about Norwegians they know. As a Norwegian researcher in Madagascar, it is extremely important to have this in mind.

With taboos comes guilt

Another aspect of the culture is what is called fady [taboo] and tsiny [guilt]. The two terms are often related to each other. Guilt is again linked to tody, which is the punishment that follows the tsiny [guilt]. It is not difficult to understand that these are words that are linked to fear. If you do something which is seen as incorrect, you may fear the tsiny [guilt] of it. I have chosen
to describe these words in some depth, since some of the informants mentioned these expressions in the interviews.

The three expressions are all linked together and in all actions a Malagasy tries to avoid making mistakes that can cause *tsiny* [guilt]. If a person does something s/he shouldn’t do, s/he is afraid of the *tody* [punishment] that may come. When you do something wrong and become guilty, you can expect some kind of punishment. Just as much as the punishment can appear immediately, it may wait for generations. You may be punished for something your great-grandfather or another ancestor did. This creates a constant fear or anxiety of being guilty or of being punished. Andriamanjato (1957) writes: “*Tsiny* is understood as guilt or condemnation. It is what you risk when you don’t act in the socially prescribed way or when you fail to keep the customs of the ancestors” (as cited in Dahl, 1998, p.153). Everyone belonging to the culture would know what the right *fomba* [custom, system, method, the way to, how to] is.

### 2.4.2 Communication

The fear of becoming guilty influences how Malagasy people communicate. As expected, people try to avoid conflicts. Harmony is important and humbleness and respect are highly valued. The Malagasy culture is in many ways indirect and you should avoid offending people. When mistakes are made, accidents appear or conflicts arise, it may be difficult to point out the one responsible for the incident – all participants are afraid of the *tsiny* [guilt] (Dahl, 1998; Dahl 1999). Without knowing the different strategies when communicating with Malagasy people, it is difficult, if not impossible, to dig deep into feelings, thoughts and opinions. Because of the reservation of Malagasy people to openly discuss thoughts and feelings, the terms being discussed are important to understand the unspoken ramifications of any interchange.

According to Hall (1976) there are different types of cultures, he distinguishes between high-context culture and low-context culture. In a high-context culture the people’s focus on interpersonal relationships would be the collective, more than the individual. The culture is seen to be intuitive and feelings are important. “A high-context communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (Hall, 1976, p.79). In low-context cultures people focus on facts and logic. The cultures are more individualistic
and action oriented. “A low context communication is just the opposite; i.e., the mass of information is vested in the explicit code” (Hall, 1976, p.79). All communication is influenced by the culture of those communicating. A culture often tends to be more high contextual than low contextual, or the other way around (Hall, 1976). How does this concern the Norwegian culture and the Malagasy culture? Malagasy culture may be seen to be a high-context culture, where people often speak indirectly. They give signals and hints, but things are not said directly. The point is to avoid the point, but still express it in a way that the respondent understands it. Norwegian culture on the other hand may be seen as a country having a low-context culture. What is said should be clear and precise and the less room for misunderstandings, the better. The different tendencies regarding the Norwegian and the Malagasy culture obviously creates room for misunderstandings, insults and frustration. I tried to keep this in mind when I did my research. Being aware of the contrast in the way of phrasing oneself was crucial when I developed the interview guide; especially since the topic was so sensitive.

In his book, Dahl (1998) lists several factors which he sees as contrasts in the Malagasy and the Norwegian culture. The picture he draws is, as he himself states, a bit black and white. Though, they are not “empty” statements and definitely have roots in reality. He compares the Malagasy idea expressed as: “Don’t show/share” your deepest feelings and thoughts” in contrast to the Norwegian value: “Show what you mean and want to achieve” (Dahl, 1998, p.208). This is interesting and worthy a thought when analyzing my findings. While Norwegians would underscore the importance of being individualistic, independent and work-oriented, a Malagasy would emphasize the importance of collective, dependent and peaceful orientation. Instead of solving the problem and moving on, they concentrate on reconstructing the “good relation” and hiding what has been problematic. They would strive to have a fihavanana [kinship] of harmony.

The Malagasy language mirrors some of the indirectness in the Malagasy culture. People may seem very diplomatic in their phrasing and show a lot of solidarity when communicating. The language is moreover full of proverbs, literary pictures and metaphors. For instance masoandro [sun] means the “eye of the day”, airplane is “flying car”, fiaramanidina. When people describe feelings or situations they tend to draw pictures. Sometimes, for a foreigner, it may even be a challenge to understand what a person wants to express when the large verbal pictures are drawn. What is really essential in this poetic picture? When a conversation has a
special purpose you always talk a lot before the core of the conversation is touched upon. And when you do, you (the people communicating) touch it together (Dahl, 1998, p. 202).

As mentioned in the introduction of this subchapter, along with the verbally pictures that are drawn, the language is rich in sayings. The sayings are related to cultural habits, ways of thinking and traditions (Dahl 1998). If you do not know the culture, some sayings may be difficult to understand because you do not know the cultural depth reflected in the actions or sayings. You may understand the saying, but not the depth of it. For example: “Rather crazy, than having a mad wife as mother to the children” (Dahl, 1998, p.150). This saying reflects the mother’s position in the family; traditionally she is responsible for raising the children.

Dahl (1999) writes about how traditionally, and often still, the culture is defined by people avoiding confrontations and arguments. In conducting this research it has been critical to remember these characteristics when asking people about how they react and respond to things they disagree with. There is a saying: “Rather a rickety hut with peace, than a beautiful castle with strife.” Harmony is a value which triumph everything. The fear of tsiny [guilt] is closely related to this, and the thought of disobeying or offending an elder is very serious. People focus on the other’s “face” rather than their own. If there are disagreements, rather than saying things directly, rumors are spread and people talk “behind” each other’s backs. When conflicts arise the elderly have a special responsibility to solve the problems and to arbitrate. In a western culture people use argument to solve problems. In a Malagasy culture, people do not necessarily aim to solve the problem, but they may in a diplomatic way just “cover” it, or agree upon forgetting it. A ray aman-dreny [parent] may ask different parties to calm down and back off, which most likely will be, met by appreciations and thankfulness. It is important to remember that there are local variations and people in general along the coastline are often said to be more direct in their speech and formulations.
3 Theory

Emotions as an aspect and part of educational organizations are not a new phenomenon. However, its importance of it was first shed light on during the 1990s (Milley, 2009; Beatty & Brew, 2004). The myriad of emotions which are found within the educational organizations are a result of the individuals who operate within them. Different individuals take part in each other’s lives and shape and challenge each other’s values and attitudes. People in school explore and develop, they discover and they learn. In such processes, different emotions are represented enthusiasm, joy, happiness, curiosity, excitement, fear, disappointment, guilt and so on and so forth (Milley, 2009; Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2004). As Harris (2007) so cleverly puts it; schools are “powerhouses of emotion” (p.3).

There are different definitions of emotions. Professor George (2000) chose to define emotions as “high intensity feelings that are trigged by specific stimuli (either internal or external to the individual), demand attention, and interrupt cognitive processes and behaviors” (p.1029). With few words George (2000) touches the breadth and complexity of emotions. Emotions are complex; they might as well be constant or changing. They might as well keep your mind busy for a while, or be fleeting, they may be internal or external – or both at the same time. Some choose to distinguish between what a feeling is and what an emotion is. However, in this paper the two terms will be used interchangeably (Fineman, 2003).

3.1 Psychological and sociological perspective

Literature often distinguishes between the psychological perspective and the sociological perspective of emotions. Traditionally, feelings in the field of education have been seen from the psychological perspective, whereas emotions are seen as an internal factor, emphasizing the individual (Zembylas, 2009). Emotions are regarded as individual expressions and responses and are often separated from its context (Blackmore, 2009). Lately, the focus on emotions has changed. Literature in general, tends to focus more on the sociological perspective of emotions. In this perspective, emotions are highly related to its context. The focus is not only on the individual, but on the individual as part of the context in which it operates. Emotions are socially and culturally constructed. They also address how different group-dynamics shape personal emotions (Milley, 2009).
The sociological perspective includes aspects as how emotions can be learned, for instance as part of a culture (Milley, 2009; Hofstede, 1994). Human beings have expectations about what determines appropriate emotional reactions and behaviors. If anything is done differently than expected, people will react. Such expectations differ depending on the culture in which people live (Markus & Kitayama, 1994; Milley, 2009). Cultural expectations determines which emotions that are produced in different situations. Such considerations are all part of the sociological perspective.

3.1.1 Neither individual nor group

Some would underscore how individuals interact with each other and that emotions are neither exclusively part of the individual nor just a result of social structures, but transformative forces. As Miley (2009) formulates it:

> Emotions are trans-formative in that they are not peripheral by-products of events, but rather they are constitutive forces for (trans)forming individuals, social interactions, and power relations. As such, emotions are constitutive of the power relationships of political and cultural exchange among individuals. The allocation of power is manifested in who gets to express and who must repress various emotions. (p.100)

To look at emotions with a mix of the psychological perspective and the sociological perspective (in which Fineman’s perspectives, which will be presented later, are included since they focus on how the emotions arise) may in many ways give the most complete picture of a situation and the emotions within it; seeing them as living transformative forces. When doing so, what Bourke (2006) states about power relations also become clearer: “Emotions such as fear do not belong only to individuals or social groups: They mediate between the individual and the social. They are about power relations“(p.354).

There are many aspects of emotions and various ways to look at them. The heart and the head are connected, and entirely separating one from the other is not possible. In this thesis, analysis and results will reflect different perspectives of emotion, as we will look specifically at fear. Working across the different perspectives, may give the most complete picture of how fear works within the field of education (Jackson, 2010). Emotions influence life as a whole: They influence how people judge, adapt, act, behave, think and cope with, life. Humans may control the emotions, but the emotions may as well control humans (Milley, 2009; Fineman,
To behave appropriately connects people, in contrast to inappropriate behavior which creates distance between people (Milley, 2009). Emotions may well influence a person’s self-esteem, for instance by carrying the feeling of acting inappropriate or doing something wrong (Markus & Kitayama, 1994; Milley, 2009). It may be said that human beings play roles in a social theater: There are certain rules that “should” be followed and some scenes where you have to suppress what you really feel (Goffman, 1959). The “ideas about emotions are both culturally and historically specific; there is often an ideological character to them that is connected to specific power relations” (Miley, 2003, 67). Some of these power relations will be touched upon when answering the research questions of this paper. In the following chapter will take a closer look at the emotion fear, which is the focal point of this thesis.

3.1.2 Fear

Psychological perspective

As mentioned, looking at emotions one may use the psychological perspective or the sociological perspective. When using the psychological perspective, fear is defined as one of seven primary emotions. It is seen as something biological and “typically used to increase reproduction and triggers behavior with high survival value (for example, fear brings about a fight-or-flight response)” (Schmidt, 2009, p.150). Fear is powerful in the sense that it is driven by the survival instinct and some would state that some fear is necessary in life to survive. When under control, fear may protect humans from danger and enable endurance through tough times. Ylander & Larsson-Lindman (1984) call this the “good fear” (p.35). On the other hand one might argue that fear is a powerful force which controls and limits individuals from fully reaching their potential; it may damage more than it helps. It has the ability to paralyze and prevent people from coping with issues that arise, blocking the ability to use common sense and think clearly (Schmidt, 2009; Rachman, 1990). The opposite of good is bad, so this type of fear may be called the bad fear. The consequences of fear depend on how people cope with them, which again depends on people’s age and previous experience with different situations (Rachman, 1990; Schmidt, 2009).
**Sociological perspective**

When using the sociological perspective, fear is not just a biological phenomenon. It may for instance be learned by looking at others, or transmitted by seeing other people’s reactions (Bandura, 1977). As previously addressed, seen from a sociological perspective, emotions are part of the context in which they arise. Hence, the cultural and social context in which humans operate may shape a person’s fear. External phenomena may cause the feeling of fear. Testing in schools is perhaps what has been discussed most recently in literature related to education and fear. Other examples of what may cause fear are lack of trust, lack of competence, imbalanced power relations, unstable systems etc. (Schmidt, 2009).

**Definition**

Reading literature and articles about fear, it appears that some do not define fear at all, even though their main topic and concern is fear. A lot of authors may take it for granted that fear is a well-known phenomenon and term, without any need for a definition. Others may try to define it, but find it too difficult since the term is wide and contains a lot of different “types of fear.” It may be said that due to the different reactions fear cause, it is difficult to define it scientifically.

Fear will mainly be looked at from a sociological perspective in this thesis, as context and culture play a significant role. The definition of fear is constructed by using elements from different theories of fear. Many of the theories have similarities and include common factors about fear. This research looks both at the micro level (individual) as well as the macro-level (context). The reason for joining different definitions and including different perspectives of the phenomena is to make sure that no perspectives concerning fear which may appear in the findings are excluded. As a focus for the research and a method of quantifying the responses of the sources fear is defined as: *The emotion troubling someone, caused by the thought of the outcome of a real or an imagined situation; the thought of the (possible) consequences. Furthermore, it is an emotion caused by real pain, loss, threat or danger. Finally, it may be described as an emotion blended with awe* (Rachman, 1990; Rachman, 1998; Schmidt, 2009; Bay & Algase, Bandura, 1977; Ylander & Larsson-Lindman, 1984).

Some choose to distinguish between fear and anxiety where fear often is seen as an emotion for which the source is fairly easy to identify. The feeling is intense, often episodic, and its
consequences are easy to spot (Rachman, 1998; Bay & Algase, 1999, Steimer, 2002; Jackson, 2010). Anxiety on the other hand, may last longer, be less intense, the source of it may be more diffuse and difficult to identify. It may even be an unconscious state of mind (Rachman, 1998; Bay & Algase, 1999; Steimer, 2002; Jackson, 2010). In this thesis however, the terms will be used interchangeably. Even theorists that try to line up clear borders between the terms find it difficult as they overlap in some areas and some would say the borders are more blurred than clear (Jackson, 2010).

3.2 Dimensions

Even though fear is one of the primary emotions, it is difficult to isolate due to its complexity. Other emotions may operate at the same time and the degree and form of fear may vary as it has different dimensions temporal, relational and spatial (Blackmore, 2009). Fear does not need to be something which arises suddenly and disappears just as soon as it arose. It can develop over time in the closeness or distance between individuals in a certain place.

3.2.1 Source of fear

Fineman (2003) roughly presents four emotion perspectives which all say something about how emotions arise. Looking at fear, these different perspectives will be touched upon. The biological perspective is linked to the history of the human being; how emotions are part of a person’s nature. The body has developed a neural system which responds to experiences (Fineman, 2003). The second perspective is early experiences emotions (Fineman, 2003). History develops, influences and shapes people. We are all marked by and are a result of our past. Sometimes present episodes may wake up feelings related to episodes experienced in the past. People may be able to identify the origin of the feeling, but again they may not be able to, as it happens unconsciously. The third perspective is linked to how humans appraise feelings. The cognitive appraisal perspective focuses on how an emotion first makes sense when it is thought about (Fineman, 2003). Finally, Fineman’s (2003) forth perspective concerns what matters in social life. Emotion as social refers to what is learned and adapted from the context in which a person is. What is considered private? What is public? What is appropriate behavior and what is inappropriate? All these things are influenced by the overall culture in a certain place and emotions may be said to be socially constructed.
3.2.2 Hofstede’s cultural dimensions

Geert Hofstede published a book in 1991 presenting a Cultural Dimension Theory. His theory is based on research done in the period from 1967 to 1973. Hofstede did his research within a big multinational corporation called International Business Machines (IBM). He conducted surveys and did interviews worldwide in the corporation’s local subsidiaries. In total he collected data from more than 70 countries (Hofstede, 1994). His work got a lot of attention and the cultural dimensions he came up with are often used as framework for research regarding cross-cultural communication and corporation. Hofstede’s theory is interesting in this research as it is fairly easy to place Madagascar within his dimensions and shed light on the rationale behind the participant’s replies. It highlights how culture plays a significant role when studying communication also within the educational field, with fear as focus.

Multicultural environment

Among IBM’s employees many different nationalities are represented. The fact that they all work under the same conditions, but have different nationalities, made the place perfect for Hofstede’s study. Hofstede (1994) states that notwithstanding the enormous differences between cultures and the way people act and think there are some structures that may be used as a common platform for communication and comprehension. As a result of his research he placed countries in groups based on similarities and tendencies in cultural behavior, attitudes and values. After his first study four dimensions were constructed, later a fifth dimension was added. Michael Harris Bond was the main person behind the fifth dimension, though his study was supported by Hofstede. More recently even a sixth dimension has been added. This dimension was based on research done by Professor Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010)

The six dimensions are: Power distance index (PDI), individualism versus collectivism (IDV), masculinity versus femininity (MAS), uncertainty avoidance index (UAI), long-term orientation versus short-term normative orientation (LTO), and the last one called indulgence versus restraint (IND).

The dimensions will briefly be explained here. Further aspects of the dimensions relevant for the thesis will be studied more into detail in the discussion chapter, related to the findings of the research.
Power distance index (PDI)

Power distance index is about how power is distributed; it “informs us about dependence relationships in a country” (Hofstede, 1994, p. 27). Power is distributed unequally in a society and PDI shows how those with less power both expect and accept these differences. There are two types of societies: High power distance societies and low power distance societies. People in a low power distance society will experience that the distance between a person high in the society’s hierarchy (i.e. a boss) and a person lower in the hierarchy (i.e. an employee) is small. They talk freely and the decision-making at the higher level is often based on opinions and reflections from the lower level (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede, 2011). In other words, despite distance in position, the power differences are balanced out by consultation and reflections across the levels and the emotional distance between the different levels is quite small (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Such a society is reckoned by so-called interdependence (Hofstede, 1994, p.27.) The employee would easily go to the boss if there are disagreements or opinions about a certain issue. The opposite of the low power distance societies are societies with a high power distance. In such countries the differences between the levels in the hierarchy are clear. Decisions are made at the top levels of the hierarchy and the role of those obtaining a lower position in the hierarchy is to obey (Hofstede, 2011). Those lower in the hierarchy would often state that they prefer this way of decision-making, top–down, or they would state the total opposite. People in high power distance societies know the structures and the different positions people ought to have. For a person to confront and disagree with a person higher in the hierarchy is rare. The society may be said to be reckoned by a negative dependence, so-called counterdependence (Hofstede, 1994, p.27).

Individualism versus collectivism (IDV)

This dimension concerns relations as well, but at another level. The dimension describes how some societies underscore the individual, while other underscores the collective – the group. In societies which Hofstede (1994) calls individualists, people are expected to take care of themselves and those closest to them; their closest family (p.50). To learn how to be independent and have an identity as a single individual is important. The network surrounding the individual is loose (Hofstede, 2011). The opposite of the individualist society is what Hofstede (1994) calls the collectivist society (p.50). In a collectivist society loyalty within a group is very important and people (within a group) are expected to take care of each other. The network in which a person operates is tight and the relations strong. “A group” may in
this case refer to a family, as well a football-club, an organization or people from a specific department in a company. The group’s interests are what are important and they overshadow those of the individual (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

**Masculinity versus femininity (MAS)**

In general some values tend to be seen as more feminine or more masculine or the opposite way around, but what values that are regarded feminine and what are seen as masculine, and how the values are distributed, differ from country to country (Hofstede, 2011). In this dimension the society is what is being reckoned as either feminist or masculine. In a feminine society values such as being tender, taking care of others, focusing on relations and cooperation are important. The quality of life is underscored. Societies that are put in the category of masculinity are more competition oriented. Goals, achievement and heroism are what are central (Hofstede, 1994 - Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

**Uncertainty avoidance index (UAI)**

An Uncertainty avoidance index is determined by the extent people “feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situation;” e.g. how does the society tolerate it (Hofstede 1994, p.113; Hofstede, 2011). This is what UAI is all about. The future is unsure and people deal with it in different ways. Law, religion and technology are all factors that in different ways help people to cope with uncertainty. A feeling of uncertainty may be personal as well as collective. Countries which score high on the UAI are more addicted to codes, fixed behaviors and principles and what is new and different tend to be threatening, while countries that score low on the UAI are more open to new ideas and unpredictable events and “norms are often expressed in basic terms, like being honest and polite, but allowing a wide range of personal interpretation as to what this means in a given case” (Hofstede, 1994, p. 118-119; Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010)

**Long-term orientation versus short-term normative orientation (LTO)**

Societies tend to behave differently when it comes to how to adapt to development, present and future. The societies which are long-term oriented, tend to focus on the future and regulate the present to allow for what they think may be the future (i.e. market interests) (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). They are more pragmatic and embrace development and change;
relationships depend on status (Hofstede, 2011). Short-term normative orientation focuses more on near future and maintenance of what exists here and now. Norms and traditions are a safe base and the process of changing them are (if ever likely) very time consuming. Social change is regarded with skepticism and one ought to “protect one’s face” (Hofstede, 2011, p.13). A person that does not change is regarded a good person; stability is highly valued (Hofstede, 2011).

**Indulgence versus restraint (IND)**

The last and most recent dimension reflects an aspect of society that the other dimensions do not touch. It is all about happiness and how that is accepted in the society. As Hofstede (2011) describes it, restraint is “a society that controls gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms” (p.15). The opposite pole is indulgence which represents “a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun” (p.15). People in an indulgent country are more likely to say that they are happy than people in a restrained country. Freedom of speech is an example which is likely to be valued and its importance underscored in an indulgent country, while it would not be of the same importance in a restrained country.

### 3.3 Luhmann and power

Niklas Luhmann is one of several theorists who have concerned themselves with the phenomenon of power. Theorists differ in how they define power and how they focus on this phenomenon. Luhmann’s theory is of interest for this thesis as he links it to communication. His theory is included as it will be discussed later in relation to the findings on power relations and fear among teachers and principals in schools. An article written by researcher, sociologist and author Trygve Gulbrandsen, is frequently used as source in this chapter, as Gulbrandsen manages to explain Luhmann’s complex theory in an understandable way. Gulbrandsen also lists that which he finds difficult in Luhmanns theory, something which is mentioned in the subchapter 3.4 Critical remarks.

#### 3.3.1 Niklas Luhmann

Luhmann was educated as a lawyer, but started to take an interest in sociology in his late 30s. He is often called a social system theorist (Bechmann, G., & Stehr, N., 2002). Luhmann wrote
more than sixty books and his main goal within the field of sociology was to develop a universal system theory (Mortensen, 1999). In his book *Macht* (1975), he explores, explains and analyses the phenomenon *power*. Luhmann was inspired by Parson, and Luhmann’s work is more or less based on Parson’s thoughts. Sociologist Parson defined power as the force for fulfillment. He focused on how power made people carry out reciprocal duties (Gulbrandsen, 1999). However, in Luhmann’s theory power is considered a “medium of communication”. (Gulbrandsen, 1999, p.134)

**System theory**

How Luhmann reflects upon the phenomenon of power must be seen in relation with how he sees society. In Luhmann’s development of universal system theory, he emphasize how society consists of several sub-systems which are all different types of communication systems (Gibson, 2013). The systems may be biological, sociological, psychological etc. (Gulbrandsen, 1999; Bechmann & Stehr, 2002). One way of categorizing Luhmann’s systems is by dividing them into three categories: Autopoietic, interactions and organizations. *Autopoietic systems* are systems which reproduce themselves, for instance economy. *Interactions* are interactions among people. They are often limited in time, such as an appointment with a counselor in the bank or a face to face conversation with a friend. *Organizations*, the third category, is often rule-bound and structured in some kind of hierarchy, such as a primary school (Gibson, 2013). Luhmann distinguishes between the systems and what *surrounds* the systems. He further claims that the systems aim at sustaining the divide between the systems and their surroundings. Obviously there is communication within and across these systems and power becomes visible in this communication. As Luhmann points out, power makes the communication less complex. In this thesis, power relations hovering in Luhmann’s different categories of systems will be looked at. Luhmann is of the opinion that social systems are communication systems (Gulbrandsen, 1999)

On the one hand one may say that the systems are separate from each other, independent, in the sense that each of them has their own particular norms to follow. On the other hand, the different systems combine to create bigger networks, which again are distinct from their surroundings. All the different systems make up what we call society (Gulbrandsen, 1999). The fact that the systems are independent creates thoughts concerning the other system’s responses towards “your” system. Another system’s reaction to what “your” system achieves
and does can create uncertainty. Is the reaction the same or different? This creates unpredictability. How do the systems relate and respond to each other? The complexity of the surroundings of the systems creates additional uncertainty. Due to this complexity and uncertainty, sub-systems often make structures and procedures within their own systems. By being more organized, creating a contrast to the surroundings, the systems aim at reducing the complexity. Being a well-organized system makes it is easier to cope with the complex surroundings. Expressions as well as categories are made to make things easier. As mentioned above; power works as a medium of communication to reduce what is experienced as complex (Gulbrandsen, 1999; Luhmann, 1979)

One may say that Luhmann aims to accomplish is examine what makes life in society easier. He studies the basic mechanisms and phenomenon of society such as different structures, connections and communication. They may for instance be symbolic structures as well as social structures. Power is one such phenomenon which Luhmann highlights. Power is by Luhmann seen as a factor benefitting social life (Gulbrandsen, 1999; Luhmann, 1979)

**Power**

Niklas Luhmann writes about power as a force influencing the behavior and decision-making of people who are somehow related. Power is a phenomenon that will either prevent action or provoke it (Luhmann, 1979; Gulbrandsen, 1999). What characterizes his view on power is that a person B would make a decision that s/he would not necessary have made based on what person A has done or what s/he believes is what person A wants. The decision person B makes may not necessarily be what s/he ideally would have chosen. S/he bases his/her choice on person A. A pre-condition for this is that both A and B have alternatives to choose from. The reasoning behind B’s choice concerns the potential negative consequences that may follow and which person A has communicated or signalized to person B. (Luhmann, 1979; Gulbrandsen, 1999). Power is in other words, as mentioned in the introduction, communication. The basis for power is often negative sanctions that person A is capable of carrying out in the relation to person B. Such sanctions are not often clearly stated; person B imagines what may be the consequences. As can be expected one may say that A is indirectly the one deciding what B is choosing due to threats being signaled or said between the lines. This may for instance be increasing a person’s load of work if something is, or is not, done. The more rules, principles, criteria, structures etc. there are, the less room there is for
fulfillment of such sanctions created in the power relations between people. However, as systems frequently interact with one another and create bigger networks, the more complex the relations become. The systems are all part of a bigger network where one is depended on benefits from one another. Thinking through all possible alternatives in every situation where a choice has to be made, is exhausting and impossible; Luhmann therefore presented his theory of generalization of symbols, which will be examined further. (Luhmann, 1979; Gulbrandsen,1999).

**Generalization of symbols**

Luhmann (1979) writes a lot about generalization of symbols. He explains the generalization as “…a generalization of meaningful orientations, which makes it possible to stick to an identical meaning when faced with different partners in different situations, in order to draw the same, or similar, conclusions” (p. 127). He further defines symbols or symbolic codes as: “…a very complexly structures interaction-situation expressed in simplified form and, in this way, experienced as a unit” (p.128).

According to Luhmann there is a universal generalization of symbols, which means that people would understand certain symbols, independent of their culture, context, background or situation (Gulbrandsen 1999; Luhmann, 1979). These symbols are said to be universal because they are coded in a specific way. Symbols represent something else and by considering these symbols, people can more easily make decisions. They do not need to think of every aspect of an alternative choice - they understand the symbols. These function as a shortcut to decision-making. In a relationship where A and B are both involved, power in itself is a code as both parts see two alternatives when a choice is to be made. Luhmann (1979) writes about this duplication when there is an interaction between a power-holder (A) and a power-subject (B). “In each case it opens up the situation for two courses, according to, or against, the intent of the power-holder.” (p.129)

**The coded symbols of power**

According to Luhmann (1979), the symbols are coded in a specific way, which allows people to recognize them. Some of these coded symbols of power are of interest for this thesis. One of them is *hierarchies*. A hierarchy indicates that people are arranged in a certain order where power is not equally distributed. Luhmann underscores that a “hierarchy saves measuring
power, and, especially, struggles to clarify unclear relationships.” (Luhmann, 1979, p.140)

Power may easily be spotted in a hierarchy; for instance looking at the description of the different positions within an organization. Titles within a hierarchy may reflect a person’s position and power. Another code from Luhmann’s work on power is terms. Every language includes terms and expressions that obviously reflect people’s power such as those related to talent, strength, position etc. (Gulbrandsen, 1999). A third code that Luhmann writes about is the fact that some positions in society are well-established and have certain status or function, which may include sanctions. (Gulbrandsen, 1999) names this status- and functions positions.” An example of this is the police who clearly have the power to use different sanctions. These are sanctions that people are fully aware of and know about. Luhmann also mentions the history of a specific system or the tradition of a certain system in relation to power. By looking at previous stories, conflicts, power struggles, people may draw conclusions and assumptions about how things will develop or be responded to within a certain system. These symbols might influence people to respond differently in relation to power than what they would have done if they were unaware of them (Gulbransen, 1999; Luhmann, 1979). Closely related to this, is the idea of episodes, which demonstrates power done by specific persons; episodes can create images for certain persons and rumors of how one is likely to respond and act, rumors of power demonstrations. These episodes easily become examples of “how it is,” and highlighted as lessons to learn from.

The symbols direct communication among people. In an interaction, people will understand what is said and expected without it being clearly stated and pronounced, and without any detailed analysis of how the power relation exists (Gulbransen, 1999). People may behave based on what they think is expected and wanted. They may act according to what they believe may be the possible consequences to come. As Luhmann (1979) states: “The power-holder does not even have to command, for even his unuttered orders are obeyed” (p. 130). The symbols simplify the communication by reducing the further analysis of power.

### 3.4 Critical remarks

The two main theories presented in this chapter are Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions and Luhmann’s theory of generalized codes. As with all theories they have their weaknesses and strengths. When using theory as framework in a research, it is important to know of the main critique made concerning the theories.
It is worth mention that Luhmann uses the term *power* on several issues, for instance, both as a code and as a medium of communication. This is confusing for many, and it may be difficult to understand what he means by the terms. I have chosen Gulbrandsen’s (1999) understanding of the phenomena: The generalized codes are not power themselves, but they are instruments in order to use power. Gulbrandsen (1999) further critiques Luhmann’s description of the code of power. Luhmann writes about the generalized symbols of power and that these symbols have codes. It is unclear what these codes are. Gulbrandsen (1999) gives an analysis and proposition of how the concepts in this research may be understood. However, the fact that it is difficult to understand is worthy of criticism.

A further critique of whose theory is the question of the extent to which symbols of power may be generalized. In answer, the context in which a situation appears matters. People within one organization may benefit from previous episodes in that organization, but the same situation may look completely different in another context or organization. Besides, Luhmann’s analysis is weak when it comes to the fact that power is influenced by the person’s having it. A power-subject (B) may misunderstand the signals from the power-holder (A) and the outcome of situations may be different than expected. The hierarchy is marked by those in it, it do not operate vacuum; what I have suggested in this comment is that the power relations may be formed by the interests of those in power. However, as Luhmann’s theory suits the research and he is a well-known and acknowledged theorist, I have chosen to include his theory.

Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory is not without critique either. McSweeney (2002) is one of the authors most known for his critique of Hofstede’s theory. He argues that the fact that Hofstede conducted his research within one organization weakens the theory. He claims that the national differences would not be as distinct within one organization, as choosing participants from different organizational contexts. The organizational culture influences the persons who operate within it. Additionally, McSweeney (2002) critiques the narrowness of informants in Hofstede’s sampling; he claims that there are not enough informants. Hofstede is open about the lack of responses to some of his questionnaires, but firmly claims that there is enough evidence to draw conclusions. Other critiques of Hofstede’s theory often concern how he conceptualizes culture. Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (1994) argue that Hofstede equates “culture” to “nation”, and they argue that Hofstede presents culture as something static instead of dynamic. As McSweeney writes (2002): “If the aim is understanding then we
need to know more about the richness and diversity of national practices and institutions – rather than merely assuming their ‘uniformity…’” (p. 112). The different critiques of Hofstede’s model have again received critique.

All in all, critical remarks of theories could highlight important issues and set some warnings of what to be aware of. Still, as Hofstede’s research is highly valued and used within the field of cultural comparative research, I have decided to use his theory in this research.
4 Methodology

In this chapter, the research paradigm, methodological choices made in different phases of the research as well as the rationale behind them, will be presented. Additionally, issues related to reliability, validity and ethics will be examined. To ensure what processes and procedures should be followed in social research, methodology is important. Not only will it guide the choice of the most suitable strategies, design, data collection methods etc. for research, it also helps to justify the reason behind the choices (Bryman, 2012).

4.1 Research paradigm

Burrell and Morgan (1979) argue that there are two major dimensions in social science; an objective dimension and a subjective dimension. Furthermore, they distinguish between four paradigms in social theory: functionalist paradigm, radical structuralist, radical humanist and the interpretive paradigm. These different paradigms indicate different world views and social research ought to be placed within one of these paradigms (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

This particular research follows the subjective strand and is located within the interpretive paradigm. In this paradigm the world is understood through the experiences and thoughts of the human beings. The social world is identified as a social process, created by those living in it. The focus is to understand the “social world as it is, in terms of an ongoing process” (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p.31). This paradigm is appropriate for this research, as it aims to examine peoples experience and their thoughts on a contemporary issue or an ongoing process. This research aims to better understand people’s behavior related to fear at their workplace. (Burrell and Morgan, 1979)

The functionalist paradigm was not chosen as it is often used in research concerning organizations. It is characterized by the testing of hypothesis, by for instance; understanding of organizational behavior and where rational human action is examined. It did not suit this research as little was known beforehand, and the testing of hypotheses was not relevant. Burrell and Morgan (1979) state that within the paradigm, which is rooted in sociological positivism, one “tends to assume that the social world is composed of relatively concrete empirical artefacts and relationships which can be identified, measured through approaches derived from the natural sciences” (p. 29).
The radical humanist paradigm differs from the functionalist paradigm in that it tends to be anti-organization and focuses on how human potential fully can be released and free from all social constraints. The paradigm claims that human beings are surrounded by ideological superstructures which control their consciousness. The result of this is a distance between the human being and his/her true consciousness, often called a wedge. This cognitive wedge “is the wedge of ‘alienation’ or ‘false consciousness’, which inhibits or prevents true human fulfilment.” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p.32).

The focus of the radical structuralist paradigm is again different from the three other paradigms and underscores how conflicts are a natural part of society and that society changes radically through political and economic crises. This paradigm has a realist view of the social world, and “seeks to provide explanations of the basic interrelationships within the context of total social formations” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 34). This paradigm was not relevant because it neither fits the research question nor the purpose of the study; change due to crises and total social formations is not a focus in this study.

Different research strategies follow different philosophical assumptions as to how the social world should be observed. The basic principles and philosophical assumptions may assist the researcher in his/her work and give a perspective on how a phenomenon should be studied. The qualitative approach and the quantitative approach are the major strategies used in social research. Mixed methods, combining the two strategies, is a third strategy (Bryman, 2012). While the quantitative strategy mainly follows the objectivist strand, the qualitative strategy follows the subjectivist strand. The strategy chosen for this project is addressed in the section which follows.

4.2 Research strategy

This research project follows the qualitative research strategy and the nature of the qualitative strategy may be difficult to define precisely. There are several reasons for this (Bryman, 2012). First and foremost, the qualitative strategy seems to include a number of research designs which differ significantly from one another. Secondly, qualitative strategy tends to be an inductive method; theory is created based on findings. This differs from the quantitative research where theory often forms the basis of the research (Bryman, 2012).
When using the qualitative strategy I used so-called *sensitizing concepts* (Bryman, 2012, p.388). These are concepts from literature and theory which give general ideas and thoughts about topics. These may work as guidelines while collecting the data. When analyzing the data some of the concepts may prove to be applicable, while others not (Bryman, 2012). I tried to make my research as inductive as possible, by being open to my informants, although I had sensitizing concepts and some theories in mind when entering the field.

In a quantitative study the researcher would focus more on already established theories and hypothesis before the research starts. As my aim was to obtain the participants’ experiences, thoughts and opinions on my topic, the qualitative strategy seemed the most appropriate choice as the perspective of the participants is the focus in qualitative research (Kvale, 2009). Obtaining solid and rich data is typical for qualitative research and I wanted comprehensive and rich data which describes how something is, more than the reason for it (Dalen, 2004). Had I chosen a quantitative strategy, it could have been difficult to compose questions which would provide me with the answers needed to solve the research questions, especially as there is lack of knowledge concerning the phenomenon fear. As the aim of this research was not to compile statistics a qualitative strategy was the most suitable. A mixed method strategy could have been an option. In that case, I could have included quantitative research methods in addition to the interviews and hopefully been able to develop some statistics which could underscore discoveries from the interviews. However, this was not considered as I wanted to explore the concept of fear in-depth. The qualitative strategy allows the freedom for the theory to be created as the study proceeds. As there is a lack of theory and knowledge concerning the topic of the research (fear in education), it was a good starting point to have some ideas about theory, but wait for the participants’ answers before analyzing and deciding upon what literature and theory were relevant for the research. As large amounts of data and broad conclusions about a social phenomenon characterize the qualitative strategy it seemed best for this study (Cresswell, 2011).

### 4.3 Design

The design of a study shows how you choose to structure your research and analyze your data, how you approach it (Bryman, 2012). Here, a case-study design was chosen. In a case study; a phenomenon is studied extensively in its context (Yin, 2009). The main reason for choosing this design was because the research looks at a *contemporary* phenomenon, fear.
Separating this phenomenon from its context, the Malagasy culture, would make the research inaccurate. There are several types of research designs; historical, experimental, surveys and case-study are just some of them. Choosing a history design I would need to focus on a phenomenon and the historical aspect of it, something which was of no interest in this study. Experimental design on the other hand, often focuses on a phenomenon without looking at the context in which it is found. In this study it would be difficult, if even possible, to separate fear from its context. I could not choose the experimental design, although a survey could look at the context as well as phenomenon. However, by using a survey the context would likely not be investigated thoroughly, which was something I wanted to do (Yin, 2009).

As far as the research design is considered, there are different types of case-study designs. One often distinguishes between the explanatory, exploratory and descriptive design (Yin, 2009; Babbie, 2013). In this particularly research, the case-study has an exploratory design. The exploratory design is intended to “explore for discovery” (Davies, 2006). This means that it aims at expanding knowledge concerning a topic where the amount of existing literature is limited (Babbie, 2013). The research will hopefully explore areas for further research. An explanatory design differs from the exploratory in that it aims to explain what is being studied and often focuses on the cause-effect. Furthermore, a descriptive design would give descriptions and seek to get more information about a phenomenon and its settings (Yin, 2009; Babbie, 2013). A descriptive design could have been chosen but as my study seeks to result in more than descriptions; the exploratory design seemed the most suitable.

Yin (2009) also categorizes case-studies as holistic case-studies, single case-studies and multiple- case studies. This is a holistic single case-study where fear is the unique situation in the setting of the Malagasy Lutheran School. The teachers and the principals are embedded sub-units. For a study to be a multiple-case study, the context for each case should be different, which is not the case in this study: The teachers and the principals operate in the same context (Baxter, 2008; Yin, 2009). They occupy different positions and will be compared: Hence, the study is a comparative case-study.
4.4 Data collection methods

4.4.1 Interview

There are several types of interviews. In qualitative research the interviews are either fairly structured with a clear focus, often referred to as semi-structured interviews, or more open, so-called unstructured interviews (Dalen, 2004; Bryman, 2012). The semi-structured interview was chosen as the main data collection method in this research. Before entering the field, I developed an interview-guide which would help me obtain the information needed to answer my research questions. The interview-guide would enable the researcher to follow with broad questions, possible subjects and prompts to set the agenda and lead the conversation (Bryman, 2012; Dalen, 2004). Before making the interview-guide, I conferred with Malagasy people and asked for advice on how best to approach the topic. These were all Malagasies who knew both western and Malagasy culture and could tell me if any of my thoughts would be unclear for my informants. The interview-guide changed slightly after a couple of pilot interviews, but these changes were not noteworthy and mainly concerned the phrasing of questions, not the content of the interview (see Appendix 4 and 5). The interview guides were almost the same for the principals and the teachers. The semi-structured interviews gave me a structure, but still allowed me to follow up on interesting matters that came up during the interviews. Finally, another reason for choosing semi-structured interviews is related to the Malagasy culture being a culture where direct speech is rare (Dahl, 1998; Dahl, 1999). The ability to slowly narrow in the focus of the interview was therefore extremely important. A structured interview could limit the informants as they might wait for the next question, instead of taking the lead and sharing what is on their mind. This could possibly be a weakness in some interview settings. All things considered, I believe semi-structured interviews to be the most suitable method for this research as it provided me with a framework where the combination of structure and flexibility was balanced.

In an unstructured interview the interview is rather conversational (Bryman, 2012). The topic of the research makes the framework, the researcher asks few questions and the interview proceeds as the informants lead the way. The researcher may have some keywords to touch upon, but the content in two interviews may end up being completely different due to the lack of structure. I could have run unstructured interviews in this research, as unstructured interviews could have opened up for unexpected information adding to the limited knowledge
of the topic. However, keeping to the topic would have been a big challenge due to the way people phrase themselves in Madagascar. Furthermore, it could have been difficult to get to the core of the research, as informants often led the conversation in unstructured interviews. Moreover, unstructured interviews may be perceived as less serious and more informal, which also could have been a risk in obtaining the principal’s approval of the interviews. If the paper I showed them only contained a couple of keywords, I may not have been given the permission to do research.

**Type of questions**

The questions I posed were mainly open-ended questions as these enabled exploration of new areas and allowed the informants to bring up issues I had not thought of beforehand. Some of the follow-up questions often included alternatives and became, in that sense, more closed/directed. Some informants came up with alternatives to the one I had mentioned, which was both surprising and interesting. Furthermore, some *vignette questions* were posed. Vignette questions are descriptions of scenarios inquiring how a person would react or respond if a certain situation arose (Bryman, 2012). These scenarios were made after conversations with Malagasy teachers and principals concerning their daily work in school. The vignette questions proved useful: I saw that they had a calming effect on the participants as they had scenarios which were realistic and showed that I knew something about their daily life, and what kind of situations they could meet. In many ways it helped develop a trusting relationship.

All in all, the interview-guide included what are called *introducing questions* (i.e. the participants tell about themselves), *follow-up questions* (i.e. allows participants to elaborate further on an issue), *probing questions* (i.e. following up on previous issues mentioned during the interview), *specifying questions* (i.e. asks about a participant’s reactions and/or feelings to something), *direct questions* and *indirect questions*, *structuring questions* (i.e. tells the participant what to continue with), *interpreting questions* (i.e. questions which challenge the informant or ask him/her for confirmation) and silence (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, p. 147-149; Bryman, 2012, p.476-478)
4.4.2 Questionnaire

As a second data collection method, a questionnaire was made (see Appendix 6). This was an open questionnaire containing a couple of questions which the informants received after the interview. Talking about fear may be frightening for some, as they would necessarily need to share inner thoughts about what causes fear and what s/he fears. Therefore, as the topic was sensitive, I wanted to give the informants a second chance to share whatever they had had in mind, in case they had been afraid of sharing anything during the interview, or forgotten to tell something or just preferred doing it in written. The Malagasy culture being indirect (ref. Chapter 2) was also a reason that made me strive to reach the informants by different methods. The intention was to use the questionnaire as a supplement to the interview. However, no one actually responded to the questionnaire. Only one participant returned it and this informant did not answer the questionnaire, but begged for money. Still the questionnaire had an effect: Instead of filling out the paper, people started to talk again when they read the questionnaire. In other words, the questionnaire had a function, though different from what I had intended. The questionnaire prolonged the interview and made the conversation a bit richer.

4.4.3 Language and assistant

The interviews were done in Malagasy, a language I speak. When conducting the interviews, I had a Malagasy assistant who took detailed notes during the interviews. Importantly she was oriented to the purpose of the study and the research questions before entering the field, and the interview-guide and the questionnaire were thoroughly explained. My assistant was a young, female teacher in the public school. She had participated in similar social research before and was well acquainted with the various procedures and challenges. Moreover, being a teacher she was familiar with the terms and the abbreviations the informants used in the interviews. To the informants she was presented as a secretary who would take notes and help out if there were any confusion. When an interview was finished, we (my assistant and I) reviewed the interview. Gestures, mimic, reactions, answers and stories shared was discussed and reflected upon. These reflections and things observed during the interviews were also noted and became a valuable data source when analyzing the interviews. All the interviews were recorded and then transcribed by me and/or another assistant. The assistant who helped in the transcribing, has done a large amount of transcribing and translating work, both for the
Malagasy government, international organizations and in other research projects. Friends had put me in contact with this person.

4.5 Research sites

The fieldwork was done in Madagascar. When being encouraged to go abroad, Madagascar was a simple choice because of my personal interest and knowledge about the island. Because of my previous work in Madagascar, it was fairly easy for me to get in contact with the Malagasy Lutheran Church School Department and ask for permission to do research. The National Leader for the Malagasy Lutheran Church Schools provided me with the names of possible schools to visit.

Digni has been involved in different types of development projects in Madagascar for many years. Therefore, before entering the field I contacted them to talk about the topic of my research and ask for their advice, tips and suggestions concerning my fieldwork. Some of the Malagasy Lutheran Schools are part of a development program called ProVert, financed by the Norwegian Government through Digni. After talking to Digni I decided to focus on schools involved in this project. There were three reasons for this: First of all, I found it safe to interview informants who worked in a school I knew was well functioning. Second, choosing schools within one program limited the differences between the schools in terms of structure, focus and courses the employees had been to etc. Finally, Digni found the topic relevant, as they had run into the issue in their work in Madagascar. This was confirmed when I talked to some of my previous colleagues working in the field of education in Madagascar.

When the national leader provided me with a list of schools my first criterion was that the schools had to be part of the ProVert-program. My second criterion was to choose schools in the highland where I know the dialect well. This would ensure that I comprehended the information being revealed in the interviews. Appendix 1 shows the geographical map of the area where the interviews were collected.

---

6 “Digni is an umbrella organisation for the long-term development-work for 20 Norwegian mission organizations and churches. Digni... annually receives 180 million NOK (Norwegian Krone) from Norad, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation. The money is distributed to about 120 development projects. Digni checks that money are spent right, and ensures that projects are performing well.” (Digni, 2016)
4.6 Sampling

In this research there have been two levels of sampling: First, the selection of the schools, second, the selection of the pedagogical staff: teachers and principals. Sampling refers to the selection of what and whom to include in a research study. In a qualitative research an indicator of the sample should be found in the research questions (Bryman, 2012). This section further presents the sampling that was done in this research and the rationale behind it.

At the first level of sampling, the National Leader of the Malagasy Lutheran Church Schools provided me with names of schools where I could conduct interviews. As already mentioned, I thereafter selected schools that as much as possible were within the ProVert- program and in the highlands where I know the dialect. All things considered, the schools were selected purposefully (Bryman, 2012). Purposive sampling is common within qualitative research and means that the sampling is not done randomly. It aims at selecting that which best may give the data to answer the research questions of the study. There are several types of purposive sampling. At the first level of sampling in this research I strived to do a so called criterion sampling. This means a sample guided by certain predetermined criteria, which in this case was to be a participant in the ProVert project and speak the dialect I know (Patton, 1990).

The second level of the sampling was a so-called convenience sampling which means that what is most convenient and accessible is selected (Patton, 1990). When a school was chosen, the principal of the school automatically became a participant in the research. To fully see the dynamics in the hierarchy of the leadership within the schools, the principals interviewed needed to work at the same school as the teachers interviewed. As mentioned in the context chapter, showing people in a position above you respect and showing that you are aware of their position as a ray aman-dreny [parent] is important in the Malagasy culture (Dahl, 1999). Hence, the sampling of teachers was left for the principals. The reason for this was first of all culturally determined, they are the leaders, and I am only a researcher asking for permission to do research. Giving them the task of choosing the participants is part of showing respect and being sensitive to the cultural context. Second, the time was limited and the interviews were done on regular school days, the principal knew which teachers who were available at the time for the interviews. The National Director emphasized how I first had to approach the principals and ask for their opinion and point of view, before stating my needs and wishes.
After the research had been approved by the principals I asked them to consider whether it was possible for me to interview both female and male teachers, as well as teachers who differ in age, both elderly and younger. In other words I underscored my wishes for the sampling, but in the end, the principals were free to decide the participants. At some schools the principals asked for time selecting the teachers for the interview, at other schools s/he just called in some teachers that did not have classes at the time I was there and I did the interviews directly. Being sensitive to the cultural context, this method was the most convenient one as I would not be demanding. All in all I think it made my way into the schools and people’s thoughts easier, as I strove to do be cultural sensitive.

Towards the end of the fieldwork some informants recommended me to do interviews with specific persons. I did one such interview where the informant was a result of snowball sampling, which means sampling where informants propose further informants (Bryman, 2012).

### 4.6.1 Participants

My original plan was to do three schools and interview the principal and three teachers at each school. After I had conducted interviews at three schools I felt that I needed more data to draw conclusions and answer my research questions. I decided to expand the size of my sampling and finally I had conducted interviews at seven different schools. The interviews lasted from forty-five minutes to one hour. The discrepancy between the number of teachers and principals interviewed is mainly because of the leadership structure within the schools. No schools have two principals; hence, the number of teachers participating in the research is higher than the number of principals. Furthermore, I visited one school where I only was able to interview two teachers and not the principal; this increased the number of teachers compared with the number of principals. In addition to the informants from the seven schools mentioned above, I had a couple of informal conversations as well as three interviews with former pedagogical staff. These interviews worked to triangulate; a way to verify information and impressions I had from interviews conducted (Bryman, 2012; Denzin, 1978). If different data sources (i.e. theoretical frameworks, informants, researchers) end up with the same conclusion, the results are often said to be more trustworthy and credible. The chart below gives an overview of the participants in the research:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 – 50 years old</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51 – 70 years old</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.6.1: Participants in research project (developed by author).*

### 4.7 Data analysis

Qualitative interviews generate large amount of data which can be a challenge when doing the analysis; a lot of information had to be categorized (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). I did not transcribe everything in each interview. As the interview-guide shows, there are some questions that were asked as a “warm-up” and the interview then slowly proceeded to what was my main interest. Following the detailed notes taken by the assistant and listening to the interviews, it was easy to find the parts of the interviews that were relevant and should be transcribed. The risk of only transcribing parts of an interview is that I may miss parts that could have been relevant. Sometimes I returned to the interview – listen once more, to see if something else was relevant or had become relevant (Bryman, 2012). I have several times returned and listened to the recordings. Another obvious risk when transcribing is making mistakes due to mishearing and lack of concentration. Something that has been a challenge in this research is the double meaning a Malagasy word may have. To be sure that I have chosen the right meaning of a word in the transcriptions, I have conferred with native Malagasy speakers, for instance my assistant. In addition, I have closely studied the context in which it was said to make sure I chose the right meaning. After each interview, immediate impressions and thoughts were written down, as well as possible themes.

When reading the transcriptions I noted words that were repeated in several of the interviews. When examining the notes and the transcriptions, themes that emerged from the data were divided into smaller categories and concepts. Throughout the analysis I tried to be as inductive as possible. When I had finished coding, I started linking concepts to existing literature. In addition to this, some new ideas/theories emerged from the data. Some argue that only studying the transcriptions when doing analysis makes researchers miss important elements, since they do not study the raw material – the recording. (Kvale, 2002). In this study, I returned to the recordings several times while analyzing, to verify the transcriptions and “listen to” the atmosphere in the room where it was conducted.
This research is demographic analysis, since people of different socio-economic strata are compared. The units of analysis in this research are the teachers and the principals.

4.8 Reliability and validity

Two important principals in the field of social research are reliability and validity. These are terms often mentioned in relation to quantitative research. However, there have been attempts on how best to apply it in qualitative research as well. It is very important to have validity and reliability in social research as they guarantee the quality of the research. In this section these terms will be addressed, looking into whether the study is reliable and valid. Additionally, I will briefly touch upon the eight criteria which Dr. Sara J. Tracy claims are good to follow to ensure the quality of a qualitative study. Her terms have in many ways functioned as an ethical compass throughout this research.

4.8.1 Validity

Validity indicates whether “a measure of a concept really measures that concept” (Bryman, 2012, 170). Measurement is what truly characterizes a quantitative study, though; validity is something to be considered in a qualitative study as well. Within the concept of validity one often distinguishes between internal validity and external validity.

Internal validity is a term which indicates to what extent it is correct that y is a result of x, and not something else (Bryman, 2012, p. 47). This has been challenging in my research. How could I for instance be sure that a principal’s temper actually was the source of a teacher’s fear? In such cases, follow-up questions to see if the informant was consequent in his/her considerations and reflections became important. In addition to this, I asked other informants the exact same questions. Triangulation and comparison of the answers became an important way to ensure the validity of the research. Though a feeling is subjective, the quantity of similar answers may indicate its validity. Guba and Lincoln (1994) see the word credibility as a parallel to internal validity (Bryman, 2012).

External validity addresses whether the research can be generalized in other settings than where it was originally done (Bryman, 2012). Even though a case-study is unique and answers necessarily will carry some of the informants’ character, I believe that some of the findings may prove to be found in other settings as well. Fear within leadership in different
organizations is not a new phenomenon. Furthermore, some of that which makes a qualitative study qualitative are the thick descriptions informants give (Kvale, 2009). When providing thick descriptions, it makes it easier for readers to recognize feelings, thoughts, experiences etc. I sought to get such in-depth information when collecting the data. A rich dataset would make it easier to see whether some issues may be generalized (Postholm, 2010).

*Ecological validity* is another term used within the concept of validity. Ecological validity refers to whether instruments used, and the way a scientific study is done, is applicable in people’s everyday life (Bryman, 2012). In this research I strove to conduct the interviews and conversations in the informants’ natural environment. The interviews were conducted at school, in a classroom or at the principal’s office. It is often easier to strive for ecological validity in qualitative research, more than in quantitative research since the instruments applied may better fit the context where the research takes place, for instance doing an interview versus an experiment.

### 4.8.2 Reliability

Reliability concerns the trustworthiness and consistency of the research (Bryman, 2012). In this research triangulation it was important to ensure reliability. Informants could give similar answers and bring up similar concepts during an interview. In that way the concept became more credible, because it was brought up independently several times. I tried to ask the same questions, so that the answers also showed consistency.

Being transparent about the process of my research has also been important to ensure the reliability in this research (Bryman, 2012). When a research is transparent, it is easier for people to control and verify what has been done, why something may be reliable or not reliable. Only if the data is reliable, can the research questions be answered truly.

“Replicability” is another expression commonly used when speaking of reliability. When a study is replicable it means that the informants would give the same answer to another researcher another time (Kvale, 2009). I cannot be sure of whether my research is replicable, but the atmosphere during my research and the impression I got was that my informants were honest and would give the same answer if another researcher conducted similar interviews.
In general, this is a typical qualitative study and scores low when it comes to reliability and validity if the terms are applied in a traditional quantitative way. Though, all things considered, looking at the terms as they may be adapted in a qualitative study, the research does score on ecological validity and external validity. The study was done in fairly natural environments and thick data were collected. When it comes to internal validity and reliability the research scores low/average, since triangulation not was done consequently.

4.8.3 Criteria for quality

Tracy (2010) lists eight criteria of how to ensure quality in qualitative research. Reliability, validity and replicability are all included in her criteria, though she uses other terms. To sum up this section of how my research fulfills requirements of validity and reliability, I will briefly explain her eight criteria and some examples of how it applies to this research in particular.

First of all, Tracy (2010) underscores the importance of the research’s topic; the topic should be worthy, which means that it should be “relevant, timely, significant, interesting, or evocative” (p.840). As shown in previous chapters, fear within leadership in education has seldom been looked into. It is interesting to see what kind of influence it has on pedagogical staff’s work.

Secondly, she underscores how the research needs to have rich rigor. This ensures a qualitative study’s aim to collect rich data, to what extent the context was the best one for this particular research, whether the procedures followed in the field were appropriate and whether the researcher had enough time in the field etc. I was very concerned about rich rigor throughout the fieldwork and always reflected upon questions such as: Am I spending enough time at each school? Should I include other types of schools? In order to ensure rich rigor the size of the sample increased during the fieldwork as I saw the need for more data. It is worth mentioning that the rich rigor in itself does not guarantee high quality, it depends on what further research brings to light. However, rich rigor creates a solid platform for the analysis and increases the chances for presenting a good product (Tracy, 2010).

The third criterion is sincerity, the importance of the researcher’s transparency throughout the research process and an awareness of subjective values, biases, position etc. (Tracy 2010). Sincerity reflects a researcher’s honesty. Due to the fact that I have a personal relation to the
setting of the research I have been concerned about the sincerity of the research since the very beginning of the project. I grew up in Madagascar, went to the Norwegian school there as a child and returned as an adult to work as a teacher for the Norwegian children. In addition to this I worked as a social worker in local projects, and supervisor for pre-school teachers and teachers doing in-fields. One way of ensuring sincerity is being open and reflective about my strengths and weaknesses as a researcher. Tracy (2010) highlights self-reflexivity as an important value in the attempt to do sincere research. Being aware of choices that are made and the rationale behind them, not taking it for granted that you are doing your research in the best way, at the best place and to the right time is part of being self-reflexive (Tracy, 2010). One concrete example of how I have strived to ensure sincerity is that I asked my assistant about how she perceived the informant’s reactions to me and my questions during the interview processes and how she evaluated my position. This made me more aware of my role and voice in the research.

The forth criteria that Tracy (2010) regards as important is the research credibility. In short, this term concerns trustworthiness. Is the data presented trustworthy enough for other researchers to refer to and be able to rely on? Providing thick description, as well as doing triangulation are ways to achieve this. With my knowledge about the culture and help of my assistant I gained information that was not necessarily stated in the interviews, but was gained through cultural gestures and indirect speech. This information is an important part of the thick descriptions gained. Tracy (2010) critiques triangulation and highlights the importance of what she calls crystallization (p. 843). Crystallization concerns how identical results from different projects should not be used to underscore the trustworthiness of a project’s results, but rather to gain a deeper insight. Tracy (2010) highlights how every research project is unique in itself and that comparing different projects may be problematic. I found this point of view of triangulation interesting and kept it in mind. It reminded me of how a research is unique in itself despite the discovery of previous similar results. Richardson (2000b) beautifully describes how a crystal:

…combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach. Crystals grow, change, alter, but are not amorphous. Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities and refract within themselves, creating different colors, patterns, and arrays, casting off in
different directions. What we see depends upon our angle of repose. (as cited in Tracy, 2010, p. 843 - 844)

Resonance is the fifth criterion. It can be seen “to refer research’s ability to meaningfully reverberate and affect an audience” (Tracy, 2010, p.844). It reflects what has already been mentioned about the research’s transferability. It also addresses the research’s ability to “promote empathy, identification and reverberation of the research by readers who have no direct experience with the topic discussed” (Tracy, 2010, p.844). Tracy (2010) stresses the importance of the presentation of the research. She underlines how something beautifully presented easily can make an impression on the reader. Working on phrases, formulation and order of paragraphs and chapters has been important to me when working on the presentation of the data.

Tracy’s (2010) sixth criterion is significant contribution, which she presents by describing four different focus areas: theoretical significance, heuristic significance, practical significance and methodological significance. Theoretical significance refers to how former theories are tested, discussed, critiqued and presented, as I have done in this research. She stresses how new theories occurring from the analysis and discussion can create new foundations for further research in the future and how that increases the theoretical significance of a project.

Heuristic significance is how a research may prompt further research questions and new concepts to be tested and explored. Tracy (2010) also underlines how a research may be heuristic if it aims at a varied audience, from policy makers to working class. In this research I aim to reach a broad audience, from the teacher in the classroom, to policy makers working with educational development.

Practical significance is whether the research is useful or not. I have argued for this research’s practical significance in the introduction of the thesis. Finally, Tracy (2010) states that “engaging research methodology in a new, creative or insightful way” will give the research methodological significance (p. 846). Here this research scores rather low. The presentation of the data and the methods used are rather traditional.

The seventh point on Tracy’s list is ethics, which will be presented separately in the last subchapter of this methodology chapter. The last criterion which Tracy (2010) stresses is
meaningful coherence. Concepts that are used should fit the purpose as well as the paradigms of the research. Furthermore, the whole presentation of the research should be coherent and presented in a logical order. I have striven to give this research a meaningful coherence, linking it all together and not let information stand alone, linking it all together. The reader of the research should feel that the purpose stated in the beginning of the research is fulfilled when having read the conclusion of the research.

4.9 Ethics

The importance of and attention for ethical reflections in social research has increased. The consideration of ethical issues has been very important for me during the whole research process; from deciding the topic until the thesis was printed. In this sub-chapter, some of the ethical reflections that have been addressed will be presented.

All my informants were free to stop the interview at their convenience, without having to provide any explanation. Every informant was given a paper where the purpose of the research was presented and the data collection methods described (ref. Appendix 3). In addition, I gave them the possibility to ask questions before they signed a consent form where I guaranteed anonymity, confidentiality and the information revealed in the interviews was only used for the purpose of the research. For those who could not read (had forgotten their glasses), the form was read out loud. The forms were written in Malagasy and English. One might question why it was written in English and not French, which is the second language at Madagascar. The consent form was originally written in English, due to the fact that the research was done under auspices of an international Masters program where English is the working language. Since all Malagasy people speak Malagasy, but not all Malagasy speak French, I did not feel that the consent form needed be translated into French.

All the interviews were recorded, but the voice recorder was only used if the informants agreed. Before entering the field, the research was reported and accepted by the NSD. All these different measures were taken to make sure that the informants felt free and not pressured to participate in the research. All information gathered was stored safely in a password protected computer in a locked room. Reporting the researches to official instances, informing the participants etc., are by Tracy (2010) referred to as procedural ethics.
Tracy (2010) also presents what is called *situational ethics*, “in short, this approach suggests that ethical decisions should be based on the particularities of a scene” (p.847). The choice of the research site was part of my ethical reflections. By choosing Madagascar I felt safer in my capacity to be culturally sensitive to the context I was entering. I am familiar with different cultural codes and it was easy to sense the atmosphere and know which step to take next during the interviews. At the same time as I was sensitive to the context, I was careful to not go native, but to keep a professional distance to the informants and the information I gained (Kvale 2009). Only in this way could the analysis of the data be done as objectively as possible, on a neutral basis. I believe I put extra effort here since I was aware of my position and this being a potential issue. However, it is important to remember that as a researcher of another nationality, I will never completely know the depth of the Malagasy cultural codes.

Even though I paid attention to the context etc., there is always risk given that that the relationship between researcher and participant is inherently imbalanced. In this specific case it is noteworthy to remember the position Norwegians have had at Madagascar for years (ref. context chapter). On one hand I could profit from being Norwegian in the sense that even before I started, I would have a lot of good will. On the other hand the relative power positions of researcher and informant is imbalanced and I needed to be aware of the fact that informants may want to please me by answering what they thought I wanted to hear, instead of what they really meant. Striving to make the participants comfortable and relaxed was very important to me. If an informant was uncomfortable talking about something I brought up, I left the issue and continued asking about something else. This was to ensure the informants did not feel pressured. Being aware of ethical issues like this is by some referred to as *relational ethics* (Tracy, 2010).

Another concern was the use of a language assistant. I was a bit worried about the assistant’s power dynamic on the participants; would the participants be comfortable expressing their opinions and sharing their concerns with someone of the same background? Before deciding on whether to bring an assistant or not, I talked to researchers who had worked with the same assistant in previous historical and social anthropology research in Madagascar. They saw the assistant to have a calming effect on the participants as they could speak freely and know that someone of “their own” would help them out of misunderstandings. This is confirmed given that Madagascar is seen as a collective society (ref. Chapter 3). As previous researchers had only positive experiences using an assistant, I finally decided to use one myself. The assistant
had a discrete role and mainly took notes during the interview. My impression was that if she supplemented the interview by reminding me of a question I had forgotten to ask or helped out if there were any misunderstandings, the participants seemed unaffected by her participation. Moreover, it was very useful to discuss the interview with someone afterwards. Last but not least, her notes were detailed and well done. It would have been impossible for me to pay attention to the answers the participants gave, take good notes, and think about necessary follow-up questions.

Finally, the findings of the research have been carefully reported and I have striven to be transparent about every phase of the research. Letting people proofread the research and hearing their reactions, has helped me to adjust phrases and paragraphs which have been unclear. It is impossible to know how something will be received, though, and letting people proofread and give feedback on the written text, has been one way to ensure a clear presentation. Exiting ethics is the term Tracy (2010) uses on the ethical reflections relating to the phase of presenting the research.

To sum it all up I will refer to Kvale (2009) who lists four areas as important ethical guidelines in research, all in which I have paid attention to: The importance of informed consent, confidentiality for the informants, consequences for the informants and the role of the researcher. Doing ethical reflections is also part of increasing the quality of the research.

### 4.10 Limitations

In research there are always limitations. Some limitations have already been mentioned earlier in this methodology chapter. Anyhow, this small section presents some more limitations related to this study.

#### 4.10.1 Limitations in methodology

Various limitations in of the methodology in this study must be acknowledged. Regarding the sampling process, the selection of teachers was left to the schools’ principals. Although they received some criteria for what kind of participants were most desirable, in the end, it was up to them which teachers participated. Because the principals were fully aware of the topic of the research, it is possible for them to choose teachers that would give a favorable
representation of the principal, him/herself. Responses from the participants however, indicate honesty and diversity, and as such it is likely that the principals chose teachers randomly.

Secondly, and as previously mentioned: an interview-situation is an artificial situation. However comfortable an informant is, an interview situation will always include an asymmetric dynamic where I have all the questions and the informant must answer. Furthermore, I am white in a former-colony where foreigners still often are considered a ray aman-dreny [parent]. Nevertheless, as conferred with my assistant it is likely to believe that the informants felt more comfortable than what they could have done, as I know their language and their culture. Still, conducting an interview, with a recorder, the asymmetry is a fact and I did not know the informants beforehand, which made me a stranger in spite of the fact that I know the language.

4.10.2 Limitations in theory

Some critical remarks about the theory used are given last in subchapter 3.4. However, these are critical remarks about the theories in general, not critical remarks of how I have applied them in my research. Luhmann (1979) writes about trust and power. I have only chosen the parts of his theory that are relevant for this research. I could have used some of his theory concerning trust, but as power was the theme that appeared most in the data, I chose to concentrate on power.

I apply five of Hofstede’s six dimensions. The Indulgence versus Restraint Dimension (IND) was not applied in this research as it did not prove useful when studying fear in the power relations. It could have been useful in the sense that it could have indicated the relation between happiness and fear. However, this was not the focus of the study and no questions were asked in the interviews which could have provided reflections related to this issue.

Based on an exhaustive literature review I have chosen to use the terms anxiety and fear interchangeably. An important limitation based on this interchangeable terminology is that I choose to use Hofstede’s research, where he emphasizes that there is a distinction between anxiety and fear. His research states that while fear has an object, anxiety is more general and not as clearly defined (Hofstede, 1994). Still, the terms are used interchangeably in this study.
5 Findings

In this chapter I will present the findings of the research done in Madagascar. The chapter is framed by the two research questions. In the first part of the chapter named Frightening Factors, findings which show what teachers and principals feared in their work are presented (RQ1). The findings are divided in two main categories; Consequences and Hierarchy, which all have different codes. In the second part of the chapter, Fear and Respect, findings related to how fear and respect appeared in the colleague fellowship are presented (RQ2). The research question focuses on fear. However, I did not know that respect was to become so visible in the findings. I have therefore included their considerations and thoughts related to respect as well, as it give substance to their view upon fear and the terms are closely related. First of all, how informants regarded the terms respect and fear will be presented. Second, findings revealing how fear is reflected in the power dynamics within school will be presented. The second part is divided in four sections, each representing a category: Family, Communication, Perspectives and Challenges. The last section, Challenges, focuses on challenges related to the other three sections. The chapter presents findings from the two categories of informants; the principals and the teachers. Some comments about the findings are given along the presentation. Presenting findings related to RQ1, a small summary and evaluation of the differences and similarities between the categories of informants are provided after each code. This is to emphasize and make the comparative perspective clearer. The main tendencies in similarities and differences between the two categories of informants will further be looked more into the discussion.

Informants have been given codes for recognition. P stands for principal, T stands for teacher and RP stands for The Responsible of Pedagogics. The number behind the letter indicates the number of the informant.

5.1 Position and place

The hierarchy in which the participants operated was important from the very beginning of this study. The categories of informants, principals and teachers, related to one another, though they possessed different positions in school, hence, their powers differed. The
relations among people in a hierarchy may be called *power relations*. Different dynamics appeared in the relations due to their position in the hierarchy and the power they had. Questions in the interview-guide carried elements that reflected the differences in power and position as the hierarchy was known for me as a researcher before I entered the field. How the power dynamics is reflected in daily life and work was however, unknown to me. Many of the categories and codes in this research reflect the power relations. It is hard to avoid them as they permeate the system. The power dynamics reflect how relations should be, according to most Malagasy people (ref context chapter, chapter 2). This is further reflected upon in the discussion part of the thesis (chapter 6) but for a better understanding of the findings, it is important to have them in mind when reading. A chart is made to visualize the hierarchy in which the informants of the research are to be found. The chart reveals how positions are ranked in relation to one another.

![Figure 5.1: Power relations (developed by author)](image)

### 5.2 Frightening factors - consequences

Conducting the interviews, it became clear that there existed a general fear of what consequences actions led to. Addressed in this chapter are these consequences of action which teachers and principals feared in their work. The fear of the consequences was visible at every school and at every level. A challenge was to distinguish between the different codes, as they
tended to intertwine with one another. In the following paragraphs, the different codes in the category consequences will be presented.

5.2.1 Fear of decision-making

Concerning fear and decision-making informants were asked broad questions related to decision-making processes. The questions during the interview searched to get an impression of whom or what the principals and teachers think when they make decisions, as well as why fear sometimes is related to decision-making. The responses given by the teachers significantly differed from those of the principals.

**Principals**

The principals expressed fear of decisions they had to make alone, as well as fear which related to decisions of financial issues. P1 said that “If it concerns money, I’m really—I’m not—I don’t dare to make decisions by myself.” P6 underscored that; “As a principal, making decisions alone is what I fear the most.” P5 further said “I can mention the example with the project I mentioned, for instance I ask for money. I am afraid to; Oh, what if I spoil- I disappear; I end up not going after all.” P5 both expressed fear related to financial issues as well as the fact that s/he ended up not facing what s/he was going to deal with, due to the fear related to it. Some of the informants mentioned other implications that fear has had on their decision-making. In the previous quote an avoidance of the situation is expressed. P3 on the other hand told the following story:

Once there was a lot of absence in third grade and there was fear for the…for the coming results, but like this and like this and like this, I had used all my lecturing hours, I didn’t finish them well enough, but then it [the fear] controlled/demanded me to: Teach them again before the exam. It really controlled/demanded me! I was tired in the month of July, but you have to work hard, do repetition with them, do…They [the pupils] are available at this time, this time, this time - do repetitions! And I strived to do it, I really did it, but I was tired… It really controlled/demanded me to… work hard, look at these gaps!

In this case the principal drew an example of how fear led to another decision than what s/he normally would have taken. The fear made him/her work harder and do repetitions, even though his/her scheduled working-hours were finished.
To get an impression of the implications fear may have on decision-making processes the informants were asked whether they felt that fear controlled their actions. The responses from the principals varied. P3 said that: “It really controls (…) the fear really controls…” P6 on the other hand said that “Until now this (that fears control) has not happened.” While P5 stated that; “Sometimes, sometimes it may happen.”

**Teachers**

While the principals first and foremost expressed fear related to decision-making influencing the school as a whole, teachers tended to express fear related to decisions in the classroom and decisions concerning the pupils. T12 described a daily situation which may appear frequently for teachers:

> Fear…it exists...once in a while maybe (…) for instance if there is something you want to do, but you're in the middle of your lecturing (…). Then you are afraid of making the decision; should I stop the lecturing and leave the classroom to do this? Like that. Then you’re inevitably a bit afraid.

In this case the informant described an everyday situation and dilemma where fear is related to decision-making. Some of the teachers also mentioned the fear of expelling a pupil, like T8 said: “Fear, for example, I am afraid of expelling pupils.” In this case however, T8 gave an impression of being afraid of making a decision, but exactly what s/he feared concerning the decision—making, is unclear. What is certain is that whatever it was, the fear of making a decisions had an impact on T8. T10 also expressed fear related to this kind of decision-making; when being asked whether fear controlled decision-making, s/he answered: “Yes! It has an impact, because, sometimes there is a child that should be expelled, s/he has gotten the last warning. Then you’re afraid sometimes: If I now finally expel this [the pupil], then what?”

Another teacher described how decision-making processes were hard due to teachers’ fear of speaking up in meetings:

> Often when we are at the meetings for everybody and there’s something you don’t agree with, because there are the people who are easily affected by it, fear; if we do this – then that. And that withholds the decisions we make together here at school. When we have a meeting, there are the teachers—there are the teachers who are easily affected by the…the…the fear and they hesitate. (T16)
The informants both expressed how fear was visible in decision-making processes as well as indicating its implications. Implications such as concluding not to expel a pupil, or deciding not to leave the classroom, or how fear may delay a decision-making process. T1 talked about how decisions sometimes are made quickly and how that often: “(…) ends up with the things I see are bad. Mm... Because the mind is all messed up by these fears, messed up by these worries.”

As the principals, teachers did sometimes answer differently concerning whether fear control their decision-making processes too. «For me, personally, the fear doesn’t withhold my decisions” (T16), “Sometimes, but not too often” (T13), “For me it’s not at all fear that commands/directs/rules me” (RP2) or “Indeed, it controls it to a large extent…to a large extent” (T18).

Comparison

Different opinions are found both among teachers and principals concerning whether fear controls decision-making processes or not. Some meant it does, some said that it does it to a certain extent and others did not see any relation between fear and decision-making. There were also similarities between the cases in how the presence of fear might lead to unexpected decisions. The teachers tended to make examples with fear related to decisions made in the classroom and concerning the pupils, while principals drew examples reflecting fear of “bigger decisions” – decisions which were part of the work as a leader and had an impact on the management of the school.

5.2.2 Fear of a bad reputation

Another code within the category consequences is reputation. Both principals and teachers expressed feared concerning a bad reputation, whether it was their own reputation or the school’s reputation. This was discovered by digging deeper asking the informants about the source of their feelings when they told stories about fear.

Principals

If the pupils for instance had a break, they would be all over the market and the roads...so...so one gets afraid of people’s mouth, the mouth of people. How is the discipline of these pupils? When there is time for a break they are all over the place
and so on (…) When it comes to the school, it may happen that one does not want to send the children to be educated here if—and that—that one must fear. People should see that the pupils are well disciplined; they are clever, get good exam results - the school manages. What creates fear is what kills the school. (P3)

The quote of the principal well addressed the fear that some principals talked about concerning a probably bad reputation. S/he is concerned with people’s thoughts and impressions of the pupils and the management of the school in general. Furthermore, it reflected the power of those surrounding the school.

Teachers

Similarly to the principals, the teachers also expressed fear related to a probably bad reputation. T1 drew an example:

The parents really do that: A Lutheran teacher and he smokes?! (…) If there for example is another place the son/daughter is taught, s/he may think that: Let me enroll my son/daughter in a Lutheran school. But if s/he sees my behavior, s/he may hesitate and: Shh! These teachers truly smoke a lot! Maybe my child may start [to smoke] as well!

This quote indicates the fear the teachers might feel concerning the rumors of the school. If a parent recognized inappropriate behavior it might stop them from enrolling their child in the school. The teacher feared a bad reputation, due to the consequences which may follow. Another aspect of a bad reputation that appeared in the findings was the teacher’s fear of the pupils telling lies about what they experience at school, just to make the teachers and the school look bad. T1 gave an example how s/he might speak firmly to the pupils about the prohibition of food in the classroom, but when the pupil went home, this is what happened:

At that time there was a child who become really frightened, so when s/he came home to his/her house, what s/he tells there is something different. For instance: The teacher got really angry and s/he took me in the neck collar of my clothes and so so so… So if you do something small while teaching, you always think about: What if the pupil exaggerates the story like that. (T1)

Comparison

For both units, the fear of a bad reputation is visible. Both the teachers and principals addressed the fear of gossip and how it might have a bad influence on the school. What might be seen as a difference is the focus of the teachers versus the principals. The teachers tended to focus on their own position and how they should act to prevent gossip. The principals on
the other hand, had a tendency to focus on how the pupils’ behavior may create a bad impression of the school in the community. The fear was centered on people external to the school.

5.2.3 Fear of bad results

The fear of the pupil’s future related to results of performance, were visible both among the principals and the teachers. This was often brought up talking about the challenges related to the role as an educator of the coming generation.

**Principals**

There were few principals that directly expressed this fear of bad results, though it was mentioned by some: “There are many fears. The first of fears are the results of the exam. The results of the exam are the first fear” (P3). Another principal, who had done a huge job making his/her school well-functioning, offering proper salaries for the teachers, having a respectable amount of pupils enrolled every year etc., stated: “The thing that really makes me worry is if the school returns to what is was before” (P4). P4 expressed a fear related to the period when the school did not function well; a period where the principal could not speak of good results, neither on behalf of the teachers nor the pupils.

**Teachers**

Among the teachers, there were many who expressed fear related to the pupils’ performance in exams. T6 described how the fear of bad exam results made him/her work even harder than what s/he was used to, in hope of improving the results:

> Sometimes—I can give the example of the pupils’ exam. Then I’m afraid because: The level of these pupils is still really low. Then it [the fear] would demand me to: Let’s do a great effort first, this week before the exam, or one or two months before the exam. I’ll go—go—I’ll go strengthening the discipline a bit, because you’re afraid that there would be ba -- (+bad) you’ve seen that the level of the pupils is quite bad and you’re afraid in case they don—don—don’t manage the exam, the pupils.. Mm.. You turn the screw a little harder. (T6)

As well as describing the fear of results, teachers tend to link the fear to their own performance as a teacher. How to do things better if the pupils lack knowledge? T9 said: “The level of the pupils’ knowledge makes me proud if it is good. It makes me afraid if the level
drops a lot. That makes me afraid. (...) How shall I receive the pupils with a lack of knowledge? That really makes me afraid.” T12 even stated it clearer: “If you are the reason for the pupils not reaching far, then you’re afraid. Haha! Especially for the kid’s future. If you are the reason for the kids getting their future destroyed, you will necessarily be afraid.”

Some of the teachers related this fear to the school’s future:

What frightens me the most is what concerns failure of success related to what I teach. That is what really frightens me, what I am afraid of. (...) I can’t stand the thought of: Am I the reason why the school doesn’t succeed? (T16)

T10 also addressed fear and uncertainty of whether the pupils acquire what was expected. This quote may additionally be seen as a reflection upon the development of the world and how time, attitudes and methods change constantly:

Hmm, what is it that really… is frightening when it comes to teaching, is the education (towards) given to the kids, does it enter or doesn’t it enter? That really is what makes me afraid these days, because in this globalized world, it’s very difficult to bring up these youngsters. (T10)

**Comparison**

What is common for the two units was the fear of results. Both the teachers and the principals mentioned the exam results in specific as an element they feared. It is important to mention that the amount of teachers expressing this fear versus principals was significant. The teachers mentioned results more frequently than the principals. What further seemed to be different was how the teachers related the fear of the pupils’ poor performance, to their own performances. They were afraid of the results, because the score of the exams would indicate whether they had done their work properly or not. The principals did not seem to address this.

**5.2.4 Fear of punishment and temper**

In general the principals and teachers expressed fear towards what I have called *punishment*. The code punishment is broad and includes different fears. The fear of other people’s temper, as well as fear related to sanctions such as having salary rescinded. A general sense of suffering from something permeates the environment.
**Principals**

P1 brought forward the fear of bad temper:

> What I don’t like is being chastised. That’s what I don’t like. I don’t like being chastised. I’m afraid of that. I think about myself, I’m not without mistakes in what I do; there will necessarily be some corrections along the way. So what I don’t like is if someone is mad at me, because we are all adults—Adults being mad at each other is not ok. But I can see that showing and being direct works well. But that is what I really fear: The bad temper.

The quote expresses the fear of being criticized as a leader. The informant knew that there would be times for chastisement, because s/he was not without mistakes, and that was what s/he feared. Other principals reflected upon how important it is to be aware of the atmosphere in the community in which they work. If not, people might become angry, something which is frightening. P5 said: “That creates fear-- (+fear). Ah! Maybe I make this one and this one angry.”

**Teachers**

The teachers expressed the fear of punishment in different ways. RP2 stated more or less the same as P1 clearly underscored:

> For me, what I really fear in my life, is me being scolded (criticized), and that I, like… the—I don’t find a way to explain it… me being blamed for anything at all, people’s reaction around me is what I really fear.

Other teachers expressed fear related to specific punishment, such as losing salary: “Maybe the source of fear is: What if I get killed if I do this. It may—I don’t know—They may withhold my salary. It may… I don’t know, maybe they chastise me” (T1). T2 stated it even clearer: “The fear comes from the punishment. Will I get my salary? Ah… that makes me shiver!”

Teachers also talked about the fear of being fired. When I asked T7 about what s/he thought may be the source of the teachers’ fear s/he responded the following: “Well, that is it (...) the fear of being fired cause you don’t have it - you don’t have a contract!” Other teachers told about the fear of losing their work due to lack of experience, the principal’s temper etc.
Comparison

When it comes to punishment, the teachers are those who frequently mentioned it and linked it to concrete sanctions. The principals did not fear punishment in the sense of concrete actions such as not receiving their salary or being fired. They described discomfort speaking of finance management, but only one principal mentioned fear specifically. What the principals certainly underscored was the fear of temper and people criticizing them. That fear was mentioned by several of the teachers as well.

5.2.5 Fear of mistakes

Another subject that was visible in the interviews was the fear of mistakes. This was highlighted by the informants in different parts of the interview and a factor they often returned to and emphasized.

Principals

The fear is indeed, eh… there’s been a mistake in…mmm… Someone do a mistake, someone do something wrong - that is when s/he thinks about fear. Mm… But if there’s nothing special with what s/he does, but…s/he does everything correctly, then there’s no—The person won’t fear anything. (P1)

This quote is representative for what the principals thought would be the reason behind teachers’ fear. However, they also talked about fear of mistakes related to their own work. P3 addressed the issue when s/he talked about achievements and requests: “You will not get what you ask for if something isn’t up to standard. That is the source of fear.” P6 is one of the principals who confirmed this by saying: “Me, I’m afraid when something isn’t alright.” The principals often expressed the fear of mistakes talking about educational programs that were not fulfilled or facing those who confronted them with the mistakes done etc.

Teachers

The teachers highlighted the fear of making mistakes as teachers, in their profession. T6 gave an example where s/he described the difficult situation of using a second language in the classroom and how that created a fear of making mistakes:

Then I’m afraid of: What if I shouldn’t show that to the children? Or what if it isn’t enough? Because s/he really receives it and hides it in his/her heart, whether it is
things that are said or written or… When it comes to the use of French here, the
difficult French, the one that blocks them… Then we are afraid, if we for example
give them one word, and the meaning of that word—Sometimes you are afraid that the
meaning of the word isn’t what it should be. That’s really… (T6)

This fear of making mistakes was also mentioned by other teachers telling about how they
become afraid if there was something they were to teach the children, but they lacked
knowledge of what they were to teach them. They underscored how easily children acquire
knowledge and that they [the teachers] may be the reason behind their incorrect knowledge.

Another mistake that several of the teachers mentioned was the fear of using physical
punishment. Physical punishment in school is forbidden by law in Madagascar. Though, it is
still common in many homes. T1 told the story about when s/he once hit the principal’s child:

I was terribly afraid afterwards. Mm… I had just slapped him/her, then, there, I
became afraid immediately. The child neither cried nor said anything, s/he just sat
there. While I, in my consciousness; this was real! That was the last and the first time I
hit a pupil. (…) What really made me afraid at that time was his/her health… what
if—in case—teeth, the mouth, the face—what if there are scars that won’t disappear? I
thought about things like that. (T1)

T7 expressed fear of the consequences of the mistake s/he had made. What if the pupil truly
was hurt? T7 said that: “The fear is…the fear is—There is something that for instance—You
do something that isn’t ok. That’s when fear exists.” RP2 addressed the same fear of making
mistakes: “What I fear regarding reactions from the principal is that if I do a mistake, and
after the mistake, if I don’t know how it can be answered to or recompensed.”

Comparison

The principals and teachers differed a bit when it came to the fear of mistakes. They were
both afraid of mistakes, but the principals seemed to link their fear of mistakes to the
institution they led; the fear of acting inappropriate as a leader. They also indicated the fear of
being caught in their mistakes. The teachers often linked their fear to pupils; the fear of the
consequences their mistakes might have for the pupils. Similar to the principals they
highlighted how the fear appeared when there was something which was not ok and they did
not manage to explain it themselves.
5.2.6 Fear of control

This fear was only spotted among the teachers. Many of the teachers expressed fear related to the controls run by the government as well by the Lutheran Department of Education. This was what some of them say:

I can see that people are a bit worried in the beginning when there’s an inspection. What if, like, what if the work isn’t done properly? If that is the case, one worries a bit about the answer of the inspection. (T14)

T2 stated it clearly: “The inspection makes me afraid.” T8 mentioned the source of the fear: “If there for example is an inspection, but there is something you’ve done improperly, or you aren’t ready, then, then, then you’re afraid”

Principals are not controlled in the same way and did not mention this fear. It may be comparable to look at how they feared the committee, which is positioned above them in the hierarchy. Anyway, the committee does not run controls of the principal in the same way as the teachers are controlled by the government. Therefore, the fear of the committee is something that will be looked at in the next part of this chapter; the category hierarchy.

5.3 Frightening factors - hierarchy

The chapter “Consequences” looks at frightening factors and what consequences the teachers and principals feared. In this chapter, findings which show how the informants somehow fear people they relate to at work are presented. As explained in the context chapter (chapter 2) the employees are part of a hierarchy and relate to each other, as colleagues, as boss and employee, let alone to parents and pupils. In addition to this, the faith in God is placed in this category.

5.3.1 The fear of God and the Devil

The schools in which the interviews were conducted are Lutheran and as an employee in a Lutheran school, you have to be a Christian. The fear of God was something that both the teachers and the principals mentioned. This code is put in the hierarchy category as it came clear that God, for many, is seen as the one on top of everything.
**Principals**

P2 presented a proverb which reflected God’s position in his life and work: “The Lord is the top of the head. It is not the head or quiet one should look at, but God is the top of the head.

P4 said it directly: “What I fear first, is God.” Moreover, P5 both addressed the fear of God, as well as describing how s/he feared the destruction the Devil may carry out:

What first makes me afraid—Because I’m the boss, and due to the call, I accepted Jesus’ call to be a boss, so I’m really afraid, what if Jesus spots that I don’t fulfill the work I was called to do. That is what I really fear. That makes me afraid. But if the work is fulfilled, oh, then it’s suddenly… that’s nice! And what I fear regarding what I just said is the devil’s work destroying—dominating in it. You wish to work as you are expected to work, but then suddenly there may be something that destroys. There’s sabotage or somebody destroys something. That makes me afraid…that—in mission for Jesus. (P5)

Later in the interview P5 talked about how the fear of God truly made him/her work and finish tasks.

**Teachers**

The fear of God was discovered in the responses from the teachers too. Three different quotes below highlight aspects of how the teachers’ fear is rooted in their religion, seeing their work as part of God’s will and God as an authority to fear:

There are those who try to—to do things which really bother you, but I strive to be quiet—let’s be quiet. Because the work I do here is sacred. If I possess a sacred work here and then go and fight with a person there, I would be distraught. That’s how it is. (T9)

What makes me afraid is what the Holy Scripture states: “As you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me.” If I don’t manage to teach the pupils so that they gain knowledge, I think that: I didn’t do my job at all. (…) What makes me afraid—Maybe it is just God who makes me afraid? Because everything will be questioned in the end, but what if… ‘Why didn’t you do anything so that this child managed to acquire knowledge?’ Even though s/he didn’t misbehave. (T11)

I truly fear the work which I have accepted in front of God. (…) One strives to do things correctly, because it is something which one has accepted in front of God. It is not the fear of the principal which makes me respect my job; I respect him/her too, but I’m God’s employee, I’m acce-- (+accepted) They laid their hands on us, the Lutheran employees, the teachers, a specific time in church. Because of that, I think that; If I don’t care about my job here—it isn’t the principal’s work, but God’s work, so I fear God, I respect God and I respect what’s for me. (T13)
Several of the teachers told about the specific ceremony in church where they were inducted to their work in the Lutheran Schools and the value of this. God’s call was the main reason for their choice of profession and work. He was said to be the main leader, as well as the one they would be held accountable for, if their work was not fulfilled.

**Comparison**

Both teachers and principals mentioned the fear of God and their considerations seemed to be quite similar to one another. The fear of God as employer, the fear related to the position they possessed; being part of God’s will. They also talked about the fear of failing due to His call and Words.

**5.3.2 The fear of the principal**

While the focus of the following section will be the teachers’ fear of the principal, the comparison aspect here will concern at the teachers’ fear of the principal as well as the principals’ fear of the teachers. To map this fear, questions concerning the cooperation, communication and roles in school were asked. Teachers often talked about communication among colleagues and with the administration.

Teachers mainly showed a tendency to first talk about how they do not fear the principals and that communication was good across the different levels of employees. Then, after a while, vignette questions were asked - which led to storytelling. If they received a question related to their story, many admitted that they were afraid and elaborated on the fear.

A tendency among the teachers was the fear of the principal’s direct speech or being called into his office. One of the responsible of pedagogics even told that teachers come to him/her and ask whether s/he, as responsible of pedagogics, can negotiate with the principal so that they do not need to go to his/her office. T9 put this fear into few words: “I’m really afraid to walk into his office, to be called in to his office, because: ‘There is something you’ve done…’ That makes me afraid.”

Another tendency among the teachers was the fear of the principal because of the position he had as a boss, a leader. The teachers underscored how the principal was powerful; that s/he controlled everything; and that s/he had the power to do what s/he wanted to do. T18 related this fear to his/her own experiences:
Here in Madagascar, a boss is capable of doing things you couldn’t even imagine: Expulsion/ chase you away or … you may risk that your work becomes really difficult because—people are afraid because the boss is really...almighty. S/he is the boss, besides, s/he can misreport to the people higher up [in the hierarchy] who swipe you away, eliminate you. Because the boss hates you; you’ll lose what you have. I have really experienced that—that’s how it is. It’s really true! What I said is really true: If your boss hates you, s/he can truly say that—because at that time when I told the boss, s/he said that: ‘You won’t do a thing here anymore, apart from teaching English!’ At the school I taught… and then I absolutely didn’t do anything else. There, in front of everybody’s eyes s/he said it. (…) That was when I resigned. I did it. I understood that I had to leave; besides there was another offer at our place. I resigned because the conditions were so hard… (T18)

Another effect of the fear of the principal was the propensity among the teachers to stick to their work. RP1 told about how the fear had an impact on the teachers’ behavior:

Some people are afraid. For example, if the principal isn’t here, or s/he’s not in class, then people stay out for a long time, take a long walk in the yard. There’s talk in the corridor between those teachers that are close to each other. But when the principal comes to this department, nobody dears to leave their classrooms! That’s an immature mentality. Because the fear, it’s just fear, it is not because: I’m a person who raise children. The personality which has the consciousness of his/her role, which makes him/her a teacher, is not there. But due to the principal s/he stays in the classroom. (PR1)

5.3.3 The fear of teachers

As teachers feared their principal, the principal was not without fear of his/her employees. Though, compared to the teachers’ fear towards the principal, few principals addressed fear towards the teachers. However, when fear was expressed, it was mostly related to the teacher’s responses to the principal’s work and decisions.

P6 told the story about a pupil that had a really bad behavior. The teachers dealt differently with the pupil; some were very angry at him/her, others tried to encourage the pupil to promote a better behavior etc. In the end the pupil ran away and quit school. The pupil now wanted to return and the principal knew that s/he had to make the decision of whether to accept the enrollment of the child or not. S/he said that:

In that moment, when I face the fact that I need to decide whether to receive the child or not, in that moment I hesitate: What will the teachers think? Because there’s a really difficult pupil, but the Madame still decides to accept his/her wish to go to school again. (P6)
The fear of the teacher’s reaction to the management of the school, was also linked to the fear of poor cooperation with the teachers. The principal was dependent on the teacher’s work and the imagined situation where the teachers did not accept the principal’s management was frightening. P5 expressed the following:

> Everyone thinks differently. If I talk harshly to someone; what if they don’t accept it? That makes one afraid. What if you don’t tell them? What if they do nothing? That makes…haha… that makes one afraid too, afraid not to fulfill the work.

The principal is dependent on the teachers and need them to cooperate as well as obey, something which the principals were aware of. Some teachers tended to mention the impression they had of the principals; always being afraid of whatever or whomever may threaten their position as a principal. However, none of the principals confirmed this, but it was definitely part of the power dynamics within the fellowship of the workers and will be treated when presenting findings for the second research question.

**Comparison**

The teachers feared the principal as leader; because of his/her power. They feared his/her corrective talks and his/her presence had an impact on their daily work. For the most part principals did not seem to fear the teachers, apart from the ones that mention how they relied on the teachers work to run the school, and that their acceptance of the school’s management was crucial.

### 5.3.4 A teacher’s fear of another teacher

Equally as the teachers feared the principals, there was also some fear among the teachers: A teacher fearing (an)other teacher(s).

> The creation—the creation of cliques which hate you. That is something as well, for the Malagasy; if you are hated by one person, you won’t be able to share your meaning/ideas again, because immediately when you raise your voice...puh... it will be torn down/destroyed (T18).

T18 mentioned how the teachers fear the creation of groupings and how damaging that may be. Some teachers underscored how the creation of groups made one feel isolated and that it on the whole had an impact on the fellowship among employees at school. Analyzing the data, two elements related to fear among the teachers was mentioned. First of all, the teachers
seemed to be afraid of gossip; that someone talks behind their back. One of the teachers gave an example where s/he told me that s/he was afraid of the reaction from the teachers that would receive his/her class the year after s/he had taught them. S/he feared their comments on the pupils’ level of knowledge, behavior etc. Closely related to the gossip is the creation of cliques as the quote by T18 cited above shows. If you are being disliked by one person, your situation may be troubled. Concerning a teacher’s fear towards another teacher I should mention that many teachers did underscore that they were not afraid of colleagues; neither to correct them, nor being corrected by them, and that the cooperation was good.

5.3.5 Fear of parents

Obviously as a teacher or principal you will to some extent relate to the parents of the pupils that are enrolled in school. The informants were directly asked about their relationship and cooperation with the parents and the fear of parents was clearly expressed both by the principal as well as the teachers. For most of the informants answering questions concerning the parents of the pupils seemed easier, compared to other relational questions posed.

Principals

Far less principals expressed fear towards the parents, than the teachers. This does not however mean that it did not exist:

The relation with the parents is one [thing that makes him/her afraid]. It worries me a lot because if the relation to the parents is harmed once, it’s done! They do not have confidence having their child here anymore. That is something one really…has to be aware of. (P4)

P4 addressed how important and dependent the school was on having a good relationship with the parents. They may risk that the parents take their children out of school if they are offended or somehow not satisfied with the school.

Because it’s a matter of worries, it’s a worry for…’What if!’ That is maybe it—if the parents are there, what if it there’s something with the colleagues which makes the parent mad? Something about their child... That may be frightening, if I don’t know about it, but the parent tells it, that may potentially be a problem. That may be frightening! (P5)

P5 made an example about how parents’ dissatisfaction could come as a surprise and that their reactions, for instance being angry, may be frightening.
Even though there are quotes that indicated a principal’s fear of the parents, many of the principals did as well say that there was no fear related to the parents.

**Teachers**

The teachers clearly expressed fear of the parents. Some talked about how they feared the hurtful comments, corrections and misbeliefs that could come from the teachers.

> Yes, there’s often fear when one talks with the parents (...) Often—speaking of parents, you may be afraid when you talk to them because you will get some hurtful comments when you communicate with them, because there are the parents who won’t admit that their child may be mistaken, their child is always right. (T16)

Coupled with the fear of corrections and harsh comments from the parents, the teachers also seemed to fear what concrete consequences the parent’s dissatisfactions could have for the pupils. The teachers seemed to fear the parents because of their authority. They had the power to stop sending their children to school, ruin the school’s reputation etc. Like T18 stated:

> Yes, I am afraid of the parents. Why? I am afraid of the parents because their cultures may be so different from another. Sometimes there are things I say which is ok for some parents, but if I tell some other parents, it may not be ok for them (...) I just know that I am the chief of the teaching, so I’m the one responsible. I may become afraid cause they [the parents] may damage the school, because; ‘there are some very strange teachers there, due to that we’ll take our children out.’ Then the children disappear—one is afraid of the interest of the school, what is said about the school.

However, there were also teachers that underscored how parents were their friends and that there was no reason why there should exist anything such as fear related to the cooperation or communication with the parents. “For me, I’m not afraid. All the parents have become my friends.” (T9)

**Comparison**

Principals and teachers gave an impression of fearing the consequences that may follow a parents’ dissatisfaction of school. They also expressed fear for harsh comments and talk. Just as there were principals and teachers that expressed fear, there were principals and teachers that stated the opposite - that there was no such reason why one should be afraid of the parents.
5.4 Fear and respect

In this section, findings related to research question number two will presented. To be able to answer the research question it was crucial to gain information about the participants’ perception of fear. Based on conversations done with people working in Madagascar before fieldwork, and my own experiences, I chose to ask the participants for the terms fear and respect specifically. I knew that they could be closely related and it was important to me to understand how they perceived the terms. If I assumed that their comprehension of the terms was the same as my own, and I was wrong, the analysis and research would be mistaken. I therefore tried to map my informants’ understanding of the terms, to better understand their role in the power relations and further be able to answer the research questions.

The first part of the chapter aims at describing how the principals and the teachers regarded and defined the two terms respect and fear. The second part of the chapter looks at how these terms were visible in the pedagogical staffs’ daily communication and work.

5.4.1 Fear

As an attempt to map how fear is looked upon, the informants were asked several questions such as: Whether they were able to define fear, how they look upon fear, how they cope with it and whether it is negative or positive and so on (ref. complete interview guide, Appendix 4 and 5). Some informants immediately reflected upon their biggest fears in life, which gave information for answering the first research question. Others reflected upon the fear in general terms and some managed to create some sort of definition. In the following, quotes and tendencies in the informants’ replies will be presented.

General considerations

When principals shared their thoughts concerning fear, some underscored that it should not be part of their work. P1 clearly stated this by simply saying: “In general, there should be no fear.” However, no one expressed that fear did not exist, rather the opposite: “It really exists. There’s a lot of fear. There are many fears” (P3). P3 continued listing some of the fears that were presented in relation with the first research question. Talking about fear, P6 expressed what it does to him/her: “I become disturbed, not relaxed. Yes… I become distressed. The
fear brings sickness.” Few of the principals addressed emotions that come with fear. P6’s quote however, touches the complexity of fear and its implications, such as sickness.

Similar to the principals some of the teachers underscored that fear did not influence them in their work: “For me it’s not at all fear that commands/directs/rules me.” Other teachers stated the exact opposite: “The fear is what really commands/directs/rules them [the teachers]” (T7). The teachers did as well mention how fear “…makes you distressed” and they often linked it to decision-making. However, they did not share details about what fear did to them.

**Definition - of differences or in anger**

Unlike the principals, the teachers often talked about how fear may be a result of differences that exist. In addition to quotes indicating fear related to differences in age and knowledge, differences in “mentality” was something that appeared several times in the data material. As RP1 said: “If they [humans] were alike, the human being’s mentality, it [the fear] would not exist.” Or like T15 talked about how s/he fears problems and that they often were caused by how the teachers were “a bit different” from each other. T11 actually linked the personal differences to customs. As s/he stated: “If you fear him/her; you don’t know the customs. Due to fear, you behave appropriately.” S/he further stated that: “To me, fear to me is, for instance: The person is not like me, therefore I’m afraid.”

Many of the teachers talked about how they fear people’s anger. T9 said the following: “…the fear is in the aggression. That is what the fear is; it’s situated in the aggression.” This was only mentioned by this teacher. Neither the principals nor any of the other teachers mentioned this. Anyhow, the finding is interesting for the discussion later in this thesis.

**Definition - a result of mistakes**

Many of the principals tried to define fear. Several of them mentioned how mistakes are a precondition of fear. Without mistakes, there would be no fear and their attempts of making definitions were therefore often linked to the fact that a mistake was made.

The fear is indeed—there has been a mistake at mmm… There’s someone who has made a mistake, something wrong. Then first will s/he be afraid. (…) I become really angry if the teacher comes and s/he hasn’t finished this. (…) If s/he hasn’t finished what s/he should have done, that is when s/he becomes afraid. (P1)
When the principals talked about mistakes they referred to it as things that were not completed, not consistent with the rules of the school.

The teachers also talked about fear related to mistakes and mistakes as the source of fear. The clearest quote considering this was the one already mentioned; when T7 stated that “The fear is…the fear is—There is something that for instance—You do something that isn’t ok.”

**Definition - a force**

The fear is also addressed as some sort of force which either makes one work or hinders work from being fulfilled.

> The fear is… The people living in fear, will not get things done. (...) ’Yikes! There comes the principal. S/he’s coming over here! Let’s work!’ and then it becomes quiet. But if the principal is absent, what will they do then? S/he won’t do a thing! (P2)

In the preceding quote, fear is reckoned as the impetus of the work. P2 indicated that the teachers would be talking to each other and do other things instead of working as long as the principal was not present. On the contrary, fear could be seen as something that hinders; “What is done in fear, won’t be fulfilled/ successful.” (P6) “If a person lives in fear, s/he won’t have any progression.” (P2) Principals talked about advancement in their profession, as well as personal improvement and development.

In the same way as the principals tried to define fear as a force which either makes you work or hinder you from work, there were similar findings in the data material from the teachers.

> To me, fear leads to, like, something, whatever it is, must be done. Like that, I’m scared and then I have to do this or that. If I’m afraid of the principal, then I have to do my homework, in case the principal asks. Wants a clarification. ”where’s your preparations/homework, Mr. X?” If I’m afraid of the principal, I’ll (decorate) make the classroom to look nice. (RP2)

T10 also underscored this. S/he did not state what the fear was related to, only that there were something which would get/arrest you if you did not do whatever you felt you had to do.

What the informant meant by get/arrest you is let alone for the listener to guess. It could have been the fear of a person, a sanction or so on; the fear of the consequences that could follow. T10 said the following: “The fear is—my explanation of it; it is the things you have to do, in case something gets/arrests you, you are obliged/forced to do it, to do the things.”
Definition - undesirable emotion, but related to love?

Furthermore, there were principals who define fear as something internal. Some said that it was “…something natural inside” but you have to “defeat” it every day (P2). P6 referred to it as a “war inside of me.” In these quotes there is an aspect of an everyday presence of an undesirable emotion. The internal aspect of the fear was also present in other answers given in the interview. P5 mentioned two different aspects of fear:

One of the aspects of fear is that there may be love. If I fear God, it is first and foremost my love to God—I’m afraid of dad - my love to him” (…) But the fear—another aspect of it is as well that there may be hate. As soon as something appears one becomes afraid, one escapes and… because I don’t like it, I’m afraid.

P4 stated that there were two types of fear. One fear was related to respect, the other one was related to love: ”There are two types of fear. There’s this; because you respect him/her—there’s mutual respect, s/he is afraid and respects you too. Then there’s the respect because s/he sees your love for him/her.” While these principals mentioned love as a factor in fear, P6 on the contrary stated that; “Fear is not an outcome of love.”

The teachers did as well come with examples of how they looked at fear as a phenomenon that was not rooted in their heart, in love. Different examples were drawn on how the things that were done in fear would include “…weaknesses, which may create problems” (T9). The best quote, which may represent the other quotes, was from T14. S/he was a special needs teacher and first and foremost worked with deaf children. Her/his love and engagement for the pupils gave a deep impression and when s/he talked about how actions should be rooted in the love for what you are doing, it was not surprising at all. S/he said the following:

When it comes to fear there’s kind of a consequence afterwards. It is like—It’s not the heart, but only fear. So, there’s something which sticks/ is stuck inside of you. There is something you would like to do, but then you are—for instance [you are] afraid of the principal so it becomes—it is fear. When fear is ravaging it is not really of the heart one does it, but just in fear, not of your heart. (T14)

Like the principals and on the contrary to what T14 states, there were teachers talking about how fear may have its origin in love. As one said: “Because you love God, you fear God” (T12). Anyhow, maybe the fear these participants are referring to may be regarded as different then what the others refer to. Further discussion will follow in chapter six.

Seen from some of the principals’ quotes, respect was mentioned. P4 even intended to define fear, but s/he started to talk about respect. More examples of how the informants tended to
speak of fear and respect as related, will be given at the end of this subchapter. First, in the following section data material on the informants view upon respect will be presented.

5.4.2 Respect

Not only was I interested in fear, I also wanted to get more information on how the participants perceive the term respect. Were there any clear distinctions between the terms fear and respect? In contrast to fear, there was only one question explicitly addressing respect in the interview guide (Appendix 4 and 5). First and foremost because I did not know beforehand that respect would become a term appearing so frequently in the participants’ responses. However, the term often appeared speaking of relations at school which will be addressed later in the findings chapter. First, the section which follows aims at presenting some quotes which represent important aspects of the participants’ perception of respect.

General considerations

Both the principals and the teachers gave an impression of respect as an obligation, something that should always be present, towards every person and in every situation. When talking about respect, both the teachers and the principals tended to draw examples from their work situation, mentioning different positions in the hierarchy. Like T15 stated: “The respect; It should always be present for human beings; whether pupil or teacher.” The quote from the principal was similar:

For me the respect is, it should always be present, which means… Not because you’re a superior you should not care about the minor. But you, as a superior, for the respect these teachers give you...Mmm... Not—you have to—you have to respect these teachers. (P1)

Another general consideration concerning respect which was brought up both by the teachers and the principals was that respect was something learned. To say that respect is something that has been learned does not define respect, but it gives an impression of how they looked upon the phenomenon. “...but they [pre-school teachers] teach the children that: ‘You have to respect the adults. That is the principle.” (P1)

The respect is, like the things you’ve learned like; this is the way to respect. (…) The respect is like the…one is used to the customs, the customs you’ve learned from back then. Like this is the way to act here and like this when there are people superior to you etc. (T6)
Definition - voluntary respect and forced respect

Studying the data material it appeared that the principals and the teachers tended to divide the term respect. Many of them talked about two different “sides” of the respect (P3). Both the teachers and the principals talked about respect as a result of love, respect from their heart. They described this respect as “voluntary” respect (P5). They phrased themselves slightly different, but love and heart were expressions frequently used and their answers were similar to each other. They defined respect as: “…something coming directly from the heart” (RP2), “the fruit of love” (T9) or “the heart’s will” (P5).

P3 talked about how one type of respect portrayed a “good mentality,” which may indicate respect out of love, while another type of respect is the respect for “self-serving.” The respect without any emotions related to it, was the other side of the respect. P5 mentioned this as s/he talked about how s/he sometimes saw respect as “forced.” S/he talked about how there is no need of love when respecting. It may have its origin in the fact that a person possesses a specific position and you are to respect him/her, “…whether I like him/her or not.” Respect defined as acknowledging a person’s position is a reasoning done even more frequently by the teachers. Like T1 said: “For me, the respect is to keep the structure.” T1 referred to the structure of the hierarchy in school, with the principle as his/her boss. T16 said something similar, but addressed the hierarchy even more explicit by saying: “The respect is again…is really…is really you really have the feeling that; this person here is above me, I have to put him/her in the place he is worthy of.”

5.4.3 Fear and respect intertwined

Many of the informants came with statements where fear and respect were intertwined. When they were asked whether they could say what distinguishes fear and respect they did not really manage to keep them apart, others kept them apart but clearly stated a relation between them and some did not seem to notice that they actually mixed them up when talking about them. “There should be fear in the respect,” P2 said. P5 stated: “…if you’re not afraid of ray amandreny [parents], those older than you, there’s no respect.”

T13 evidently expressed that the terms belong together as s/he said: “What I think is that they depend on each other. If I’m afraid of the principal, I respect him/her. The fruit of the fear is the respect.” P3 gave examples of how s/he feels that the fear makes him/her respect. S/he
said that due to the fear of the pupil’s poor exam results, s/he tried to respect the hours of his/her classes and the rules at school. “The way I see it the fear leads to respect.” T5 said something similar:

I am one of the teachers that are feared by pupils here because I don’t like having a mess in the classroom. And that fear generates respect from my pupils. I also respect my pupils and that generates good results. But if your pupils don’t fear you, they will not respect you and the results will be bad.

P2 was a fairly young principal who quite recently had received his/her position. The interview was very interesting as s/he gave an impression of being young and innovative in his/her way of thinking and managing the school, at the same time as it became clear that s/he possessed a position where a lot of different people had different expectations towards him/her. His/her comments contained a number of reflections that were contradictory and sometimes s/he gave the impression of not really knowing what step to take next or what her/his opinion really was...

Before there was a saying that went like this: “When no people fear you, no people will respect you (...) For me, it is the opposite: The respect for others should not be based on fear, the respect from people should derive from the things you do.” (P2)

This is how P2 related to the terms respect and fear, others again looked at it differently. In the next part of this chapter findings related to fear and respect in power relations in school will be presented. Is the old saying still valid for some, or is it just an old saying in which the content is no longer valid?

5.5 Power relations

In the previous section the principals’ and teachers’ views about fear and respect was presented. The last findings reflect how the two phenomena were visible in the power relations existing within the system of the Lutheran school. This section is divided into four sections. The sections family, communication and attitudes and perspectives all show different aspects of the power relations: How they are visible, looked upon and coped with in different levels of the hierarchy. The last section is called challenges and presents findings which reflect challenges that in many ways are linked to the previous, three sections.
5.5.1 Family

In the context chapter, the term *ray aman dreny* [parent] was presented. Several of the informants used the term in their interviews and many of the interviews carried elements of the *ray aman-dreny* [parent] aspect, even though the term was not spelled out. Power relations were visible in how the principals and teachers described the relationships in the pedagogical staff. Findings showing different aspects of the *ray aman-dreny* [parent] phenomena will be presented beneath, portraying the power relations and dynamics.

### Parent - child relation

Many of the teachers referred to their relationship as a parent - child relationship. The teachers were the children, the principal was the parent. “…the principal and the teachers are like parents and children” (T15). Other family terms were also used such as; “…as colleagues one should be like siblings” (T11). In the data material there were similar quotes from the principals. Not as many, but a significant quantity. One principal called the school “one household,” which gives an impression of how s/he looked upon the relations among the people within “the house”, the school (P1).

Teachers talked about how they taught the principle of respecting the elder to their pupils from the very beginning. In relation to this, a teacher nicely described how this way of thinking has followed him/her from the early childhood:

> Because… it is a matter of culture. Since I was a child living at home, this was made basic: The younger ones respect the elder ones. And then you have to live that out, if you are in a community, at work, you always live in that. Wherever [you are]. (T16)

One of the teachers reflected upon how different people may be regarded as *ray aman-dreny*, a parent, depended on the situation in which one operates. The teacher was fairly young and s/he told me about how s/he thought when meeting the parents’ of the pupils.

> First and foremost I look at the fact that I’m younger than they are (…). That must be the basis, the respect for children and parents… what makes them parents must be the basis. But when they arrive—because they do also put me as a parent in those settings, because when we’re in class, I’m the parent of these children. When they are at home, they are the parents. (…) In other words, I make that basis: They are parents. (T16)

The teacher touched upon the fact that not only position matters as a *ray aman-dreny*, but also the age of a person. There is also an element of competence in the quote given above,
competence as being the respective parents of a child and the competence being a parent due to the professional position you have as a teacher. In the next paragraph; findings reflecting this more will be presented.

**Age and competence**

Age and competence play a significant role and highlights the power relations within the pedagogical staff. The teachers described the cooperation among the pedagogical staff as difficult when age differs. Like T5 said: “Here, in general, working together is a little complicated because there are many older people and few younger people.” T14 said that; “Between the teachers, everybody get along, everybody is very young here.” P4, the new principal, expressed how s/he was worried about the fact that: “I am, one can say, more or less a little brother. What truly worried me the most in the beginning was: How can I lead these elderly people?” The tension in age was always present.

Complications were also mentioned due to differences in competence, due to education or superiority. T1 talked about how the older teachers sometimes at meetings may argue by saying: “We’ve been here the longest and back then we did like this and like this!” Therefore, they behave like they do and stick to their traditional ways of working. T1 later stated that; «…those with many diplomas will necessarily give the best advices, be more successful». Another teacher told me about how s/he sees competence and age as part of the hierarchy at school: “I, as a teacher, have other teachers who are the same as me, and then there are teachers who are situated superior to me, because they may have diplomas and seniority; been working here for ten years…” (T1) Furthermore, teachers told stories about how they correct younger and recently hired teachers: “When I see mistakes, I tell it!” (T7).

One of the informants in the research talked about the relation young versus old, competence versus experience, higher position versus lower position. One of his/her longer quotes sums up how many of the informants regarded the power relations.

The elders have a general opinion that: Should a person that was a child yesterday manage us? And they [the elders] get together and talk. This is the situation at many workplaces. ‘You came yesterday…’ They are afraid of being replaced/ moved before their retirement. They also fear being told: ‘These old don’t know a thing!’ It is very important for the Malagasy the: Rather die, than making people ashamed. (…) For instance: ‘Your opinion doesn’t work!’ Then the younger tries to defend what s/he
means and then it explodes. Don’t you try to underrate the opinion, so, so, so! One discusses, but it is not a question of competence anymore, but that the elder should be more respected in the community/ fahafizokina. ‘But you—when you’ve got—then blablabla!’ It is really difficult! Among the Malagasy one mixes up the professional and the social, one really mixes it up and people really know how to manipulate it. If an opinion/idé is wrong professionally speaking:

[Young teacher]: It won’t work, I’m sorry! It is not pedagogical!’
[Young teacher]: ‘But you—when you…as teachers…do you disregard a parent?!’

People don’t consider you based on whether you have or don’t have knowledge about something, but whether you show correct manners/customs, whether you disregard the ray aman-dreny [parent]. (T18)

The elders’ temper and reactions were talked about by other principals and teachers as well. An elderly man told me how s/he sometimes tried to convince the principal about different decisions due to the experience s/he had. S/he sighed and said the following: “I must put him/her—S/he is the principal, even though he is younger than me. That’s it! … I retire within two years.” The last sentence was said with a smile and a blink with the eye and between the lines I could see him/her telling me that: “I can’t wait to retire!”

The quote gives an impression of how the communication among the pedagogical staff may be. In the following, the focus is how the power relations are visible in the communication at school.

5.5.2 Communication

In the interviews the informants were asked questions concerning the communication at work: The communication among the teacher colleagues, communication as teacher and principal, the communication with parents of pupils and some touched upon the communication with the pupils. The informants talked about how the communication flows across different levels of the hierarchy, what they find difficult, easy, frightening etc. They were also asked questions about communication related to decision-making. The section is divided into four main sections highlighting different aspects of communication; Language, Moral and Temper, Cliques, Gossip and Meetings.
Language

The famous British novelist and journalist Angela Carter once said: “Language is power, life and the instrument of culture, the instrument of domination and liberation.” In the interviews the power dynamics became visible when the informants talked about how their verbal communication may be like. First of all, direct speech was mentioned several times. One of the principals talked about how s/he is afraid when facing the Executive Local Committee, due to his/her untypical way of phrasing himself/herself:

“How should I take this? What makes me simple—I don’t know how to do the speaking indirect (…) That’s my flaw. I’m direct. If you look at the Malagasy life, that’s [to be direct] not very Malagasy. The Malagasy make pictures when they achieve stuff. So, I’m not very like that. I’m direct. This is the goal, this is my way to get it and that’s it.” (P1)

A teacher said the same: “…there are people that don’t stand it; the straightforward way of talking isn’t accepted by people.” (RP2) The two informants expressed how direct speech may be a hinder in their work as the traditional, Malagasy way of phrasing oneself is indirect. RP1 add another aspect of the same issue by stating: “That is what makes the teachers afraid; that the principal will come and tell them directly.” In other words, the one phrasing himself/herself in a direct manner may be afraid, and the one receiving whatever the direct message is, may be afraid of getting a message stated in a direct manner to which they are not accustomed.

In schools where the principals gave an impression that they were direct in the way they communicated, several of the teachers said the same: Their communication was straightforward. In schools where nothing was really indicated, the teachers gave an impression of directedness as something complicated and difficult. A teacher told a story about how s/he once had managed to tell something directly to the boss. His/her quote turned out to be a unique one as no other informant ever expressed that they had corrected the principal’s behavior:

Our principal sings in a choir, and s-/he conducts a choir in church. And there was a time that they all went to Antananarivo (…) and they arrived back here really late. And I endured to say: School comes first, then the choir. And that’s… like, those things are really difficult for you to tell to your boss, and you’re not supposed to, even though there are times that you are obliged to tell the truth/say what is correct behavior. (RP2)
RP2 indicated that there were certain rules to follow that apply to the next issue discussed in relation to power dynamics in language and communication among the different levels of the hierarchy terminology and body language. In line with appropriate behavior one should bend down a bit when passing people. P1 however told me about how s/he looked at this:

There are some pupils, when they walk on the road and some of them, when they pass you, they really bend over. (…) However, some of them are truly afraid so that is why they do it, but there should not—there should not be fear at all, (…) but only respect. It’s normal to respect!

The quote indicates some of the dynamics in the relation between the principal and the pupils. T18 on the other hand gave examples from relation teacher - principal. “The Malagasy are afraid of their boss, which is logic because it’s not the case that fearing your boss doesn’t matter - it really matters! For instance how you phrase yourself…” The impression was strengthened when T9 talked about his/her relation to her/his boss. It became clear during our conversation that s/he was really close to his/her boss; they were not only colleagues, but friends after having worked together for many years. S/he described him/her as a boss full of humor and laughter and gives details of how they can make fun, laugh together and talk in the school yard. However, when s/he was to describe how s/he behaved when entering his/her office in occupational errand s/he said the following:

What is difficult for me is to not care about the structure. I have to establish a different respect towards him/her, a different one when I enter [the principal’s office] and start talking to him/her. If I enter—If I bring something to him/her, I erase the fun we had in the school yard from my memory. Only then is the structure established, now I’m going to make a step where s/he is the boss: “Excuse me, I’m truly sorry, Mister.” I need to put the structure which makes him/her boss, and then I listen to him/her in virtue of his/her position and talk to him/her as a boss. (T9)

Another aspect of the same issue was stated by P2. S/he talked about how the former principal neither accepted nor received new ideas and alternative suggestions from the young teachers. S/he underscored that this happened despite the fact that: “The way they thought and phrased themselves was appropriate.” (P2)

T18 on the other hand described his/her impression of the principal’s position and behavior: “S/he has to show off in the way s/he dresses, the way s/he speaks (…) the way s/he manages (…)”
Morality and temper

As seen from the findings related to the first research questions there were several of the informants who expressed fear towards temper and aggression. This section concerns communication in terms of being reprimanded for not following what is seen to be the moral standards or getting angry at each other etc. This is another area where the power dynamics are visible.

Some of the teachers told about how they are harsh towards the pupils. RP1 told about the teachers leaving the classroom to chat with each other and how the pupils remained silent due to the teacher’s temper: “They let the children stay there... If they chastise them, they just become silent.” (RP1) Another teacher expressed the dilemma of being in the middle between the parents and the pupils. S/he talked about how “…you have to get angry at the child, not very angry, but threaten them or something like that,” and s/he further talked about how it is difficult to educate the children because you may be afraid of being angry at the children due to the parents’ reaction and lack of accept (T8). In this quotes the power dynamics between the parents and the teacher, as well as the teacher and the pupils are visible.

The Responsible of Pedagogies was asked how it is to possess a position which is in the middle of the teachers and the principal, as you have some more responsibility than what the teachers have. All of them described this as difficult. One told me that if s/he knows beforehand that what the teachers have asked for, will not be accepted by the principal, s/he tries to convince the teachers about it, so that s/he does not need to go to the principal or s/he creates a proposition for the principal which is not exactly what the teachers asked for, but something in between which s/he thinks the principal will accept. An attempt to satisfy all parts involved in the request. As mentioned before, some of the teachers also come to the Responsible of Pedagogies, when being called to the principal’s office: “…they try to push me to negotiate with the principal” so that they do not have to meet the principal. That the responsible of pedagogic possess another position than the teachers become clear in such situations, as well as in the situations where they described how they liked to try to convince the teachers about a certain issue and “What makes you happy is when (…) you don’t need to show the person aggression, but what is logic in the education and the hierarchy here at school is being followed” (RP1). The principals talked about how they call the teachers into their office if they hear gossip they do not like or when they need to correct the teachers etc.
P4 said that s/he does not tell them strictly what the morals are, “…simply tell them, in power of being colleagues.” Several of the principals underscored that the fact that they know each of the teachers and that makes it easier to talk to them. Corrections were first and foremost done at his/her office, “not outside” [among others]. (P1)

Cliqués, gossip and meetings

A fourth issue that is brought up by the informants concerning communication was how colleagues tended to gather themselves in small groups talking about what they like and dislike, instead of stating and sharing their opinions in meetings, where all the colleagues are gathered. The forming of groups among the colleagues was a clear tendency in the data material and mentioned by many of the informants. “S/he doesn’t dare to say his/her opinion, but when—only when s/he is together with two or three [people] s/he tells his/her opinion” (T6).

They are shy so they won’t say anything in front of everybody, but they talk anyway: ‘Come on over her for a minute!’ And they call people, one by one, but not-- (...) They won’t say it in a meeting (T1).

T1 further talked about people’s reaction if they had seen others talk in groups, they may “…become worried that something else than what the principal originally said is being told.”

One of the principals told me about how s/he acted and behaved if s/he heard such talk: “What I don’t like is if the teachers gossip behind my back (…) I have said: If it is me you want to tell something, then come here to me and tell me.” (P1) The principal continued by saying that s/he does not yell at the teachers in front of other people’s eyes, as s/he says: “…dirty clothes are to be washed inside the house, not outside.” The principal further told me a story about how s/he once reacted when s/he heard that there were parents that held something against a teacher. The way the example is told examfifies the power and position of the principal.

The parents of a child that were being chastised here at school were looking for the teacher [that had been mad at their child], because they wanted to beat him/her up. So I went and I said: We are going to fight now. Then the parents came here, entered here, and I said: When you are here in this domain, you will not win over me! And you are not allowed to touch me! Cause if you ever touch me once, I’ll show you what really—I’m simple! I’ll show you what makes you stubborn (…) Then, the parents softens a bit: “Ok, Sir, do what is needed to make it settled/organized/ calm. And I tell him/her: Do not hit or scare the teachers outside of school. It is not only your child that
we get angry at, there are a hundreds of kids that people get angry at here, so if it is just for your child’s sake that you will hit him/her [the teacher]. Simply: There are many schools, change school for your kid cause shhh…! That is my principle. There’s no compulsion here, whether teachers or pupils or parents. They all want to come here. There’s no—No one says—no one takes you there: You have to study here! You come here and say: It is my wish to come here. I work here because I want to. The workers want me to work here. There’s no compulsion. So when your desire doesn’t work for you: Then just go! Don’t—don’t add that mood in your life. (P1)

Cooperation and methods

What is described in the previous quote is a certain communication as response to a specific episode. Still, it carries elements of respect and maybe fear as well. It further reflects the position of the principal, as well as the teachers and parents response to it. The methods the pedagogical staff used and how they operated related to one another and the emotions and reactions involved also reflect the power dynamics where fear and respect are visible.

One of the teachers told me that at their school they had often done feedback or come up with suggestions by “…writing a letter” (T6). For some, it was easier to bring something forward doing in writing.

T12 talked about the two different principals s/he had experienced and simply said: “Everyone has their own way of doing things, you just adapt.” P2 talked about how s/he “…strives to be a model. Then people will become afraid. No, when it comes to the principal we cannot talk like this because s/he doesn’t do it. Hence, the basis for their respect towards you is established.” Anyhow, the same principal talked about how s/he “imposes” decisions and things to do, but s/he underscored the importance of “adding an explanation,” to make the teachers understand the rationale (P2).

P1 was good at describing. S/he was direct and openly told me that s/he tried to smile and be open when s/he spoke to the teachers because if s/he got angry and “…beat the table with his/her fist (…) nobody would say a word, nobody would answer.” So to get to know their thoughts and what was on their mind s/he had to be happy. S/he further told me that if s/he screamed once, all the 600 pupils enrolled in their school would become quiet.

T16 had an interesting point of view when I asked about the cooperation at the school where s/he works:
Often when it comes to elders and employees… the talk always goes downwards, not upwards [in the hierarchy]. At our place, our principal, there are conversations. If there’s something that is unclear to you, you may tell him/her: Madam, what if we for instance did it this way? And s/he will listen to you whether it sounds ok or not. If it brings something good to the school, it will happen. (…) We always follow the fellowship here when it comes to the work (…).

The teacher explained how it is possible to discuss issues with the principal. Another teacher expressed the same and states that the “missionary status” still holds in their school, explaining that it is possible to discuss, whatever position you may possess (T5). Quite a few of the teachers described their principal as a cooperation worker and as a person that “always solves the problems (…) helps you ‘do it like this,’ and finds a solution” (T8). “S/he always looks at what’s right, cause s/he is a ray aman-dreny” (T15). RP3 said the following:

We [him/herself and the principal] are close to each others hearts - that is the truth. S/he doesn’t put herself above us, and I do not think that s/he is above me either, but we’re at the same level in the matter of work speaking even though we have the hierarchy I mentioned… So I don’t hesitate if for example s/he says annn… for example… I don’t get angry if s/he critiques me… I know that it will make the work better.

At of the schools there were committees among the teachers with different responsibilities, for instance “a social group” being responsible for the social activities in and outside of school for the teachers. Some principals underscored the importance of these groups and that s/he actively used them in decision-making processes, not to feel that the decisions were made alone. Another told about the class representatives which could contact the responsible of the pedagogics if they wanted changes that mattered to teachers.

A last aspect of the methods part is a topic that only was mentioned by the principals. The principals told me about how they control the work of the teachers. They described how they sometimes do observe the teachers in class. Or like P3 told me:

I do not control the preparations papers of the teachers that much, but I see it at their work…and the teachers don’t know that. For instance, I take one of the children’s books and look at what hours they have done? That is my work. (P3)

**Executive Local Committee and controls**

The principals were also asked about their cooperation with the *Komity Mpitanana* [Executive Local Committee]. In general the principals said it worked out well. Studying the data material closer, the quote from P3 will summarize a tendency several of the principals expressed: “If it is something good, it flows (…) It is no problem at all if it brings something
good to the school.” All the principals talk about how decision-making processes rely on the Komity Mpitantana [Executive Local Committee], though P6 stated: “They ask for my opinion and if it is ok they follow it, and if it is not, they make it better.”

5.5.3 Attitudes and perspectives

During the interviews several attitudes and point of views were expressed which in some way reflects power dynamics where fear and respect may be found. The subchapter is divided into three sections: Protecting position, Left behind and Self-image and tsiny.

Protecting position

The teachers spoke about what they believed their principal feared. T18 was the teacher phrasing himself/herself most clearly at this point:

I believe s/he’s afraid, his/her fear is that s/he will be replaced by someone who knows more! (…) ‘I’m the principal now and you tell me that you’ll make this paradise tomorrow?!’ In other words, s/he’s afraid of someone taking his/her position. (…) Who can manage to take his/her position? And s/he hits those who fall, so that everyone becomes afraid.

T18 further elaborated on how s/he believed the education in Madagascar did not equip the employees for receiving the principal if s/he asked for advice, tried to have a dialogue. S/he claimed that it often resulted in people being very proud, which the principal again may not withstand. As T18 said” If you pick an idea from someone, you’ll be afraid they will tell it to someone higher in the hierarchy; That principal doesn’t know a thing! S/he gets ideas and opinions from friends.” Additionally T18 said: “Protect you power…protect your chair, if not, it will be tripped over by the people’s fight.”

The fear of losing a position was confirmed by other teachers. T7 told me about how the principal at his/her school “… was afraid I would replace him/her” when s/he first started working there. RP1 stated the similar issue about teachers wanting the position s/he had: “They [the teachers] choose the one [responsible of pedagogics], but they dream about my position.”
**Left behind**

Another aspect of the power relations where fear was visible turned out to be the fear of being left behind when something was to be said or done in settings where the entire staff is gathered. T18 told me the story of how s/he finally had to leave his/her position at the school s/he used to work. In the following there will be cited three quotes from T18, showing how it may look like among the colleagues:

This is what is really frightening: No one tells you that they are afraid… it doesn’t exist… (…) S/he won’t tell you: I’m afraid. For instance, if you and I talk together, we have a boss: ‘Let us do this!’ But then, you won’t tell me that you are afraid. (…) Sometimes the Malagasy tend to say that: ‘I’m not afraid of him/her,’ but when it really matters…than it [the fear] will be visible. Many—I’ve been a victim of it, I know. (T18)

At that time I ended up standing there alone, because the friends I thought would make the same conclusion as I, they had given false reports already, something else, to the principal. You see, that is what one fears, that is what many people fear that: You’ll be left alone there! You’ll be forsaken! Because behind the scenes the Malagasy, many Malagasy state that: Yes, that is absolutely truth, about the principal, or about those being older or having a high position. (T18)

For instance, if the two of us are teachers, and you say to me: ‘Our principal, our principal did something that was not ok; this is the case…’ But this I tell the boss: ‘X said that…’ And then the principal will call on you. That is very hard! (T18)

T18 was more or less forced to resign from his/her former post because s/he dared to speak up. As in the quote above, s/he counted on his/her colleagues that suddenly backed out when it all came to an end. T1 also talked about how s/he did not report to the principal if other colleagues were talking behind the principal’s back. S/he avoided it because s/he had the impression that it “…always creates a big fight.” (T1)

**Self-image and tsiny [guilt]**

Another aspect that became visible related to perspectives and point of views where how people looked at themselves, their positions and personal character. T1 said: “I just set the structure: S/he is the boss, I’m a teacher, a human being beneath him/her.” Something similar is said by another teacher; “s/he is the principal, I am a simple teacher, so respect always has to be there. I put him/her at his/her place s/he is the number one of the school” (T5).

T1 also stated that s/he had a lot of temper and was sometimes afraid of how it influenced the pupils and made them stressed. S/he stated that: “They do not manage to concentrate
anymore because they are afraid.” These quotes reflect some of the teachers’ self-image: Where they see themselves in the hierarchy, as well as how they regard their position.

Tsiny, guilt, was another aspect of the power relations that came up. First and foremost it was mentioned in relation to the parents of the pupils. T3 told about how s/he does everything for her pupils. If a pupil wet himself/herself and did not have any clean trousers, s/he would personally go to the child’s home to fetch him/her some clean trousers. S/he described how they took care of many, many children in their school and compared it to how parents may strive just watching a couple of children, compared to the teacher watching many. Then s/he sighed and said: “Still, some parents will give you the tsiny” (T3). Another teacher said that some parents would give it because they were not satisfied with what the child learned at school: “If it is not in line with what they thought, they will give the tsiny.” T11 told about how s/he gives himself/herself the tsiny if there were something s/he did not manage to do and had to go to the administration and principal of the school to get help: “First of all, I do not manage to solve this, second, I bring it here [the principals’ office]”

5.5.4 Challenges

The forth section is named challenges. This section will as well reflect fear and/or respect in power dynamics among the pedagogical staff, but it will focus on challenges faced in relation to the previous sections communication and family. Challenges have already been mentioned throughout the different subchapters, though, some challenges will be stated here in specific.

Alcohol

In relation to communication, alcohol was mentioned by some of the informants. One of the responsible of pedagogics told me about one of his/her challenges related to the communication with pupils, teachers or the parents of the pupils.

Whether it is a pupil or a teacher, s/he drinks a bit of alcohol before s/he talks to you. That happens. Sometimes, even, parents of the pupil. If one has called for them—due to the fear they may have managed to get drunk before they meet you. They respect you, but they do not dare to talk to you unless they are drunk. (RP1)

RP1 addressed alcohol as a result of the people’s fear; a way to cope and face the person who have called them in to their office.
Role as an educator

As an educator, you will always possess a specific role; a role constantly following you. This was by several of the informants seen as a challenge. Wherever you go, people recognize you for what you do for a living. Like one principal said: “What is distressing is that I’m the principal so people will judge me for all kinds of stuff. Whether it is my life outside of work, my life here at work - everything affects the role as an educator.” The principal further highlighted that it was actually part of the rules of the Lutheran Schools to be aware of their role wherever they are. T6 also stated that: “Your private life gets a bit limited.” T6 talked about how s/he may have friends that by others may reckoned to have an inappropriate behavior, or that in Malagasy family parties there would necessarily be drinks etc. and this could be something people start to talk about and observe your movements outside of school as well.

Colleagues as parents

It is obvious that as teachers we teach children of teachers. This once happened: The pupil behaved really badly and brought his/her phone to the class. The regulations clearly states that you are not allowed to bring a phone. I told him/her once and s/he accepted it, but then the second time, I would necessarily need to increase the way I talk to him/her. Afterwards, that evening, his/her mum, a colleague of us here, suddenly said: ‘You were too hard on him/her. This is how one should do it!’

As seen from this quote and from many of the quotes in the findings the social and the professional are linked together and hard to separate. Like T18 beautifully put it: “For us, the Malagasy, we do not only live, we live together with those who surround us”
6 Discussion

The first part of this chapter provides a summary of the research. Thereafter follows a brief summary of the findings presented in chapter five. In the second part of this chapter the findings will be discussed: categories which emerged in the data material will be further explored and analyzed, taking into consideration the literature and theoretical framework chosen for the research.

6.1 Summary of research

In this case-study twenty-three teachers and six principals in Madagascar were interviewed. The aim of the interviews was to get information to be able to answer the two specific research questions of the study: 1) What are the factors that pedagogical staff in Lutheran Schools in Madagascar fear? 2) How is fear visible in the power relations between pedagogical staff working in Malagasy Lutheran Schools? A qualitative research design was chosen, as the participants’ personal stories, thoughts and feelings would serve the purpose of the study: Overall this study examines fear structures and dynamics among teachers and principals in Malagasy Lutheran schools and what this fear concerns.

A lot of literature was read before the fieldwork started and when entering the field, I had some sensitizing concepts in mind. Some of the concepts proved useful as it either supported or brought interesting perspectives to the findings. Further analysis of the findings resulted in the inclusion of other theories as well. Analyzing the transcriptions of the interviews and organizing the findings was a time consuming process. Reading through the data material; codes and categories were produced, merged, split, erased and renamed over and over again, till it finally ended in the presentation provided in chapter five.

6.2 Summary of the findings

6.2.1 What are the factors that pedagogical staff in Lutheran Schools in Madagascar fear? (RQ1)

Studying the data material two categories were created related to what frightening factors (RQ1) the teachers and principals experience in school: Consequences and Hierarchy. Within
the category of consequences six major codes were developed: decision-making, bad reputation, bad results, punishments and temper, controls and mistakes. First of all, it became clear that fear could be related to decision-making. This included both the act of making a specific decision, as well as the situation that may follow a certain decision. There were some differences between the principals and the teachers concerning this fear and the differences mainly concerned the fear of whom they could affect with their decisions. Second, the consequences related to a bad reputation emerged from the data. We see that fear related to what people external to the school may think about the school or about those working there was evident, both for the teachers and the principals. The teachers mentioned how pupils may create gossip about their school and those working there. Third, fear of bad results is also part of the fear of consequences. Fear of bad results reflects both the fear of pupils’ bad performances as well as poor professional performance as a teacher or a principal. Some of the findings brought forward the responsibility which lies in educating the new generation, to be responsible for today’s future. The latter was mentioned by teachers. Furthermore, the code punishment and temper, became apparent as a broad concept, including different aspects some which reflect fear related to sanctions. From the findings we see that the fact that someone who holds something against you or is mad at you is an uncomfortable thought, because it gives an indication that there may have been an incident of inappropriate behavior. The findings also reflect the fear related to the lack of formal papers, such as contracts or principals having the power to withhold salary. In Madagascar, there are a few instances protecting you as an employee. We see that findings among the teachers reflect the fear of concrete sanctions by certain people, while the principals reflect a more general fear for people’s temper. Additionally, the fear of mistakes emerged early as a code in the findings as several of the participants mentioned it. Findings show that teachers’ fear of mistakes often is related to their own profession; either lack of knowledge or professional mistakes made facing the pupils. The principals, on the other hand, underline the fear of deviating from what is seen to be standard or correct management. Finally, findings show that controls run by the government or by people possessing a higher position than the informants, also are feared by the teachers. This is not the case for the principals as the controls do not affect them in the same way as the teachers. Whether the fear of consequences further is linked to what may appear from higher up in the hierarchy, is impossible to say for sure. Though, looking at the findings related to the situated hierarchy, it may be likely that there is a link, which brings me to the next category: hierarchy.
The category *hierarchy*, concerns the fear the informants mentioned towards different the levels of the hierarchy within the management of the school: from pupils at the bottom, to God as an authority at the top. First of all, the fear of God and the Devil as authorities was mentioned by several of the informants, both principals and teachers. This fear was a result of the fact that they regarded their work as sacred. Thus, fear related to failure in their sacred mission was described as: not fulfilling the mission they saw themselves called to, as well as failure in what they reckoned as appropriate Christian behavior or God’s will. The fear of God seemed to be the type of fear which is blended with awe. Fear was also related to the fact that teachers and principals are in charge of many children, and within Christianity, children have a specific position. Related to this, was the talk of the spiritual warfare between good and evil. Some informants mentioned the risk of damage and sabotage by the Devil since they were on mission for God. In contrast to the fear of God, the fear of the Devil seemed to be related to a real threat of something dangerous.

Secondly, findings showed that within the hierarchy, the teachers feared the principals and vice versa. In short, the teachers feared the principals due to the position s/he occupied and the power s/he had along with what s/he was capable of doing. The fact that the principal was regarded as a *ray aman-dreny* [a parent] influences how the employees behaved and acted towards and around him/her. Being called into his/her office was alone a reason to be afraid, as you may have done something wrong, such disrespecting a parent. What follows then, is the *tsiny* [guilt] which may last for generations (ref. context chapter; chapter 2). The principals feared the teachers as well. Findings show that the principals’ fear mainly concerned teachers’ reactions to their decisions. Furthermore, some principals expressed fear related to the fact that a principals’ management depends on the work of the teachers, thus, good relations are a necessity.

Third, fear among the teachers was also present in the findings. We see that their fear centers on gossip and groupings, for example - being disliked by colleagues. The imagined situation of having colleagues talking behind your back was frightening for many. Moreover, it is important to remember that part of the findings also showed that some teachers emphasized that fact was *not* part of their emotions towards colleagues. Fourth, there was a fear towards parents. The principals’ fear is focused on the parents’ satisfaction and the consequences for the school if what was expected was not fulfilled. The teachers agreed to this, as well as they added the fact that they feared the parents because their reactions might influence the pupils.
The overall impression is that the fear for different consequences is linked to hierarchal structures; fear of different aspects all comes back to power relations based on the different positions in the hierarchy.

### 6.2.2 How is fear visible in the power relations between pedagogical staff working in Malagasy Lutheran Schools? (RQ2)

Doing the research it was necessary and important for me as a researcher to gain information about how my informants perceived the terms fear and respect. The informants perceptions and experiences of fear included fear being an undesirable emotion, an emotion as a result of something unknown or different from oneself, an emotion in aggression, an emotion as result of a mistake, something natural inside, awe, something without love. Their definitions were closely related to the factors listed as findings related to research question one. The definition of fear presented in the theory chapter includes the different aspects revealed in the interviews and is therefore still valid studying the responses from the participants. Respect, as a phenomenon, was regarded as mandatory, learned, a result of love, voluntarily or simply a kind of acknowledgement without love. What is not included in the definition is the fact that some of the informants seemed to mix up the two terms, and some even stated that they depend on each other. In the following sub-chapter, a short summary of the findings related to how fear is visible within the power relations in school (RQ2) will be given. The findings were divided into four categories: family, communication, attitudes and perspectives as well as challenges.

#### Visibility: Family

Relations were often, both by the principals and the teachers, described using family terms. The *ray aman-dreny* [parent] principle as a code of behavior early became visible in the data. Fear and respect were visible in how the teachers and principals refer to one another. The complexity which follows such as the ‘family view’ of relations within a fellowship was visible when the principals and the teachers described how they view and relate to one another. The differences between the teachers and the principals in this case were due to their different positions. A teacher would call his/her principal a parent, while the principal would call the teacher a child. Furthermore, the findings gave insight into how respect is taught and established already at an early age. As a grown-up you may not even remember when you
learned this; it is just the way it should be. Moreover, the informants underscored the importance of giving a person above you the position s/he had the right to possess. Whether the respect includes some kind of fear is unclear. Some informants gave the impression that the two terms are mixed. In the findings we see that age and competence underscores how the *ray aman-dreny* [parent] expression includes different aspects, not just the parent-child relationship. Because of the different aspects, disagreements may arise. For instance, findings show that age tends to override competence, which does not always pass quietly. Some of the young teachers may have their education from teacher-school, while the elder teachers may have a long length of service, but not the academic background. This may cause disagreements and tension where fear and respect are highly present. This aspect was expressed by both groups.

**Visibility: Communication**

From the findings communication became a category and several aspects highlighting fear in the power relations appeared in different ways within this category. Findings show that both the teachers as well as the principals seem to fear the effect of using direct speech instead of indirect speech,- with the latter seen as culturally appropriate and accepted. A certain body language was also mentioned as a factor for showing respect. This was only mentioned by a principal speaking of the pupils, but was observed in the teacher-principal relationship as well. Fear and respect also became visible in the lack of communication. For example, this included when the teachers described how pupils remained silent in fear of being chastised or how the teachers remained silent themselves in fear of the pupils’ parents. The fact that there have been episodes where the Responsible of The Pedagogics tried to negotiate with the teachers to find temporary solutions, may also be seen as an indicator of the fear facing the principal, striving to avoid situations which were uncomfortable.

Findings further revealed reflections concerning cliques and gossip among the teachers and how this creates fear; the fear of being talked about without knowing it. As indirect speech is reckoned appropriate, a person being talked about might not even know it, as it is not stated directly and what is said indirectly may be difficult to understand. The fact that some schools need to make use of letters as a way to communicate, instead of speaking directly in meetings, may be an indicator of how communication in power relations is influenced by fear. Some of the teachers clearly stated that the communication flows from the top of the hierarchy
downwards. Other teachers underlined how communication and cooperation is respectful based on different positions with fear not part of their relationships. Several of the principals mentioned how it is important to talk calmly to the teachers to create a safe platform where teachers can feel comfortable speaking up. Some teachers did seem to value the principals’ decisions as always right and equal to civil rights and law. This fear of communication in cliques or being left alone is not part of the principals’ reflections. What they mentioned is what mattered to levels higher up in the hierarchy. The principals did not say the relationships they have were filled with fear, but some mentioned that they were fine as long as things were in line with what the committees thought and meant. In other words, they did not explicitly say that fear is part of their relationships with those higher in the hierarchy. The quotes give an impression that the situation is slightly different when what they said is in contrast to what the level higher up in the hierarchy thought.

**Visibility: Attitudes and perspectives**

Findings related to attitudes and perspectives concerned only the teachers. Responses related to this create a picture of what the teachers believe that the principals fear. According to the teachers, the principals feared that someone would take their position. One of the responsible of pedagogics further expressed that gaining more power and being promoted was a teacher’s biggest dream. It is therefore likely to believe that if a teacher dreams about a position, it would naturally mean that they believed that the principal could be fearful of their [the teacher’s] power if it increased. The teachers’ awareness about their position was further expressed when they told me that they saw themselves in position below the principals and above the pupils. Related to what was mentioned in the previous paragraph concerning gossip and cliques was the everlasting fear of being left alone if you dared to speak up at meetings. Despite the fact that colleagues have said they share a point of view and will support each other, they do not dare to speak against the principal. According to one of the informants, they benefit from the situation instead by lacking the dissatisfaction that they have been entrusted by with their colleagues to the principal behind the colleague’s back. Finally, we see from the findings that fear was visible in the power relations by the term *tsiny* [guilt]. In the context chapter it is made clear that *tsiny* [guilt] is something a Malagasy would try to avoid. When the teachers described how some parents might make them feel *tsiny* [guilt], it is likely to believe that it is something they feared. This was supported by the findings which showed that teachers to some extent did fear the parents and their reactions. However, one teacher even
stated that s/he may give himself/herself the tsiny [guilt] as a result of not fulfilling what s/he sees as her/his duties.

Visibility, challenges

In the findings we see that there are certain challenges related to the different aspects of communication. Alcohol was mentioned in particular. The fact that parents, or even pupils, may drink some alcohol before meeting the teachers indicated fear and unsureness. However, keeping in mind that one may regard a teacher as a ray aman-drency [parent] within his/her field makes it quite incredible that the parents and/or pupils chose to meet a teacher after consuming alcohol. Though, maybe this indicates the authority and power the parents feel the teachers have in the domain of the school. The principals did not mention this. Furthermore, emotions related to the role of being an educator were mentioned; in the respect teachers showed towards the position that they possessed. The third challenge mentioned was that it may be complicated to have parents as your colleagues.

6.3 In light of theoretical framework

Studying the data material collected, it became clear that some informants described a type of fear which seemed to be immediate and biological whereas,- others described situations where fear clearly had its origin in the person’s context. To be able to do the coding and answer the research questions a definition of fear was constructed (ref. Chapter 3). The sociological perspective of emotions, where a feeling is closely related to its context, turned out to be evident in this research. The feeling of fear in the educational system is truly rooted in the present culture and society. However, it is important to keep the psychological perspective in mind as well; an internal, natural phenomenon which sometimes results in immediate actions or behavior. We see that fear is related to history, traditions, lessons learned, expectations, roles and power dynamics.

In the following section the findings will be seen in light of theory and concepts chosen for this research. Some of the theories and concepts were useful while studying and analyzing the findings, others were less relevant. New thoughts which emerged from the data material will be presented. To make the presentation easier to follow, I have sorted my theories in three main categories. The theory of Luhmann mirrors vertical power relations, while Hofstede’s
theory reflects *binary oppositions*. Other theories that are mentioned such as; Fineman’s theory about how emotions arise, Milley who writes about different perspectives of emotions, Dahl who writes about the significance of Malagasy culture etc. are called *biological, cultural and pedagogical factors (BCPF)*. To visualize how the theories flow, the following model was created:

![Diagram showing the theories]  

*Figure 6.3: An overview of the theories. Blue arrows represent Hofstede’s dimension theory, indicating oppositions. Green men represent Luhmann’s theory, where the power is vertical. BCPF stands for biological, cultural and pedagogical factors (Model developed by author).*

Luhmann’s theory concerns the vertical power relations to a large extent; this is especially reflected in his generalized codes. The green men in the vertical line symbolize a hierarchy. The blue lines represent Hofstede’s six cultural dimensions. The dimensions have two different poles (symbolized with the arrows) and Madagascar is placed somewhere along the different lines. The orange bubbles symbolize the biological, cultural and pedagogical factors. They may be placed wherever in and around the different power dynamics. A person possessing a position as a principal, being part of a Hofstede’s masculine dimension, is likely to be just as much influenced by his/her culture as a principal being part of the feminine dimension. In other words, the different findings may be linked to several of the theories at the same time. What is most relevant in the context of this study was chosen for the different findings and the corresponding discussion.
One of the factors which made the organization of the findings in this research difficult was that in the end; fear has several masks, but there is always a face behind the mask. With this I mean the effects of fear, how it manifests itself and is expressed differ, however, behind the responses of the participants there is always a source of fear, and the source may be similar. Behind an effect there is an agent. In other words, in many of the quotes, the source is found in the power relationship in which the individuals are situated. What you immediately perceive as fear, may sometimes be the effect of the fear of something else. The complexity of a culture where indirectness is seen as the most appropriate way to communicate makes this even harder to identify. It forces you to dig deeper and look beyond what is being said. The assortment of the findings is based on the different categories that emerged linked to each research questions. However, in the discussion, the different findings may, to a certain extent, be joined, as there are several elements linking them together. Looking at the findings separately would leave out important aspects which are needed to be able to see the full picture of how fear hovers quietly in the power relations within the educational discipline in Madagascar.

6.3.1 The caring collective

Hofstede’s cultural dimensions

As indicated in the introduction to this subchapter, there are several connections within the findings. As can be expected, the fear among the different levels of the hierarchy manifests itself in different ways. The fear of decision-making, bad reputation, bad results or making mistakes is visible both among teachers and principals. Seen in the light of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, it may be easier to spot the rationale behind the fear (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). First of all, Madagascar is a country where the society is reckoned as more feminine than masculine. Being close to the femininity pole in Hofstede’s masculinity versus femininity dimension (MAS); one of the values would be to take care of one another. The importance of good relations is underscored (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Being part of this dimension does not make decision-making among pedagogical staff in Madagascar easy. As a principal, one occupies a position where one has the main responsibility for an entire school. A principal’s decisions influence a lot of people, you are supposed to take care of. If a school has a bad reputation, the principal being the head of the school, may be the one accused for not initiating measures for whatever
the problem may be. Equally s/he may be the one questioned if the school’s exam results are bad or if there are mistakes done. In the same way as the principal is the one closest to the community and the teachers, the teachers are likely to be the ones closest to the pupils and feel a certain responsibility for taking care of them. Their decisions often affect pupils: They may be held responsible for bad exam results as well as making mistakes or being the reason for a school’s bad reputation. These frightening factors may be rooted in and strengthened by the fear of not being able to take proper care of one another, an element in Hofstede’s femininity dimension (1994; 2011).

Furthermore these frightening factors may be linked to Hofstede’s individualism versus collectivism dimension (IDV). Madagascar is a country where the collective is important, as one of the teachers put it: “For us, the Malagasy, we do not only live, we live together with those who surround us” (T18). When decisions or mistakes are made, there is always a thought of those being part of “your” group, which in this case is the school. The teachers’ fear of other teachers first and foremost concerned the fear of colleagues talking behind their back. There is an expectation towards loyalty among the members of a group, when this loyalty is shaken by, fear is created. Both the teachers and the principals reflect upon this feeling of being part of a group, being responsible for one another and taking care of one another. The complexity of having parents to pupils as colleagues was also touched upon.

**Biological, cultural and pedagogical factors**

Moreover, knowing that *fihavanana* [kinship] is an important cornerstone in the Malagasy culture, this strengthens Madagascar’s position within IDV dimension and MAS dimension. Milley (2009) underscores that an emotion may be socially constructed or learned. The fact that one should treat relations heartily and with warmth is taught and adapted from the context in which the participants of this research live. Obviously the frightening factors may be seen in the light of the BCPFs too. A teacher mentioned the fear of being caught in the act of doing something inappropriate, in this case; smoking. This may be seen as what Fineman (2003) identifies as an *emotion as social* in the sense that it is taught and it is socially constructed; it is seen as inappropriate within a certain social context. Some of the frightening factors may as well be linked to the *early experienced* perspective. The teacher and/or the principals may for instance be afraid of bad results because they have experienced it before and they know about the consequences which may follow. One of the principals clearly expressed it when
s/he stated that what s/he feared was a relapse to how the school was before. S/he refers to a situation in the past. In this case it is easy to identify the situation and the experience. Whereas in other cases, early experience may be difficult to identify; one only understands that the feeling of fear is related to a similar experience in the past. Fineman’s (2003) *emotion as social* is closely related to Luhmann’s codes - *episodes* in the past and *system history* as they both deal with using the past for the present.

A pedagogical factor linked to the fear of making mistakes is what one of the teachers touched upon concerning the fear of doing lingual mistakes in language lessons due to the lack of education. This may be linked to what has been presented in the context chapter regarding the pedagogical history of the use of language within school. For a certain period of time the teachers neither received any proper education in French nor Malagasy. No wonder there is fear related to the risk of doing mistakes, as some feel that they are not well enough equipped for their lecturing.

### 6.3.2 Avoiding the unknown

As seen, the fear of decision-making, bad reputation, bad results or making mistakes may be linked to the MAS dimension, IDV dimension and some of the BCPFs. The fear of punishment and temper may be linked to some of this too, but there are other parts of the theories that may be more relevant. When it comes to Hofstede’s *uncertainty avoidance index* (UAI), Madagascar is complex and to some extent difficult to place. On the one hand, due to its history as a former colony, the country carries elements which suit the typical weak uncertainty avoidance country (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). This may be elements such as time being irrelevant and rules often expressed in basic terms. On the other hand, other elements which suit Madagascar are seen as typical characteristics for a strong uncertainty avoidance country; elements such as being fixed to certain behaviors and principals, as well as being uncertain of things being different than what they are used to (Hofstede, 1994; Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). The fear of another person’s temper, morality, direct speech and aggression is a clear tendency for both units. Knowing that Malagasy culture has a typical high-context communication, what you mean should rather be shown than said, may be linked to Hofstede’s thoughts of being a strong uncertainty country; addicted to fixed principals and behaviors (Hofstede; 1994; Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010, Hall,1976; Dahl, 1998). Teachers’ and principals’ fear of other
persons’ aggression and temper may be seen as a fear caused by its unfamiliarity. They are
not used to people being direct or chastising; it is regarded as inappropriate behavior and
makes people uncomfortable. As already mentioned, harmony is highly valued and being
indirect in the way of communicating is seen as proper decency. A person’s direct range is
frightening and unusual. There are certainly some unwritten rules about how to behave which
may reinforce the anxiety if they are not being followed (Goffman, 1959).

Speaking of traditions, Hofstede’s *long-term orientation versus short-term orientation* (LTO)
should be mentioned as well. Madagascar is closer to have a short-term oriented society than
a long-term oriented society. Present time is what is important and as already mentioned;
norms and traditions are seen as a safe platform. As one of the informants expressed: a
principal who asks for advice and suggestions from his employees and suggestions, create
uncertainty: The teachers have not learned how to cope with it. That one above you in the
hierarchy asks for advice is unfamiliar and may be seen as a symbol of weakness. What they
are used to is safe, and norms which permeate the society are very difficult to change. A
person’s need of protecting one’s face is part of the short-term dimension, and also mentioned

We see that in light of Hofstede’s UAI dimension and LTO dimension and some of the BCPF,
the rational behind the fear of the temper and punishment code becomes clearer. However, an
important aspect of this fear is the power dynamics among those involved. This brings me to
Hofstede’s power distance index dimension (PDI).

### 6.3.3 Who is in charge of whom?

Several of the codes which emerged in the data material may be seen in the light of
Hofstede’s (1994) *power distance index* (PDI). Madagascar is a country reckoned to have a
low power distance society where the differences between the people at different levels within
a hierarchy are clear. The fear of another person’s reaction may be a result of the distance to
this person. PDI may be linked to several of the codes which emerged from the data and last,
but not least, it may be linked to how the fear is visible in the power relations among the
workers.

Studying the findings in light of PDI is interesting. It questions whether there really is a fear
of making mistakes or getting a bad reputation etc. or whether whatever the fear may be is
rooted in the fear of the one superior to oneself. Of the findings it came clear that the participant’s faith in the Christian God affected the view of their work. On one hand one can say that the way they see God as their main leader and boss, one that should be obeyed and accepted, is mirrored in how they view the hierarchy in which they all are situated, as part of a staff. The fear is visible in the power relations in school, almost without exception, and one may question whether the fear is rooted in the fact that someone is superior to you, everyone occupies a positions within a hierarchy. The teachers should obey the principals and as we see in the findings, several of the teachers describe how they carefully set the standard. They mark the hierarchy: “I just set the structure: S/he is the boss, I’m a teacher, a human being beneath him/her” (T1). Furthermore, some of the teachers express how the communication goes from the top and downwards. Anyhow, there are some teachers as well who point out how they can make proposals and talk to the principal, as long as the standard is set.

Parenthood across borders

PDI is visible at almost every code, but BCPF make the PDI even more complicated. In situations where one is likely to think that it is obvious who is superior to whom, the parental authority principle makes it all more complex. As mentioned in the context chapter; there is a horizontal social structure in the society, the so-called family community, “…which equalizes for better and for worse” (Dahl, 1998, p.143). This horizontal social structure is a strong sense of belonging to a group where solidarity and unity is important. The family terms used by the informants about the school staff emphasizes this. However, there is also a vertical structure, which alludes to the parental authority principle; the parent-child principle. In light of the BCPF one may say that the teachers are likely to respect the principal, not fear him/her. Though, in this research, some of the participants state that they fear him/her, due to the power s/he has. The parental authority principle complicates the different relations since from time to time it may be difficult to say who the “parents” are, because persons are parents in different arenas. As one of the teachers explained: On the one hand the parents need to give him/her as a teacher the ray aman-dreny [parent] title, because s/he is the one having the competence within the field of education. On the other hand, they are the parents of the child and in charge of the child at their domain. Correspondingly there are tensions between the teachers differing in age and competence. As findings show, it can be difficult to cope with those situations as all parts involved may regard themselves as a parent, the one having the right to tell and decide. The question of what is most important almost becomes impossible to
answer and maybe irrelevant for the discussion as well, as the discussion may be seen as a
discussion of who has the power to decide. Seen in the light of Luhmann’s theory terms can
be indicators of a person’s power. A professional title, or as seen from the discussion above,
titles being culturally rooted.

On one hand one may say the high score on the PDI shows that the hierarchy in Madagascar
at different jobsites is clear, nevertheless, the BCPF makes it complex and not as easy as one
may think. To disagree with your boss is rare in a country which scores high on the PDI. This
is emphasized by the teacher who tells the story about how s/he once corrected the principal’s
attitude concerning his/her priority of spare time and work, s/he underlined how rare this is.
This was also confirmed looking at the consequences for the teacher who once spoke up and
ended up teaching English, only, and was forced to resign after a while due to the situation in
which s/he ended after speaking up against the principal. The fear of temper and punishment,
is visible in the power relations and may be linked to the fear of those superior to you.
Anyhow, Luhmann’s theory makes it even clearer how the power dynamics can make the fear
a permanent emotion in the power relations.

**Hierarchy as generalized code**

Luhmann writes about how power influences behavior and decisions. Central to the theory is
the duplication - the interaction between person A and B and that there is always a certain
mutual dependency in the interactions. He further writes about the generalization of codes,
which are elements in a society, elements that are easy to spot and makes one recognize
phenomena, in this case *power*. Hierarchy is one such code. Due to Luhmann; a hierarchy
helps people clarify relationships and positions; it makes it easier to see who is on the top and
who is lower in the hierarchy. In light of the findings in this research, Luhmann’s statement of
how it clarifies relationships may be discussed. On one hand one can see there truly exists a
hierarchy which is clear for everyone and it is certainly a code symbolizing power. On the
other hand, the relationships may be imbalanced in the sense that there can be disagreements
of who has got the most power. The horizontal family community structure in the society may
challenge what is reckoned to be a “classical” hierarchy and it may not be as easy as one first
believed to say who is at the top in different situations. Eventually, it is a symbol of power,
but it may not necessarily clarify who has the final word in discussions. This tension may be
the root of fear because it creates uncertainty.
Looking at the fear of bad reputation, principals feared the bad reputation in the sense that the school depends on the parent’s sending their children to the school. The power of the principal is therefore limited because s/he is dependent on a good relationship with the parents. However, one of the principals stated it clearly that s/he is independent and did not rely on the parent’s decisions or opinions and gave me a speech of how s/he may talk to the parents. From my point of view, the principal’s speech became a power demonstration. S/he benefitted from the position s/he possessed and clearly showed the parents that s/he was in charge in the school’s domain. For instance s/he told the parents *directly*, something they may be unfamiliar and uncomfortable with. The teachers also expressed fear towards the parents. Some mentioned explicitly the difficulty of being a “parent” in different domains, but underscored the respect as basis and standard. This may be an example of how *fihavanana* [kinship] works as a horizontal structure. It may as well unite where it seems like it splits.

**Sanctions**

Luhmann’s theory of how the power holder (A) may rule over power subject (B) in the sense of having access to several sanctions which affect B is visible when studying the teacher’s fear of the principals or the teacher’s fear of the parents. One of the informants stated it clearly that s/he feared the withholding of his/her salary, another informant stated that s/he feared being fired due to the lack of contract. These are both clear sanctions which the principal is in charge of. A third informant said: “S/he is the boss, besides, s/he can misreport to the people higher up [in the hierarchy] who swipe you away, eliminate you.” The use of power results in fear; fear becomes visible in how power is used. The principals do as well express some fear towards the teachers and some unsureness towards the Regional Executive Committee. In relation to the teachers, the principal is dependent on their work. Without their cooperation, it may be difficult. Making decisions on behalf of the teachers may as well be difficult and can lead to a lack of confidence or unpopularity. Regarding the BCPF the principals’ fear of the teachers, it may as well be linked to the wish of maintaining a good atmosphere and harmony.

The teachers mention another type of sanction as well, especially related to the parents, the *tsiny* [guilt]. The *tsiny* [guilt] is, as presented in the context chapter, a cultural phenomenon. When a person feels guilty, s/he will further fear the *tody* [punishment], which may come. Some of the teachers express a fear of the *tsiny* [guilt] that they may feel if the parents are not
satisfied with the work they do, or if they [the teachers] are not satisfied with their own work. When the *tsiny* [guilt] is feared, it is likely that they fear the *tody* [punishment] which often is linked and associated with the feeling of guilt. Markus & Kitayama (1994) and Milley (2009) underscore how feelings may influence a person’s self-esteem by for instance doing something regarded as inappropriate. Fear may be the first feeling in a situation which further leads to a lower self-esteem, due to the fear of having misbehaved. Sanctions may not always be spelled out, but the threats of them are hidden in communication and between the lines, but they are visible enough for the power-subject to spot. Though, sometimes conclusions about what is to happen may be drawn, remembering similar episodes from the past, comparing and making a calculus of probability. More of Luhmann’s episodes and system history will be discussed in the next sub-chapter.

### 6.3.4 Past as lessons for the present

The power relations in which the fear is visible have a past, a history which people gain knowledge and experience from. Such history of a specific system or episodes may function as a basis to create speculations and assumptions of what may come, how a person will react etc. and people may become afraid based on this. Luhmann writes especially about episodes and history which witness power - power demonstration. In some of the quotes of T18, it is clear that s/he has experienced a lot within the school system and express himself/herself in general, though referring to specific episodes and lived life from time to time. S/he talked about how the principal had made his/her situation unbearable and how it resulted in him/her resigning. Such a story creates fear among other teachers. Another principal told me about how everyone becomes quiet if s/he hit the table with his/her fist. Such a power demonstration may result in the teachers doing everything they can to avoid him/her becoming furious. Episodes of how gossip has changed the situation for a person influence those who hear the story. The tradition of a system, which includes norms, attitudes, organization etc., influences how people act and think. One makes references to the past and gain experience from what is already learned. However, the consequences of this may be, for instance, teachers in a school where there has been a principal with a lot of temperament, who easily gets angry, do not dare to speak up, even though their new principal at current time has a completely different mentality than the previous. One of the teachers even told me s/he closed the school and sent his/her pupils home in fear of the control by the community and the leaders of the school. What was s/he afraid of? S/he told me s/he had heard about those controls, but did not really
know what they were. Fear was created, based on the rumors s/he had heard about her superiors.

**Breaking the law**

Luhmann also fronts a code which he calls status and function-positions. He does not really give any example of this, Gulbrandsen (1999), however, mentions how the police may be an example of this. The function of the police is widely known and they are in charge of a lot of different sanctions. Histories about how they have acted before and their status make their power widely known. They have a lot of power. In the findings we see one example of how the fear is visible in a situation where a crime is being committed. Doing something against the law may involve the police. One of the teachers told about how s/he once hit the principal’s son. His/her immediate fear may have been linked to the principal and the consequences which may follow when the principal hear what has happened. However, as corporal punishment is illegal, the fear may as well be linked to the further consequences which may follow as the teacher actually committed a crime, against the law. The police’s power creates fear, as one knows what they may do.

**6.3.5 Good fear and bad fear**

Part of the BCPF is also what Ylander and Larsson-Lindman (1984) describe as the *good fear* - the instinct for survival and endurance through tough times. In the case where there is fear of bad results one informant told me about how s/he gave the little extra as a final effort to prepare the pupils for their exams. Maybe this could be called good fear as well, since the results of the fear results in gains for pupils, those lowest in the hierarchy. The teachers show endurance in a tough time. If the teachers work hard because they fear the principal and his/her power, the situation would look different and it is problematic to call the fear a good fear. Even though the consequences for the pupils may be positive, the teachers are still driven by fear of a possible sanction from a superior in the hierarchy. They fear what the principal may do, if they do not give the little extra.

**Agent as source of fear?**

One of the teacher’s quotes concerning decision-making underlines the fear of making the decision whether to leave the classroom or not. But what the informant *really* fears is unclear.
S/he clearly states fear related to a certain decision, but whether s/he fears the colleague’s reaction, the pupil’s reaction being left alone or the principal’s reaction or something else, is unclear. Maybe the commentary made by another informant about how the teachers tend to leave their classrooms when the principal is not there, may indicate that it is the fear of the principal? This is only speculation, but when we see the other findings in light of the theoretical framework, maybe there is something to it? This chain of thoughts may be applied to several of the findings and is surely part of this research’s conclusion.
7 Conclusion

Jackson (2010) refers to Martin Luther King who said that:

It is not necessary to make active or express threats in order to arouse fear; instead, fear can, and usually does, hover quietly about the relationships between the powerful and the powerless, subtly influencing everyday conduct without requiring such in the way of active intimidation. In fact, what makes this unspoken fear so influential, especially in a liberal democracy, is that it does not, as a rule, require overt acts of coercion” (Jackson, 2010, p. 19)

In the beginning of this thesis I asked the questions: 1) What are the factors that pedagogical staff in Lutheran Schools in Madagascar fear? 2) How is fear is visible in the power relations between pedagogical staff working in Malagasy Lutheran Schools?

As a starting point it was important for me to understand the concept of “fear”. In the theory chapter, Chapter 6, I explored the concept from a sociological and psychological perspective respectively; fear might be an internal feeling, as well as a result of external elements, such as governmental inspections. Fear can be awe and include a clear element of respect. Indeed, in this research we have seen that some of the informants tended to use “respect” and “fear” interchangeably. Others said that one of them implied the other. Theories which examine different dimensions of emotions were confirmed in the data collected. Fear is present in relations (relational); for instance between teacher colleagues, and it has a temporal dimension in the sense that it may for instance influence whether something is done quickly or not. Additionally, a spatial dimension of fear has been identified as well. Indeed, a teacher behaves quite differently outside of the principal’s office than when s/he enters his/her office. When the participants in this research defined fear and respect, it often involved both people and acts. This reflects the essence in the answer of research question one which will be presented in the next section.

The factors that pedagogical staff in Lutheran Schools in Madagascar fear are complex, and the answer to research question one involves persons as well as factors. What is seen as a frightening factor at first sight, may be an effect of the fear of something else. The frightening factors presented in Chapter 5 (decision-making, bad reputation, bad results, punishments and temper, controls and mistakes) are closely related to the people involved in them. It is
impossible to separate the frightening factors from those involved, they are intertwined. The fear of punishment also included the fear of the one carrying out the punishment. As we have seen, according to Luhmann’s theory; people act, based on what they believe the people they are in a relationship with prefer. Fear was linked to incidents involving people who all were part of the hierarchy in school. In this case, the fear of consequences and the hierarchy are linked. The hierarchy and the consequences are both feared by principals and teachers. The hierarchy creates the basis for the power relations that exist in the educational discipline.

The answers to the two research questions are closely related to one another. Fear manifests itself, is visible, in the power relations, in the way people communicate, act, name one another and behave in different situations. The different theories applied to the research have proved to be a pertinent analytical framework to understand the rationale behind the informants’ thinking and provides background as to the source of the participants’ fear.

I would underscore that fear also is a result of the type of power relations which exist in the educational discipline in Madagascar. In light of literature concerning Malagasy culture which has been presented in this study, we have seen that cultural codes and habits make communication within the hierarchy more complex. There is a vertical hierarchy within society, maintaining people’s positions. Furthermore, there is a horizontal hierarchy striving to maintain harmony and equalize people, despite the vertical hierarchy structure. A newly educated teacher may not be considered a person without any experience if s/he has his/her education from abroad, s/he may be considered a ray aman-drey [parent] because of his/her wealth and experience. As Hofstede also emphasizes in his PDI; this would immediately change the position in the hierarchy and status of the person concerned.

Fear is to some extent more visible among the teachers and one may question whether that is because they are lower in the vertical hierarchy. Regarding the comparative aspect, answers from both teachers and principals reflect how the presence of fear influences their behavior and decisions. There are differences between the teachers and the principals according to their different positions within the hierarchy. Throughout this thesis we have seen that teacher’s fear tends to be related to personal qualifications or elements in their closest surroundings, while the principals are marked by their positions as leaders and their fear concerns their closest surroundings, as well as elements external to the school. The principals share broader reflections in the sense of involving more elements external to the school. They are aware of other networks of systems surrounding their school. As Luhmann’s system theory shows, one
is aware of the systems surrounding one’s own system. However, as their position includes more power, there are certain factors, which the teachers mentioned, that are not part of the principals’ reflections. For instance, the principals’ fear of bad results is not linked to their own work as principals. Teachers, situated lower in the hierarchy, have more people superior to them than principals have. Throughout this thesis, in light of Luhmann and Hofstede’s theories, we have seen that fear is visible in these power differences and what they fear concerns people linked to the hierarchy.

This research has demonstrated that “…fear hovers quietly about the relationships between the powerful and the powerless.” The research further shows that it influences teachers and principals in their daily work. Fear may be quiet in the sense that threats might not be spelled out directly, but read between the lines by the power subject (B). Even though it is not said directly, the threats causing the fear may be obvious to those involved because of the fixed positions and expectations which are part of the context in which they operate.

7.1 Outlook

Malagasy people know about the power dynamics in their society and organizations and how it all affects them. They are proud of honored titles such as a ray aman-dreny [parent] and the cultural norms create a unity which is difficult for foreigners to fully understand. There is a vertical and a horizontal structure in the society and they perfectly know how to cope with it. Besides the aim of finding answers, this research is an attempt to make fear within the educational discipline agenda; to highlight how fear is visible in the power relations and how it affects those working within the educational sector in Madagascar. It is an attempt to shed light on how the power-holder (A) in a high power distance index country would rule the power subject (B). The vertical structure can from time to time seem to limit the fully potential of a power-subject and it would be interesting to bring this study to another level. As Madagascar is influenced by vertical and horizontal structures, it would be interesting to see how this affects their cooperation with countries being positioned in the other end of Hofstede’s dimensions. In cooperation with a wealthy western country, a Malagasy principal may automatically make himself/herself the power subject. In such a case, would s/he protest, if s/he saw that a project did not benefit their school? Taking into consideration their way of communicating and their respect for a ray aman-dreny [parent]? And if they dared to, would the development partner understand that the principal say no, indirectly? In such a research
several factors would influence the process. Being involved with projects including international partners might include extra funding, which is highly needed in a poor country. How would fear of losing financial support influence a decision-making process? Would the result be an agreement to run a project, although the locals involved would think it did not benefit the pupils, but the school is in need of extra funding? Øyvind Dahl gives several examples on how communication between the Western and the Malagasy leads to misunderstandings in his book: "Meanings in Madagascar. Cases of Intercultural Communication (1999)." It would be interesting to examine fear more closely in such situations.

Furthermore, it could be interesting and useful to map the terms fear and respect. The terms are closely related, some even use them interchangeably. Is it possible to define the nuances between the two terms? Personally, I believe that it would be very difficult to separate one term from another; although, this may be different from one culture to another. Perhaps it is for future research to examine the terms? It could be interesting to conduct a similar research in the Western part of the world. I think we would be surprised by the findings.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Map

Map 1: Madagascar. Area where interviews were conducted is marked with a green circle.
## Appendix 2: Number of School Establishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARITANY/PROVINCE</th>
<th>DINEC</th>
<th>FFSM</th>
<th>FJKM</th>
<th>FLM</th>
<th>ELM</th>
<th>EPM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventiste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifohazana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soatanana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loterana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole libre de M/car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoles Privés de M/car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARITANY/PROVINCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antananarivo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antsiranana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fianarantsoa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahajanga</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toamasina</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre d'établissements primaires / Number of elementary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre d'établissements secondaires/ Number of upper secondary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adventiste: Adventist  
Catholique: Catholic  
Reformé: Reformed  
Ecole libre: Nondenominational schools  
Anglican: Anglican  
Fifohazana Soatanana: Lutheran  
Revival movement
Appendix 3: Consent form Interviews

To __________________________________________

This consent form is to be signed by participants who will contribute to the research done by Marte Schie during the months of September, October and November 2014. The fieldwork forms the basis for the master thesis which will be produced as part of the Comparative and International Master Program at the University in Oslo, Norway, which also are the ones responsible for the research project. The research has been accepted and reported to The Norwegian Ombudsman for Protection of Privacy in research (Personvernombudet for forskning) and the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS).

The purpose of this study is to provide information about how teachers and principals cooperate and work together at four different schools in Madagascar, what kind of dynamics and structures that exists within the pedagogical staff and what their decision-making possibly is influenced by. The main focus of the study will be the different participant’s experiences and feelings concerning the cooperation at school. Approximately 15 participants (teachers and principals) will be interviewed.

The information that is collected will only be used for the purpose of the thesis. It is important to underscore that whatever personal information you give, or the other participants give, will be kept safely in a computer which is password protected. No personal information will be kept together with notes, recordings or transcriptions of the interviews – they will be stored separately, and when the thesis is submitted and defended, the notes and transcriptions will be made anonymous. The project will at the latest end the 31.01.2016. Only Marte Schie, her supervisor and the interpreter will know who you are; the final thesis will not by any means reveal your identity. It will be impossible to discover your identity by reading the final thesis.

As a participant in this research you are unpaid and free to withdraw from the study at any time without providing any explanation. Participation is voluntary and you can refuse to answer questions. There will be a tape recorder recording the interview which approximately will last for 1-2 hours. There will also be taken notes during the interviews. If you do not want to be taped, you can still participate in the research. For more information about the research, questions or if you have any additional information to give, please do not hesitate to contact me. My own contact information (1) and my supervisor’s contact information (2) are:

1. Marte Schie
   Styrilja 35
   2080 Eidsvoll
   Telephone: +47 99536847
   E-mail: marsch@ulrik.uio.no

2. Tove Kvil
   Løkebergtunet 17
   1344 Haslum
   Telephone: +47 41204422
   E-mail: tove.kvil@norad.no

I have read and understood the information and I will participate in this research. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Date: ___________________      Signature: ________________________________________
Ho an’i

Natao araka ny fikarohana dia mba ahazahaona toro mikasika ny fiara-miasa misy eo amin’ny mpampianatra sy ny talen-tsekoly eto Madagasikara sy ny rafritra pedagojika misy ary ny fomba fanapahan-kevitra. Ho jerena aikaiky amin’izany ny triaikely anan’ny mpandray anjara tsirairay sy ny fahatsapana momba ny fiara-miasa any amin’ny sekoly. Olona miisa 15 (mpampianatra sy tale) eo ho eo no hahidayena.


Tsy mandray karama ny mpandray anjara ary manana safidy malalaka hamaly ny fanadihadiana na tsa. Tsy an-tery ny fandraisan’anjara amin’ireto fanadihadiana ireto ary azy ajanona avy hatrany koa ilay izy na tsy milaza ny antony aza raha toa ka tsa sy te hanao intsony ilay voahadihady. Hisy fandraisam-peo mandritra ny fanadihadiana izay maharitra ora 1 na 2 ary hisy koa mpirakitra an-tsratana. Raha tsy tianaoo ny alaina feo dia afaka mamaly fanontanianena ihany ianao. Raha toa ka manana fanontanianena fanampiny ianao na te hanome toro hafa dia aza misalasala ka antsoy aho na mandefasa malalaka any amin’ny adresy voasoratra etsy ambany (1). Azonao atao koa miantso na manoratra amin’ny mpitariaka ahy avy any Norvezy (2).

1. Marte Schie
Styrilia 35
2080 Eidsvoll
Telephone: +47 99536847
E-mail: marsch@ulrik.uio.no

2. Tove Kvıl
Løkeberggtunet 17
1344 Haslum
Telephone: +47 41204422
E-mail: tove.kvıl@norad.no

Fanekena fandraisan’anjara amin’ny fanadihadiana:

Nahazo fanazavana momba ny fanadihadiana hatao aho ary manaikey ny handray anjara amin’izany ny tenako.

Daty: ___________________ Sonia: __________________________________________
Appendix 4: Interview guide, teachers

A) BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1) Could you please tell me a bit about yourself?
   • Age, origin, academic background etc.
2) Why did you become a teacher?
   • For how long, feelings, why this school, specific motivations

B) THE ROLE AS A TEACHER
1) Tell me about what kind of decisions you have to (can) make by yourself during a school-day? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Feelings (why)? Whether position influences?
   • Share stories

2) Under what kind of circumstances do you have to go to the director for permission to do something? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Feelings (easy, difficult, challenging – why?)
   • Stories (Feelings, thoughts, preparations, results)

3) Tell me about what and/or who influences you the most when taking decisions related to your work as a teacher? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Family, reputation, status, education, director, parents, community?
   • Stories (Feelings, thoughts, preparations, results)
   • Who/What influences the director? (If different, why?)

C) RELATIONS
1) Could you tell me about your role in the group of teachers? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Specific position, duties

2) Could you tell me about the communication within/across different levels at school? (RQ2)
   • When? Who? (director, colleagues, parents, community)
   • Equally treated?

3) Could you tell me about what kind of unwritten rules the teachers at this school follow? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Reason for following, feelings
D) FEAR
1) What would you say is the difference between respect and fear? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Visible differences at work? Individual differences?

2) Could you tell me about whether you fear anything as a teacher? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Leadership? Cooperators?
   • Stories
A) MOMBAMOMBA ANAO

1) Afaka mitantara sy manazava kely ny mombamomba anao ve ianao?
   • Tsingerin’taona, tanâna iavianao, fianarana nataonao sns.

2) Inona no antony nahatonga anao nifidy ny hanao mpampianatra?
   • Efa ela ve ianao no niditra tamin’ny sehatry ny fampinanarana? Ahoana ny fahatsapanao izany? Inona no antony nisafidiananao ny hampianatra amin’ity sekoly ity? Misy famporisihana manokana ve mahatonga anao hisa eto?

B) ANJARA ASA AMIN’NY MAHA-MPAMPIANATRA

1) Inona no fanapahan-kevitra raisinao manokana (azonao raisina na tsy maintsy raisinao manokana) mandritry ny fotoana fampinanarana momba ny zavatra rehatra ao an-dakilasy, ohatra ny lokon’ny dabilio, ny akanjo, sary amin’ny rindrina sns?
   • Afaka mizara tantara ve ianao?

2) Trangan-javatra ohatra ny ahoana no tsy tapakao fa tsy maintsy anantonanao ny tale?
   • Inona no tsapanao momba an’izany? (sarotra sa mora sa ahoana ny fiaatrehana an’izany)/ Manahoana ny fihetsem-pônao rehetra manontany ny tale?
   • Itantarao tranga na tantara efa nisy momba an’io.

   • Fianakaviana, mamy-hoditra na mangidy hoditra, fianaranana nataonao, ray- amandreny, ireo manodidina,…
   • Tantara (fahatsapana, fieritreretana, fiomanana, vokany)
   • Iza/ Inona mamporisika/ manakana ny tale? Ahoana ny fandraisan’tale ny fanapahana-kevitra raisinao? Araka ny eritreritrao misy tahotra olona/ na zavatra/ tale rehetra mandray fanaphana-kevitra?
C) FIFANDRAISANA

1) Afaka milazalaza momba ny andraikitrao eto amin’ny sekoly sy eo amin’ny mpampianatra mpiara-miasa aminao ve ianao?
   - Andraikitra isanandro na isan-kerinandro na isam-bolana, andraikitrao ato amin’ny sekoly

2) Afaka milazalaza mikasika ny ny fifandraisana eo amin’ny samy mpampianatra eto amin’ny sekoly ve ianao?
   - Isaky ny fotoana inona no misy ny fivorian’ny ray amandrenin’ny mpianatra miaraka amin’ny tale na komity samihafa
   - Mitovy lanja ve ny mpiasa rehetra sa izay ambony diploma no to-teny kokoa ohatra?

3) Misy fitsipika tsy voasoratra ato amin’ny fitsipiky ny sekoly kanefa arahinareo ve?
   - Ohatra tsy voasoratra amin’ny fitsipiky ny sekoly fa tsy maintsy manao zipo ny vehivavy, kanefa manao zipo ihany ny vehivavy rehetra mba ho fifanajana

D) FAHATAHORANA

1) Inona aminao no maha-samy hafa ny fahatahorana sy ny fifanajana amin’ny ankapobeny? (Amin’ny fiainana andavandro)
   - Inona no maha-samy hafa azy ireo amin’ny sehatry ny asa raha ny hevitrao?
     Miankina amin’ny olona sy ny cas (trangan-zavatra) misy ve?

2) Afaka milaza zavatra atahoranao amin’ny maha-mpampianatra anao ve ianao?
   - Iza, inona, antony, negative ve (amin’ny tsara ve?), positive ve (amin’ny ratsy ve?, inona ny zavatra ataonao manoloana izany? Maloka ve ny endrikao sa mitomany na tsemboka ve ny tananao sns?
Appendix 5: Interview guide, principals

A) BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1) Could you please tell me a bit about yourself?
   • Age, origin, academic background etc.
2) How did you become the director of this school?
   • For how long, why this school, specific motivations

B) THE ROLE AS A LEADER
1) Could you tell me about how you experience having the role as the director of this school?
   • Appreciations, benefits, challenges, tasks, motivation?
   • Has it changed since the beginning? Why?
2) Could you please tell me about the kind of decisions you have to take as a director?
   (RQ1,RQ2)
   • Feelings and thoughts related to it,
   • Permission
3. What and/ or who influences you the most when making decisions? (RQ1,RQ2)
   • Family, donors, reputation as a leader, colleagues, your education, parents etc.
   • Stories to share? (Feelings, thoughts, preparations, results)
   • Whom do you influence?

C) RELATIONS
1) Could you tell me about communication within/across different levels at school? (RQ2)
   • When? Who? (staff, parents, donors, community)
   • Equally treated? Atmosphere?
2) Could you tell me about what kind of unwritten rules you follow as a principal? (RQ1, RQ2)
   • Reasons, feelings, expectations
D) FEAR
1) What would you say is the difference between respect and fear? (RQ1, RQ2)
   - Visible differences, individual differences?

2) Could you tell me about whether you fear anything as a director? (RQ1,RQ2)
   - Leadership? Cooperators?
   - Stories
A) MOMBAMOMBA ANAO

1) Afaka mitantara sy manazava kely ny mombamomba anao ve ianao?
   • Tsingerin’taona, tananà iavananao, fianarana nataonao sns.

2) Ahoana no nahatonga anao ho talen’ity sekoly ity?
   • Efa ela ve ianao no niditra tamin’ny sehatry ny fitantanana ity sekoly ity? Ahoana ny fahatsapanao izany? Notendrena ve ianao sa safidinao ny nahatonganao ho tale ato? Inona ny risi-pônao manokana mahatonga anao hiasa eto?

B) ANJARA ASA AMIN’NY MAHA-TALE

1) Lazalazainao ve hoe ahoana ny fahatsapanao ny toerana na “role” ananao amin’ny maha maha-tale anao an’ity sekoly ity?
   • Inona no tombony tsapanao amin’ny maha-tale anao? Misy antony manokana ve mahatonga anao ijanona ho tale ato?
   • Nisy fiovana ve teo amin’ny fiaina maha-tale anao atramin’izay raha oharina amin’ny zavatra voaza ao amin’ny valin-teny teo aloha? Ohatra: malalaka kokoa ianao taloha noho ny amin’izao. Inona no antony?

2) Inona ireo karazana fanapahan-kevitra tsy maintsy raisinao amin’ny maha-tale anao?
   • Inona no antony? Inona no tena fanapahana-kevitra hatoao matetika, mikasika inona izany? Misy fotoana ianao tsy maintsy mangataka alalana amin’ny olona miasa amboninao vao afaka manao zavatra ve? Manao ahoana ny fihetsem-ponao manoloana izany?
   • Afaka manambara trangan-javatra mikasika izany ve ianao?

3. Iza na inona no mamporisika/manankana anao indrindra (mi-influencer) anao indrindra rehefa mandray fanapahan-kevitra mifandray amin’ny asa maha-tale anao ianao?.
   • Fianakaviana, mamy-hoditra na mangidy hoditra, fianaranana nataonao, ray- amandreny, ireo manodidina,…
   • Tantara (Fietsem-po, fahatsapana, eritreritra, fiomanana, vokany)
   • Iza/ inona no mamporisika ny tale? Ary mety mamporisika an’iza ianao (iza no “influence-nao”? / Araka ny eritreritrao misy tahotra olona/ na zavatra/ ny mpampianatra rehefa mandray fanaphana-kevitra
C) FIFANDRAISANA

1) Afaka lazalazainao ve ny fifandraisana/serasera eo amin’ny samy mpianatra sy ny mpampianatra eto amin’ny sekoly?
   - Isaky ny fotoana inona no misy ny fivorian’ny ray amandrenin’ny mpianatra miaraka amin’ny ProVert na komity samihafa
   - Mitovy lanja ve ny mpiasa rehetra sa izay ambony diploma no to-teny kokoa ohatra?
   - Manahoana ny rivotra iainana/ atmosphere eto @ ity sekoly ity?

2) Misy fitsipika tsy voasoratra ao amin’ny lalànan’ny sekoly kanefa arahinareo ve? (ohatra tsy voasoratra amin’ny fitsipiky ny sekoly fa tsy maintsy manao zipo ny vehivavy, kanefa manao zipo ihany ny vehivavy rehetra mba ho fifanajana)

D) FAHATAHORANA

1) Inona aminao no maha-samy hafa ny fatahorana sy ny fanajana amin’ny ankapobeny? (Amin’ny fiainana andavandro)
   - Inona no maha-samy hafa azy ireo amin’ny sehatry ny asa raha ny hevitrao?
     Miankina amin’ny olona sy ny cas misy ve?

2) Misy zavatra atahoranao ve amin’ny maha-tale anao?
   - Zavatra, olona, trangan-javatra, inona ny antony? negative ve, positive ve. Ahoana ny fomba iatrehanao izany? Maloka ve ny endrikao sa mitomany na tsemboka ve ny tananao?
   - Ny mpitantana, ny mpiara-miombon’antoka?
   - Manana tantara azonao zaraina ve ianao?
Appendix 6: Fill-out-form for research-participants

This fill-out form will be given to participants contributing to the master thesis-research which will be done by Marte Schie during the months of September, October and November 2014. The form asks for some personal information. It also opens up for you as a participant to share issues concerning the topic discussed if you still have something you would like to say and share. I will be grateful for everything you share. This form is just an option and it is not mandatory to fill it out. However, all information you give will be treated confidentially and it will not be possible to link your information to what you may have said in the interview.

Gender of participant: ______________________________________________________

Age:____________________________________________________________________

Post at school: _____________________________________________________________

Academic Background________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Are there any thoughts/opinions/feelings/experiences or ideas concerning what we talked about which you did not reveal or mention during the interview, but which you would like to share now? If so, please write it on the lines below (separate sheet may be added if needed):
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

If you would like to talk more or have any other information, inputs, contributions or questions concerning the topic of my research and prefer to take it in person, please do not hesitate to contact me and we could arrange a time to talk which is convenient for both of us.

Marte Schie

Afaka misafidy hameno na tsia (ity taratasy ity) ny mpandray anjara fa tsy voatery izany. Ny zavatra voahangona rehetra dia ampiasaina hanaovana ny fikarohana nefa tsy hisy famoahana ny mombamomba ny olona tsirairay nanaovana fanadihadihana.

Lahy /vavy:___________________________________________________________
Taona:_________________________________________________________________
Asa iandraiketana ao amin’ny sekoly iasana:____________________________________
Fianarana natao:____________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Manana eritreritra na hevitra na fahatsapana manokana na traikefa mahakasika ny zavatra noresahana ve ianao ka tsy nolazainao nandritra ny fanadihadihadina? Te hizara izany ve ianao? Raha izany dia mba afaka manoratra izany etsy amin’ny faritra voatondro etsy ambany ve ianao? (Raha tsy ampy ny toerana voafaritra hanoratana dia afaka manampy taratasy hafa) ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Raha mila fanazavana fanampiny na fanampi-kevitra na fanontaniana mahakasika ny (taranja) hanaovana ny fikarohana ianao ka te hiresaka mivantana dia za misalasala manoratra amiko. Afaka mijery fotoana izay mampety ny roa tonta. Misaoitra mialoha.

Marte Schie
Appendix 7: Explanations to transcriptions

… The informant pauses, are quiet, thinks

(…) Irrelevant words or phrases are taken out

Tak-- (+take) Partial words. Double dash marks where the word was broken off. Possible complete words indicated in brackets after +

-- Restarts indicated by double dash. Informant cut him/herself off before continuing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Form</th>
<th>Contracted Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have</td>
<td>I've</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot</td>
<td>can't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will not</td>
<td>won't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you have</td>
<td>you've</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could not</td>
<td>couldn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should have</td>
<td>should've, shoulda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would have</td>
<td>would've, woulda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could have</td>
<td>could've, coulda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is</td>
<td>it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin is</td>
<td>Marvin's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin has</td>
<td>Marvin's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to</td>
<td>gonna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want to</td>
<td>wanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got to</td>
<td>gotta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>