



1991

## A Study of Principal Leadership in Applying the Change Research to School Improvement Efforts at the K-5 Level

Gail Daniels Fahey  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Fahey, Gail Daniels, "A Study of Principal Leadership in Applying the Change Research to School Improvement Efforts at the K-5 Level" (1991). *Dissertations*. 3170.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/3170](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3170)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1991 Gail Daniels Fahey

Gail Daniels Fahey

Loyola University of Chicago

A STUDY OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP IN APPLYING THE CHANGE RESEARCH  
TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS AT THE K-5 LEVEL

The major purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective DuPage County principals improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change, and isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

In 1985 principals were mandated to become instructional leaders. Illinois law required principals to devote a majority of their time to tasks of instructional improvement. The concept of instructional improvement was assumed to be self-evident and not explicitly defined in state law. Therefore, how did effective principals interpret the meaning of instructional improvement and apply it to the improvement of their schools?

A multi-case or comparative case study which blended naturalistic, qualitative approaches with some quantifiable evidence to produce a mixed methodological study was employed. Methods of analysis included coding, frequency counts, displays in the form of narrative text and tables, and interpretive qualitative analysis of assignment of responses and attribution of observed behaviors to categories defined by the researcher. Triangulation strategies were utilized.

Results indicated that the teachers' perceptions of their principals' level of performance working at improving instruction varied by the sub-group classification to which the teacher belonged and by the number of years the principal had served in the setting. School improvement behaviors on the part of the principal were observed more than change facilitation behaviors regardless of the principals' years of experience. The experienced principals classified barriers to change in terms of time and their own miscues. Each principal viewed the impact of the reform legislation from a perspective based on the number of years as a principal and also from when the first principalship appointment occurred.

In conclusion, effective principals were found to evolve through stages of change themselves in terms of their understanding and application of change and school improvement behaviors.

A STUDY OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP IN APPLYING THE CHANGE RESEARCH  
TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS AT THE K-5 LEVEL

by

Gail Daniels Fahey

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

May

1991

**Copyright by Gail Daniels Fahey, 1991**

**All Rights Reserved**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge a number of people who generously supported me during this project:

Dr. Max Bailey and Dr. Philip Carlin, co-chairmen of the dissertation committee, for their help and their humor and insight which sustained me throughout my doctoral studies and especially for their assistance on this paper

Dr. Barney Berlin for introducing me to the concepts of school culture and the change process

Dr. Steven Miller for his help from the sidelines regarding qualitative methodology and analyses

Mrs. Rose Sugden, former superintendent, director of curriculum and personnel, principal, and teacher for being my mentor and living the vision of being a life-long learner

Dr. L. Mitchell Bers, superintendent of schools, and the Board of Education of Medinah Elementary School District 11 for their support and encouragement which took many forms but without which this study would have been far more difficult to complete

The staff of Medinah South Elementary School for their extreme patience and willingness to forgive their "phantom principal"

Dr. Judith Zito, Dr. Mary Curley, and Dr. Mona McNeese for their willingness to share their craft knowledge with me and their friendship

Mrs. Enid Baxter for her technical computing assistance in the preparation of this manuscript as well as her warmth and persistence in the midst of personal concerns

My friends and principal and teacher colleagues who kept telling me that getting a doctorate was a "useful" thing for me to do. Their emotional support and humor are hereby acknowledged

Last but not least to my sister, godchildren, and brothers for understanding that the time commitment required by this project the past four years is the only reason I was less of a sister and a godmother than I know how to be.

## DEDICATION

To my mother and father who encouraged me and supported me through four college degrees and who continue to love me unfailingly despite my miscues.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	xiv
LIST OF APPENDICES .....	xvii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background .....	1
The Illinois Picture .....	4
Statement Of The Problem .....	6
Purpose Of The Study .....	7
Definition of Terms .....	8
II. THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE .....	11
Introduction .....	11
Background .....	12
Research On The Principal As Instructional Leader .....	16
What Instructional Leaders Do .....	17
Research On The Principal As Organizational Change Agent .....	21
The Process of Teacher Change .....	23
Joyce and Showers' Coaching Model .....	24
The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) .....	24
What Principals Who Are Change Facilitators Do .....	26

· The Phases And The Complexity of Change .....	30
The School Improvement Research .....	34
Principal/Teacher Relationships .....	39
Principal Role .....	39
Teacher Role .....	41
Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For This Study .....	43
III. METHODOLOGY .....	46
Background .....	46
Rationale For Using Multiple Sources of Evidence .....	49
Data Sources .....	51
Qualitative Sources .....	51
Quantitative Sources .....	52
Collection of Data .....	52
Statement Of The Problem .....	57
Purpose Of The Study .....	58
Research Questions .....	58
Methods of Analysis .....	59
Dangers and Safeguards .....	62
Summary .....	63
IV. PRINCIPAL BLUE PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....	65
Introduction .....	65
Research Questions .....	66
Background .....	67
How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School? .....	69
Principal Interview .....	69
Key Informant Interviews .....	70

Key informant #1 .....	70
Key Informant #2 .....	71
Key Informant #3 .....	71
<b>How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching and Learning? .....</b>	<b>71</b>
Principal Interview .....	71
Key Informant Interviews .....	73
Key Informant #1 .....	73
Key Informant #2 .....	73
Key Informant #3 .....	74
<b>What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change? .....</b>	<b>74</b>
Principal Interview .....	74
Key Informant Interviews .....	75
Key Informant #1 .....	75
Key Informant #2 .....	75
Key Informant #3 .....	75
<b>What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change? .....</b>	<b>76</b>
Principal Interview .....	76
Key Informant Interviews .....	77
Key Informant #1 .....	77
Key Informant #2 .....	78
Key Informant #3 .....	78
<b>Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect to School Improvement And Instructional Leadership? .....</b>	<b>78</b>
Principal Interview .....	78
Key Informant Interviews .....	79
The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys .....	79

Analysis of Table 1 .....	83
Analysis of Table 2 .....	89
Analysis of Table 3 .....	94
Analysis of Table 4 .....	98
Analysis of Table 5 .....	103
Analysis of Table 6 .....	108
On-Site Observations .....	109
Analysis of Table 7 .....	110
Archival Records And Documents Examination .....	110
Summary .....	112
<b>V. PRINCIPAL WHITE PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA .....</b>	<b>113</b>
Introduction .....	113
Research Questions .....	114
Background .....	115
How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School? .....	117
Principal Interview .....	117
Key Informant Interviews .....	118
Key Informant #1 .....	119
Key Informant #2 .....	119
Key Informant #3 .....	119
How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning? .....	120
Principal Interview .....	120
Key Informant Interviews .....	121
Key Informant #1 .....	121
Key Informant #2 .....	122
Key Informant #3 .....	122

What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change? .....	122
Principal Interview .....	122
Key Informant Interviews .....	123
Key Informant #1 .....	124
Key Informant #2 .....	124
Key Informant #3 .....	124
What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change? .....	124
Principal Interview .....	124
Key Informant Interviews .....	126
Key Informant #1 .....	126
Key Informant #2 .....	126
Key Informant #3 .....	127
Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership? .....	127
Principal Interview .....	127
Key Informant Interviews .....	128
The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys .....	128
Analysis of Table 8 .....	132
Analysis of Table 9 .....	138
Analysis of Table 10 .....	143
Analysis of Table 11 .....	147
Analysis of Table 12 .....	152
Analysis of Table 13 .....	156
Analysis of Table 14 .....	161
Analysis of Table 15 .....	166
On-Site Observations .....	166

	Analysis of Table 16 .....	167
	Archival and Documents Examination .....	168
	Summary .....	169
VI.	PRINCIPAL ECRU PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA .....	170
	Introduction .....	170
	Research Questions .....	171
	Background .....	172
	How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School? .....	173
	Principal Interview .....	173
	Key Informant Interviews .....	175
	Key Informant #1 .....	176
	Key Informant #2 .....	176
	Key Informant #3 .....	176
	How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning? .....	177
	Principal Interview .....	177
	Key Informant Interviews .....	178
	Key Informant #1 .....	178
	Key Informant #2 .....	178
	Key Informant #3 .....	179
	What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth Or Change? .....	179
	Principal Interview .....	179
	Key Informant Interviews .....	180
	Key Informant #1 .....	181
	Key Informant #2 .....	181
	Key Informant #3 .....	181

What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change? .....	181
Principal Interview .....	181
Key Informant Interviews .....	183
Key Informant #1 .....	183
Key Informant #2 .....	184
Key Informant #3 .....	184
Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership? .....	184
Principal Interview .....	184
Key Informant Interviews .....	185
The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys .....	185
Analysis of Table 17 .....	189
Analysis of Table 18 .....	193
Analysis of Table 19 .....	199
Analysis of Table 20 .....	203
Analysis of Table 21 .....	208
Analysis of Table 22 .....	213
Analysis of Table 23 .....	218
Analysis of Table 24 .....	223
On-Site Observations .....	223
Analysis Of Table 25 .....	224
Archival Records And Documents Examination .....	225
Summary .....	226
VII. A STUDY OF THREE PRINCIPALS: A CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....	228
Introduction .....	228
How Did Effective Principals Support Teaching And Learning? .....	229

Analysis of Table 26 .....	230
Analysis of Table 27 .....	233
Analysis of Table 28 .....	235
Analysis of Table 29 .....	237
Analysis of Table 30 .....	238
Tales Of Three Principals .....	238
Principal Blue .....	239
Friday, August 31, 1990 .....	239
Principal White .....	242
Monday, September 10, 1990 .....	242
Principal Ecru .....	243
Wednesday, September 5, 1990 .....	243
What Practices Of Effective Principals Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change? .....	248
Analysis of Table 31 .....	250
Analysis of Table 32 .....	252
Analysis of Table 33 .....	254
Analysis of Table 34 .....	256
Analysis of Table 35 .....	259
Analysis of Table 36 .....	262
Analysis of Table 37 .....	263
Analysis of Table 38 .....	264
What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change? .....	264
Analysis of Table 39 .....	266
Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What Effective Principals Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership? .....	267
Analysis of Table 40 .....	267



VIII. FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	269
Introduction .....	269
Review Of The Purpose Of The Study And Its Methodology .....	269
Summary Of Findings .....	272
1. How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching and Learning In Order To Improve The School? .....	273
2. What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change? .....	274
3. What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change ? .....	274
4. Did the Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership? .....	275
Conclusions	275
Limitation Of The Study .....	276
Recommendations .....	277
Questions for Further Research .....	278
What This Study Meant To Me .....	279
APPENDIX A .....	281
APPENDIX B .....	283
APPENDIX C .....	285
APPENDIX D .....	291
APPENDIX E .....	295
APPENDIX F .....	299
APPENDIX G .....	302
APPENDIX H .....	308
REFERENCES .....	310
VITA .....	316



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Principal Blue Perceiver Survey .....	81
2. Summary of Blue K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	84
3. Summary of Blue K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	90
4. Summary of Blue Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	95
5. Summary of Blue Special Area Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	99
6. Summary of Blue Aggregated Teacher <u>M</u> Scores in Comparison To Principal Score .....	104
7. Summary of Blue On-Site Observations .....	110
8. Summary of Principal White Perceiver Survey .....	130
9. Summary of White K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	133
10. Summary of White K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	139
11. Summary of White Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	144
12. Summary of White Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	148
13. Summary of White Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	153
14. Summary of White Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	157
15. Summary of White Aggregated Teacher <u>M</u> Scores in Comparison to Principal Score .....	162

16. Summary of White On-Site Observations .....	167
17. Summary of Principal Ecrú Perceiver Survey .....	187
18. Summary of Ecrú K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey .....	190
19. Summary of Ecrú K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	194
20. Summary of Ecrú Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	200
21. Summary of Ecrú Grade 4-5 Teacher Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	204
22. Summary of Ecrú Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores .....	209
23. Summary of Ecrú Special Area Teacher Survey Frequency and Percent Scores .....	214
24. Summary of Ecrú Aggregated Teacher <u>M</u> Scores in Comparison to Principal Score .....	219
25. Summary of Ecrú On-Site Observations .....	224
26. Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview Instructional Leadership Data .....	230
27. Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Interview Instructional Leadership Data .....	232
28. Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Survey Data .....	234
29. Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Observational Data .....	237
30. Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Documentation Data ....	238
31. Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview Change Facilitation Data .....	249
32. Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Interview Change Facilitation Data .....	251
33. Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview School Improvement Data ..	253
34. Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Interview School Improvement Data .....	255
35. Summary of Cross-Case Change Facilitation and School Improvement Survey Data .....	257
36. Summary of Cross-Case Change Facilitation Observational Data .....	262

37. Summary of Cross-Case School Improvement Observational Data .....	263
38. Summary of Cross-Case Documentation Data .....	264
39. Summary of Cross-Case Deterrents To Change Data .....	265
40. Summary of Cross-Case Impact of 1985 Education Reform Act Data .....	267

## CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A	
OBSERVATIONAL MATRIX .....	282
APPENDIX B	
CASE STUDY LOG SHEET .....	284
APPENDIX C	
CASE STUDY PROTOCOL .....	286
APPENDIX D	
PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT SURVEY (PRINCIPAL PERCEIVER) .....	292
APPENDIX E	
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (PRINCIPAL) .....	296
APPENDIX F	
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (TEACHER) .....	300
APPENDIX G	
TEACHER LETTER .....	303
TEACHER SURVEY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA .....	304
PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT SURVEY (TEACHER PERCEIVER) ...	305
APPENDIX H	
AUDIT ANALYSIS FORM .....	309

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background

During the 1980s the quality of American public education was a popular topic of debate. In 1983, the Education Commission of the States reported that over 250 education task forces had been established to develop educational reform programs (Chance, 1986). Reports such as the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation At Risk; the Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching report, A Nation Prepared; and the National Governor's Association report, A Time For Results illustrated the extent to which educational reform had become an important political issue. These reports were the catalyst, as was Sputnik in 1957, to focus attention on the problems and the achievements of the public educational system.

While these highly publicized reports played a key role in focusing national attention on the perceived ills of the public school system, the states also were instrumental in the reform movement. "The state government of the 1980s is a far stronger governance entity than the state body of the 1950s" (Frazier, 1987, p. 105). The state legislatures, departments of education, state boards of education, and governors' offices assumed a stronger role as education became a popular political issue. Arguably, the states began to recapture their role as the legal entity primarily

responsible for education provided for in the Tenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

Initially the "excellence in education" reform movement placed a great deal of attention on who teaches and how they teach. Hundreds of policies were enacted at the state level to reshape recruitment, selection, assignment, evaluation, compensation, retention, and career options for teachers, but up to this point there has been a fragmented focus on school leadership. Little attention has been directed to the policies and systems that prepare and employ school administrators (Education Commission of the States, 1990).

Today, however, states are taking aim at the nature and quality of school administration. Policy makers across many state capitols are showing interest in how state policy relates to the nature and quality of administrative work at the school level. More and more state policy makers, especially governors, want to know which state policies contribute to effective administrative leadership and what policy options are at their disposal to improve the quality of principals. A recent 50-state survey conducted by the National Governors' Association (NGA), Results In Education: 1989, concluded that the education community lacks a clear definition or consensus on the role of the principal and how best to prepare people for such jobs (Education Commission of the States, 1990).

In general, state policy says very little about the principalship. In Ohio, for example, five specific employment duties are mentioned in code: (a) conduct drills, (b) keep records, (c) follow due process for student discipline, (d) display the American flag and (e) supervise student savings plans. Other duties are subject to local interpretation. Another common duty found in most states was the reporting of



child abuse cases. In practice, however, principals have really become the fundamental accountability agents for most school districts (Pipho, 1990).

Some of the important conclusions about the principalship drawn from seven case studies which included Illinois and conducted by the Policy Center Network of the Education Commission of the States were released in February 1990.

#### **PRESERVICE POLICIES:**

Preparation and entry is a lockstep process in most states.

Entry is a matter of persistence and tenacity and not a rigorous search for talent.

State policy is virtually silent on the attraction of females and minorities into the school of principalship.

#### **CAREER DEVELOPMENT POLICIES:**

State policy does little to influence the nature and quality of professional development.

Recertification requirements are standardized and generally do not reflect the needs of principals.

Effective induction programs for first-year principals are largely ignored in state policy.

#### **EMPLOYMENT POLICIES:**

The employment life of a school principal is largely determined by the local school board.

Few state policies address role, function or specific job responsibilities.

State policies flow from the state to the district and building and fail to mention the principal.

#### **PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:**

Performance appraisal policies are not usually defined in state policy.

No state ties principal performance to school performance.

#### **CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION:**

State policy provides lots of cues but little help in rethinking the job of the principal.

The confluence of state policies and local interpretations gives conflicting clues as to how a principal should provide instructional leadership.

The role of the principal as an instructional leader is ill-defined.

#### **TEACHERS:**

State policy fails to set priorities for principals on the management of instructional personnel (pp. 5-6).

The bottom line from the case studies appears to be that principals receive mixed signals on what state policy makers and often what their superintendents want from them. Yet, the principal is held accountable for school improvement.

Restructuring America's schools, the reform theme of the 1990s, could result in the

ultimate examination of instructional leadership and school improvement (Lewis, 1989).

### The Illinois Picture

A history of the reform movement in Illinois provides a context for examining the changes brought about by the 1985 Illinois reform legislation. The process began as early as 1981 when the State Board of Education initiated a comprehensive review of state education mandates to determine which, if any, should be changed. Student records, transportation, compulsory attendance, and school day/year requirements were examined. During this same time period, the Board also studied the quality of educational personnel in Illinois, their preparation and on-the-job performance as well as the system of funding for elementary and secondary schools. As a result, by the spring of 1983 there was already a broad base of information available about the problems affecting the schools of Illinois.

In 1983 the publication of A Nation At Risk, and the myriad of other national reports, created a climate of public concern. This growing public sentiment and the information from the mandate studies conducted by the State Board led the General Assembly to create the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education (hereafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission, made up of twelve legislative and eight lay members chaired by Senate Education Committee Chairman Arthur Berman and House Education Committee Chairman Richard Mulcahy, was directed to:

Study the problems relating to elementary and secondary education in Illinois, conduct public hearings throughout the state, and consider all relevant information, data, suggestions and proposals for improving elementary and secondary education in the state. (The Commission, 1984, Introduction)

The Commission reviewed the studies already completed by the State Board of Education and solicited input from individuals and organizations for reform recommendations.

In January of 1985 the Commission issued its report, Excellence In The Making. This report cited problems and made recommendations for improving Illinois education. In February, Governor Thompson focused his State of the State Address on education. He detailed his proposal for the Illinois Better Schools Program. Subsequent budget recommendations demonstrated his commitment to educational reform.

Other reform initiatives and reports were under way in 1984 and 1985. Among these were the State Chamber of Commerce's report entitled Task Force On The Future Of Education In Illinois, the Illinois Project for School Reform's report entitled Education In A New Illinois, education reform proposals in the Illinois Federation of Teachers' report Meeting The Challenge, recommendations from the Chicago Teachers Union's report Perspectives From The Classroom, and Chicago United's adoption of an education platform.

All of the above reports and initiatives laid the groundwork for the public policy discussions during the 1985 General Assembly. The Commission report, Excellence In The Making, however, served as the blueprint for the comprehensive legislation on school improvement, Senate Bill 730. "The fact that the Commission was a quasi-legislative organization, chaired by a legislative leader afforded its recommendations with a preemptive quality over those of other organizations." (Chance, 1986, p. 75). As a result of the work of the Commission and other groups, nearly 170 initiatives were made law.

The educational omnibus legislation passed by the General Assembly and subsequently signed by the governor underscored the need for principals to be instructional leaders in their schools if educational reform was to occur. Four of the components of Public Act 84-126, the so-called educational omnibus legislation, specifically related to the building principal. It revised Chapter 122, Section 10-21.4 of the Illinois School Code to include a new duty of instructional leadership. The amended requirement reads as follows:

**Principals-Duties** To employ principals who hold valid supervisory or administrative certificates who shall supervise the operation of attendance centers as the board shall determine necessary. . . The principal shall assume administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent, and in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations of the board, for the planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area to which he or she is assigned.

School boards shall specify in their formal job description for principals that his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction. A majority of the time spent by a principal shall be spent on curriculum development through both formal and informal activities, establishing clear lines of communication regarding school goals, accomplishments, practices and policies with parents and teachers.

School boards shall ensure that their principals are evaluated on their instructional leadership ability and their ability to maintain a positive education and learning climate. . .

### Statement Of The Problem

In effect principals were mandated to become change agents for reform. This legal requirement, however well-intentioned as public policy, generated at least one critical area which needed examination since a mandate alone did not mean that change would necessarily occur. Namely, what lessons could practicing principals, who had been identified as effective by their superintendents or immediate supervisors in larger districts, teach about improving schools? In Illinois where policy required principals to devote a majority of their time to tasks of instructional leadership, the concept of instructional leadership was assumed to be self-evident and not explicitly

defined in state law. Therefore, how did effective principals interpret the meaning of instructional leadership and apply it to the improvement of their schools? Did the confluence of a vague state policy and local interpretation generate inconsistent, incoherent and/or incomplete cues for the principal in matters of instructional leadership? What cues did the principal pay attention to? How did the principal respond? Why did the principal act in a particular way?

When one examined the process of change adopted by the state of Illinois, it became immediately evident that the state had adopted a "top-down" model. That is, both the nature of the change and the pressure for change began at the state level. The objective of the state legislation was to improve instruction. The instrument of change was the building principal. But this objective could only be met if the principals helped teachers change the way they taught. A number of researchers have studied instructional leadership, the change process, and school improvement (see Chapter II for a discussion of these topics). This study concentrated on principal leadership in applying the change research to the school improvement process at the K-5 level.

### Purpose Of The Study

The major purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to:

1. Isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change.

2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature on the principal as instructional leader, the principal as organizational change agent, and school improvement. The methodology and research design utilized to investigate the research questions are described in Chapter III. Chapters IV, V, and VI contain the analyses of the data collected at the three sites. Chapter VII reports the cross-case analysis of the data. In Chapter VIII the research questions are discussed, the implications of the study are discussed, and recommendations concerning principal leadership behaviors are made.

### Definition of Terms

Throughout this study 15 terms were used repeatedly to focus the study and clarify the findings. Definitions for these terms are as follows:

1. Instructional Leadership--the principal focuses effort on the improvement of instruction; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement.

1.1 Resource provider--the principal views the entire school community and district as possessing potential resources for use in the school and that it is the principal's job to get these resources.

1.2 Instructional resource--the principal encourages the use of different strategies and serves as a cheerleader, encourager, facilitator, counselor, and coach for expanding the teacher's repertoire of instructional strategies.

1.3 Communicator--the principal is capable of interacting clearly on three levels; one-on-one, as a small group facilitator, and in creating a sense of vision for the school within the school community at-large.

1.4 Visible presence--the principal is out and around the entire school daily; the principal's presence is felt, whether in the building or not, by a deeply ingrained philosophy that permeates the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

2. Change Facilitation--the principal works directly with teachers who are expected to change (grow).

2.1 Trainer--the principal arranges for teacher training on an on-going basis in order to enable teachers to grow and to continue developing new skills.

2.2 Developer--the principal acquires the resources, plans for and manages the process necessary to implement and support changes on an on-going basis.

2.3 Buffer--the principal sees to it that an innovation is given time to work before other changes are introduced.

2.4 Monitor--the principal seeks data to help assess progress in implementing a change (Hord et al., 1987).

3. School Improvement--the principal develops the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis.

3.1 Model--the principal "lives" the values of the school in an observable fashion on a daily basis.

3.2 Collaborator--the principal builds a base of personal relationships upon collegiality and mutuality in pursuing school improvement.

3.3 Culture builder--the principal arouses awareness and consciousness that elevates organizational goals and purposes to the level of a shared covenant and bonds together leader and followers in a moral commitment to school improvement.

3.4 Responsible party--the principal turns improvements into routines so that they become second nature; ministers to the needs of the school; is of service;

guards the values; and assures that school improvement is an on-going process (Joyce, Hersh & McKibben, 1983; Sarason, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990).



## CHAPTER II

### THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This study was about how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to isolate any factors which were deterrents to change; and isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

The concepts of principal as instructional leader and as organizational change agent have been the focus of study for nearly two decades by a number of scholars. However, until recently, the principal as instructional leader and the principal as organizational change agent were two separate research arenas. The principal as instructional leader research studies focused on what principals did to support teaching and learning. The principal as organizational change agent research studies identified conditions and practices which promoted significant, durable change in educational programs. Specific contributions of the principal were identified

(Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; DeBevoise, 1984; Fullan, 1982; Hord et al., 1987; Rosenblum & Jastrzob, 1980; Sarason, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The merging of the principal as instructional leader with the principal as organizational change agent research was clearly seen in the school improvement research (Fullan, 1982; Goodlad, 1975; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Joyce, Hersh, & McKibben, 1983; Sergiovanni, 1990).

This chapter is divided into five parts. The first part is background. In this section the concepts of leadership and effective schools are briefly explored as backdrop to a more panoramic view of the concept of instructional leadership, which is the focus of part two. Part three will discuss the research on principal as organizational change agent. Part four will describe the school improvement research as it relates to the principal. Part five will detail the theoretical framework for this study on how principals improve their schools and its significance. The theoretical framework is derived from the union of the instructional leadership research with the organizational change and school improvement research.

### Background

Until the 1980s most of the literature focused on the leader's behaviors, traits, and effectiveness. Henry Mintzberg in his often quoted work The Nature Of Managerial Work (1973) identified three schools of study concerning leaders and leadership. The first was the leader effectiveness school.

. . . The study of leadership is the study of interpersonal behavior specifically that between the leaders and the led. . . Researchers of the leader effectiveness school. . . focus not so much on the job of managing as on the man in the job. They seek to discover what set of personality traits or managerial styles lead a manager to effective performance. . . To conclude, the leader effectiveness school is only beginning to say something about those factors that produce successful leaders. . . (p. 17).

Mintzberg named the second school of study the leader power school. In summarizing the words of Melville Dalton, Richard Neustadt, French and Raven, and Darwin Cartwright he stated that the leader power school:

. . . concerns itself with power and influence, with the manipulative prerogatives of the leader. . . they study the leader's ability to use power to evoke desired responses from subordinates and peers. Some studies focus on the position and the discretion it allows the incumbent; others focus on particular individuals and how they use this discretion. . . In some of the literature on leadership, a distinction is made between informal leadership, where the leader is chosen by the followers, and formal leadership where the leader is appointed from above. . . (p. 19).

The third scientific school identified by Mintzberg was the leader behavior school. Mintzberg cautioned readers of the behavioral studies that each finding was to be studied one by one since the methods varied widely, the researcher's work had not been built upon, and no central theme or common thread of conclusions had emerged from these studies. Essentially, the writers and researchers in this constellation of studies "analyzed the actual content of the manager's job by studying the behavior of the incumbents" (p. 21). The leader behavior school included Hodgson, Levinson, and Zaleznick (1965); George Homans (1950); the Ohio Leadership Studies (1940s-mid-1960s); and Leonard Sayles (1964).

Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver in their book titled The New School Executive: A Theory Of Administration (1973) were the first to discuss that administration may be both scientific and artistic:

. . . administration may be scientific in that one can make fairly accurate initial predictions based on theory, propositions, and the like; but administration is also artistic in the sense that once action is implemented, the variability and complexity of human behavior produce unanticipated consequences which defy systematic decision-making. . . (p. 201).

By 1982 in an article titled "Ten Principles of Quality Leadership" in Educational Leadership, Sergiovanni had "rejected James G. March's belief that leaders are interchangeable (assuming equal basic managerial competence); one leader makes no more significant impact on the organization than another" (scientific

school) and had instead fully developed his belief that a strategic view of leadership emphasizing quality was needed. He stated that the discouraging news implicit in the scientific school (competent leaders are necessary to ensure things will work but they appear not to make much difference beyond a minimum level of satisfactory organizational performance) was the result of "too much emphasis on what leaders actually do and how they behave and not enough on the more symbolic aspect of leadership, the meanings they communicate to others. This shortcoming is most noticed in our almost exclusive emphasis on leadership objectives, leadership behavior, leadership outcomes, and measurable leadership effectiveness" (p. 330).

Sergiovanni's strategic view of leadership required that balanced attention be given to both tactics and strategy. He defined strategy as "the science and art of enlisting and employing support for certain policies and purposes and for devising plans toward goals". Tactics, by contrast, were defined as "involving actions or means of less magnitude or at a shorter distance from a base of operation than those of strategy and as small-scale actions serving a larger purpose" (p. 330). His equation for leadership was  $QL = LS (LA + LM + LCE)$ . Translated this equation meant quality leadership resulted from the compounding effects of leadership skills (LS) interacting with leadership antecedents (LA), meanings (LM), and cultural expression (LCE). Though conveniently sorted into four categories of skills, antecedents, meanings, and cultural expression, the art of leadership was celebrated in their integration and practice (p. 336).

How were the topics of leadership and the school principal interrelated?

First of all, principals were by definition managers and leadership was a role of the manager (Barnard, 1938; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). Secondly, Brookover and Lezotte (1977), Edmonds (1979), and Rutter (1979) and a number of others studied characteristics of both effective and ineffective schools. They each concluded

that effective schools shared certain essential characteristics. One finding that emerged from all studies was that the principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction was essential to an effective school.

Gilbert R. Austin (1979) noted that while exceptional schools appeared to have a critical mass of positive factors, which when put together, made the difference, the school that performed in unusually successful ways had a principal or a leader who was an exceptional person.

. . . Recent research by Guditus and Zirkel (1979) indicates that this kind of leadership comes to a principal as a result of what is called expert power as compared with legitimate power, coercive power, referent power, or reward power. The principals in these studies were viewed by the teachers and pupils as persons who are expert in a wide variety of areas concerning education. In these studies, the principal is identified as an expert instructional leader, instead of an administrative leader, and the level of instructional expertise falls in the area of reading or math. The second characteristic that emerged from these studies is that the levels of expectations for the children by the principals and teachers were unusually high, and the children tended to rise to these expectations in their performance levels. . . ( p. 12).

James Sweeney analyzed the conclusions of eight different studies which examined this question: "Do principals make a difference and if so, which leadership behaviors are associated with positive outcomes"? He stated that "the evidence clearly indicates that principals do make a difference, for leadership behavior was positively associated with school outcomes in each of the eight studies" (1982).

. . . Of equal importance was the emergence of specific leadership behaviors consistently associated with effective schools. . . school effectiveness is enhanced by principals who emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, provide an orderly school atmosphere, frequently evaluate pupil progress, coordinate instruction and support teachers. . . (p. 350).

Although the effective principal as leader has been a topic of investigation for more than two decades, only more recently has a narrower focus of study, namely the principal as instructional leader, been heavily researched.

## Research On The Principal As Instructional Leader

For purposes of definition, the concept of instructional leadership encompasses those actions that a principal takes to improve instruction and promote growth in student learning; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Wynn DeBevoise wrote about the principal as instructional leader in his article "Synthesis of Research on the Principal as Instructional Leader" in Educational Leadership (February 1984).

. . . Among the characteristics of instructional leaders that Blumberg and Greenfield observed in their sample (inferred primarily from talks with the principals) are: A propensity to set clear goals and to have these goals serve as a continuous source of motivation, a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others, tolerance for ambiguity, a tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems, a sensitivity to the dynamics of power, an analytic perspective, and the ability to be in charge of their jobs. . . (p. 15).

Mr. DeBevoise indicated that Blumberg and Greenfield's findings were supported by the Florida State Department of Education's research which revealed that "beyond the basic competencies, the effective principal has a clear sense of mission and control, tests the limits in providing resources, is persuasive and committed to high standards, uses a participatory style, and is not content to maintain the status quo" (p. 17). He concluded that the important lesson to be learned from an examination of the characteristics of effective principals relative to instructional leadership was the diversity of styles that appeared to work in a variety of contexts.

. . . Ultimately, the provision of instructional leadership can be viewed as a responsibility that is shared by a community of people both within and outside the school. Principals initiate, encourage, and facilitate the accomplishment of instructional improvement according to their own abilities, styles, and contextual circumstances. They still need a lot of help from others if improvement is to become the norm. . . (p. 20).

In a September, 1987 interview with Ron Brandt, editor of Educational Leadership, Richard Andrews also talked about the good principal as being one who

provided instructional leadership. His unique research examined the teachers' perceptions of the leadership of their principals. In "high profile" schools, principals were strong instructional leaders in the perceptions of teachers. According to teachers' reports, the schools were also characterized by having high expectations, frequent monitoring of student progress, a positive learning environment, and goal clarity (p. 10).

Our characterization of these schools as high profile is based directly on teachers' perceptions of the quality of their workplace. We might say that where teachers have very positive perceptions of the quality of their workplace, they are more productive, so we see incremental growth in student achievement. . . but what is far more important is the quality of the relationships with other human beings in that environment and since the principal is in the best position to influence that, we would expect his or her leadership to be an important variable, and sure enough it is. . . (p. 11).

Andrews discovered as a result of his research that the principal perceived as an instructional leader by teachers displayed several key behaviors: (Smith & Andrews, 1989)

1. The principal was a resource provider.
2. The principal was an instructional resource.
3. The principal was a communicator.
4. The principal was a visible presence in the school.

Andrews' research on how instructional leadership was displayed led logically to a review of three articles written by researchers who, using the case study technique, followed real principals around their schools over a period of time to observe firsthand typical daily activities.

### What Instructional Leaders Do

This section of part one on the research concerning the principal as instructional leader describes in a narrative fashion the specific behaviors of real principals operating as instructional leaders.

Ken Wilson, in an article titled "An Effective School Principal" published in Educational Leadership (February 1982), described the life of one principal in Watertown, Massachusetts as observed during weekly day-long visits throughout the 1979-80 school year.

. . . The school's instructional program is the main emphasis of William Corbett's principalship. Most of his activities explicitly or implicitly aim at ensuring quality instructional time for students. . (this) begins with recruiting a competent staff. Though his influence on teacher selection has varied over the years, Mr. Corbett has had some hand in hiring 14 of Lowell's twenty teachers . . . He has striven to include at least two teaching styles at each grade level. . . . Staff selection thus functions as one component of the process of student placement. In a more immediate fashion he attends to this process throughout each school year as he gathers information relevant to each student's placement for the following year. . . .

. . . most of all he leads his staff to accomplish a clearly defined, reasonable--in-number set of major instructional goals emanating from two overall school goals: children will advance a minimum of one grade level by any measure, and children will demonstrate respect for the rights of others and for property. . . .

. . . a remarkable component of his effort to implement goals is his communication of instructional emphasis to students. Twice each year (he) listens to each child in the primary grades read aloud. (He) asks questions and discusses the story with the child. He writes a note complimenting the child or suggesting an area of improvement and asking if the child will read the same story to his or her parents that very evening. . . .

. . . Mr. Corbett employs a similar procedure to communicate his concern for and to monitor children's progress in writing and mathematics. Again twice each year he obtains writing samples from each class. These he reads at home, returning each with comments on usage, spelling and creativity. Math papers receive the same treatment. . . .

. . . Another component of this student recognition strategy is the display of student work throughout the building. . . in the office, classrooms, and corridors. . . .

. . . Maintaining a visible presence and availability is the initial step in establishing a reasonable atmosphere. On most days Mr. Corbett is at school at least one-half hour early, organizing his agendas and performing tasks that might later take him away from students and teachers. When most people arrive, he is there in the hallway awaiting them. At that time, throughout the day, and for awhile after school hours he is known to be available for advice and troubleshooting. . . .

. . . He gives parents an open line to his office and responds within one day to any parent inquiry. . . . (pp. 358-361).

Although the aforementioned passages were quite lengthy they were germane to the analysis of the principal as instructional leader in that they chronicled some of the specific, discrete, and real daily behaviors which caused a principal to be perceived as an instructional leader by those around him.



In a September 1985 Phi Delta Kappan article authored by William L. Rutherford, this researcher reported the results of five years worth of on-site visitations to Texas elementary and secondary schools to observe the instructional leadership skills of principals. As a result of his observations he was able to draw the following conclusions:

1. Without hesitation effective principals could list their goals for the school, most of which focused on students. The principals responded with enthusiasm that reflected their personal belief in and active support of their goals.

2. The principals with visions for their schools were almost always identified by their teachers as the individuals most influential in determining what happened in those schools. "They led the band and made things happen".

3. Effective principals allocate funding and materials in ways that maximize teaching effectiveness and thus student achievement. In addition, they selectively and systematically apply such other support mechanisms as advantageous scheduling, careful assignment of teachers, and the dispensing of recognition to achieve these ends. To them, a good school environment is one that enhances students' learning and development.

4. The most effective principals took time to discover what was going on in the classrooms. They gathered information through formal classroom observations as well as through informal means. These included walking the halls, ducking in and out of classrooms, attending departmental and grade level meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with individual teachers.

5. The effective principals looked for positive features and then directly and sincerely recognized and praised the teachers responsible for them. They also spotted problems and took necessary corrective actions (p. 33).

Rutherford found that while the effective principals differed from the ineffective principals in the five areas just described, effective instructional leaders were not necessarily all alike.

Yes, effective school leaders will demonstrate the five essential qualities of leadership in their work. But no, they will not demonstrate these qualities through identical behaviors. The fact that effective leaders behave in varying ways is positive and encouraging for two reasons. First, it means that individuals who wish to be effective leaders need not undergo a personality change or take part in therapy aimed at changing their behaviors to fit some predetermined pattern. Second, it means that, as situations change, leaders can modify their behaviors accordingly and still retain their commitment to the five essential qualities of effective leadership. For these five qualities - not the daily behaviors - are the variables that truly determine a leader's effectiveness. . . (p. 34).

The final article to be reviewed in this section of the chapter on the principal as instructional leader was authored by Gene Hall, William Rutherford, Shirley Hord, and Leslie Huling titled "Effects of Three Principals' Styles on School Improvement" published in Educational Leadership (February 1984).

As a result of their case study research the authors developed operational descriptions of three school leadership styles which they called initiator, manager, and responder. Essentially, initiators had clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcended but included implementation of current innovations. They tended to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be and worked intensely to attain this vision.

Responders placed heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believed their primary role was to maintain a smooth running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students well.

Managers demonstrated both responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiated actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seemed to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff as well as how they understood and bought into a particular change effort.

The authors concluded from their research that all effective principals were not the same. If one desired to improve a school by simply identifying a particularly effective style and appointing a principal who fit this style to the school, this type of school improvement vaccination probably would not take (p. 24).

It was essential that the role of the principal as instructional leader in the school improvement process must be reviewed in terms of the many factors that affected it rather than naively assuming that a quick cure could be made simply by

changing one variable, such as the change facilitator style of the principal. School life was much richer and more complex than that (p. 28).

### Research On The Principal As Organizational Change Agent

For purposes of definition, the concept of principal as change facilitator means the principal works directly with teachers who are expected to change/grow (Hord, Rutherford, Austin, & Hall, 1987).

Change is now generally accepted to be a process, not an event (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; Havelock, 1973; Hord et al., 1987; Rosenblum & Louis, 1981; et al.). Because of a vast amount of research on the process of change during the past 20 years, guesswork and intuition need not be the principal's only touchstones. A great deal about how to plan for and manage change more efficiently and effectively is now known.

Since the concept of principal as change facilitator requires the principal to work with teachers, the principal interested in implementing change needs to develop an understanding of teachers and the teaching profession.

A research study by Lortie titled Schoolteacher, published in 1975, identified conservatism, individualism, and presentism as significant components in the ethos of the American classroom teacher. Since the manner in which students were admitted into professional preparation for teaching was relatively open, people could decide to become teachers at any number of points, as a young child or later in life. Considerable self-selection was allowed in that membership was not standardized by professional consensus nor was membership screened through a shared criteria for admission. These recruitment factors fostered a conservative outlook among entrants to the profession. Teachers often reported that they entered the teaching profession to provide a valuable service of special moral worth or because they had become so

attached to school that they were loath to leave it. Implicit in these themes of service and continuation was an emphasis on conserving the past rather than changing it (p. 33).

Lortie's study attributed the individualistic aspect of the teaching profession to the fact that students learned about teaching primarily through imitation or an apprenticeship of observation. Educational pre-service training had a low impact, and teachers did not see themselves as sharing a common technical subculture. Rather they fell back on individual recollections of how their teachers taught. This pattern encouraged the conception of teaching as individualistic rather than collegial and was an ally of continuity rather than change (p. 70). The individualistic environment was compounded by the cellular or "egg crate" structure of the schools in which teachers were isolated from their colleagues. Since the average teacher visited other teachers to observe them teach less than once every three years, teachers had no concept of who they were professionally or how they stacked up against others (Joyce, 1981).

The dominance of the present versus future orientation (presentism) of teachers seemed to be created by the lack of stages in the teaching career and by "front loading" (Lortie, p. 101). Front loading, beginning at a high income level relative to one's earning potential, was also linked to teachers' attitudes toward presentism. A Rand Corporation study indicated that front-loading and lack of career staging created a negative correlation between length of teaching career and successful implementation of change (Weinshank, Trumball, & Daly, 1983, p. 301).

Lortie found that another factor the principal should consider when implementing change in the school was that teachers emphasized psychic rewards in their work over extrinsic rewards such as earnings, level of prestige, or power over

others. Teachers expressed satisfaction in their work when they felt they reached their students (p. 104).

### The Process of Teacher Change

Thomas Guskey developed a model of the process of teacher change as a result of staff development efforts (Guskey, 1986). According to the model, "significant change in the beliefs and attitudes of teachers is contingent on their gaining evidence in the learning outcomes of their students (Guskey, p. 7). The model was based on the belief that change was a learning process for teachers that was developmental and primarily experientially based. It "implies that change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes is primarily a result, rather than a cause, of change in the learning outcomes of students. In the absence of evidence of positive change in student's learning, the model suggests that significant change in the beliefs and attitudes of teachers is very unlikely" (p. 9).

Guskey recognized that the underlying concept of the model was not new. Michael Fullan had expressed a similar viewpoint stating: "changes in attitudes, beliefs, and understanding tend to follow rather than precede changes in behavior" (Fullan, 1982). Guskey also acknowledged that his model was not a comprehensive change model. The simplicity of the model was "offered primarily as an ordered framework by which to better understand trends that appear to typify the dynamics of the teacher change process" (Guskey, 1986, p. 7). The implications of the model for staff development efforts, he felt, suggested three guiding principles: (a) change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers; (b) teachers must receive regular feedback on student learning progress; and (c) teachers need continued support and follow-up after the initial training (Guskey, 1986, p. 11).

### Joyce and Showers' Coaching Model

Joyce and Showers (1980) identified five key elements of successful change efforts: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching. All five elements, they argued, must be present for lasting change to occur. They also identified five major functions of coaching: provision of companionship, provision of technical feedback, analysis of application, adoption to students, and facilitation. Although they acknowledged that principals or curriculum supervisors could perform the coaching function, Joyce and Showers suggested that peers could effectively coach one another as they implemented changes. "From a purely logistical point of view, teachers are closer to one another and in an excellent position to carry out most of the coaching functions (Joyce & Showers, 1982, p. 7).

### The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) was a comprehensive change model from the perspective of individuals within an organization developed in the early 1970s. The model has evolved since that time as the Texas-based CBAM staff have worked with schools to implement changes. Key assumptions underlying CBAM were: (a) change is a process, not an event; (b) change is made by individuals; (c) change is a highly personal experience; (d) change involves developmental growth in feelings as well as skills with respect to an innovation; (e) change is best understood in operational terms; and (f) the focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context (Hord et al., 1987).

The CBAM model "views the teacher as the focal point in the school improvement efforts, yet acknowledges and attends to the social and organizational influences as well" (Loucks & Hall, 1979, p. 4). Change facilitators were key to the success of CBAM. They played three distinctly different roles, operating as the: source for

innovation, impetus for innovation, and implementation facilitator (Hall & Guzman, 1984).

In the CBAM model, change facilitators are responsible for using informal and systematic ways to probe individuals and groups to understand them. Three dimensions have been identified and verified for accomplishing this diagnosis: Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configurations (IC). With these three sets of diagnostic data in mind, the change facilitator is informed enough to provide interventions--actions that affect and facilitate teachers' use of new programs and practices (Hord et al., 1987, p. 13).

The three diagnostic dimensions described essentially, three key questions that were asked when considering the teacher's position in the change process. The first dimension, Stages of Concern, asked: "How do they feel about it?"--teachers' concerns went through a series of varying emphases. The second dimension, Levels of Use, asked: "Are they using it?"--use ranged on a continuum, with gradual behavioral changes as they moved from absolute non-use, to a state of comfortable and routine use, to a state of renewal, in which they sought to improve or replace it. The third dimension, Innovative Configurations, asked: "What is it?"--different teachers used very different forms of an innovation (Hall, 1986, p 12).

To help change facilitators manage their role in the change process, a checklist for principals, who were identified as the first level change facilitators by Hord et al. was created. This checklist, based on years of research, identified six distinct categories of interventions. The categories were referred to as game plan components (GPC) because the role of the change facilitator was "not unlike that of an athletic coach who prepares a game plan (often with input from assistant coaches and sometimes from the players themselves) and then offers advice and assistance in carrying it out" (Hord et al., 1987, p. 79-80).

### What Principals Who Are Change Facilitators Do

Hord et al. spent a number of years in schools documenting the actions associated with implementing curriculum programs, behavior processes, and other innovations. These six game plan components (GPC) introduced above were as follows:

GPC 1: DEVELOPING SUPPORTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

GPC 2: TRAINING

GPC 3: CONSULTATION AND REINFORCEMENT

GPC 4: MONITORING

GPC 5: EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

GPC 6: DISSEMINATION

As teachers were the pivotal force in any change process that occurred within the schools, the principal has been described as the gatekeeper of change and a key person in school improvement and change (Hord, et al., 1987; Sarason, 1982). Principals who encouraged their staffs to participate in staff development activities significantly increased the chances of real, lasting change in the professional performance of the faculty (Wood, Thompson, & Russell, 1981). The principal as initiator or implementor of change was a crucial role. However, the principal had come from the same background as the teacher, with the same inclinations toward conservatism and individualism; and these background factors may be antithetical to appropriate performance in the role. In addition, the principal's role in change or staff development was complicated by pressures from the community and central office administration which may differ from the pressures within the school (Fullan, 1982; Sarason, 1982).

The principal who attempted to plan staff development activities for the teachers in an individual school assumed an appropriate but considerable



responsibility for leadership. Goodlad suggested that change in the individual school under the principal's leadership had the potential for securing community support, minimized the danger of expecting too much of just a part of a school, enhanced the chances of improving the working place, and increased the satisfaction of those connected with the schools (Goodlad, 1975). Elements that were evident in a healthy school workplace were mutual trust between principal and teachers, autonomy for classroom teachers, support for teachers by the principal, and respect for each other as professionals (Goodlad, p. 52).

A study for the National Institute of Education revealed that the more effective schools have norms of collegiality and continuous improvement among the faculty and the administration. A norm of collegiality was the expectation of shared work among teachers and the principal. A norm of continuous improvement was the expectation that analysis, evaluation, and experimentation were tools of the profession. School culture or climate became an important factor in staff development when the focus for professional growth was on the interaction between teachers, principal, and the school site (Howey & Vaughn, 1983).

Recent research rejected the notion that schools were classical bureaucracies and had rather suggested that they were loosely coupled systems in which the work of the teachers was somewhat independent of the principal's supervision (Weick, 1976). Weick believed that in a loosely coupled organization the coupled events were responsive to each other. However, each event preserved its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness. Weick also suggested that a loosely coupled organization was like a set of building blocks that could be grafted on to the organization or severed from it with relatively little disturbance to either the blocks or the organization. As a loosely coupled organization, the educational system was responsive to local adaptations. The system could retain a greater number of

mutations and novel solutions while any breakdown was sealed off and did not affect other portions of the organization (Weick, p. 8).

However, the system also allowed more room for self-determination by the teachers and did not effectively coordinate its major business which was the education of children. This isolation of classrooms as workplaces subjected teachers to little organizational control and allowed them to create the curriculum (Weick, p. 9).

The principal who attempted to implement change was confronted on the one hand by research that described the loosely coupled organization of the school and on the other hand by the school culture model for staff development and change that presented the importance of the principal's leadership in developing the appropriate climate for change. The school culture model suggested that changing schools required changing people's behaviors and attitudes as well as school organization and norms. Since consensus among staff was a more powerful force than overt control, an important factor in implementing change was building staff agreement on specific norms and goals that included collaborative planning, collegial work, and a school atmosphere that was conducive to experimentation and evaluation (Fullan, 1982; Goodlad, 1975; and Sarason, 1982). The loose coupling organization of the school makes the development of teachers as a group in a whole school a difficult task, but such development was more likely to result in significant and lasting improvements in the school's educational operation (Sanders & Schwab, 1981).

Ernest House developed the argument that the political and economic structure of the school allowed certain types of activities and prohibited others. Therefore, principals interested in change through staff development must assume the role of an entrepreneur, an advocate working within the system, in order to overcome the rigid internal structure. The principal as entrepreneur operated best where there was a fragmented or loose bureaucratic structure which was conducive to exercising

individual initiative. The entrepreneurial principal worked in a setting that was characterized by an absence of tight hierarchical control, generally little reward for achievement, and few opportunities for upward mobility (House, 1974).

The effort to persuade teachers to change was most difficult and also depended on whether enthusiastic advocates composed of teachers and parents would join with the principal to protect and propagate the change. A Rand study underlined the importance of developing a constituency for change in that the more committed groups were to the proposed change, the more likely the goals of change would be approximated (Sarason, 1982).

To create this type of climate for change in a school the principal facilitated, buffered, and provided teachers with time to learn new skills, and think about new ways of doing things. Norms of collegiality and continuous improvement were shaped by interactions that allowed for frequent talk among teachers about the practice of teaching and frequent opportunities to observe and evaluate one another's teaching. If conditions for exchange and communication were to exist, teachers must learn to value and trust each other (Joyce, 1986; Little, 1982; Sarason, 1982).

Though Lortie's study indicated that psychic rewards were more important to teachers than extrinsic rewards, rewards and incentives were a crucial variable associated with professional growth. The power of the principal to dispense rewards at the building level was enhanced by the isolation of teachers from their colleagues (House, p. 81). However, it was difficult for the building principal to exercise control over how rewards were distributed and to whom they were extended since the offering of stipends, tuition reimbursements, or released time was typically controlled at levels beyond the building level. Yet research indicated that attention and emphasis should be placed on intrinsic rewards (Lanier, 1983). Informal rewards such as the interactions with students and the alterations in the conditions of

work were more powerful motivators. They allowed for the potential power of adult-adult relationships, released time, and a shortened day (Griffin, 1983). The principal worked within the organization of the school to provide the appropriate rewards and incentives for teacher growth and change.

### The Phases And The Complexity of Change

A number of researchers have identified specific phases, or stages in the change process. Three phases were identified in the Rand Change Agent Study: mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Hall and Hord identified five phases: assessment of present practice, adoption, initiation, implementation, and institutionalization (Hall & Hord, 1986). Levine identified four stages: recognition of need, planning and formulation of a solution, initiation and implementation plan, and institutionalization or termination (Levine, 1980). Rosenblum and Louis identified four stages: readiness, initiation, implementation, and continuation (Rosenblum & Louis, 1981). The phases identified by these researchers have striking similarities, as Fullan noted:

Most researchers now see broad phases to the change process. Phase I--variously labeled initiation, mobilization, or adoption-consists of the process which leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change. Phase II--implementation or initial use (usually the first two or three years of use) -involves the first experiences of attempting to put an idea or program into practice. Phase III--called continuation, incorporation, routinization, or institutionalization-refers to whether the change gets built in as an on-going part of the system or disappears by way of a decision to discard or through attrition (Fullan, 1982, p. 39).

Change was a complex process. And "nothing has been more characteristic of efforts to change schools than oversimple conceptions of the change process" (Sarason, 1982, pp. 11-12). There appeared to be definite phases to the process (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Hord et al., 1987; Levine, 1980; Rosenblum & Louis, 1981; et al.). And users' perceptions of the change were very important in the

process (Fullan, 1982; Havelock, 1973; Loucks & Hall, 1979; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971; et al.).

Communication was essential for change--communication between change agents and users (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; Havelock, 1973; Hord et al., 1987; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971) and between users (Bentzen et al., 1974; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Leadership was vital in the change process (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Fullan, 1982; Kanter, 1983; Peters & Austin, 1985; Rosenblum & Louis, 1981; et al.). Further, organizations which were more tightly structured and "whole"-oriented responded more easily and successfully to change (Kanter, 1983; Rosenblum & Louis, 1981).

Staff participation in implementation planning was also essential for successful change efforts (Bentzen et al., 1974; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; et al.). Ralph Tyler explained that "unless the teachers have participated in identifying the problems or inadequacies of the school and in developing workable solutions, they may not believe that a given problem exists or that a proposed solution will be an improvement over current practices" (Tyler, 1988, p. 16). Kanter also stressed the importance of participation, explaining that "a great deal of innovation seems to demand participation, especially at the action or implementation stage" (Kanter, 1983, p. 243).

Huberman and Miles "found that efforts to develop cooperation, coordination, and conflict resolution across the differing worlds of administrators and users were often critical to successful implementation--and that it was often important to lay off from close supervision, giving dedicated professionals the chance to invent, adapt, and extend" (Huberman & Miles, 1984, p. 28). But they cautioned that too much flexibility can lead to lower percentages of use and weaker institutionalization of an innovation.

Sarason was among the first to identify the culture of the school as a critical factor in the change process. "One must make explicit and examine the degree to which one's theory of change takes account of the important social and psychological dimensions that categorize the setting" (Sarason, 1982, p. 34). Building upon Sarason, Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) conducted a study to investigate the effects of school culture on change efforts.

The design of their study included intensive fieldwork, indepth interviewing, and observations in three high schools with differing demographics, histories, and native populations. The data analysis strategy was designed as a cross-case comparison approach. The researchers found that where proposed changes threatened not only "the way we do things" but "who we are around here," resistance to the change resulted in extreme aversion, and/or partial compliance. When the normative control of the change was not taken into account, the results were less than expected.

Lieberman and Rosenholtz (1987) reported case studies that show "the major barrier to school improvement is the school culture itself, but that the bridge to its improvement and change is that very same culture" (p. 94). The culture "has within it the possibilities of becoming a collaborative, humane, problem-solving culture rather than an isolated, defensive one" (p. 95).

Fullan organized the complex factors affecting implementation of changes in schools by classifying critical factors into four broad categories (Fullan, 1982, p. 56):

1. Characteristics of the Change: need and relevance of the change, clarity, complexity, quality, and practicality of the program
2. Characteristics at the School District Level: the history of innovation attempts, the adoption process, central administrative support and involvement, staff development (inservice) and participation, timeline and information systems (evaluation), and board and community characteristics
3. Characteristics at the School Level: the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics and orientations
4. Characteristics External to the Local System: role of government, external assistance.

The Rand Change Agent Study also identified clusters of factors crucial to successful implementation. The following is a summary of the clusters, along with supporting findings from other studies:

1. Institutional Motivation--teacher commitment was influenced by at least three factors: (1) the motivation of district managers "The attitudes of district administration about a planned change were a signal to teachers as to how seriously they should take a special project" (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 72); (2) project planning strategies; and (3) the scope of the proposed change-agent project.

2. Project Implementation Strategies--staff development strategies selected to assist the staff in acquiring the new skills and information necessary for project implementation were most important; strategies that facilitated the development of clarity were critical, since specificity of goals had a major effect on implementation: "The more specific the teachers felt the project goals were, the higher the percentage of goals the project achieved, the greater the student improvement attributed to the project, and the greater the continuation of both project methods and materials" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 79).

3. Institutional Leadership--"The Change Agent data showed that the more effective the project director (in the view of the teachers), the higher the percentage of project goals achieved, and the greater the student improvement observed as a result of the project" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 81).

4. Teacher Characteristics--"The most powerful teacher attribute in the Rand analysis was teacher sense of efficacy. This teacher characteristic showed a strong, positive relationship to all of the project outcome measures" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 85).

Rosenblum and Louis (1981) suggest that implementation involved two vectors:

One vector, which we have called 'facts of educational change,' refers to the aspects of the educational system in which the change is taking place. The second vector concerns the nature of the implementation that is taking place. This vector comprises two dimensions of organizational change: the quantity of change and the quality of change (p. 63).

However one chose to organize or label the factors affecting implementation, it was clear that the change process was complex. Multiple factors must be attended to in implementation efforts. Principals, in their role as change facilitators, must have carefully planned for implementation so that all factors were managed appropriately.

## The School Improvement Research

For purposes of definition, the concept of school improvement means those actions the principal takes to develop the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis. Several research studies conducted over the past 20 years have revealed a group of common factors that seem to be present in schools that are described as improving. These identified common factors began to provide the principal with the reasonable assumption that their presence was a necessary condition for school improvement. The factors related to the principal-teacher relationships and the role of the teachers and the principal within the organization of the school. The behaviors within each factor that were characteristic of teachers and the principals in buildings which were improving can be encouraged through adjustments made by the principal.

One of the earliest studies was sponsored from 1966 through 1972 by the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, I/D/E/A, with the League of Cooperating Schools and John Goodlad from UCLA. The League brought together the principals and staff members from 18 schools in southern California in a Study of Educational Change and School Improvement (SECSI). One purpose of SECSI was to explore and refine a hypothesis postulated by Goodlad that "an effective change strategy is one through which those within a given institution become responsive to what is required to assure institutional renewal and to outside resources most likely to expedite that renewal" (Goodlad, 1975).

The working hypothesis of SECSI was that a single school with its principal, teachers, pupils, parents, and community links was the key element in educational change. Subhypotheses of the study were that a school was a social system with regularized ways of behaving by those who inhabit it; no matter what the approach to



change, one ultimately reckoned with this social system; and the school itself was an agent of change (Goodlad, 1975; Sarason, 1982).

The findings from SECSI indicated that the principal and the principal-teacher relationships were key factors in teacher satisfaction. In addition, several elements were identified as present in a healthy school workplace:

- Mutual trust between principal and teachers.
- Autonomy for classroom teachers.
- Support for teachers by principals.
- Respect for each other as professionals.
- District commitment to change.
- Principal open enough to be aware of teacher, community and district needs.
- Early adapters of the change who raise issues and serve as examples.
- Community support for change.
- Peer group climate that invites dialogue and problem-solving activities (Goodlad, 1975).

In 1972, the same year that the League of Cooperating Schools study was completed, the United States Office of Education commissioned the Rand Corporation to examine 293 federally sponsored programs that were trying to promote educational change in public schools. Their report, the Rand Change Agent Study, was released in 1978 with several major findings (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

First, the effective implementation of improvement projects was dependent on a setting that was supportive and fostered mutual adaptation of the staff to the project demands. The important factors were: principals, meetings, ethos of the district, and climate of the school. Principals in effective settings facilitated, protected (buffered), and provided teachers with the time needed to learn new skills and to think about new ways of doing things. Meetings were held so that teachers could get excited about and committed to an extra effort above the daily routine. The ethos of the district was determined by whether the citizens voted for or against school budgets. In an effective climate faculty members worked together with common concerns rather than every teacher doing his or her own thing (Lieberman, 1982).

A one year study of six urban desegregated school districts was completed in 1982 by Judith Warren Little for the Center for Action Research. Little used semistructured interviews, supplemented by observation, of 105 teachers and 14 administrators. The major finding of Little's research was that schools receptive to change were differentiated from less receptive schools by a patterned norm of interaction among the staff.

Little identified these norms of interaction as a norm of collegiality and a norm of continuous improvement. Her research described a norm of collegiality as expectations for shared work. Shared work was the specific interactions that teachers used "to discuss, plan for, design, conduct, analyze, evaluate, and experiment with the business of teaching" (Little, p. 338). A norm of continuous improvement was the expectation that analysis, evaluation, and experimentation were tools of the profession. These norms resulted in continuous professional development when certain critical elements were present. First, the work relationship for school improvement was achieved when teachers engaged in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about the teaching practice; and when teachers were frequently observed and provided with useful critiques of their teaching (p. 339).

Another critical element for continuous change or school improvement as determined through Little's research involved the role of the principal. Principals needed to be able to stimulate teacher's participation in collegial work by describing expectations for collegial and experimental work; by modeling or enacting the desired behavior; by sanctioning the modeled behavior through allocating resources such as released time; and by defending the norms from countermovements within the school (p. 334).

In an analysis of a 1982 research study, *A Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI)*, Clark, Lotto, and Astuto reported that the main ingredients of improvement were processes and/or procedures, people, innovations, and resources. An important aspect of the processes and procedures that facilitated an effective school improvement program was an early commitment to the innovation by the administrator. Then during the implementation the focus was on the users and their need to work with the innovation (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984).

DESSI also revealed that the most important person to affect the school improvement process was the chief executive officer of the school district. Yet, the principal served several facilitating functions: communicated the importance and likelihood of successful implementation; provided or arranged training and materials necessary for successful implementation; scheduled time for teachers to work with and on the new program or practice (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, pp. 51-55).

According to Joyce, Hersh, and McKibben there were three stages of school improvement (1983):

STAGE ONE	Refine	Initiate the process	Organize Responsible Parties Use effectiveness criteria Improve social climate of education
STAGE TWO	Renovate	Establish the process	Expand scope of improvement Embed staff development Improve curriculum areas
STAGE THREE	Redesign	Expand the scope	Examine mission of school Study technologies Scrutinize organizational structure Develop long-term plan

Joyce et al. believed in the development of an organization of Responsible Parties--principal, teachers, and community members who examined the health of their school continuously, selected targets for improvement, and drew on knowledge about school improvement to implement desired changes. They envisioned the Responsible Parties as a permanent organization responsible for establishing a

climate conducive to change, for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the school, and for effectively bringing about improvements. Their task was to establish the process of school improvement in a way that would consider long-run as well as short-run improvements (p. 8).

Thomas Sergiovanni identified four stages of leadership in the school improvement process (1990):

#### STAGES OF LEADERSHIP

**Leadership by Bartering:** Leader and led strike a bargain within which leader gives to led something they want in exchange for something the leader wants.

**Leadership by Building:** Leader provides the climate and interpersonal support that enhances led's opportunities for fulfillment of needs for achievement, responsibility, competence, and esteem.

**Leadership by Bonding:** Leader and led develop a set of shared values and commitments that bond them together in a common cause.

**Leadership by Banking:** Leader "banks the fire" by institutionalizing improvement gains into the everyday life of the school.

Leadership by bartering, building, and bonding, when viewed sequentially, were developmental stages of leadership for school improvement (Sergiovanni, 1990, pp. 24-26).

Bartering provides the push needed to get things started; building provides the support needed to deal with uncertainty and to respond to higher levels of need fulfillment; and bonding provides the inspiration needed for performance and commitment beyond expectations.

School improvement initiatives become real only when they become institutionalized as part of the everyday life of the school. To this effort, leadership by banking is the fourth stage of school improvement. Banking seeks to routinize school improvements, thus conserving human energy and effort for new projects and initiatives. When practicing leadership by banking, the principal ministers to the needs of the school and works to serve others so they are better able to perform their responsibilities. In addition to manager, minister, and servant, the leader functions as a "high priest" by protecting the values of the school (Sergiovanni, 1990, p. 24).

These major findings, published from 1966 to 1990, revealed a set of factors that were characteristic of the roles and relationships established in a school environment that was improving. The studies indicated that in effective schools

certain relationships existed between the principal and the teachers and that principals and teachers assumed specific roles.

The following is a summary of the principal-teacher relationships, the principal role, and the teacher role in school improvement situations as revealed through major research studies of the past 20 plus years.

### Principal/Teacher Relationships

SECSI

Share mutual trust

Respect each other as professionals

Rand Change Agent Study

Involve equal input from teachers and principal through collaborative planning

Little

Share an expectation of analysis, evaluation, and experimentation

Joyce

Collaboration of responsible parties

Sergiovanni

Exchanging human needs and interests that allow satisfaction of independent (leader and follower) but organizationally related objectives

### Principal Role

SECSI

Be aware of teacher, community, and district needs

Provide support for teachers

## Rand Change-Agent Study

Acknowledge teachers as professionals and support their efforts to learn

Involve all those affected by the change in meaningful ways

Establish channels of communication and solicit involvement from the participants through adaptive on-line planning

Generate administrative support at the onset of the project

Provide skills and time necessary to focus on school site problem-solving

Facilitate, protect, and provide teachers with time to learn new skills and to think about new ways of doing things

Hold meetings so that teachers can get excited about and committed to an extra effort above the daily routine

## Little

Provide useful critiques of teaching

Engage school-based teams in learning and testing ideas staged over time

Observe teachers frequently and provide with useful critiques of their teaching

Establish norms of interaction among the staff

Stimulate teacher's participation by describing expectations for collegial and experimental work

Model or enact the desired behavior through allocating resources such as released time

Defend norms from countermovements within the school

## DESSI

Provide on-going training, assistance, and time for mastery

Focus on users and need to work with the change during implementation

Demonstrate commitment to the change

Communicate importance and likelihood of successful implementation

Provide or arrange training and materials necessary for successful implementation

Schedule time for teachers to work with and on the new program or practice

Joyce

Use effectiveness criteria

Provide staff development

Examine mission of school

Build a community that deliberately and openly builds, supports, evaluates, and rethinks the school program

Active formal leadership is essential

Sergiovanni

Empowerment

Symbolic Leadership

Cultural Leadership

Building Followership

### Teacher Role

SECSI

Have some autonomy

Raise issues and serve as examples of change for others

Establish peer group climate that invites dialogue and problem-solving activities

### Rand Change Agent Study

Work together with common concerns rather than every teacher doing his own thing

Identify problems from which staff development flows and is related

Share collegiality within the school

Develop local materials

Support critical mass of local staff members

### Little

Expect to share work

Engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about the teaching practice

Plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together

### DESSI

See materials as passing the practicality ethic

Perceive direct and concrete benefits of the change for students

### Joyce

Teachers can provide much of the training for each other

To close this section of Chapter II on the school improvement research and to bridge to the next section on the formulation of this study's theoretical framework, a vignette of a principal engaged in the on-going task of school improvement seemed appropriate.

Lauren is principal of a twenty-classroom school in a rural area. In addition to the twenty teachers who are assigned to classrooms, there is a full-time librarian and special education resource teacher. Lauren has organized the faculty into four study groups. Each group is responsible for exploring a particular teaching strategy and preparing themselves not only to use that strategy but to demonstrate it for other groups. Lauren, together with one member of each study group and five parents elected by the parent community, constitute the school community. This committee is responsible for organizing parents and community members to examine the educational health of the school



and suggesting ways of improving curriculum, instruction, and the social climate. Instructional strategies are the focus for the current two-year period.

The faculty gathers once a week in an informal meeting in a social setting with refreshments. Study groups report on their progress and watch a videotape of one of the teachers using one of the new instructional strategies.

In addition, Lauren, the librarian, and the resource teacher each teach one period each day, taking over classes from other teachers, freeing them so that the coaching partnerships can function effectively. Lauren also visits the classroom of one teacher each day, trying to identify areas of need that can become the focus of the weekly meetings. It is on those visits that she makes the tapes that provide some of the substance of those meetings. Also, she is preparing herself to think through what she believes should be the next focus for school improvement - more effective use of the computer as an instructional tool. She is already aware that only two of the faculty members have more than the most primitive understanding of the possibilities, let alone skill in using computers themselves. She is discussing options with a consultant from the state department. Lauren knows that resources are available to increase the numbers of computers in the school and she is determined to work out a feasible plan and ensure a good implementation. However, she is also concerned that the science curriculum is very weak and wonders if strengthening the science is a greater priority than the computer or if the two objectives can be combined. She already plans to build on the study of instructional models to strengthen the science program, but she wisely doesn't want to overload the faculty by asking them to deal with too many initiatives at once.

One of the keys to Lauren's achievements as an instructional leader is that she has no doubt at all that it is her chief responsibility. She believes that she has the responsibility for organizing the faculty and involving community members in the development of the healthiest social climate, curriculum, and instructional setting that she can. Although Lauren is integrative and gentle, she is quietly forceful - everyone is involved in the decision-making process, but steady improvement is central in every meeting. She does not tolerate complacency (Joyce & Showers, 1988, pp. 20-21).

### Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For This Study

A common thread of factors can be identified in the research that defines the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement.

The following four factors have been drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal behaving as an instructional leader (Smith & Andrews, 1989):

1. Resource Provider
2. Instructional Resource

3. Communicator
4. Visible Presence

The research has also indicated four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal behaving as a change facilitator (Hord et al., 1987):

1. Trainer
2. Developer
3. Buffer
4. Monitor

The research has also indicated four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in school improvement (Joyce, Hersh, & McKibben, 1983; Sarason, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990):

1. Model
2. Collaborator
3. Culture Builder
4. Responsible Party

By synthesizing the research findings of these eminent scholars, this study seeks to use this new configuration of characteristics to examine the behaviors of three practicing principals in DuPage County, Illinois, all judged to be effective by their superiors. This study is significant because of its relationship to the practice and training of elementary principals in light of Illinois P.A. 84-126 and the principal's new duty of improvement of instruction as discussed in Chapter I. Specifically, this study holds significance for practice because it considers the day to day work of the principal. Results of the study may help principals as they attempt to balance the various demands of their role. Better understanding of the role of the principal can assist superintendents as they seek to improve the school system.

This study holds significance for training in that specific responses to the surveys and interview questions by the principals and teachers may provide direction for improving the training of principals in light of the new duties mandated in Chapter 122, Section 10-21.4 of the Illinois School Code. This idea will be explored further in Chapter VIII. The analysis of the interviews and observation notes

described in Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII should add to the understanding of how principals feel about their twin roles of gatekeeper of change and accountable agent for change at the school site.

Chapter III will present the research design and methodology.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Background

In designing a study, the researcher had a specific question or questions to be answered. Yin (1989) indicated that research design was the action plan for getting from "here" (initial questions) to "there" (conclusions or answers). Included in the action plan were such issues as where data were located; which data should be collected; and how the data should be analyzed and the results presented.

There were conditions which determined which research design was the most appropriate. Yin (1989) stated that these determining conditions included the type of research question which was posed; the extent of control which the researcher had over actual behavioral events; and the degree to which the focus was on contemporary rather than historical events. In analyzing the predominant strategies--which included experiments, surveys, archival analyses, histories, and case studies--Yin (1989) concluded that the case study was the design of choice where the questions were "how" or "why"; when the focus was on contemporary events; and when the researcher had little control over behavioral events. Added Yin (1989, p. 19), "The case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence--documents, artifacts, interviews and observations."

While there had been a tendency to devalue any research strategy other than scientific experiments, Yin (1989) said that this hierarchical rating of research strategies was inappropriate. The researcher should view these designs pluralistically, since there was overlap between and among them. Each strategy could be used to serve exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory purposes, but the case study method was suggested when the situation or phenomenon was not easily separated from its context (Yin, 1989).

It was this consideration, especially, which influenced this researcher to select a case study design. This researcher was interested in school improvement, the central aspect of the principal's work. As this study's theoretical framework presented a view of the school improvement process as embedded within situational context and affected by conditions from the environment as well as personal factors within the principal, the phenomenon under study was not easily separated from its context. The focus was on contemporary events. This researcher wanted to know what was happening now in the principal's work.

A naturalistic approach was required when a researcher was interested in the "as-is" of a situation. As this researcher was looking at the principal's day-to-day work which must continue during this study, there was not the behavioral control required for the various experimental designs. Once the problem was formulated and the study questions emerged, selection of appropriate methodology became a concern. Experimental designs were discarded because of this researcher's lack of control over the principals' work contexts. An historical design was discarded in favor of methodology which emphasized the contemporary situation. The case study method with its multiple data sources seemed to be the best approach for understanding the principal's leadership role in applying the change research to school improvement efforts.

After considering the alternatives, a comparative or multi-case approach was selected as the best means of understanding and explaining the effects of principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement efforts. This researcher was attracted to the comparative case study because it appeared to offer more explanation through opportunities for a replication logic. If, for example, in a multi-case study similarities occurred in the way principals improved their schools, these likenesses might be for predictable reasons following the given theoretical framework. This was a replication logic contrasted to sampling logic. According to the sampling logic, a number of subjects was assumed to represent a larger pool of subjects, so that data from a smaller pool of persons were assumed to represent the data that might have been collected from the entire pool (Yin, 1989).

On the other hand replication logic was analogous to that used in multiple experiments. Thus, if one had access to only three cases of a rare, clinical syndrome in psychology or medical science, the appropriate research design was one in which the same results were predicted for each of the three cases, thereby producing evidence that the three cases did involve the same syndrome. If similar results were obtained from all three cases, replication was said to have taken place (Yin, 1989).

Further, the problem to be studied did not seem to fit the rationale stated by Yin (1989) for the single case design--wherein the case represented a critical case, an extreme or unique case or a revelatory case which was previously inaccessible.

The logic underlying the use of multiple-case studies is the same. Each case must be carefully selected so that it either (a) predicts similar results (a literal replication) or (b) produces contrary results but for predictable reasons (a theoretical replication). Thus, the ability to conduct six or ten case studies, arranged effectively within a multiple case design, is analogous to the ability to conduct six or ten experiments on related topics; a few cases (two or three) would be literal replication, whereas a few other cases (four to six) might be designed to pursue two different patterns of theoretical replications. If all the cases turn out as predicted, these six to ten cases in the aggregate, would have provided compelling support for the initial set of propositions. If the cases are in some way contradictory, the initial propositions must be revised and retested with

another set of cases. Again, this logic is similar to the way scientists deal with contradictory experimental findings (Yin, 1989, p. 54).

The replication approach to multiple-case studies consisted of specific steps. The initial step in designing the study consisted of theory development followed by case selection and definition of specific measures which were of equal importance in the design and data collection process. Each individual case study consisted of a whole study, in which convergent evidence was sought regarding the facts and conclusions for the case; each case's conclusions were then considered to be the information needing replication by the other individual cases. Both the individual cases and the multiple-case results could and should be the focus of a summary report. For each individual case, the report should indicate how and why a particular proposition was demonstrated or not demonstrated. Across cases, the report should indicate the extent of the replication logic and why certain cases were predicted to have certain results, whereas other cases were predicted to have contrary results (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Yin, 1989).

This study was designed to investigate how three effective principals as determined by their superintendent or immediate supervisor exercised leadership in applying the change research to school improvement efforts at the elementary (K-5) level.

#### Rationale For Using Multiple Sources of Evidence

A major strength of case study data collection was the opportunity to use multiple sources of evidence. The opportunity to use multiple sources of evidence far exceeded that in other research strategies, such as experiments, surveys, or histories. Experiments, for instance, were largely limited to the measurement and recording of actual behavior and generally did not include the systematic use of survey or verbal information. Surveys tended to be the opposite, emphasizing verbal

information but not the measurement or recording of actual behavior. Finally, histories were limited to events in the past and therefore seldom had any contemporary sources of evidence, such as direct observation of a phenomenon or interviews with key actors (Yin, 1989).

The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allowed an investigator to address a broad range of historical, attitudinal, and observational issues. However, the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence was the development of converging lines of inquiry or the process of triangulation. Thus, any finding or conclusion in a case study was likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it was based on several different sources of information, following a corroboratory mode. In this manner, the potential problems of construct validity also could be addressed, because the multiple sources of evidence essentially provided multiple measures of the same phenomenon (Yin, 1989).

The choice of a multiple methodology was consistent with the approach used by Miles and Huberman (1984) in the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) study:

Surveys are inappropriate vehicles for picking up on subterranean career agendas or internecine rivalries or people's incoherent behaviors, and when they do get such data, the statistical analyses often yield interpretations that border on the surreal. Field studies, on the other hand, can handle only a few settings, and can get so mired in local-setting variables that they lose the programmatic thrust of the study initially undertaken. Surveys and field studies combined not only extend and deepen the data set; they also keep one another analytically honest and on target. . . One of its [the field study's] purposes was to compensate for a survey's typical weaknesses (predesigned instrumentation, one "snapshot" pass at a site, difficulties in unraveling over-time processes, clumsiness in the face of unanticipated or unequivocal findings). Another objective was historical and descriptive: that of "telling the story," and identifying and documenting typical patterns and local determinants. There was the additional hope of validating, or at least of lending more plausibility to survey-analytical findings (Miles & Huberman, 1984, pp. 36-37).



### Data Sources

Evidence for this study came from six sources, five of which were traditional data sources for the case study: archival records, structured subject interviews, key informant interviews, direct observation, documentation, and surveys. The survey source was derived from simple quantitative methodology.

### Qualitative Sources

Documentary information which contributed evidence for this study included faculty meeting agendas and minutes, calendar information from principals and teachers, written teacher observation and evaluation records, memos, newsletters, and handbooks.

Structured interviews of the three principals which provided a source of evidence for this study were guided by a set of questions with varying levels of elaborations by each principal.

Key informant interviews were conducted with volunteering teachers whose classrooms were under the supervision of these principals.

From the volunteers, teachers were selected to provide a stratified, though non-random sample of the grade levels and supportive programs.

Direct observation of three principals as they engaged in school improvement activities provided another source of evidence for this study. Each principal was observed a total of 20 hours divided into five four-hour blocks in each school in addition to the interviews and review of archival and documentary records. The five four-hour block arrangement permitted this researcher to observe different time segments in the day-to-day activities of the principal. An observation protocol was used for each observation of each principal in this study.

Archival records which contributed evidence for this study included current test scores, longitudinal student achievement data, parent survey tabulations, and

budget records. In utilizing archival records this researcher was cautioned by Miles and Huberman (1984) to be alert to problems of bias resulting from selective deposit and selective survival of data.

### Quantitative Sources

The case survey data source required the development of a 36 item closed-ended coding instrument administered to both principals and teachers. The coding was cross-checked and its reliability assessed by means of other data sources such as documentation, observation, and key informant interviews. Unlike the "pure" naturalistic approaches described previously, the case survey results were mainly quantitative in nature because the principals' responses were translated into numerical equivalents and cross-checked with the teachers' aggregated responses item by item. Frequency and mean scores were calculated. It was determined that this procedure was necessary in light of the work of Smith and Andrews (1989) which found that a principal was an instructional leader if the principal was perceived as such by the teachers who worked with the principal on a daily basis.

As a result, while this study was overwhelmingly qualitative in design, it did involve a mixed methodological approach.

### Collection of Data

This researcher requested permission of the superintendent or the principals' immediate supervisor to conduct the study in the three districts.

The superintendent or immediate supervisor was asked to identify an effective elementary principal(s) within their districts. Of the five nominations, three were invited to participate in the study. How were they selected? In the early stage of this proposed study this researcher had considered looking at any practicing, effective principal. Then after a preliminary review of the research, it seemed important to

find a principal who was considered both effective and had a knowledge of the change research. In short, effective principals with recent doctoral level training were needed. This study's selection process was consistent with the well-known Blumberg and Greenfield study of effective principals originally conducted in 1980. A follow-up was published in 1986. In their longitudinal study, the cases were selected from nominations by the subjects' colleagues and university faculty members who knew the nominees through coursework they had taken.

Ralph Tyler, Michael Fullan, and John Goodlad had all researched the concept of time and its relationship to change. Since the change process as conceived by Fullan (1982) may be divided into three distinct phases initiation/implementation/-institutionalization--it also seemed important to select principals who could in general terms be described as initiating changes, implementing changes, and institutionalizing changes based on their number of years in the principalship. Of the five principals nominated, only three met the criteria. The principals were similar in that all were female, all possessed earned doctorates, and all had knowledge of the change research. They were different in that Principal Blue had been a principal for 3 years; Principal White for 9 years; and Principal Ecu for 18 years. They also varied in the number of students and teachers they supervised. Principal Blue supervised 520 students and 30 teachers; Principal White supervised 490 students and 28 teachers; and Principal Ecu supervised 330 students and 25 teachers.

It was at this stage that the surveys and interview questions were developed as part of the data collection process. Proposed surveys were field-tested with three non-participating principals in other suburban school districts and with four summer school teachers in the researcher's home district. Clarifying revisions were made in the final documents as suggested by the field-test results.

A case study protocol and an observational matrix were developed. The observational matrix was generated from a synthesis of the three distinct research arenas described in Chapter II. The research arenas were instructional leadership, change process, and school improvement. The purpose of the matrix was to aid the researcher in coding the data during the 20 hours of direct observation at each of the three schools. Data collection points were established at half-hour intervals. Related to the model developed in the theoretical section of Chapter II (Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For The Study), it was assumed that the observation matrix would assist the researcher in documenting those principal behaviors as they were observed. The identified codes were (a) observed; (b) not observed, not relevant; and (c) missed opportunity. The purpose of the protocol was to assure procedural uniformity across case studies in terms of the theoretical framework and accepted methodological practices. The on-site or direct observation was the first evidence gathering method used. A total of 15 four-hour on-site visitations were conducted. It was felt that conducting this procedure first would facilitate richer responses to the interviews and surveys to be subsequently administered due to a familiarity and possibly even a relationship with the researcher. Extensive field notes were collected. Handwritten field notes were transcribed, typed up, and coded after each visit. A case study log and contact summary sheet was kept for each activity specifying date, time, and purpose. Sample observational matrix, log, and contact summary sheets are found in Appendix A and B. A copy of the case study protocol is found in Appendix C. In order to maintain a chain-of-evidence, a three-ring binder containing the protocols, logs, coding sheets, transcribed interviews, surveys, and transcribed field notes was maintained for each case study.

Principals completed a 36 item survey prior to the interviews which were conducted during non-school hours. The interviews were intended to last about two

hours. The standardized, open-ended interviews lasted from two to three hours. Responses to the interview questions were taped with the principals' permission to facilitate the interview process. The tapes were later transcribed verbatim for use in Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII. The principals seemed genuinely interested in the project and were most willing to participate. Their surveys were returned quickly. Sample survey and interview questions are found in Appendix D and E.

Responses on the principals' survey were tabulated. Each statement on the survey was derived from 1 of the 12 characteristics described in the theoretical framework found in Chapter II. The principals responded to the statements in terms of how often they engaged in the activity described in each statement. All 36 items were developed from aspects of the research bases in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. There were 3 items for each of the 12 characteristics comprising the theoretical framework, for a total of 36 items on the survey.

At each school, all of the teachers were invited to participate in the survey portion of the study. They were told that the focus was on the principal, and that the information which they provided would assist in completing a view of their principal and would validate information given by their principal. A stratified, though non-random sample of classroom teachers was selected for the key informant interviews. This researcher was concerned that there might be a difference by grade level in the amount of time which principals spend with their teachers on instructional matters. An attempt was made to invite teachers to be interviewed by their grade level in order to ensure this representation. Generally, the staff ratio in these schools is between 7 and 16 (K-3) primary teachers to 4 to 7 teachers in grades 4-5. In all, 22 special area teachers, 30 primary grade teachers, and 9 teachers of intermediate grades

participated in the survey portion of the study; 9 teachers participated in the interviews.

The interviews with teachers were conducted during non-instructional hours at times and places selected by the interviewees. Prior to the interview, each key informant teacher had completed the 36 item survey designed to solicit their views about their principal in terms of instructional leadership, school improvement, and the change process. Six interviews were held in the principal's office when the principal was away from the building. Three interviews were conducted over the telephone. The interviews were 20 to 30 minutes in length. They were organized by basic questions, but then frequently were broadened and expanded as the teachers talked about their principals. This researcher was permitted to tape record the interviews by all nine of the key informants. The tapes were transcribed verbatim and analyzed in terms of the theoretical framework. Sample interview and survey questions used with the teachers are found in Appendix F and Appendix G.

Responses on the teachers' surveys were tabulated. Each item on the teacher survey paralleled equivalent items on their principal's survey. Frequency distributions and mean scores were generated from this information and matched to the principal's responses. The teacher data generated from the surveys were an additional means of validating the principals' activities in terms of the theoretical framework.

An audit of teacher personnel files was conducted. A randomly selected sample of 10 teacher evaluation files was examined at 1 school; 9 files at another school; and 5 teacher evaluation files at the third school. Data collected included information about written suggestions for improvement, amount of time spent in classrooms for purposes of instructional improvement, number of visitations to each classroom by the principal, and the relationship of written comments to this study's theoretical

framework. An audit analysis form was developed to facilitate data collection. Refer to Appendix H.

Specific documentation which was examined from each school included the following: faculty meeting agendas, school improvement plans as described in Chapter 122, Section 2-3.63 of the Illinois School Code, memos, newsletters, and correspondence. Some items were unique to the individual school such as school slogans and minutes of meetings but were still considered because of their appropriateness to the study. Since the documentation and copies of archival records were transportable, these items were analyzed by the researcher away from the school site.

In summary, data were collected on each principal's school improvement efforts through surveys and interviews with principals and teachers; through direct observation of the principal's daily activities; and through audits of teacher personnel files. Data were collected on the principals' application of the change process by means of surveys and interviews with principals and teachers; through review of the documentation; and archival records. Data were collected on the principals' leadership activities by means of surveys and interviews with principals and teachers; through the review of the documentation; through direct observation of the principals' daily activities; and through audits of the teacher personnel files.

### Statement Of The Problem

As noted in Chapter I, Illinois principals were mandated to become change agents for reform. This legal requirement, however well-intentioned as public policy, generated at least one critical area which needed examination since a mandate alone did not mean that change or growth would necessarily occur. Namely, what lessons could practicing principals, who were identified as effective by their superintendents or immediate supervisors in larger districts, teach about improving schools? In

Illinois where policy required principals to devote a majority of their time to tasks of instructional leadership, the concept of instructional leadership was assumed to be self-evident and not explicitly defined in state law.

### Purpose Of The Study

As noted in Chapter I, the major purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools.

Secondary purposes were to:

1. Isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change.
2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

### Research Questions

1. How did an effective principal improve the school?
2. How did an effective principal support teaching and learning?
3. What practices of an effective principal promoted significant, durable change or growth?
4. What factors were deterrents to achieving change?
5. What was the relationship between the effective principal's longevity in a setting and the institutionalization of change?
6. Did the Education Reform Act of 1985 influence what the effective principal did with respect to school improvement and instructional leadership?



## Methods of Analysis

According to Miles and Huberman, qualitative data, in the form of words rather than numbers, had always been the staple of certain social sciences, notably anthropology, history, and political science.

In the past decade, however, more and more researchers in fields with a traditional quantitative emphasis (psychology, sociology, linguistics, public administration, organizational studies, urban planning, educational research, program evaluation, and policy analysis) have shifted to a more qualitative paradigm.

Qualitative data are more attractive. They are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations. Then, too, qualitative are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks. Finally, the findings from qualitative studies have a quality of "undeniability," as Smith (1978) has put it. Words, especially when they are organized into incidents or stories, have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves far more convincing to a reader - another researcher, a policymaker, a practitioner - than pages of numbers (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 15).

Patton described qualitative analysis in the following way with the following cautions.

The purpose of qualitative inquiry is to produce findings. The process of data collection is not an end in itself. The culminating activities of qualitative inquiry are analysis, interpretation, and presentation of findings.

The challenge is to make sense of massive amounts of data, reduce the volume of information, identify significant patterns, and construct a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveal. The problem is that "we have few agreed-on canons for qualitative analysis, in the sense of shared ground rules for drawing conclusions and verifying their sturdiness" (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 16). There are no formulas for determining significance. There are no ways of perfectly replicating the researcher's analytical thought processes. There are no straightforward tests for reliability and validity. In short, there are no absolute rules except to do the very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal given the purpose of the study.

This does not mean there are no guidelines to assist in analyzing data. But guidelines and procedural suggestions are not rules. Applying guidelines requires judgement and creativity. Because each qualitative study is unique, the analytical approach used will be unique. Because qualitative inquiry depends, at every stage, on the skills, training, insights, and capabilities of the researcher, qualitative analysis ultimately depends on the analytical intellect and style of the analyst. The human factor is the great strength and the fundamental weakness of qualitative inquiry and analysis (Patton, 1990, pp. 371-372).

While the qualitative tradition was a growing one as was shown in the citation from Miles and Huberman above, the case study researcher was still faced with common research dilemmas (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 16). Among these were the following questions which this researcher had to consider:

1. In a changing, practice-oriented field, how did the researcher know which theories should be the guiding framework?
2. How could the researcher preserve the descriptive, insider's view and still write an analysis which related to previous knowledge?
3. How could the researcher convince policymakers that the case study research on a process was as important as quantitative research related to outcomes?
4. How could the researcher manage the subjectivity/objectivity trade off - gaining an objective perspective of the subject's view?

Several of these dilemmas must be resolved in this chapter. This study's research design was essentially a confirmatory, descriptive one. This study took basically a naturalistic approach as it depended heavily on data collected through interviews, observations, and document examination.

This approach was augmented by quantifiable evidence such as scores derived from the administration of the teacher and principal surveys and numerical counts of the instructional improvement comments yielded through the audit of the teacher evaluation files. The following analytic procedures were used:

1. In analyzing the survey and interview information taken from the principals this researcher followed the general analytic strategy of relying on theoretical propositions (Yin, 1989, p. 106) which was used in literal replication studies. When differences in responses were noted, these were considered in light of the information provided by teachers, observation as reflected in the field notes, observational matrices, and documentation. These were qualitative decisions which

the researcher made in the analysis stage, capitalizing on the possibilities for comparison in this multi-case approach. Evidence collected from these sources was tabulated and categorized to address the study questions. Other analytic procedures used in the data analysis component of this study were explanation-building, pattern-matching, and repeated observations.

2. The data for each principal from the principal and teacher perceiver surveys were first tabulated and displayed and then considered in a qualitative sense as this researcher examined the principals' responses for congruence with responses from the corroborating teachers and for similarities to responses from the other subjects. Where differences seemed to occur in the surveys, both between the principal and her teachers as well as among the principals, an attempt was made to understand them through other information which was part of the natural setting.

3. Data from the audit of the teacher evaluation records were counted and tabulated onto chart form for each principal and then analyzed for differences from school to school. Where differences appeared, these were considered in light of what the interviews had revealed about how the principals viewed instructional leadership, change process, and school improvement. These data were also compared to the results of the observations of each principal in the five four-hour on-site visits.

4. Qualitative methods were used in the natural settings when the researcher was an observer during the 20 hours of on-site visitations. Field notes were taken and after the observations, the notes were coded but deciding on which behaviors were apparent was basically a subjective decision made by the researcher. These observations were sorted, guided by the observational matrix which the researcher had developed (See Appendix A). Both descriptive and interpretive codes were used. From the field notes, a judgement was made as to the category for each behavior noted. These judgements were checked for congruence with the data provided by the

principal and teacher interviews. The final stage of data analysis was to write the case study report. Narrative text displays were the basic unit of analysis. Narrative text displays in the form of responses to the research questions served to organize the single case as well as the cross-case analysis.

### Dangers and Safeguards

Yin (1989) reminded potential case study researchers that the use of case studies had long been stereotyped as a weak sibling in comparison to such methods as surveys, experiments, or quasi-experiments even though case studies continued to be used in social science research. Miles and Huberman (1984) demonstrated in their well-known, first-of-its kind sourcebook, that there were procedures for addressing design and methods, causal inference, and external validity.

Forewarned and forearmed, the researcher was alert to these problems throughout the design, data collection and analysis stages of the study, using strategies suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984), Patton (1990), and Yin (1989) to address these concerns.

Yin (1989) urged that evidence should come from multiple sources and should be assembled where possible into a separate, retrievable data base. Evidence for this study was collected from 3 principals, 61 teachers, and audits of 24 teacher evaluation records. Evidence was collected through survey and interview methods, documentation, archival records as well as through observation of the study principals in over 60 hours of on-site visitations. Written responses, field notes, and individual audit records were filed by subject and retrievable. Interviews were corroborated with surveys, observations were guided by matrices, and on-site procedures were guided by protocols. Explicit links were sought between data collected and questions asked and the conclusions which were drawn. Informants

reviewed the information for accuracy. All of these strategies were suggested by Yin (1989) as means to strengthening case study validity and reliability.

For each of the research questions, a chain of evidence was maintained. A strategy of pattern matching (Miles & Huberman, 1984), using the predicted pattern of specific variables defined prior to data collection, was employed as a means toward strengthening internal validity. The outcome for each question was predicted based on the theoretical framework. If the data analysis in a single case study failed to support even one of the predictions, the researcher could augment in a literal replication using additional case studies to test the original predictions. The literal replication strategy was used in analyzing data for each of this study's questions. For the data analysis component of this study, pattern matching following this strategy was used. An attempt was made to categorize responses to research questions according to differences in how principals improve their schools, apply the change research, and improve instruction. Throughout the content analysis, the researcher attempted to be alert to the possibilities of spurious and confounding factors, and the existence of alternative explanations. They were identified where they became apparent.

### Summary

This chapter outlined the methods used in this study. Basically a multi-case or comparative case study which blended naturalistic qualitative approaches with some quantifiable evidence, the study was subject to the dangers and weaknesses of construct validity and reliability which were sometimes ascribed to case studies. The researcher was aware of these dangers and used methods suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984), Patton (1990), and Yin (1989), to offset these problems. Data sources included teacher evaluation records, surveys and interviews with principals and teachers, written documentation, student achievement information, and observation. Methods of data collection included auditing, interviewing, and

observing. Methods of analysis included coding, frequency counts, displays in the form of narrative text and tables, and interpretive qualitative analysis of assignment of responses and attribution of observed behaviors to categories defined by the researcher.

In addition, verification of findings was further attempted through triangulation methodologies. Both observer triangulation and methodological triangulation processes were employed in this study. The narrative report of the findings, or case study report, was laced with documented vignettes to illustrate various points. The overriding goal of the study was to provide a "thick description" of the phenomena.

Chapter IV will introduce the reader to Principal Blue who was one of the subjects of the study as prelude to the reporting and analysis of the data concerning Principal Blue.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRINCIPAL BLUE

#### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

##### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Also, the study identified contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to:

1. Isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change.
2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

Evidence for this study came from six sources, five of which were traditional data sources for the case study. They were archival records, structured subject interviews, key informant interviews, direct observation, and documentation. The survey data source was derived from quantitative methodology. As a result, while this study was overwhelmingly qualitative in design, it did involve a mixed methodological approach.

This chapter was devoted to Principal Blue to facilitate the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapters V and VI were devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data on the other two subjects. The cross-case presentation and analysis of the data were discussed in Chapter VII.

In order to organize each case study, the following decisions were made. First, for the structured subject interview, five of the six research questions listed below and previously described in Chapter III were displayed separately. The subjects' responses were analyzed and displayed in narrative text form as they answered each applicable question. Secondly, the sixth question on the relationship between longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change was considered within the context of all of the data in the summary section of Chapter IV and substantially explored in Chapter VII which considered the cross-case analysis. Third, each of the remaining data sources was presented separately and each research question was applied to it as was deemed appropriate in terms of the characteristics defined in the theoretical framework in Chapters I and II. In several instances, some research questions were not applicable to a given data source.

#### Research Questions

1. How did an effective principal improve the school?
2. How did an effective principal support teaching and learning?
3. What practices of an effective principal promoted significant, durable change?
4. What factors were deterrents to achieving change?
5. What was the relationship between the effective principal's longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change?
6. Did the Education Reform Act of 1985 influence what the effective principal did with respect to school improvement and instructional leadership?



Before entering into a presentation of the data and analyses which resulted from the study, each principal who provided the focus for this inquiry was introduced to the reader at the beginning of the individual case study. Following the situational perspective which was introduced to the reader in Chapters I, II, and III, it was important to this researcher to present the reader with a sense of the local environment in which the principal worked as well as biographical data.

### Background

Principal Blue was three years into her first principalship in the fall of 1990. Principal Blue was promoted to the principalship from within the school district. Prior to her appointment she was an assistant principal and guidance counselor at the junior high school for a total of nine years. Her teaching experience had been at the high school and junior high levels in the areas of health and physical education over a period of five years. Her educational training included earned Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, and Doctor of Education degrees from three different state and private universities within Illinois.

There were a lot of factors in her decision to seek the principalship. She had observed the principalship for six years from the guidance counselor position wondering if it was something she wanted to pursue.

I was a guidance counselor . . . and I was involved in process. And I worked with crisis management and after six years I wanted a little bit more product. I wanted something more tangible. A situation arose [promotion of the assistant principal to an elementary principalship] where I could apply for an administrative position in this school and I was very fortunate in being promoted as assistant principal. From the assistant position I observed the principalship and I had a lot of leeway and a lot of sanction from my advisor, my supervisor, to perform many of the tasks of the principal and I enjoyed it. I enjoy the role of leadership. I enjoyed decisionmaking and problemsolving and I felt that if an opportunity ever arose that I would certainly try to interview for it. In 1987, I applied for a principalship in the district and was promoted. . .

By no means was Principal Blue given the elementary principalship. She was in a competitive situation and interviewed along with a number of other candidates.

There were three rounds of interviewing. The first was with 12 teachers from the school. The second was with school board members, parents, and PTA representatives. The third round consisted of the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and school board members. There were two finalists and Principal Blue was chosen.

Besides being the principal of a Pre K-3 building housing 520 students and 30 teachers, the largest elementary building in the district, Blue was responsible for other administrative duties. They included district level staff development and grant writing. All of the principals perform some of the tasks of the assistant superintendent since the position was eliminated two years ago.

Blue's school district served a blue collar community with several pockets of affluence. Through the years Blue's district attracted a lot of immigrants. Located on the southwest edge of O'Hare Airport, the district originally was home to Germans, who worked on the railroads and on farms, at its inception in the late nineteenth century. Hispanics came as migrant workers in the 1930s and settled. The Hispanics preceded the East Asian Indians, who began to arrive about a decade ago, and have continued to be the dominant immigrant group. Blue's school community was the most transient and served the most minorities of the four elementary schools. It served a predominantly low socio-economic status clientele whose children spoke a variety of languages besides English. There was no assistant principal. Blue's district spent less than \$4000 per student, the second lowest amount in DuPage County.

## How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal Blue in a structured interview format (Appendix E). Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. Research question one was designed to address the issue of school improvement. As discussed in Chapters I and II, the research of Joyce, Hersh, and McKibben, 1983; Sarason, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990 identified four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in school improvement. School improvement was defined by Joyce et al. as the principal developing the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis. These behaviors of model, collaborator, culture builder, and responsible party formed the crosshairs on the lense through which Principal Blue's responses were examined. The data were reported in a narrative text display.

The following responses of Blue were instructive in terms of the school improvement research.

. . . I have a major responsibility to set the right climate for the building, to provide the right leadership for teachers to work as effectively with students as possible. I feel that I need to work effectively with parents and to promote education throughout the community. And a personal situation that has arose is that I work in a school that has a heavy stigma upon it and that we serve a large minority population and people in the town are not real happy to always send their children to school because it has all the minority students and I work hard to promote what a positive environment this school is and how educationally sound a school it is. So I have a real challenging situation and my beliefs center around promoting an excellent education institution that I've been very fortunate to work in and continue to help develop. . . And we're seeing some positive results in the area of science in our test scores. There have been many projects that I've been involved with and they've all been in the collegial fashion with teachers and I tend to promote study groups and we research questions together. . . And we looked in the area of the affective domain and have added some [activities] in the area of student recognition. Last year we had a star of the week program where every child was identified for his strengths and this year we've kind of sophisticated it and will continue student affirmation. . .

We identified them [goals] through our test scores and through collegial discussions in faculty meetings and we've identified them through NCE [North Central Evaluation]. We participate in NCE evaluations each year and through professional evaluations of the NCE committees, the district identifies particular

goals and we certainly follow that. And it's also been through self-evaluations by the staff and evaluations that I've done looking at our instructional activities in the school. . . At the end of the school year last year we identified and defined what whole language would mean for us at our school. And we've been, the teachers at the school and myself, have been working diligently to develop a whole language program at the first grade level which is now being extended into the second grade. . .

The spoken language of Principal Blue included words such as responsible and collegiality. Her actions indicated modeling and culture building.

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to school improvement. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display was used to report the data.

#### Key informant #1

Key informant #1 was a bilingual teacher with 10 years of experience, 4 of which were at Blue's school. Principal Blue did not hire this teacher.

She's involved in everything. She seeks grants and tries to develop new programs for the school and she is also the one that wants to implement whole language. Also, she's very supportive of science. Okay, for example, I was one of the teachers that also went for the science workshop. And I mean, the minute I expressed some interest, she said, you know, go ahead and do it. She's very supportive of that--people who are willing to improve and always willing to learn.

Key Informant #2

Key informant #2 was a special education teacher with 14 years of experience, 11 of which were in a primary learning disabilities classroom. Principal Blue did not hire this teacher. This teacher had worked for 3 principals prior to Blue in the same building.

It is interesting to note the difference in administrators as far as what they look for. I think she looks more for like more global, philosophical, humanistic type things. She would note more the climate of the classroom rather than is there trim on the bulletin boards or is the room neat or are the kids all in their seats which are things that have been noted before. She would be more the type that would like to come into a room where everybody was doing something and everybody was participating actively and not necessarily in a traditional setting. And I really think, I mean that's where education is at now. I think there are many administrators who aren't there.

Key Informant #3

Key informant #3 has taught for four years in the third grade and was not hired by Principal Blue.

I do believe she's making this a good place for me to teach or doing what she can. She's very supportive of me personally. And I think as far as the children are concerned. She supports the teachers who maybe, this is interesting, I feel she has great support and great discussions and what am I trying to say, communication with teachers who are doing things in their classrooms and really doing their best. I think that as far as the teachers who may need some more goals or objectives set for them that she isn't doing as much as she could.

### How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching and Learning?

#### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of instructional leadership. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school

improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal behaving as an instructional leader: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Instructional leadership was defined by Smith and Andrews as the principal's focused effort on the improvement of instruction; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement. The responses to this question reported on the basis of these four behaviors and displayed in narrative text form.

We have a large ESL (English as a Second Language) population and when I first came their teachers were very, very frustrated. They did not know how to work effectively with ESL students and as the population was growing teachers became much more frustrated. We had a situation where our reading program was phonics based and it was not meeting the needs of the learner at all. And the teachers had some concerns about that. We had some concerns that our test scores were very low and that our children did not seem to be performing as well as children in the other end of the district. . . We have re-structured the entire bilingual program where we have gone into self-contained models which has cleaned up a very fragmented scheduling system for our very young students. We had students who were going into many pull-out programs and we've eliminated a lot of that. We've eliminated tracking within the school; that's something that had been there prior to my coming and we now have heterogeneous groupings in our classrooms and I have found that to be a very positive with the teaching staff. We've gone to a new basal series [in reading] that promotes whole language and it's been much more effective in working with our high ESL population. . . I have a teacher in the third grade who is very interested in science, a lot more hands-on and problem-solving science application and she's been working very hard in her classroom but she's promoted that and extended that out to the third grade. . . We don't do a lot of achievement testing in primary grades so I look at other types of assessments. We have assessments in our preschool which are very important that are done daily as well as throughout the year and those assessments help us develop a range of how our children are growing and becoming ready for school. In the first and second grade we do use some ability testing and some reading achievement. Our bilingual population is tested with the LAS [Language Assessment Survey] which tells us how they are progressing in the areas of Spanish and English language which is an indicator of growth. I like to look at teacher evaluations and. . . at student report cards. I also like to look at the type of product that's coming out of the classroom as part of the assessment program. I really like the idea of the portfolio that's pretty dominant within the research right now. I think for the very, very young children that we serve, one test score is not how we can really serve our children. Young children have a hard time with testing situations and I really am promoting the idea that is happening within the early childhood movement of a portfolio assessment. . .

## Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to instructional leadership. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. The data were reported in a narrative display format.

### Key Informant #1

Well, she encourages me to take workshops and even for me to apply and get this scholarship to study in Madrid last summer through the Illinois State Board of Education she nominated me, you know she was very supportive of me. And she supports bilingual education. Some people are not for it but she certainly is. And anything that we might be interested in or may want such as workshops, she supports that. . . One of our goals this year is to apply whole language and I also believe ESL. You know she's been really working on ESL and bilingual. We have more classes. . . And also we are implementing the science curriculum.

### Key Informant #2

The thing I think I like best about her is she pretty much recognizes my ability to do what I do and she doesn't try and second guess what I'm doing with, like with questioning things that I do when she knows that I know what I'm doing so she'll support what I do in the sense that she'll say 'go ahead and do it'. If I want to team teach, like one year I switched for I think it was an hour a week, with another teacher, had another teacher teach in my room for an hour and I taught in a regular classroom. Previous to [Blue] there were two principals who said no because it was not current, it was not the philosophy of the district, or who knows. [Blue] said, 'Fine, go ahead and do it.' She's always been very open to anything I wanted to try. She's really never tried to make me feel as though she's my superior and I'm her subordinate. I like when she comes into my room and she'll read stories to the kids. I feel as though she really knows who the kids are. She knows the families. She knows me. She knows my aide. It's like she knows everything that's going on and then when I tell her about something it's not like I have to explain, plus with all her years in the district she knows a lot of those families, so I just bring up a name and she'll say 'Oh yes, I remember them from Blackhawk.' And then I can get some feedback from her. I would say that's probably her greatest strength is an ability to communicate and also I would say

pretty much of a positive, upbeat type nature when it comes to implementing anything that's new. . .

### Key Informant #3

I would say that the most prominent thing that she does to support me in my teaching is. . . major amounts of encouragement, praise, psychological support for anything interesting I want to do, anything new I want to do. Most of her support has consisted of verbal support and praise. . . She also, because she knows my special interests, she does do a lot of, whenever like routing of mail or information or special interest information, she will route that to me as far as my personal interest in science is concerned. She'll do that too. Bring things to my attention. . .

## What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of change facilitation. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in change facilitation: trainer, developer, buffer, and monitor (Hord et al., 1987). Change facilitation was defined by Hord et al. as the principal worked directly with teachers who were expected to change (grow). The responses to this question were reported on the basis of these four behaviors and displayed in narrative text form. The following statements were instructive in terms of the change facilitation research.

Something that has been identified as a goal, not only for our school, but for the district is developing in the area of whole language. And it's something that was not addressed at the district level but we really addressed it at our school. And I did it with my first grade teachers. And we held a mini-workshop session



with some presenters at the end of the school year last year and we identified what whole language would mean for us at our school. And we've been, the teachers and myself, working diligently to develop a whole language program at the first grade level which is now being extended out into the second grade. And I also have, identified whole language activities for preschool and kindergarten that we've been promoting. And that's been a big change in how we've approached reading and language arts. Our students are writing a lot more and we've had very positive feedback from the parents. . . We're also promoting more hands on math and that's been a project that I brought into the school a couple of years ago with my dissertation research. I had some teachers trained in the area of math and we did adopt a new math series two years ago which promoted more cooperative learning and hands-on experience. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to change facilitation. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. The data were reported using the narrative text display.

#### Key Informant #1

She always, you know, is supportive of additional training. . . She's very supportive of the staff. . . and very supportive in developing their own talents.

#### Key Informant #2

Key informant #2 did not respond to any of the eight interview questions with language relating to the principal as buffer, trainer, developer, or monitor.

#### Key Informant #3

Materials definitely. Books, science materials, whatever. Yes, we have communicated this to her and she has responded as far as getting books in the classroom, using other monies instead of like ordering Weekly Readers and stuff like that. And instead of ordering reading workbooks, we get to use that money to

buy books for the classroom. Yeah, it's going to turn out real nice. She let the grade levels vote. Third grade didn't use workbooks this year so we get to use the money to buy trade books which is really nice. And yeah I think she does as much as she can under the money restrictions that she has. . .

### What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?

#### Principal Interview

Michael Fullan (1982) classified potential deterrents to change into four broad categories. Specifically, they were characteristics of the change itself, characteristics at the school level, characteristics at the school district level, and characteristics external to the local system. They included factors such as need and relevance of the change, clarity, complexity, quality of the program, the history of innovative attempts, staff development and participation, time-line and information system, the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics and orientation, board and community characteristics, district office support and involvement, and the adoption process.

Research question four was designed to address the issue of deterrents to change. Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal Blue in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. The data were reported using the narrative text display.

The following responses of Blue were instructive in terms of Fullan's research on deterrents to change.

Well, certainly some of the barriers is money. I think there is always a challenge to have the right finances to promote programs and I think that one of the barriers to change is that I have to spend a lot of time with grant writing and trying to increase our financial means. Again, for all of the positives about the staff, I do have some staff members who have been here many, many years and are very set in their ways and I find it takes a lot of hard work, and time, and encouragement to convince people who are set in their ways to look at new ideas, new options to improve instruction. Sometimes a barrier to change is that we don't have the parent support and some of our parents were not very successful in school. We would like them, have them much more involved with their children at home and we find that our parents are not as involved as we would like them.

Our major complaint among the principals is that we spend too much time doing other responsibilities, other than the principalship and instructional leadership, and we are not allowed to spend as much time in our buildings doing what we should be doing--acting as principals. . . Barriers are not always overt. You are not always sure where your opposition lies or what particular situations are, happening to perhaps either undermine or oppose. . . I work in a building that is very heavily involved in the (teachers') union. I happen to have the union president working within my building and it's been a little bit of a territorial issue where when I first came in it was her territory and she felt she was running the show and I had to establish myself. And I am still very aware that the union president has a great influence upon the building and how people perceive things and this has been a barrier over the years. As a district we tend to be reactive not proactive. The Board of Education and the superintendent unfortunately at this point are not providing the leadership that we need to continue quality and improvement of instruction. We have a superintendent that has not been in great favor with the Board, he's on a one year contract. Through his battles with the Board and trying to establish himself, this has had a great impact on the morale of the district. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to deterrents to change. This researcher asked the teachers about a significant challenge or challenges the principal faced that they were aware of rather than using the Fullan language of deterrents to change in order to avoid having to define terms and possibly influence responses. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display format was used for purposes of reporting the data.

#### Key Informant #1

I don't know if she really faced a challenge because she was actually with the district for a while. So I really don't see her as, and maybe she had and I don't realize it, having to face, you know, a great challenge.

Key Informant #2

Well in other words, there were sometimes what she has to enforce from the district level is stuff that may not either be good for the building or set well with some of the teachers. . . I think it's probably very difficult to come into a building where there are teachers who have been there since the building was built. You know and it's probably hard to be a principal where somebody has been teaching third grade for 40 years and what do you have to offer those individuals when your background has been junior high or counseling and you come into a primary building where lots, I mean I'm still one of the youngest people in that building and I'm by no means young anymore, of teachers are older. . .

Key Informant #3

I thought of this for awhile and I think the most significant challenge is dealing with the great amount of ESL and bilingual students in this school. Especially they're so disproportionate to the rest of the schools in the district and I think it's been very difficult for her because of as far as the grants are concerned, the money has to be spent a certain way. And her limitations of what she can and can't do and trying to get services and knowing that she needs services but they're not being (pause). . . I feel a lot of things have really been out of her hands and so that, that's, I don't know I'm not in her shoes, but what I see has probably been a big, big headache for her and a big challenge and just dealing with the district's and the federal government's requirements and the state requirements and the community requirements as far as getting these kids in the right place and dealing with parents that don't speak English and dealing with kids that don't speak English. I think that is certainly her biggest challenge. . .

Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership?

Principal Interview

A total of twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of the impact of the Illinois legislation on the effective principal requiring that a majority of the principal's time be spent on the improvement of instruction. As discussed in Chapters I and II, this requirement was written in broad terms and consequently might be interpreted in a variety of ways. What cues did the principal pay attention to? It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the responses

of the principal might be related to the number of years in the position and the situational context of the principal. Principal Blue was appointed to the principalship two years after the passage of the Education Reform Act of 1985. A narrative text display was used to report Principal Blue's response to this research question.

Absolutely it impacts. I think the whole issue of accountability has been something we've been affected by. I believe the public has been very sensitive and very in tune to the issue of accountability that's the product of the legislation. . . It provided the opportunity now that we can better assess our learning situations and we are now accountable for all of our teaching and learning that happens within a school building. And there is nothing wrong with that because I think there have been some very positive things that have been occurring within our business and I think this will allow our field to be looked at in a much more professional manner. . . The direction that I get from my superintendent is total support and encouragement. . . Sometimes I'm the type of person where I'll just go ahead and do something and ask permission later and I sometimes, I'm sure, I aggravate him, but if I had to go through the channels at all times and if I had to get permission for everything, I couldn't get enough done. So basically I'm the kind of person that's going to go ahead and do it and I'll say I'm sorry later if it's a real problem. But basically I just know what my limits are and I try to follow them closely. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

There was no question within the key informant structured interview format which was designed to address this research question. It was felt that only the principal would be able to respond to this question since this research question was designed to explore the principal's interpretation and response to the law.

### The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys

The case survey data source required the development of a 36 item closed-ended coding instrument (Appendices D and G) administered to both principals and teachers. Three questions were developed to explore each of the 12 characteristics described in the theoretical framework in Chapter II. The case survey principals' responses were translated into numerical equivalents and cross-checked with the teachers aggregated responses item by item. Frequency and mean scores of the teachers' responses were

calculated. The data were disaggregated in terms of three sub-groups. They were K-3 teachers, 4-5 teachers, and special area teachers. A total teacher score was also calculated. It was determined by this researcher that this procedure was necessary in light of the work of Smith and Andrews (1989) which found that a principal was an instructional leader if the principal was perceived as such by the teachers who worked with the principal on a daily basis. It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the teachers' perception of the principal would vary based upon whether the teacher was a primary, intermediate, or special area teacher due to the uniqueness of the teacher-principal relationship involved in each of these three teaching positions.

Table 1

Summary of Principal Blue Perceiver Survey

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	E
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	D
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	C
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	D
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	D
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	D
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	C
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	D
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	D
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	E
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	B
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	D
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	C

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	C
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	D
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	E
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	D
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	D
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	D
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	E

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model



### Analysis of Table 1

Table 1 indicated that Principal Blue rated herself the lowest in the area of collaboration with a (2.0), one of the school improvement behaviors. The next lowest rating, a 3.0, was assigned by Principal Blue to her performance in the areas of instructional resource and communicator, two of the instructional leadership behaviors. A 3.0 rating was also assigned by Principal Blue to the areas of trainer and monitor, two of the change facilitation behaviors. A 3.0 rating was given twice to the area of model, another one of the school improvement behaviors. This was significant because there were only three questions per principal characteristic or behavior asked. In all, 25 percent of the school improvement questions were rated by the principal to be at the sometimes (3.0) or seldom (2.0) level. Principal Blue's highest self-determined rating was in the area of visible presence, one of the instructional leadership behaviors. She rated herself a 5.0 on all three questions. On no other characteristic did she rate herself this high, this consistently. A perfect 4.0 was recorded for the three buffer characteristic questions, one of the change facilitation behaviors.

Table 2

Summary of Blue K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses												60 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D	D	D	D	D	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	50	4.17
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	D	E	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	C	E	C	50	4.17
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	E	D	C	D	C	B	C	C	D	C	C	C	40	3.33
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	E	D	E	D	D	D	E	D	C	E	D	51	4.25
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	C	D	E	D	C	E	C	D	C	D	D	B	44	3.67
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	C	D	B	C	B	C	D	- *	C	B	D	C	33/ 55	3.0
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	C	C	C	A	C	C	D	C	B	C	C	35	2.92
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E	D	E	D	D	C	C	D	E	C	D	D	48	4.0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses												60 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	E	D	C	C	C	C	D	C	D	A	C	C	39	3.25
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	E	D	C	C	C	D	D	C	D	B	D	C	42	3.5
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	E	D	E	C	D	C	C	D	D	B	C	B	42	3.5
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E	E	E	C	D	D	E	E	D	D	D	D	52	4.33
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	A	C	B	35	2.92
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	E	D	E	C	C	C	C	D	E	C	D	B	44	3.67
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	D	D	D	C	C	C	D	C	D	A	D	C	40	3.33
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D	D	D	C	D	D	D	D	D	C	E	C	46	3.83
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	D	D	C	E	D	C	D	C	E	D	48	4.0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses												60 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C	D	B	C	A	A	C	B	E	A	C	B	30	2.5
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	B	B	C	B	C	A	B	B	C	A	A	A	23	1.92
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D	D	D	D	C	D	C	E	D	D	C	D	46	3.83
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	D	D	B	- *	C	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	33/ 55	3.0
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	E	D	C	C	B	41	3.42
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D	D	E	C	C	C	C	D	C	B	D	B	40	3.33
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	D	D	D	D	B	D	C	D	D	B	C	A	39	3.25
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D	E	D	C	C	C	C	D	D	A	C	C	40	3.33
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D	D	C	C	B	C	C	C	C	A	C	B	34	2.83

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses												60 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	D	D	B	D	C	40	3.33
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	E	E	E	D	C	D	D	D	E	C	D	D	50	4.17
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E	D	E	D	D	D	C	E	E	D	E	D	52	4.33
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	D	E	D	D	D	C	E	E	B	D	C	48	4.0
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E	D	E	C	C	D	D	E	C	C	D	B	44	3.67
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	D	D	A	C	C	41	3.42
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	D	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	D	C	D	C	42	3.5
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	D	D	D	C	C	B	C	C	E	C	D	B	40	3.33
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E	D	E	C	D	D	D	D	D	C	D	D	48	4.0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses												60 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	E	D	E	C	C	C	D	D	D	A	C	C	42	3.5

N = 12

-\* Missing Response

**Key:** A = Almost Never = 1  
 B = Seldom = 2  
 C = Sometimes = 3  
 D = Frequently = 4  
 E = Almost Always = 5

**Legend:** IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 2

Table 2 indicated that the K-3 primary teachers gave Principal Blue the lowest scores on two of the three probes in the area of collaborator, one of the school improvement behaviors. These scores ranged between 1.92 and 2.92 or slightly below seldom and sometimes. Two other scores averaging slightly below sometimes or 3.0 (R=2.83-2.92) were in the areas of instructional resource and resource provider, two of the instructional leadership behaviors. The highest teacher scores were in the area of visible presence, one of the instructional leadership behaviors and responsible party, one of the school improvement behaviors. These scores ranged between 3.67 and 4.33 or slightly below frequently and almost always.

Table 3

Summary of Blue K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	83	17
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	17	50	33
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	0	1	7	3	1	0	8.5	58	25	8.5
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	9	58	33
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	1	4	5	2	0	8	33	42	17
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod *	0	3	5	3	0	0	27	45	27	0
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	1	1	8	2	0	8	8	67	17	0
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	25	50	25
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	1	0	7	3	1	8.5	0	58	25	8.5

(table continues)



Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	0	1	5	5	1	0	8	42	42	8
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	0	2	4	4	2	0	17	33	33	17
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	8	50	42
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	1	1	8	2	0	8	8	67	17	0
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	0	1	5	3	3	0	8	42	25	25
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	1	0	5	6	0	8	0	42	50	0
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	25	67	8
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	25	50	25
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	3	3	4	1	1	25	25	33	8.5	8.5
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	4	5	3	0	0	33	42	25	0	0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	25	67	8

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf *	1	3	3	3	1	9.5	27	27	27	9.5
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	0	1	6	4	1	0	8.5	50	33	8.5
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	0	2	5	4	1	0	17	42	33	8
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	1	2	2	7	0	8	17	17	58	0
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	1	0	6	4	1	8.5	0	50	33	8.5
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	1	2	7	2	0	8	17	58	17	0
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	0	1	6	5	0	0	8	50	42	0
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	17	50	33
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	8	50	42

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	0	1	2	5	4	0	8	17	42	33
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	1	4	4	3	0	9	33	33	25
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	1	0	5	5	1	8	0	42	42	8
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	50	50	0
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	2	5	4	1	0	17	42	33	8
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	0	2	8	2	0	0	16.5	67	16.5
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	1	0	5	4	2	8	0	42	33	17

N = 12

\* = Missing Response

**Key:**  
 A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

**Legend:**  
 IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 3

Table 3 indicated that there were a number of probes rated at the frequently or almost always levels at least once by 75 to 100 percent of the respondents. There were three probes per principal behavior. They included instructional resource (100%), resource provider (83%), visible presence (91% and 83%), culture builder (75%), trainer (92%), responsible party (92%), and developer (83.5%). There were also several areas rated at the almost never or seldom levels at least once by 25 to 75 percent of the respondents on the three questions developed per characteristic. They included model (27% and 50%), collaborator (75%), buffer (36.5%), trainer (25%), and resource provider (25%). Only trainer and resource provider received both a high and a low score.

Table 4

Summary of Blue Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses							35 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	B	E	A	D	D	C	E	24	3.43
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	C	D	C	D	D	C	D	25	3.57
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C	B	A	C	C	C	C	18	2.57
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	C	D	B	C	C	C	22	3.14
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	26	3.71
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	A	C	B	C	C	C	A	16	2.23
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	D	D	B	B	C	D	23	3.29
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	D	E	E	D	D	E	D	31	4.43
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	A	C	C	D	D	E	B	22	3.14
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	B	C	D	C	C	D	C	22	3.14
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	C	C	B	B	C	D	C	20	2.86
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	D	E	E	B	D	E	D	29	4.14

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses							35 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	A	C	B	C	D	D	A	18	2.57
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	A	C	C	D	C	D	C	21	3.0
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	C	C	C	D	D	E	C	25	3.57
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	C	D	C	D	E	D	C	26	3.71
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E	B	D	D	E	D	B	26	3.71
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	A	B	A	A	B	C	A	11	1.57
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	D	A	A	C	B	B	A	14	2.0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D	D	A	C	D	C	C	22	3.14
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	A	C	B	C	B	E	A	17	2.43
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	A	C	D	D	C	C	C	21	3.0
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	B	D	C	B	C	C	C	20	2.86
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	A	C	B	C	B	E	A	17	2.43
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	C	C	A	B	D	E	B	20	2.86
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	A	C	B	B	E	D	A	8	2.57

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses							35 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	A	C	C	B	C	D	C	19	2.71
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	A	C	C	C	E	E	D	24	3.43
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	A	D	D	C	E	D	D	25	3.57
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	A	D	D	C	E	D	C	24	3.43
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	B	C	D	D	E	D	C	25	3.57
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	B	C	C	D	D	D	C	23	3.29
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	B	D	C	C	B	D	C	21	3.0
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	B	C	A	A	D	D	A	16	2.29
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	C	D	B	B	E	E	D	25	3.57
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	C	C	C	C	C	D	D	23	3.29

N = 7

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 4

Table 4 indicated that the special area teachers gave Principal Blue a number ratings below the sometimes and seldom levels. They were in the areas of instructional resource, resource provider, communicator, monitor, developer, buffer, trainer, model, and collaborator. The range of scores was from 1.57 to 2.86. In the areas of instructional resource, communicator, developer, and model two of the three probes per characteristic received less than a 3.0 or sometimes rating. The high areas of visible presence, responsible party, and culture builder all consistently received scores slightly below the frequently level.



Table 5

Summary of Blue Special Area Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	1	1	1	2	2	14	14	14	29	29
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	43	57	0
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	1	1	5	0	0	14	14	72	0	0
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	1	4	2	0	0	14	57	29	0
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	43	43	14
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	2	1	4	0	0	29	14	57	0	0
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	2	1	4	0	0	29	14	57	0
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	57	43
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	1	1	2	2	1	14	14	29	29	14

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goals.	M	0	1	4	2	0	0	14	57	29	0
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	0	2	4	1	0	0	29	57	14	0
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	0	1	0	3	3	0	14	0	43	43
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	2	1	2	2	0	29	13	29	29	0
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	1	0	4	2	0	14	0	57	29	0
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	57	29	14
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	43	43	14
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	0	2	0	3	2	0	29	0	42	29
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	4	2	1	0	0	57	29	14	0	0
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	3	2	1	1	0	43	29	14	14	0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	1	0	3	3	1	14	0	43	43	0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	2	2	2	0	1	29	29	29	0	13
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	1	0	4	2	0	14	0	57	29	0
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	0	2	4	1	0	0	29	57	14	0
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	2	2	2	0	1	29	29	29	0	13
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	1	2	2	1	1	14	29	29	14	14
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	2	2	1	1	1	29	29	14	14	14
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	1	1	4	1	0	14	14	57	14	0
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	1	0	3	1	2	14	0	43	14	29
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	1	0	1	4	1	14	0	14	57	14
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	1	0	2	3	1	14	0	29	43	14

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	1	2	3	1	0	14	29	43	14
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	0	1	3	3	0	0	14	43	43	0
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	0	2	3	2	0	0	29	43	29	0
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	3	1	1	2	0	43	14	14	29	0
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	2	1	2	2	0	29	13	29	29
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	72	28	0

**N = 7**

**Key:**  
 A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

**Legend:**  
 IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 5

Table 5 indicated that there were only three areas where more than 70% of the special area respondents rated Principal Blue at the frequently or almost always levels. They were culture builder (100%), trainer (86%), and responsible party (71%). On the other hand there were many areas where 28% to 86% of the respondents rated Principal Blue's behavior at the almost never or seldom levels. These areas included model (43% and 86%), collaborator (29% and 72%), buffer (28%, 29% and 58%), developer (29%, 29% and 29%), instructional resource (28%, 42% and 42%), communicator (28% and 28%), responsible party (29%), trainer (58%), resource provider (58%), and monitor (57%). Only in the areas of buffer, developer, and instructional resource did the responses to all three probes per characteristic fall into the almost never or seldom categories. It must be noted that in all but 9 instances of the 19 scores reported above that just 2 respondents of the N of 7 or 28.6% of the special area teachers marked almost never or seldom.

Table 6

Summary of Blue Aggregated Teacher M Scores In Comparison To Principal Score

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$n = 12$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$n = 7$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$N = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/-1.0
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	4.0	4.17	3.43	3.89	
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	5.0	4.17	3.57	3.95	-1.05
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	3.0	3.33	2.57	3.05	
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	5.0	4.25	3.14	3.84	-1.16
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	4.0	3.67	3.71	3.68	
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	3.0	3.0	2.23	2.72	
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	4.0	2.92	3.29	3.05	
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	5.0	4.0	4.43	4.16	
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	4.0	3.25	3.14	3.21	
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	4.0	3.5	3.14	3.37	
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	4.0	3.5	2.86	3.26	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\bar{n} = 12$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 7$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\bar{N} = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	5.0	4.33	4.14	4.26	
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	3.0	2.92	2.57	2.79	
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	4.0	3.67	3.0	3.42	
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	4.0	3.33	3.57	3.42	
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	5.0	3.83	3.71	3.79	-1.21
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	5.0	4.0	3.71	3.89	-1.11
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	3.0	2.5	1.57	2.16	
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	2.0	1.92	2.0	1.95	
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	5.0	3.83	3.14	3.58	-1.42
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	4.0	3.0	2.43	2.78	-1.22
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	3.0	3.42	3.0	3.26	
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	4.0	3.33	2.86	3.16	
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	3.0	3.25	2.43	2.95	
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	4.0	3.33	2.86	3.16	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$n = 12$ K-3 <u>M</u>	$n = 7$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$N = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/-1.0
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	4.0	2.83	2.57	2.74	-1.26
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	4.0	3.33	2.71	3.11	
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	5.0	4.17	3.43	3.89	-1.11
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	5.0	4.33	3.57	4.05	
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	5.0	4.0	3.43	3.79	-1.21
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	5.0	3.67	3.57	3.63	-1.37
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	4.0	3.42	3.29	3.37	
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.32	
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	4.0	3.33	2.29	2.95	-1.05
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	5.0	4.0	3.57	3.84	-1.16
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	5.0	3.5	3.29	3.42	-1.58

$N = 19$

76% Return

(table continues)



**Key:** A = Almost Never = 1  
B = Seldom = 2  
C = Sometimes = 3  
D = Frequently = 4  
E = Almost Always = 5

**Legend:** IR = Instructional Resource  
RP = Resource Provider  
C = Communicator  
VP = Visible Presence  
RPa = Responsible Party  
M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
CB = Culture Builder  
Buf = Buffer  
TR = Trainer  
Dev = Developer  
Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 6

Table 6 indicated that there were 13 significant discrepancies between the principal's perception of her behavior in the areas of instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement and the total of the teachers' perception of her behavior in those same areas. Mean scores were judged to be significant if they deviated from the principal's score by more than 1.0. As a result, 13 of the 36 questions produced this variation. In all 13 instances, the principal rated herself higher than the mean score of the 19 teachers who completed the survey. This was significant to this researcher because it confirmed a high level of expectation concerning her performance that this researcher noted during the interviews and the on-site observations. Since 3 questions were asked about each of the 12 behaviors that comprised the theoretical framework, it was important to cluster the teacher scores around each characteristic or behavior. From this perspective, only 2 cases of the 13 teacher mean scores which deviated from the principal's score repeated. They were the behaviors of resource provider and visible presence in the instructional leadership cluster. The 10 remaining principal behaviors clustered within the categories of change facilitation and school improvement each received 1 score which deviated from the principal's score by more than 1.0. Interestingly, the K-3 teachers gave Principal Blue 8 higher average ratings (11 below scores) over all than the special area teachers (19 below scores) gave Principal Blue. This supported the hypothesis that different categories of teachers would view the principal differently. This was possibly due to the amount of time the principal spent with each sub-group of teachers.

### On-Site Observations

Direct observation of three principals as they engaged in school improvement, instructional leadership, and change facilitation activities provided another source of evidence for this study.

Principal Blue was observed for only a total of 16 hours since the fifth four-hour observation scheduled was cancelled due to Blue's illness. The five four-hour block arrangement permitted this researcher to observe different time segments in the day-to-day activities of the principal. An observational matrix protocol was used for each observation in this study (Appendix A).

The observational matrix was generated from a synthesis of the three distinct research arenas described in Chapter II. The purpose of the matrix was to aid the researcher in coding the data during the observation segments. Data collection points were established at half-hour intervals. Related to the model developed in the theoretical section of Chapter II (Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For This Study), it was assumed that the observation matrix would assist the researcher in documenting those principal behaviors as they were observed. The identified codes were (a) observed; (b) not observed, not relevant; and (c) missed opportunity.

Table 7

Summary of Blue On-Site Observations

	Total of Code "Observed" 30' Time Series Intervals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Visible Presence	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2. Instructional Resource	1	1	0	2	3	3	1	2
3. Resource Provider	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	1
4. Communicator	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5. Trainer	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2
6. Developer	2	1	0	3	3	2	1	2
7. Buffer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Model	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
9. Collaborator	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
10. Culture Builder	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
11. Monitor	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
12. Responsible Party	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

N = 4

Codes: 1. 0 = Observed  
 2. N = Not Observed, Not Relevant  
 3. M = Missed Opportunity

Analysis of Table 7

Responsible party, communicator, and visible presence received the maximum of four tallies in each of the half-hour segments. Visible presence and communicator were two of the instructional leadership behaviors. Responsible party was one of the school improvement behaviors. The fewest number of observations were recorded in the change facilitation cluster with buffer being the lowest. No observations involving the principal behaving as a buffer were recorded. The school improvement cluster consisting of the behaviors of collaborator, model, culture builder, and responsible party received the greatest number of tallies overall.

**Archival Records And Documents Examination**

Archival records and documents were considered together given the nature of their form. They were examined away from the study site with the exception of the teacher evaluation records which were examined in the principal's office.

An audit analysis form was developed (Appendix H) to assist this researcher in summarizing the information listed in the evaluation records in terms of the 12 principal behaviors that are the basis of this study. This researcher had assumed based upon her experience as a principal that the evaluation records would state the number of minutes over the course of an evaluation year that the case study principal was in the classroom for evaluative purposes. Such was not the case either because of contract language which stipulated the number and length of evaluation visits or because it was deemed unimportant by the study principal. Thus, there was no way to ascertain or verify the principal's information on this issue in record form. The on-site observations of Principal Blue did confirm a very high level of visible presence as did the survey, especially among the K-3 classroom teachers.

The audit analysis did reveal that of the 10 randomly selected teacher personnel files, 7 were evaluated as excellent, the highest rating. Two were rated satisfactory and one was rated probationary satisfactory. This suggested to this researcher that Principal Blue was involved in trying to change teacher behavior by engaging in developing and monitoring behaviors. Principal Blue stated the following on a teacher's formal record rated satisfactory in May 1990:

Teacher X successfully addressed areas of concern discussed with her by the building principal from her last evaluation from the 88-89 school year. Her lesson plans have been written and available in the classroom throughout the school year. The learning activities I observed formally and informally have all been age appropriate for her student population. I have observed an acceptable amount of ditto usage in her lesson planning and implementation.

Principal Blue's opening year agenda for her faculty was revealing in terms of the 12 research behaviors. Of the 23 itemized topics, only 3 were devoted to topics of an instructional nature. However, a portion of the meeting (Agenda item #17) was devoted to a discussion of the goals and objectives for the school for the current year, all four of which are curriculum or instructionally oriented. In addition to communicator, this suggested a principal engaged in developer, culture builder, and

responsible party behaviors. In addition, since the goals were developed in concert with a school improvement team, a collaborator behavior was identified. Weekly bulletins and other agendas indicated a heavy emphasis on management type items as opposed to instructional improvement activities as the year progressed, however.

Parent survey results reported parent attitudes about public relations, discipline, school climate, and school procedures but nothing about instructional issues. However, the very use of instruments designed to seek parent input and reaction to the school indicated a principal aware of the need to assess the external environment (Fullan, 1982) to improve the school.

### Summary

Principal Blue was three years into her first principalship in the fall of 1990. She has been rated as effective by her immediate supervisor, the superintendent. Research by Fullan, Tyler, and Goodlad as reported in previous chapters confirmed that change required five to seven years minimally to institutionalize. In terms of the research question relative to the relationship between the principal's longevity and the institutionalization of change, it seemed appropriate to draw only the conclusion that she is in the transition period between initiation and implementation. However, on the basis of the surveys and interviews, it could be concluded that she has displayed to her teachers a number of the 12 behaviors associated with principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement during her 3 year tenure.

Chapter V will introduce the reader to Principal White who was one of the subjects of the study as background prior to the presentation and analysis of the data concerning Principal White.

## CHAPTER V

### PRINCIPAL WHITE

#### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

##### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Also, the study identified contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to:

1. Isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change.
2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

Evidence for this study came from six sources, five of which were traditional data sources for the case study. They were archival records, structured subject interviews, key informant interviews, direct observation, and documentation. The survey data source was derived from quantitative methodology. As a result, while this study was overwhelmingly qualitative in design, it did involve a mixed methodological approach.

This chapter was devoted to Principal White to facilitate the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapters IV and VI were devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data on the other two subjects. The cross-case presentation and analysis were discussed in Chapter VII.

In order to organize each case study, the following decisions were made. First, for the structured subject interview, five of the six research questions listed below and previously described in Chapter III were displayed separately. The subjects' responses were analyzed and displayed in narrative text form as they answered each applicable question.

Secondly, the sixth question on the relationship between longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change was considered within the context of all of the data in the summary section of Chapter V and substantially explored in Chapter VII which considered the cross-case analysis. Third, each of the remaining data sources was presented separately and each research question was applied to it as was deemed appropriate in terms of the characteristics defined in the theoretical framework found in Chapters I and II. In several instances, some research questions were not applicable to a given data source.

#### Research Questions

1. How did an effective principal improve the school?
2. How did an effective principal support teaching and learning?
3. What practices of an effective principal promoted significant, durable change?
4. What factors were deterrents to achieving change?
5. What was the relationship between the effective principal's longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change?



6. Did the Education Reform Act of 1985 influence what the effective principal did with respect to school improvement and instructional leadership?

Before entering into a presentation of the data and analyses which resulted from the study, each principal who provided the focus for this inquiry was introduced to the reader at the beginning of the individual case study. Following the situational perspective which was introduced to the reader in Chapters I, II, and III, it was important to this researcher to present the reader with a sense of the local environment in which the principal worked as well as biographical data.

### Background

Principal White was nine years into her first principalship in the fall of 1990. Principal White was promoted to the principalship from within the school district. Prior to her appointment she was an interim principal for six months and a curriculum coordinator in the central office for six months. Her teaching experience was primarily in the intermediate grades although she taught at the primary level as well over a period of seven years. Her educational training included Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Certificate of Advanced Study, and Doctor of Education degrees from two state and private universities located in Illinois and on the east coast.

Principal White did not seek the principalship. She was asked to assume the principalship in an interim capacity when a principal resigned in mid-year ten years ago.

At first I was very hesitant to take the position because of the fact that I was enjoying the curriculum position. But then after taking the position for six months, I fell in love with the position. The community, the teachers--my dreams kind of changed as a result of the experience. Because I had such a good experience, I wanted to continue in this capacity. The process used by the district is they build a committee based on two representatives from the teaching staff, two parents, and then two or three administrators and they interview several candidates and then decide on who will be the final candidate. And so, I went through that process after the interim position and I received the position.

Besides being the principal of a 490 student K-5 building and supervising 21 classroom teachers and numerous support staff totaling 55 in all, Principal White had other responsibilities at the district level. She served on the Curriculum Council, on the Reading Committee, on numerous task forces. She was also an instructor in the district's induction program designed to train all in-coming new teachers in the district's expectations for lesson design, student achievement, as well as review basic learning and teaching principles.

White's school district served a middle to upper middle class, predominantly white, community with several pockets of poverty. Overall, the community was very well-educated, affluent, and influenced in large measure by a local Christian college with a national reputation and strict fundamentalist beliefs. The community was very supportive of its schools by approving referenda during the difficult school-funding period of the 1980's when other taxpayers were not as supportive at the polling place.

Principal White's school was one of 13 elementary schools and considered the last neighborhood school in the district because most of the children walked to school. However, change was on the horizon because in 1990 some children were bussed from a very expensive housing development which had recently opened. Special education students had always been bussed to White's school which gave the school somewhat of a cosmopolitan flavor. There was no assistant principal. White's district spent nearly five thousand dollars per student which placed the district in the top third of school districts in the county.

## How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal White in a structured interview format (Appendix E). Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. Research question one was designed to address the issue of school improvement. As discussed in Chapters I and II, the research of Sergiovanni, 1990; Joyce, Hersh, and McKibben, 1983; and Sarason, 1982 identified four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in school improvement. School improvement was defined by Joyce et al. as the principal developing the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis. These behaviors of model, collaborator, culture builder, and responsible party formed the crosshairs on the lense through which Principal White's responses were examined. The data were reported in a narrative text display.

The following responses of White were instructive in terms of the school improvement research.

. . . My main belief is that I can be a facilitator, a leader, a nurturer and that we can make school an integral part of every child's life. I really believe that if they get a good foundation in elementary school and that they feel good about themselves and have high self-esteem, that they are going to be more successful as a whole person later on in life. And so one of the things I feel is that the elementary school should challenge them academically; it should also provide a lot of rich experiences for them to participate in, like talent shows, Great Books, the publishing center. . . Something for everybody, so that they feel good about themselves and good about their school. And I think the principal is the catalyst that brings in good teachers to the school, who tries to work to strengthen teachers who in turn work to strengthen kids. I really believe I make a positive difference in the lives of kids. . . Upon my arrival there wasn't a lot of organization. They rarely had faculty meetings. They weren't used to agendas; they weren't used to staff development in any form, because the principal low-keyed all that. He was just a real good guy that everybody liked. They loved their principal but there was no group thing, no communication. There was no bulletin board for any kind of daily or personal messages. That was a big thing to get people to agree to read a bulletin board. . . I had an older staff. I would have to say that when I came I started right away with staff development. I worked with each teacher. . . The custodial situation was bad, but that's an on-going thing that we

constantly work for. I would have to say that there wasn't a lot of interaction between colleagues at every grade level, so I tried to build teams. Also, we didn't have a lot of involvement from this staff on curriculum committees and now many are involved which is great because then people are excited and bring ideas back [to the building].

I would have to say that I have, over time, been able to help people retire or counsel them into other fields to the point that where most of my people that were marginal are gone. I have tried to bring new blood in, I have tried to find good people that complement other people.

Also, we had a PTA that was supportive, but did not have goals and was not really involved in supporting instructional development, it was more money oriented, and kind of like the frills approach. Now the PTA has developed a sense of pride in terms of tying their goals to my goals and supporting our instructional programs, like the publishing center where a thousand manuscripts are published a year.

Our test scores have improved because we also set up goal setting conferences with all the teachers and focused on personal and instructional goals. I've seen improvement in instruction, an increase in test scores, an increase in student involvement in student activities, and an increase in parent involvement. We have developed a behavior standards program to reward kids and reinforce them. Initially, when I would first go into the classrooms, and this was ten years ago, the teachers would teach a lesson, most of them would know what they were going to teach, but they didn't really stop to think about the objective or the purpose and I don't want to just quote different terms, but I mean they didn't know how they were going to check for understanding, how they would provide practice, what they were going to do with the lesson or how to do different approaches with the same material. . . So what I did was just start from scratch with all the key basic points of the Madeline Hunter approach. . . We started to look at curriculum in that way and we were using common terms.

I think we have organized things, we have things going, so I think we have kind of got things going from being disorganized to being kind of tied together. And then a new staff, so I kind of feel we are strong in staff, strong in instruction, strong in test scores. I kind of feel proud about their records.

While the spoken language of Principal White did not include the specific words of responsible party, model, culture builder, or collegiality, her statements included such words as catalyst, leader, organizer, and team-builder.

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the

structured interview relative to school improvement. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display was used to report the data.

### Key Informant #1

Key informant #1 was a kindergarten teacher with ten years of experience, four of which were at White's school. Principal White hired this teacher.

First of all, I feel her support and that's a big issue. She is there when I need her. She encourages me. She builds me up. She answers my questions with good judgment and she respects my opinion. And I think most of all she listens. She gives us an opportunity to be involved in change. You buy into a process when you have something to do with the decision. For example, night conferences a couple of weeks ago, and this was a change, we have never had this before and time to see how we could perhaps be there for fathers who wanted to come at later hours and she had us all in the process of deciding what would be the best to do and we all had a hand in the decision and we came up with a workable solution that I like. . .

### Key Informant #2

Key informant #2 was a second grade teacher for the past 14 years. In total she had taught for 30 years in Pre-K to third grade classrooms. She was not hired by Principal White.

. . . Just by her support and her constant monitoring of our feelings and needs. She is very caring. She knows all of us personally; she knows the children personally and the parents. If it's at all possible, it gets done within the confines of the budget and administration. She puts herself on the line for us. . . She always takes input. We have this BEST team that I think you are familiar with, it is teacher improvement input and we have four or five teachers that serve on this. . . And we plan our own inservices three or four times a year for one-half day and the input from that is taken and she makes sure she meets needs. . . I think we have good rapport. . .

### Key Informant #3

Key informant #3 had 14 years of experience in teaching physical education and was not hired by Principal White.

First-of all it's her school and no matter what you do it has to be done through her. Her greatest strength is her flexibility. She hires teachers to do a job and if they can't do the job, she comes in and she instructs and she tries to assist and help and she takes them through the different steps. I find her to be a very good leader in the sense that she will take you through the process so that you understand what you are doing, why you are doing it. . . And then I also find her to be very good if you know what you are doing, she tends to sit back and let you do your job. She doesn't just get in your way or interfere or to stop you from what you are doing. But she really pushes you to become the best. And she expects nothing but the best from you, which is good, because she takes a lot of pride in her building. . .

## How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of instructional leadership. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in instructional leadership: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Instructional leadership was defined by Smith and Andrews as the principal's focused effort on the improvement of instruction; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement. The responses to this question were reported on the basis of these four behaviors in narrative text form.

Well, specifically, hiring people. I think that's the key if you bring in good people and you spend a lot of time in finding them, when you see good teaching going on you feel like you have made a difference there. In helping other people, not in the sense of remediating them, but in the sense of helping them see their strengths and improve, in other words not be stagnant, try to keep seeking to improve. . . Also, probably going into the classroom and teaching myself. I teach

every year. I think it shows the teachers how much I value teaching and encouraging people to grow, that we are all in this together and that I am not perfect, they are not perfect, but that we can just keep growing to be better. I am proud of that effort. We are never there. There is always more to do. . . I did a needs assessment in terms of where we were at every instructional level, and then conferencing with every teacher; I conferenced with the staff, I conferenced with the PTA, and I tried to determine where we should channel our efforts based on the concerns of many and I looked at our test scores. And I think that one thing we really need to work on is making the computer center an integral part of every child's week. So that is a very involved process and I think it will benefit instruction in many ways. . . Also to improve our whole language program and by improve I mean a lot of hand-holding, a lot of sharing, a lot of observing, a lot of feedback to help people get a handle on what whole language is and how they can make it an integral part of their classroom. . . I would like to maintain the test scores, so I don't want to see us drop in that. I would like to see us increase in that area if possible if we can by examining the results every year. . . But I would like to see us become involved in other things. For example, reading recovery is something I don't know a lot about so I want to look into that and thinking patterns . . . I would like to see all different types of strategies being tried in different classrooms because there are so many different ways of doing things. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to instructional leadership. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. The data were reported in a narrative display format.

#### Key Informant #1

I think one of the greatest things is the communication she has among the parents and faculty and pulling us all together and treating us all like a family. The children know her, she is so responsive to them and as she moves through the halls - they love her. They can feel that, we all can feel that, children, parents, teachers, alike. I just feel her positive outlook. I can't tell you how nice that is to just feel that and her compassion for children and for the learning process and for all of us comes through in everything that she does.

### Key Informant #2

I think she is always trying to make sure that we have the materials and the emotional support that we need to try the new things that the district has offered us. District [White] is really on the cutting edge of many new programs and they are very interested in research and development of the current trends and we are free to make these choices and her support is very necessary because a lot of it is different than what we have taught before. So she has given us the feeling that if we make a mistake, that's fine as long as we have the children's best interest at heart and that we are credible. We keep good data and we know the children are learning, she feels that we have the freedom to try new things, to make mistakes, and that we won't be looked upon negatively.

### Key Informant #3

. . . I guess one of the most important ways she helps me in my teaching is the fact that she has allowed me to connect my program with everything in the school. We do a problem-solving course that I would not be able to have in other schools. She believes that we work with the whole child, not just one part of them. . .

## What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of change facilitation. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in change facilitation: trainer, developer, buffer, and monitor (Hord et al., 1987). Change facilitation was defined by Hord et al. as the principal worked directly with teachers who were expected to change (grow). The responses to this question were reported on the basis of these four behaviors and displayed in



narrative text form. The following statements were instructive in terms of the change facilitation research.

. . . I started staff development in my building. I started instructional meetings at my building. We had district seminars, but I started hosting them at my building. And then I started going into the classrooms and teaching and letting the teachers critique me in the same way I critique them so that trust was established and they were seeing me at my best and worst, and vice-versa. And I think I really built in a commitment to improve instruction that has been kind of on-going. And so I would have to say that evaluation became, I hope, valuable in their improvement of instruction and I think they learned from those critiques and those discussions. So I think that would be one thing.

Identifying objectives would be another thing and the most important because I don't think that they thought in those terms. . . I am really motivated by a lot of programs, and so I think I help to build enthusiasm for a lot of our programs and I think I help teachers to self-evaluate and to start sharing different ways of teaching and to not be as personal about it but look at it [instruction] as prescriptive and choose programs to implement for their own staff development and make their own staff development plan. . .

Another strategy I used was trying to get my best people to buy into different ideas that I thought would benefit the staff and have them coach their peers and having our most enthusiastic people represent our staff for the process writing and patterns of thinking workshops. Also bringing some of my people that question the changes and involving them to show them the benefits and have them tell the benefits to the staff. . .

Another strategy would be to explain testing to the teachers and explain how they interpret their test results and how they can benefit from their test results and set goals to improve the scores directly. Not just to take the test scores and the profiles and put them in the folders; what do those profiles mean? Where does their class come in on the chart? I help them with these questions. . .

Another strategy would be that I am continually taking classes with them. And I am continually saying that I have more to learn. I'm right there with them and so we are in it together.

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to change facilitation. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances

follow-up questions were required. The data were reported using the narrative text display.

#### Key Informant #1

Well, I see her as a facilitator. She provides money and time and workshops and support. She strongly encourages us to grow; she is open to new ideas. I know change is hard to come by, but I want her to continue to encourage everybody to at least be exposed to all of these things because then the teacher can make a judgment. I know its a long hard evolving process, but I want her to continue to do that. . .

#### Key Informant #2

. . . That she is not afraid if there is a little extra noise or if there is a test that doesn't get a gold star that day because you tried something new and it failed, that's ok. And the teachers need to feel this way because that's how we grow. . .

#### Key Informant #3

Key informant #3 did not respond to any of the eight interview questions with language relating to the principal as buffer, trainer, developer, or monitor.

### What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?

#### Principal Interview

Michael Fullan (1982) classified potential deterrents to change into four broad categories. Specifically, they were characteristics of the change itself, characteristics at the school level, characteristics at the school district level, and characteristics external to the local system. They included factors such as need and relevance of the change, clarity, complexity, quality of the program, the history of innovative attempts, staff development and participation, time-line and information system, the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics and orientation, board and community characteristics, district office support and involvement, and the adoption process.

Research question four was designed to address the issue of deterrents to change. Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal White in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. The data were reported using the narrative text display.

The following responses of White were instructive in terms of Fullan's research on deterrents to change.

. . . Well, I have to say along the way, and this is where I feel it is really important, that since I have been here for nine years, the answer varies based on the number of years here. Initially, people were not as receptive; they were feeling me out and I was really such a staunch supporter of staff development, on-going staff development and I had to earn their trust. . . That even though the changes I was suggesting required time and work, it wasn't what their perception was; it wasn't so drastically different. . . It was kind of just refining their skills and I wasn't out to get them. I was out to help them and that we were in this together. . . When I came the old guard really had reservations about any kind of changes, because they felt they did it the right way and the way they did it was the right way kids learned and they were going to do it that way until they died. . . And so I would have to say in the beginning there were reservations and then I would have to say that there are people that are negative and don't ever want to change and that was very hard for me to accept. . . The only thing is that people can't handle too much, and I think that for us when we have a vision and we want to communicate that vision to the staff and they are concerned with the day to day mechanics of getting their kids through and they have to buy into that vision and they have to share in that decision-making process and I think through that process of developing BEST teams [school improvement teams], people feel that they are more a part of what we are doing. I would have to say it was more my vision than their vision. And so we share tough times and good times and now it's like they really feel like their building with me. When I first came here I believed in shared decision-making, but yet they were my goals that they were trying to accomplish and I kind of think now that in moving forward as a family or as a team, but we have gone through good times, and bad and hard times and struggling times and people that are resistant to change had to be shown that change is ok. . . I would have to say that I have two people that have become bitter over time and both of them are special ed. and there is a lot of paperwork and support that is needed for those teachers and so I think they are kind of burned out. I would have to say that my custodians. . . I have never had a custodian who has been committed to having the best building in the world. It is really hard to develop pride at that level. So change for them is a big thing. . . Another I would have to say is we went through two strikes in this district. You can be the most positive person in the world and love your staff, but when there is a dollars and money issue, that was very heartbreaking for me. You are administration and they are teachers. . . that was a very tough time for me and then to build credibility back, that takes a toll. . . And the other barriers would be at times we have large class sizes, at times we haven't had the support for the programs we've adopted, at times programs were adopted but not delivered in their entirety. . . and central office impacts on a building and so sometimes that's tough, when they

[teachers] think that maybe central office has too many ideas. . . and money,always. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to deterrents to change. This researcher asked the teachers about a significant challenge or challenges the principal faced that they were aware of rather than using the Fullan language of deterrents to change in order to avoid having to define terms and possibly influence responses. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display was used.

#### Key Informant #1

Well, the one thing that comes to mind, I don't know if you heard about our school board meeting last night [supplementary reading material controversy], the thing that comes to mind I mean that has been a real challenge in the last month or so and I know that she has spent many hours meeting with parents, and I know she has been there to listen. I also appreciate the fact that she has informed the staff of what our responsibilities are, she has given us written materials [research about the materials], and she has called us together to help us work together with this concern and I appreciate that. . .

#### Key Informant #2

We are in the middle of this controversy right now in selecting reading materials for children. We work in a community where there is a heavy influence of very high morals, church influence and we have been aware of this for many years; it's a college-church town and we know that we have a very diverse community, from both ends of the spectrum. She rides this fine line to please everybody and she handles herself so well; she is very articulate and intelligent and she tries to meet people on both sides. I don't think you can always win this, but she does the best she can to defuse hot tempers, to calm people down, to help them see both sides, to help them see the finer points that perhaps they are missing because they see one issue and they don't see the whole picture. She

does a very good job with this. We haven't solved the problem yet, but I have watched her work on this and I think that's hard. . .

### Key Informant #3

One of the hardest challenges that she had at this school was getting the school to work together. Everybody on the staff when she first arrived was very competitive. The school was very competitive within itself. To get everybody to work together and share the information that they have and be willing to work with everything, work with the new teachers coming in was always a problem, because even when I first arrived, everybody had their own little island and you would try to be king of your island or try to outdo everyone else. And within her time here, it has become one working unit where people share, people work, and people do different things no matter where it is. If I needed help, a fifth grade teacher would come down and help me with my program in the gym. And if they needed help and I had time, I would go down and work with them. So that we do work as a total school and we do work together. . .

Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership?

### Principal Interview

A total of twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of the impact of the Illinois legislation on the effective principal requiring that a majority of the principal's time be spent on the improvement of instruction. As discussed in Chapters I and II, this requirement was written in broad terms and consequently might be interpreted in a variety of ways. What cues did the principal pay attention to? It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the responses of the principal might be related to the number of years in the position and the situational context of the principalship. Principal White was appointed to the principalship four years before the passage of the Education Reform Act of 1985. A narrative text display was used to report Principal White's cryptic response to this research question.

No. - I would do it whether it [law] was there or not. . . Initially, when I came here, the superintendent was a real visionary and I was completely inspired, in awe of him. I wanted to find every way to meet every child's needs, to do it better. I couldn't read enough, I couldn't try enough because he really inspired me and he felt that no child should ever fail. It was our responsibility to see to it, to make sure that no child ever fails. And he would encourage and he would bring the programs in and set a goal for, like myself, and say ok, now what are you going to do after you reach this goal? Are you sure you are doing the best for kids? . . . Now I'd say that I know that my superintendent wants us to do the best job we can, but I would say that it is a self-motivation. I'm going to do the job that I can do, but the one thing that I like is that I am encouraged. There is never a direction given but there is encouragement, there is support. . . [He says] what do you need to do this, why do you want to do it? It's not like why don't you do this, but when I come to him and say I'm doing this and I'm doing that; he says ok, What do you need to do it? . . .

### Key Informant Interviews

There was no question within the key informant structured interview format which was designed to address this research question. It was felt that only the principal would be able to respond to this question since this research question was designed to explore the principal's interpretation and response to the law.

### The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys

The case survey data source required the development of a 36 item closed-ended coding instrument (Appendices D and G) administered to both principals and teachers. Three questions were developed to explore each of the twelve characteristics described in the theoretical framework in Chapter II. The case survey principal's responses were translated into numerical equivalents and cross-checked with the teachers' aggregated responses item by item. Frequency and mean scores of the teachers' responses were calculated. The data were disaggregated in terms of three sub-groups. They were K-3 teachers, 4-5 teachers, and special area teachers. A total teacher score was also calculated. It was determined by this researcher that this procedure was necessary in light of the work of Smith and Andrews (1989) which found that a principal was an instructional leader if the principal was perceived as

such by the teachers who worked with the principal on a daily basis. It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the teachers' perception of the principal would vary based upon whether the teacher was a primary, intermediate, or special area teacher due to the uniqueness of the teacher-principal relationship involved in each of the three teaching positions.

Table 8

Summary of Principal White Perceiver Survey

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	D
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	E
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	D
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	E
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	D
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	D
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	D
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	E
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	E
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	E
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	E
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	D

(table continues)



Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	D
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	D
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	D
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	D
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	D
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	E
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	D
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	D

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 8

Table 8 indicated that Principal White rated herself the lowest in the area of model with a (3.0), one of the school improvement behaviors. The remaining statements, all 35, were rated either (4.0) or (5.0) which translated into either frequently or almost always, respectively. The clustering of the responses into school improvement, change facilitation, and instructional leadership categories revealed that buffer, a change facilitation behavior, received the highest rating with a (5.0) listed for all three probes. No other behavior received this high of a rating, this consistently. The only other behaviors receiving a consistent rating of (4.0) for all three probes were monitor, another of the change facilitation behaviors and instructional resource, one of the instructional leadership behaviors. The remaining 31 behaviors received mixed ratings of either (4.0) and (5.0).

Table 9

Summary of White K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses											55 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D	E	E	C	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	51	4.64
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	54	4.91
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C	D	- *	B	D	E	C	C	D	E	B	35/ 50	3.5
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	D	E	D	C	D	C	D	D	C	D	42	3.82
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	E	C	- *	D	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	46/ 50	4.6
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	D	D	E	C	C	E	D	D	B	D	D	42	3.82
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	C	E	D	E	E	E	D	E	D	E	49	4.45
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	54	4.91

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses											55	<u>M</u>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	E	C	E	E	C	E	E	D	B	E	D	46	4.18
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	E	D	- *	E	D	E	E	D	E	D	E	46 / 50	4.6
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	D	D	C	C	D	E	E	C	C	E	E	44	4.0
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E	E	- *	C	D	E	E	C	E	D	E	44 / 50	4.4
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D	E	- *	D	D	E	C	C	D	D	A	37 / 50	3.7
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	D	E	E	C	D	E	E	D	D	D	D	47	4.27
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	E	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	E	D	E	53	4.82
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	E	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	54	4.91
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	55	5.0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses											55 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	D	C	- *	B	D	D	C	B	D	D	A	31/50	3.1
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	D	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	D	D	D	50	4.55
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	E	D	- *	D	D	E	E	E	E	D	E	46/50	4.6
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	D	C	- *	C	C	E	E	C	B	C	D	35/50	3.5
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	E	D	E	E	D	D	E	D	E	D	C	48	4.36
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	E	C	C	D	D	E	E	C	D	D	E	45	4.09
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	D	E	- *	D	D	D	E	C	B	D	D	39/50	3.9
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	E	E	- *	D	D	E	E	C	E	D	E	45/50	4.5
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	E	E	C	C	D	D	C	C	E	D	B	41	3.72

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses											55 Total	<u>M</u>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E	E	- *	C	D	E	D	C	D	D	B	39/ 50	3.9
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	E	E	- *	D	D	E	D	D	C	E	C	42/ 50	4.2
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	D	E	E	C	D	E	E	E	D	E	C	48	4.36
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	E	E	D	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	53	4.82
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	54	4.91
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	E	E	- *	C	D	E	E	D	D	E	E	45/ 50	4.5
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	E	E	E	D	E	E	E	E	C	E	C	50	4.55
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	D	D	C	B	E	E	C	C	D	D	C	40	3.64
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E	E	- *	C	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	47/ 50	4.7

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses											55 Total	<u>M</u>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	E	E	E	D	D	E	E	C	E	E	E	51	4.64

N = 11

- \*= Missing Response

Key: A = Almost Never = 1  
 B = Seldom = 2  
 C = Sometimes = 3  
 D = Frequently = 4  
 E = Almost Always = 5

Legend: IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 9

Table 9 indicated that the K-3 primary teachers gave Principal White the lowest scores on two of the probes in the areas of buffer, a change facilitation behavior, and communicator, an instructional leadership behavior. These scores ranged between 3.5 and 3.9 or slightly below frequently. This was significant because the principal gave herself a perfect (5.0) or almost always rating on these same probes. There was no significant difference on the remaining 33 behaviors between the principal's and the teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in terms of school improvement, change facilitation, and instructional leadership.



Table 10

Summary of White K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	9	18	73
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	9	91
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C *	0	2	3	3	2	0	20	30	30	20
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	27	64	9
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa *	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	10	20	70
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	0	1	2	6	2	0	9	18	55	18
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	0	1	4	6	0	0	9	36	55
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	9	91
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	0	1	2	2	6	0	9	18	18	55

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior		Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	*	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	40	60
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev		0	0	4	3	4	0	0	36	27	36
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	*	0	0	2	2	6	0	0	20	20	60
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	*	1	0	2	5	2	10	0	20	50	20
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP		0	0	1	6	4	0	0	9	55	36
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C		0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	18	82
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP		0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	9	91
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa		0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	100
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	*	1	2	2	5	0	10	20	20	50	0
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col		0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	36	64
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	*	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	40	60

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior		Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	*	0	1	5	2	2	0	10	50	20	20
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M		0	0	1	5	5	0	0	10	45	45
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev		0	0	3	4	4	0	0	27	36	36
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	*	0	1	1	6	2	0	10	10	60	20
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	*	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	10	30	60
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP		0	1	4	3	3	0	9	37	27	27
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	*	0	1	2	4	3	0	10	20	40	30
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	*	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	20	40	40
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa		0	0	2	3	6	0	0	18	27	55
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod		0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	18	82

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	9	91
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB *	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	10	30	60
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	0	0	2	1	8	0	0	18	9	73
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	1	4	4	2	0	9	36	36	18
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev *	0	0	1	1	8	0	0	10	10	80
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	9	18	73

N = 11

\* = Missing Response

**Key:**  
 A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

**Legend:**  
 IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 10

Table 10 indicated that there were a limited number of behaviors rated at the almost never or seldom levels by more than ten percent of the K-3 teachers on any of the three questions per characteristic. They were communicator (20%) and monitor (30%). All of the remaining statements were rated at the frequently or almost always levels by 75 to 100 percent of the respondents except for a single visible presence (50%), model (50%), buffer (40%), developer (40%), and resource provider (66%) statement.

Table 11

Summary of White Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceivér Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	E	E	E	C	E	D	27	4.5
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E	E	D	E	E	D	28	4.67
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C	E	C	B	E	D	22	3.67
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	D	D	C	D	E	24	4.0
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	E	E	D	28	4.67
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	C	D	D	C	C	D	21	3.5
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	D	D	E	D	C	24	4.0
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E	E	D	E	E	D	28	4.67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	D	D	C	B	E	C	21	3.5
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	C	C	C	E	E	D	23	3.83
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	C	D	C	C	- *	E	18/ 25	3.6
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	D	E	D	D	D	E	25	4.3
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D	D	C	C	D	C	21	3.5
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	D	E	C	E	E	D	26	4.3

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	D	E	E	D	E	E	28	4.67
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D	E	D	E	E	D	27	4.5
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	E	E	D	28	4.67
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C	C	B	B	- *	D	14 / 25	2.8
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	E	D	E	D	E	E	28	4.67
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D	E	E	E	E	D	28	4.67
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	C	E	C	A	E	C	20	3.33
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	E	D	C	D	E	C	24	4.0
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D	E	D	D	- *	E	22 / 25	4.4
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	C	E	C	C	- *	D	18 / 25	3.6
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D	D	C	C	E	D	23	3.83
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D	E	C	B	E	D	23	3.83
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	D	E	C	C	E	D	24	4.0
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	D	E	D	A	C	C	20	3.33
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	D	E	D	D	E	D	26	4.3
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	D	E	E	E	D	D	27	4.5
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	D	E	E	E	E	E	29	4.83
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	D	E	E	E	E	D	28	4.67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	C	E	E	E	E	D	27	4.5
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	C	D	C	B	D	C	19	3.17
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	D	E	D	D	E	D	26	4.3
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	D	E	E	D	- *	C	21 / 25	4.2

N = 6

- \* = Missing Response

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model



### Analysis of Table 11

Table 11 indicated that the Grade 4-5 teachers gave Principal White the lowest scores on the four probes in the areas of collaborator, buffer (2X), and communicator. These scores ranged between (3.3) and (4.0) or slightly above sometimes and frequently. These scores were below the principal's self-determined ratings of (5.0) on each statement. There was no significant difference between the principal's rating and the teachers' ratings on the 32 remaining statements within the instructional leadership, school improvement, and change facilitation clusters.

Table 12

Summary of White Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
3. I lead formal discussion concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	0	1	2	1	2	0	17	33	17	33
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	17	66	17
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50	0
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	17	66	17
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	0	1	2	2	1	0	17	33	33	17

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	50	17	33
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev *	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	60	20	20
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	67	33
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50	0
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod *	0	2	2	1	0	0	40	40	20	0
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	1	0	3	0	2	17	0	50	0	33
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	33	33	33
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev *	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	60	40
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR *	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	60	20	20
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	33	50	17
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	0	1	1	2	2	0	17	17	33	33
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	33	33	33
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	1	0	2	2	1	17	0	33	33	17
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	66	34
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	34	66
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	33	17	50
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	1	3	2	0	0	17	50	33	0
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	66	34
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR *	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	20	40	40

N = 6

\* = Missing Response

**Key:**  
 A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

**Legend:**  
 IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 12

Table 12 indicated that almost every statement was rated at the frequently or almost always levels at least once by 75 to 100 percent of the respondents on the three questions per characteristic. Only in the buffer and monitor categories did fewer than 75 percent of the respondents consistently rate the principal lower than almost always or frequently.

Table 13

Summary of White Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	E	E	E	E	D	E	29	4.83
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E	D	E	E	D	E	28	4.67
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	E	C	E	E	D	D	26	4.3
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	D	E	E	D	E	27	4.5
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	C	E	E	E	D	D	27	4.5
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	E	D	E	E	D	E	28	4.67
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	E	C	E	E	E	E	28	4.67
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E	D	E	E	D	E	28	4.67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	E	D	D	E	D	B	24	4.0
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	D	E	E	E	D	C	26	4.3
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	D	C	E	E	C	E	25	4.17
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E	E	E	E	C	E	28	4.67
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	E	D	D	E	C	E	26	4.3

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	D	C	E	E	D	- *	21 / 25	4.2
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	E	E	E	E	C	E	28	4.67
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	E	D	E	E	D	E	28	4.67
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E	E	E	E	D	E	29	4.83
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	E	D	D	E	C	E	26	4.3
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	C	C	E	E	E	- *	21 / 25	4.2
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	E	E	E	E	D	D	28	4.67
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	E	D	E	E	C	A	23	3.83
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	E	E	E	E	E	E	30	5.0
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D	D	E	E	C	- *	21 / 25	4.2
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	E	E	E	E	C	E	28	4.67
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D	E	E	E	C	E	27	4.5
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	E	D	E	E	C	E	27	4.5
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E	D	E	E	C	E	27	4.5
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	E	D	D	E	D	E	27	4.5
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E	E	E	E	D	E	29	4.83
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	E	E	E	E	E	30	5.0

(table continues)



Question	Principal Behavior	Responses						30 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E	E	E	E	E	E	30	5.0
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	E	D	E	E	D	E	28	4.67
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	E	D	E	E	E	E	29	4.83
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	E	C	D	E	D	E	26	4.3
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E	E	E	E	D	E	29	4.83
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	E	C	E	E	D	E	27	4.5

N = 6

- \* = Missing Response

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 13

Table 13 indicated that the special area teachers gave Principal White the lowest score in the area of buffer, one of the change facilitation behaviors. Two of the three buffer probes were rated below the principal's score by a full level. The principal's score was (5.0) compared to teacher scores of (4.0) and (3.83). This was a difference ranging from almost always (principal perception) to slightly less than frequently (teacher perception). It was interesting to note that Principal White rated herself lower than the teachers did in three areas. They were model, monitor, and collaborator. A perfect (5.0) was recorded by the teachers in the areas of monitor and collaborator compared to the principal score of (4.0) in both of those areas. The teachers recorded a score of (4.3) compared to the principal's score of (3.0) in the area of model.

Table 14

Summary of White Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	34	66
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	17	0	83
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	0	1	0	3	2	0	17	0	50	33

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	33	17	50
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	17	0	83
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP *	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	20	40	40
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	17	0	83
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	34	66
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col *	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	40	0	60
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	33	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	1	0	1	1	3	16	0	17	17	50
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	100
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev *	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	20	40	40
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	17	0	83
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	50	50
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	100

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	100
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	34	66
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	17	33	50
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	83
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	17	17	66

N = 6

\* = Missing Response

Key:  
A = Almost Never  
B = Seldom  
C = Sometimes  
D = Frequently  
E = Almost Always

Legend:  
IR = Instructional Resource  
RP = Resource Provider  
C = Communicator  
VP = Visible Presence  
RPa = Responsible Party  
M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
CB = Culture Builder  
Buf = Buffer  
TR = Trainer  
Dev = Developer  
Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 14

Table 14 indicated that there were only three areas where more than 70% of the respondents did not rate Principal White at the frequently or almost always levels. They were developer (67%), collaborator (60%), and buffer (67%). In each of these cases, only one of the three probes scored below 70%.

Table 15

Summary of White Aggregated Teacher M Scores In Comparison to Principal Score

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$n = 11$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$n = 6$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$n = 6$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$N = 23$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	4.0	4.64	4.5	4.83	4.65	
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	5.0	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.78	
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	4.0	3.5	3.67	4.3	3.77	
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	4.0	3.82	4.0	4.5	4.04	
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	5.0	4.6	4.67	4.5	4.59	
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	4.0	3.82	3.5	4.67	3.96	
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	5.0	4.45	4.0	4.67	4.39	
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	5.0	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.78	
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	5.0	4.18	3.5	4.0	3.86	-1.04

(table continues)



Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$n = 11$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$n = 6$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$n = 6$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$N = 23$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	4.0	4.6	3.83	4.3	4.32	
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.17	3.95	
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	5.0	4.4	4.3	4.67	4.45	
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	4.0	3.7	3.5	4.3	3.82	
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	4.0	4.27	4.3	4.2	4.27	
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	5.0	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.74	
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	5.0	4.91	4.5	4.67	4.74	
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	5.0	5.0	4.67	4.83	4.87	
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	3.0	3.1	2.8	4.3	3.38	
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	5.0	4.55	4.67	4.2	4.5	
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	4.0	4.6	4.67	4.67	4.64	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\underline{n} = 11$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 6$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 6$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\underline{N} = 23$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	5.0	3.5	3.33	3.83	3.55	-1.45
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	4.0	4.36	4.0	5.0	4.43	
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	4.0	4.09	4.4	4.2	4.19	
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.67	4.04	
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	4.0	4.5	3.83	4.5	4.32	
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	4.0	3.72	3.83	4.5	3.96	
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	5.0	3.9	4.0	4.5	4.09	
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	4.0	4.2	3.33	4.5	4.05	
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	4.0	4.36	4.3	4.83	4.48	
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	5.0	4.82	4.5	5.0	4.78	
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	4.0	4.91	4.83	5.0	4.91	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\underline{n} = 11$ K-3 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 6$ 4-5 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 6$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\underline{N} = 23$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	4.0	4.5	4.67	4.67	4.59	
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	5.0	4.55	4.5	4.83	4.61	
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	4.0	3.64	3.17	4.3	3.70	
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.83	4.64	
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	4.0	4.64	4.2	4.5	4.5	

$\underline{N} = 23$

85% Return

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 15

Table 15 indicated that there was one significant discrepancy between the principal's perception of her behavior in change facilitation and the total of the teachers' perception of her behavior in that same area. Significantly, two of the three probes in the buffer category were rated below the principal's score by the teachers. Mean scores were judged to be significant if they deviated from the principal's score by more than 1.0. Interestingly, when the discrepant scores were disaggregated the K-3 teachers rated two areas of buffer and communicator below the principal's score; the Grade 4-5 teachers rated the three areas of buffer, communicator, and collaborator below the principal's score; and the special area teachers rated only the buffer area below the principal's rating. On the other hand, only the special area teachers rated the principal above the principal's score in the areas of model, monitor, and collaborator. This supported the hypothesis that different categories of teachers would view the principal differently. This was possibly due to the amount of time the principal spent with each sub-group of teachers.

### On-Site Observations

Direct observation of three effective principals as they engaged in school improvement, instructional leadership, and change facilitation activities provided another source of evidence for this study. Principal White was observed for a total of 20 hours. The five four-hour block arrangement permitted this researcher to observe different time segments in the day-to-day activities of the principal. An observational protocol was used for each observation in this study.

The observational matrix was generated from a synthesis of the three distinct research arenas described in Chapter II. The purpose of the matrix was to aid the researcher in coding the data during the observation segments. Data collection points

were established at half-hour intervals. Related to the model developed in the theoretical section of Chapter II (Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For This Study), it was assumed that the observation matrix would assist the researcher in documenting those principal behaviors as they were observed. The identified codes were (a) observed; (b) not observed, not relevant; and (c) missed opportunity.

Table 16

Summary of White On-Site Observations

	Total of Code "Observed" 30' Time Series Intervals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Visible Presence	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2. Instructional Resource	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	1
3. Resource Provider	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
4. Communicator	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5. Trainer	3	4	2	2	1	1	1	1
6. Developer	2	4	2	2	1	2	1	1
7. Buffer	1	2	3	2	1	1	0	0
8. Model	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
9. Collaborator	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
10. Culture Builder	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
11. Monitor	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5
12. Responsible Party	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

$N = 5$

Codes: 1. 0 = Observed  
2. N = Not Observed, Not Relevant  
3. M = Missed Opportunity

Analysis of Table 16

Visible presence, communicator, model, culture builder, and responsibility party received the maximum of five tallies in each of the half-hour segments. Visible presence and communicator were two of the instructional leadership behaviors. Model, culture builder, and responsible party were three of the four school improvement behaviors. The fewest number of observations were recorded in the change facilitation cluster with buffer being the lowest. The greatest number of observations were recorded in the school improvement cluster.

### Archival and Documents Examination

Archival records and documents were considered together given the nature of their form. They were examined away from the study site with the exception of the teacher evaluation records which were examined in the principal's office.

An audit analysis form was developed (Appendix H) to assist this researcher in summarizing the information listed in the evaluation records in terms of the 12 principal behaviors that are the basis of this study. This researcher had assumed based upon her experience as a principal that the evaluation records would state the number of minutes over the course of an evaluation year that the case study principal was in the classroom for evaluative purposes. Such was not the case either because of contract language which stipulated the number and length of evaluation visits or it was deemed unimportant by the study principal. Thus, there was no way to ascertain or verify the principal's information on this issue in record form. The on-site observations of Principal White did confirm a very high level of visible presence and monitoring behaviors as did the survey across all three sub-groups of Principal White's teachers.

The audit analysis revealed that of the five randomly selected teacher personnel files, three were rated as superior, the highest rating. One was rated excellent and one was rated satisfactory. This suggested to this researcher that Principal White was involved in trying to change teacher behavior by engaging in developing and monitoring behaviors. Principal White stated the following on a teacher's formal record rated excellent, the second highest rating, in May 1990:

[Teacher X] works well with parents, students, and her colleagues. She is presently working with me on utilizing effective elements of lesson design in various subject areas. . .

Principal White's opening year faculty agenda was revealing in terms of the 12 research behaviors. Of the 28 unenumerated topics, only 2 were devoted to topics of

an instructional nature. Conversely, succeeding agendas and bulletins and memos revealed a heavy emphasis on instructionally related items. This suggested a principal engaged in the behaviors of instructional resource, communicator, culture builder, and responsible party.

Monthly newsletters to the parents were unique in that they were written and produced in a collaborative fashion with the PTA. Specifically, the principal and PTA representative jointly wrote many of the articles. There was a very high level of parent involvement in the school for instructional purposes. They were used as tutors, publishing center sponsors, and learning center assistants. These activities indicated to this researcher that Principal White was demonstrating all of the instructional leadership behaviors of resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence at a high level of conceptualization and implementation.

### Summary

Principal White was nine years into her first principalship in the fall of 1990. She was rated as effective by her immediate supervisor, the superintendent. Research by Fullan, Tyler, and Goodlad as reported in previous chapters confirmed that changes required five to seven years minimally to institutionalize. In terms of the research question relative to the relationship between the principal's longevity and the institutionalization of change, it seemed appropriate to draw only the conclusion that changes had been institutionalized. On the basis of the surveys and the interviews, it also could be concluded that she displayed all of the behaviors associated with principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement to her teachers with the possible exception of buffer during her nine year tenure.

Chapter VI will introduce the reader to Principal Ecu.

CHAPTER VI.....	170
PRINCIPAL ECRU.....	170
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	170
Introduction.....	170
Research Questions.....	171
Background.....	172
How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School?.....	173
Principal Interview.....	173
Key Informant Interviews.....	175
Key Informant #1.....	176
Key Informant #2.....	176
Key Informant #3.....	176
How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning?.....	177
Principal Interview.....	177
Key Informant Interviews.....	178
Key Informant #1.....	178
Key Informant #2.....	178
Key Informant #3.....	179
What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth Or Change?.....	179
Principal Interview.....	179
Key Informant Interviews.....	180
Key Informant #1.....	181
Key Informant #2.....	181
Key Informant #3.....	181
What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?.....	181
Principal Interview.....	181
Key Informant Interviews.....	183
Key Informant #1.....	183
Key Informant #2.....	184
Key Informant #3.....	184
Did The Education Reform Act of 1985 Influence What the Effective Principal.....	184
Did With Respect to School Improvement and Instructional Leadership.....	184
Principal Interview.....	184
Key Informant Interviews.....	185
The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys.....	185
On-Site Observations.....	223
Analysis Of Table 6.....	224
Archival Records And Documents Examination.....	225
Summary.....	226



## CHAPTER VI

### PRINCIPAL ECRU

#### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

##### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Also, the study identified contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to:

1. Isolate any factors which were deterrents to achieving change.
2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

Evidence for this study came from six sources, five of which were traditional data sources for the case study. They were archival records, structured subject interviews, key informant interviews, direct observation, and documentation. The survey data source was derived from quantitative methodology. As a result, while this study was overwhelmingly qualitative in design, it did involve a mixed methodological approach.

This chapter was devoted to Principal E cru to facilitate the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapters IV and V were devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data on the other two subjects. The cross-case presentation and analysis were discussed in Chapter VII.

In order to organize each case study, the following decisions were made. First, for the structured subject interview, five of the six research questions listed below and previously described in Chapter III were displayed separately. The subjects' responses were analyzed and displayed in narrative text form as they answered each applicable question.

Secondly, the sixth question on the relationship between longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change was considered within the context of all the data in the summary section of Chapter VI and substantially explored in Chapter VII which considered the cross-case analysis. Third, each of the remaining data sources was presented separately and each research question was applied to it as was deemed appropriate in terms of the characteristics defined in the theoretical framework found in Chapters I and II. In several instances, some of the research questions were not applicable to a given data source.

#### Research Questions

1. How did an effective principal improve the school?
2. How did an effective principal support teaching and learning?
3. What practices of an effective principal promoted significant, durable change?
4. What factors were deterrents to change?
5. What was the relationship between the effective principal's longevity in the setting and the institutionalization of change?

6. Did the Education Reform Act of 1985 influence what the effective principal did with respect to school improvement and instructional leadership?

Before entering into a presentation of the data and analyses which resulted from the study, each principal who provided the focus for this inquiry was introduced to the reader at the beginning of the individual case study. Following the situational perspective which was introduced to the reader in Chapters I, II, and III, it was important to this researcher to present the reader with a sense of the local environment in which the principal worked as well as biographical data.

### Background

Principal Ecu was 18 years into her third principalship in the fall of 1990. Principal Ecu was an experienced principal when she was hired 17 years earlier from a neighboring and highly regarded school district in Cook County. During her tenure in her current school district she served in two principalships. The second appointment resulted from the closing of her first school. Prior to assuming the principalship in her first district, she had been an assistant principal for two years. She had taught for 12 years before becoming an administrator, 10 years of which were in kindergarten. Her educational training included Bachelor of Arts, two Masters' degrees, and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in public policy analysis from private and public universities in the Midwest.

Principal Ecu did not seek the principalship. She was tapped for the position while serving in the part-time assistant principalship role.

I didn't really decide to become a principal. It just sort of happened, and that's the truth. Okay, there's a lot of stuff in the literature about that, about people kind of being tapped and so forth. I was appointed. I was an assistant principal and without applying I was appointed to a full principalship and I sort of felt, once I got into it, that I should try it. I should give it my best shot. And if I liked it that I should probably try it in a setting that I felt more compatible with, my, you know, philosophical beliefs, which was the reason I stayed one year at [school district] and then came here. But I didn't seek the principalship. As a

matter of fact, my second master's. . . was taken to certify me to do consulting in early childhood, which is the work I was doing then and what I really like to do and I was told that if I wanted to do that, I had to go back to school and be certified. And as soon as I did that, voila!, I was an assistant principal and so on. . .

This one was a school closing situation. I was principal of the school that was being closed and about one-third of my students and families were to be assigned to this school. There was an internal upheaval with an opening coming because of a principal going on leave at a strange time of the year. So there was a reorganization and it made sense to have me administer two schools; closing one and preparing the other for the transfer of students and teachers. So my last year at my other school I was really principal of two schools. . .

Besides being the principal of a 330 student Pre K-5 building and supervising 25 assorted classroom and certificated support personnel, Principal Ecu had other responsibilities at the district level. She was assigned to the early childhood, kindergarten, assessment, and administrative evaluation and compensation task forces. She was also assigned to the art and music curriculum committees and the district homework task force.

Ecu's school district served a middle to upper middle class, conservative, predominantly white, community. It tended to be fairly demanding in its expectations of its schools. The schools were considered to have a good reputation and were seen as responsive to the public's concerns.

Principal Ecu's school was one of eight elementary schools and somewhat different in several respects from the others. Ecu's school served children from \$800,000 homes in the northeast section of a contiguous suburb to modest middle class bungalows near her school. Typically, Ecu's school served 15-20 free lunches. However, in 1990-91 there was only one free lunch. Her school was multi-ethnic in that it served many Asian and Hispanic children. There was no assistant principal. Ecu's district spent approximately \$5300 per child which placed the district in the top third of school districts in the county.

### How Did An Effective Principal Improve The School?

#### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal Ecu in a structured interview format (Appendix E). Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. Research question one was designed to address the issue of school improvement. As discussed in Chapters I and II, the research of Sergiovanni, 1990;

Joyce, Hersh, and McKibben, 1983; and Sarason, 1982 identified four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in school improvement. School improvement was defined by Joyce et al. as the principal developing the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis. These behaviors of model, collaborator, culture builder, and responsible party formed the crosshairs on the lense through which Principal Ecrú's responses were examined. The data were reported in a narrative text display.

The following responses of Ecrú were instructive in terms of the school improvement research.

. . . The principal can make a difference. If I didn't believe that, I wouldn't be a principal. I believe that the principal's work with teachers, students, and parents can impact teaching and learning. And since I believe that I hold myself accountable for spending a lot of time working with teachers and with kids. . . I do believe that everyone is capable of growth and change and believing that kind of structures the way I work with people. . . I felt that the school was kind of rigidly administered, kind of rule-bound, then when I came I saw that as a weakness. There were kids. . . it broke my heart to find there were kids who didn't want to come to school. . . I recall I had to deal with some cases where I would go and pick up kids and bring them to school because they didn't want to come. And I had never encountered that in any school that I had been principal at or teacher and so that said something to me about the climate and that was one of the things I really needed to work on right away. . . I just feel real strongly that if the district is going to establish goals and we're all going to be expected to work towards them, given finite resources, given the research on three to five manageable goals, that we'd better be working on the same ones the district is and it would take something really extraordinary for me not to do that. It would take all the teachers rising up saying that's a stupid goal or we're not going to support you in that or something. And that's not the way it is. We have real solid district goals and so basically our school's goals are a flavor of those. They have to do with technology, invitational climate, integrating reading and writing, and integrating math and science which are all worthy goals, you know instructional. So they were identified, first of all, because they flowed from the district goals. And then teachers in groups choose one of those goals to work on, and they develop the kind of activities and strategies which they felt were worthwhile for us to be following up on. . . We're improving, improving, improving, and always to get better. I think that. . . we as a group at the school have a much better handle on the knowledge base. I spend a lot of time teaching teachers, making teachers aware of the knowledge base. . . A couple of years back I really spent a lot of time with them on effective instruction strategies, a lot of stuff with Rosenshine, a lot of stuff from the University of Illinois think tank people and all that, and the Good and Grouws stuff out of Missouri. . . and the teachers would look at each other and say "Oh!" you know, "That's why we do that." Whereas if they hadn't been doing it or if they didn't know why they were doing it, now they could articulate why. . . [At]

faculty meetings. I'd give them handouts in their mailbox and ask questions about it later, or initiate a discussion about it. But for the last, I would say for the last three or four years I really try to protect faculty meeting time so that we have time to talk about these issues and I generally break them into small groups to do that. . . and then there are report out sessions. . . [Other improvements have] to do with protecting instructional time and understanding the difference between allocated time and engaged time. . . I brought in all the time research, the whole thing about allocated, engaged, and wait time, all of that stuff on time. . . teachers were wasting a heck of a lot of time here, part of that was that it is a two story building. You know you've got to take kids up stairs. They were doing a lot of team teaching, departmentalizing, where kids were moving and the kids would just go from one door to the other talking and sharpening pencils. . . and they were losing time, time, time. We cut way back on a lot of that to protect time and in order to have the kids more settled. The transitions were costing them dearly. . . Articles, a lot of modeling, a lot of finding a teacher that was doing it right and having him do a little sharing at the meetings, you know, talk about what he was doing. Teachers here are real comfortable with that. Bob, tell us what you did with. . . And then teachers will say oh, you know, boy, that's a. . . I'm going to try that. You know, could I come up and watch or whatever?

While the spoken language of Principal E cru did not include the specific words of responsible party, culture builder, or collegiality, she did use the word model to describe herself. However, her illustrations clearly reflected that she was the responsible party, as well as the culture builder, and the shaper of a new meaning for collegiality within the school during her eight year tenure.

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to school improvement. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display was used to report the data.

### Key Informant #1

Key informant #1 was a second grade teacher with 24 years of experience who worked with Principal Ecu in both the closed and the current schools. She was not hired by Principal Ecu.

Oh she, she definitely is through all, you know, through our building goals and our personal goals. We can't help but improve. You can't be stagnant here because she just won't allow it and that's, that's good for all of us. She always is available for us, you know. She pops in our rooms a couple of times a day. Not as a judge, but as an interested party. Sometimes when she comes in, she gets involved with the kids and I think that's a real healthy thing. . . But there's some principals that have been around a very long time and then some don't, you know, jump on to the new innovations in education the way she does. But she's always, she's always ahead. I think we do a lot of things before other schools do. . .

### Key Informant #2

Key informant #2 was in her fifth year of teaching. She was hired by Principal Ecu four years earlier as a resource learning disabilities teacher.

. . . Definitely, yes. The school bond we have as far as an invitational climate since we started talking about that and working towards that has helped teachers, students, and parents. We are using parents a lot for learning center and I think that helps the overall instructional quality, and attitude, and communication. Certainly the goal process as far as the teachers go in the building helps. . .

### Key Informant #3

Key informant #3 was an 18 year veteran who began her career as a classroom teacher and was now serving as a guidance counselor. She was not hired by Principal Ecu.

. . . Well, we do goals all the time with our regular faculty meetings, we work on them probably all year. And a lot of the goals are curriculum oriented, with integrating math and science; we have a technology goal this year, which I can take more of a part in than math and science and also reading and writing, I believe, is another one of our goals this year. And then improving our school climate which we have been working on for a while. . . It's something that she always brings to everyone's awareness, she doesn't just say that these are our goals and this is what we are going to work on. It is something that we talk about and we work on all the time so that it is not something you hear one time and then it is put away. You are always thinking about it and. . . in teachers' evaluations, they are again brought up so that everyone all the time is aware of them and working on them. . .

## How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning?

### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of instructional leadership. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in instructional leadership: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Instructional leadership was defined by Smith and Andrews as the principal's focused effort on the improvement of instruction; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement. The responses to this question were reported on the basis of these four behaviors in narrative text form.

. . . Well, I think specifically the visibility of the principal, accountability of the principal. I'm willing to put my expectations on the line and I'm willing to stand up and take the heat when somebody has a concern or complaint about that. I'm in the classrooms everyday, twice a day most days when I'm here. And, I'm proud of that because it takes some protection to do. The other thing I think I'm proudest of is in moving the teachers along, um, to a more, a more group process oriented kind of faculty work. . . Talking together across grade levels and working together. . . Well, the district uses outcome measures, Iowa test scores, state data, so forth. I tend to use a lot more student to student, individual things. I tend to make either mental notes or even actual notes of where kids are at a particular point and then watch that same student two months hence or two weeks hence. With my little ones, my kindergarten ones, it's more on a weekly measure. I pick out. . . the ones who stand out to me as kids who ought to be doing better than they're doing. . . and say they're having a lot of trouble with higher ordering questioning or pulling ideas together to give an oral report. . . I want to see them in two weeks to see if they've gotten any better. . . and sometimes I determine that on the basis of test scores, sometimes my own observations, sometimes, you know, real soft data, but that's just as important to me as the serious stuff. . . I'll go back into the classrooms to check. . . I don't collect writings because mostly we post everything



. . . As much as we can we get student work up every place. . . I was in the learning center in an initial notetaking phase so then I'll make it a point to get back when they're in first draft phase or when they're in revision phase and see how that's coming along. . . then with that information I'll talk to the teacher, talk with the parent, talk with the student. What I think I should do more of is talk with the kids themselves. . . they really are the owners of their own learning. . . but I wish I just had more time for kind of one-on-one tutorials with kids. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to instructional leadership. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. The data were reported in a narrative display format.

#### Key Informant #1

Well, I think first of all, she keeps us well informed. You know on district decisions, and certainly the way the wind is blowing and with certain people. . . She certainly helps us to set clear goals. She sets clear goals for the school and for us and she makes it very easy for us to reach these goals. She's helpful and she checks on us without being, you know, dogmatic. She does it very gently. She's wonderful when we have parent conferences and if we need her support she has just the right words. She's very good at that and when I need her I know I can count on her. . . She's always there to talk to us and then to help us get materials that we need or try to figure out problems that we're having and how to deal with certain parents. . .

#### Key Informant #2

The first thing that comes to mind is her physical presence day to day. I think that that is probably one of the most important things to me. I notice it when she is not here and I feel a difference and I prefer it when she is in the building and she is physically available. Also, I think her awareness, her intellectual awareness helps me in my field of special education. I feel that she is a peer, that I can communicate with exactly with what I'm doing and I would suspect that other teachers feel the same way in various fields in the building. . .

### Key Informant #3

Specifically, I guess what a counselor needs, what I need, is somebody to talk to, you know when I have a problem or want to know if what I'm doing is the right thing. Or if I have a parent who is having a problem at school with a teacher or something, it seems like I am put in the middle a lot and I need someone who I can go and talk to who I know will keep things between us and that is probably what she does for me that I really need. . . And I think that because she is in the classrooms all the time that she can give suggestions to the teachers or she can, and I know she does this a lot, compliment them on what they are doing and always relating it to the school goals. I have seen her do this in science and it is really great because we are really talking about that on our school improvement [committee]. . .

### What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth Or Change?

#### Principal Interview

Twenty-five questions were asked in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of change facilitation. As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in change facilitation: trainer, developer, buffer, and monitor (Hord et al., 1987). Change facilitation was defined by Hord et al. as the principal worked directly with teachers who were expected to change (grow). The responses to this question were reported on the basis of these four behaviors and displayed in narrative text form. The following statements were instructive in terms of the change facilitation research.

. . . Well to have teachers come into other teachers' classrooms. I have taken some classes so that particularly the teachers that were in the Corridor problem-solving, they needed to evaluate each other, you know critique. So I would take classes and they could go and do that and that was real helpful. I should do more of

that. . . I have more patience then probably a real good change facilitator would have because I'll wait, I'll wait for some people a good long time. I won't give up on them. And maybe a real good change facilitator would say three years, buddy, and. . . But I'll see some little glimmer of hope and I'll see some little things start happening there and I'll say I'm going to work on that some more. I'm not going to give up. . . I'm most influenced by the psychological school of thought called rational motive therapy. I don't really want to get into a whole lot of blaming, accusing, worrying about why this happened. I really want to be reality based. Here's where we are. What can we do to change this? So, I try to do all my facilitating kind of toward, you know, bringing them along. . . Bringing the problem to their attention. Teachers tend to do things the way they've always done them or the way it was done to them or whatever. They don't even think about it so you have to give them some possibilities, you have to put some issues in front of them, challenge them a little like when was the last time you tried it differently. . . I do a daily, morning bulletin to teachers that's personalized and current and up to date and that's not on the word processor, that's part of the institution now. People come first thing in the morning to check that out and if they don't, they're in trouble. They'll forget to come to an assembly or something and then they'll be real embarrassed, you know, because we don't call them twice. My classroom visits are expected and just part of the routine. . . The pre-conference observation, you know, post-conference format which is part of the system district-wide, is really something that happened after I came here and the way I do it here has just kind of its own little stamp. That's institutionalized. . . Teachers meeting their kids at the bell. Teachers taking their kids to the lunchroom. Teachers walking their kids out when they're dismissed. Teachers being responsible for personally overseeing kids work if they're absent, making sure that gets home with some kind of nice note. . . I keep saying that our school is family-sized. We should be small enough that we can operate like a family so we treat each other like family. . . They would go on if I weren't here. That's how you know if they're institutionalized, they continue even when you're dead and gone, until somebody else comes along and says 'That's the dumbest thing I ever heard.'

...

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and the programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interview was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to change facilitation. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. The data were analyzed and reported using the narrative text display.

Key Informant #1

. . . Of course in our district we had a big push on writing in the last five or six years and now we want to see that it's carried across the curriculum. More writing in all subject areas. And then whole language too. . . She encourages us to get involved with that. . . For example, I chose to go to a workshop because whole language is kind of my thing. Then we have another one on integrating math and science and many of us have our professional growth objectives connected with that. Then we have a technology goal which forces those of us who have been dragging our feet on the computers, but we just had a workshop last week on that . . . And it was really great because we were all forced to face it and it wasn't so bad. . . She allows us to try new things. She allows us to take risks and to develop our own specialities. She doesn't seem to put any obstacles in our way. And she supports us in this and also in dealing with parents. . .

Key Informant #2

Her main strength, I would say, is using the tools that we have like the evaluation process of teachers as a learning experience. I have been struck by that since my first year here, because I know a lot of the teachers feel the evaluation process as a chore part of their job and for me it has always been a real learning experience and re-directive of certain areas of my growth as a teacher. That's not the only process, faculty meetings, any kind of communicative setting whether it is just one-on-one or a whole group of teachers. She has the ability to keep goals right in front of you and from the very beginning I think she has seen more in me than I realized I could do as far as being a teacher. . .

Key Informant #3

You know you get that paper that these are our goals and teachers put them on their desks and that's it for the year, but I think that it's something that she always keeps drawing back in on. When I was thinking about this, I was surprised how I could remember it. And probably the only reason I could remember it was because we talk about it all the time and you kind of get real comfortable with it, so I think that is really good. . .

### What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?

Principal Interview

Michael Fullan (1982) classified potential deterrents to change into four broad categories. Specifically, they were characteristics of the change itself, characteristics at the school level, characteristics at the school district level, and characteristics external to the local system. They included factors such as the need

and relevance of the change, clarity, complexity, quality of the program, the history of innovative attempts, staff development and participation, time-line and information system, the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics, district office support and involvement, and the adoption process.

Research question four was designed to address the issue of deterrents to change. Twenty-five questions were asked of Principal E cru in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some cases for purposes of elaboration. The data were reported using the narrative text display. The following responses of E cru were instructive in terms of Fullan's research on deterrents to change.

. . . I guess if there would be a weakness it would be that a certain amount of inertia goes with a mature staff. You know, things were okay last year, why change? They were a mature staff eight years ago when I came, so they're eight years maturer now, you know. And me too. . . [In terms of barriers] there aren't very many. Actually, I have to think back to my previous school in this district for a real good example. When I came in 1973 I was perceived as a flaming liberal, you know, from [District X]. The very first year I wanted to do something in observance of Martin Luther King, which at that time was a commemorative holiday in the Code and boy I got anonymous calls. Phone calls that said, 'I'm not prejudiced, but my husband is, and we don't. . . 'we moved to [here] to get away from. . . A lot of that kind of stuff. Just knowing my background they were really afraid that I was going to come in with some kind of big change. . . We also had some really weird numbers at the school that didn't lend themselves to, there were too many to be in one group, not enough to be two groups. People hated the whole idea of split classes and all that kind of stuff. So I am coming out of some real important work in open education in [District X] and I proposed a non-graded kind of primary that would have put all that together. I nearly got ran out of town. It was terrible. The superintendent said, 'Well, don't do that again.'. . . He would have backed me. . . but I backed off the idea. I could see there hadn't been enough work done to get them ready for it and some other things happened and we got some aides and stuff like that in the classroom. . . You have to have some time to put all that together. I just floated it out there as kind of a trial balloon as one way that we could arrange this and you know it was just pretty funny, I mean, I sure got my reading back immediately. It didn't take any time at all to figure out where that one was going to stand and where I was going to stand if I tried that one more time. . . Now, at this school, I would say they're not very many dissidents. Most people are very much supportive of me. . . Right now, I've got some [parent] questioners in my kindergarten because we've really made a change from an old lady with 28 years of pencil and paper kind of isolated skills learning to a real strong integrated, experiential approach and I've got some people out there sitting back and waiting to see how this goes. . . Well, I can not think for the last six or seven years that I've had anybody who was really oppositional. For the most part at this school, people have a lot of class. So if they have a complaint about a teacher, they'll do it right. They'll go see the teacher first and if it's not

addressed there, they'll come to see me. . . Generally people will be pretty forthright if they have a concern about what I think. And if not, given the collegial structure, somebody will say maybe not use the name but say that someone at one of our sessions, somebody is uncomfortable with this. . . you've got constraints of contract, you've got some constraints of school board policy and so forth, but you try to, you try to set out within those to start with so you're not running into too many brick walls. . . the most difficult challenge I have had would be the teacher who can't accept a particular kid the way he is, you know, the teacher who wants them all to come a certain way. . . Early on here there was a lot of lounge talking about individual kids that I thought was not healthful or productive and I really worked to extinguish that. . . [at the district level] if I wanted to try something new. . . I would have to present a rationale. I would have to show them all the problems that would ensue; I would have to demonstrate how it wasn't going to step on anybody's toes. You know, there wouldn't be a lot of, I hesitate to say deliberate road blocks, but there would be road blocks. . . Everybody will say money or an additional teacher. I would say another six hours in my day. I need more time. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

Three key informant interviews were conducted. Each of the teachers volunteered to participate and were selected because they represented a cross-section of the grade levels and programs at the school. The purpose of the key informant interviews was to verify in general terms the information provided by the principal in the structured interview relative to deterrents to change. This researcher asked the teachers about a significant challenge or challenges the principal faced that they were aware of rather than using the Fullan language of deterrents to change in order to avoid having to define terms and possibly influence responses. The key informant interview was initially structured around eight questions (Appendix F) but in several instances follow-up questions were required. A narrative text display was used to report the data.

#### Key Informant #1

. . . We are the only building in the district that has this early childhood program and I get little glimpses and words here and there. I know it's a tremendous responsibility. All this testing that goes on in early childhood and I know the teachers. . . I know they're frustrated with certain things that go on and she never complains. Never, never even infers that she has more than other

principals to deal with and I think this has to be a real challenge to her because those kids are not easy. . .

### Key Informant #2

. . . I think the constant play of personalities among teachers and in the past. Since I came here three or four years ago, she has hired quite a few new teachers and I think that has to be a challenge as far as finding the right person for the job and then matching young personalities in some cases with older, more experienced teachers and sort of leading everybody to mutual respect. . .

### Key Informant #3

. . . The challenge that I see happening all the time and I think it is probably one of the principal's most difficult jobs is when staff have problems with each other or there is a little bit of disagreement or something and as difficult as things are she can always just go on and not let it get her down. I never see her harbor any resentment, she treats everybody the same all the time. . . And the other challenge I would say is having the early childhood programs here because I know the amount of time it takes from the job. You know there are four special ed classrooms, four sessions, two classrooms, they take an unbelievable amount of time and she has to be in on all the meetings from the initial placement to the annual reviews--it takes a lot of time. . .

Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership?

### Principal Interview

A total of twenty-five questions were asked of the principal in a structured interview format. Follow-up questions were asked in some instances for purposes of clarification and elaboration. This research question was designed to address the issue of the impact of the Illinois legislation on the effective principal requiring that a majority of the principal's time be spent on the improvement of instruction. As discussed in Chapters I and II, this requirement was written in broad terms and consequently might be interpreted in a variety of ways. What cues did the principal pay attention to? It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the responses of the principal might be related to the number of years in the position and the situational context of the principalship. Principal Ecu was appointed to her first

principalship-13 years before the passage of the Education Reform Act of 1985. A narrative text display was used to report Principal Ecrú's cryptic response to this research question.

. . . Well the truth of the matter is I haven't changed a whole lot, what I do, since that time. That's because what I do is right. And I also suspect that if a principal was really adamantly opposed to or inept at, or set in his old ways, no amount of law is going to change, you know, what he does. Because there is no overseer in this law. Superintendents are not out everyday, in the buildings, seeing what principals are doing. There's a whole lot of trust out there, a whole lot of good faith. . . I think the oversight in the law will be a lot less formal. It will be parents, you know, who will have some sense of. . . It will be kids who rat or teachers who will rat on principals that don't ever do such and such. . . and that pre-dated the law anyway and they (legislators) already knew that. . .

### Key Informant Interviews

There was no question within the key informant structured interview format which was designed to address this research question. It was felt that only the principal would be able to respond to this question since this research question was designed to explore the principal's interpretation and response to the law.

### The Principal And Teacher Perceiver Surveys

The case survey data source required the development of a 36 item closed-ended coding instrument (Appendices D and G) administered to both principals and teachers. Three questions were developed to explore each of the twelve characteristics described in the theoretical framework in Chapter II. The case survey principal's responses were translated into numerical equivalents and cross-checked with the teachers' aggregated responses item by item. Frequency and mean scores of the teachers' responses were calculated. The data were disaggregated in terms of the three sub-groups. They were K-3 teachers, 4-5 teachers, and special area teachers. A total teacher score was calculated. It was determined by this researcher that this procedure was necessary in light of the work of Smith and Andrews (1989) which



found that a-principal was an instructional leader if the principal was perceived as such by the teachers who work with the principal on a daily basis. It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the teachers' perception of the principal would vary based upon whether the teacher was primary, intermediate, or special area due to the uniqueness of the principal-teacher relationship involved in each of the three teaching positions.

Table 17

Summary of Principal Ecu Perceiver Survey

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	D
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	E
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	C
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	D
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	C
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	D
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	D
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	C
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	C
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	E
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	D
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	C
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	B
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	No Response
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	No Response

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Rating
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	C
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	E
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	D
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	D
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	No Response
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	C
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	D
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	E
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	D
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	C

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 17

Table 17 indicated that Principal Ecpu rated herself lowest in the area of model with a (2.0), one of the school improvement behaviors. The remaining 32 statements which were responded to by Ecpu ranged from (3.0) or sometimes to (5.0) or almost always. Three probes in the areas of buffer, monitor, and model were not responded to by Ecpu on the survey. The clustering of the responses into school improvement, change facilitation, and instructional leadership categories revealed that visible presence, resource provider, and trainer received the highest ratings at slightly above frequently when averaged. Visible presence and resource provider belonged to the instructional leadership cluster. Trainer belonged to the change facilitation cluster. The only other characteristics to be rated highly by Ecpu with a cluster average of (4.0) or frequently were instructional resource and communicator which rounded out the instructional leadership cluster.

Table 18

Summary of Ecu K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses							35 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	E	D	E	D	C	E	E	31	4.43
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	E	E	E	D	C	E	E	32	4.57
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	E	E	E	D	D	D	E	32	4.57
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	D	E	E	D	E	E	32	4.57
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	C	E	E	E	E	E	E	33	4.71
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	C	C	D	E	C	E	D	27	3.86
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	23	3.29
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	E	E	D	D	D	E	D	31	4.43
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	E	D	D	D	- *	E	D	26/ 30	4.33
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	C	C	E	D	D	- *	C	22/ 30	3.67
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	C	D	C	D	D	D	D	28	4.0
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E	E	E	D	D	E	E	33	4.71

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses								35 Total	M
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	E	D	C	C	B	E	D	26	3.71	
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	E	E	D	C	C	E	E	30	4.29	
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	E	D	E	E	D	E	E	33	4.71	
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D	E	E	D	D	E	E	32	4.57	
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	35	5.0	
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	D	C	D	C	B	E	D	25	3.57	
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	B	B	B	A	A	D	- *	12/ 30	2.0	
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	E	E	E	C	C	- *	E	26/ 30	4.33	
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	D	E	B	D	- *	E	D	24/ 30	4.0	
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	C	D	D	E	D	- *	D	24/ 30	4.0	
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	C	D	C	C	C	- *	E	21/ 30	3.5	
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	B	E	E	D	A	E	- *	22/ 30	3.67	
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D	E	C	E	A	E	D	27	3.86	
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	E	E	C	E	A	E	E	29	4.14	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses							35	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	M
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E	E	D	D	C	E	E	31	4.43
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	E	D	C	E	C	E	E	30	4.29
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E	E	D	D	D	E	E	32	4.57
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	E	D	C	D	E	E	31	4.43
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E	D	D	E	E	E	E	33	4.71
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	E	D	C	D	C	- *	E	24 / 30	4.0
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	C	E	E	C	- *	E	E	26 / 30	4.33
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	C	C	C	C	D	D	E	25	3.57
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E	D	C	E	D	D	E	30	4.29
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	D	D	D	D	C	E	E	29	4.14

N = 7

- \* Missing Response

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RP = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Builder
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 18

Table 18 indicated that the K-3 primary teachers gave Principal Ecu the lowest scores on two of the probes in the areas of trainer and monitor, two of the change facilitation behaviors. These scores ranged between (3.57) and (3.67) or half-way between sometimes and frequently. On the same probes Principal Ecu gave herself a perfect (5.0) rating. Conversely, there were six probes where Principal Ecu rated herself significantly lower than the K-3 teachers did. They were in the areas of responsible party (2X) and culture builder, two of the school improvement behaviors; communicator, one of the instructional leadership behaviors; and developer and trainer, two of the change facilitation behaviors. There was no significant difference on the remaining probes between the principal's and the teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in terms of school improvement, change facilitation, and instructional leadership.



Table 19

Summary of Ecrú K-3 Teacher Perceiver Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	14	29	57
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	14	14	72
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	43	57
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	43	57
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	14	0	86
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	43	29	29
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	72	28	0
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	57	43
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf *	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	67	33

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M *	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	50	33	17
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	28	72	0
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	28	72
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	0	1	2	2	2	0	13	29	29	29
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	29	14	57
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	28	72
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	43	57
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	100
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	0	1	2	3	1	0	14	29	43	14
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col *	2	3	0	1	0	33	50	0	17	0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB *	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	33	0	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	*	Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	*	0	1	0	3	2	0	17	0	50	33
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	*	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	17	66	17
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	*	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	66	17	17
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	*	1	1	0	1	3	16	17	0	17	50
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR		1	0	1	2	3	14	0	14	29	43
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP		1	0	1	0	5	14	0	14	0	72
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C		0	0	1	2	4	0	0	14	29	57
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP		0	0	2	1	4	0	0	29	14	57
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa		0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	43	57

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	14	29	57
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	28	72
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB *	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	33	33	33
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf *	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	33	0	67
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	57	29	14
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	14	43	43
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	14	57	29

N = 7

\* = Missing Response

(table continues)

Key:  
A = Almost Never  
B = Seldom  
C = Sometimes  
D = Frequently  
E = Almost Always

Legend:  
IR = Instructional Resource  
RP = Resource Provider  
C = Communicator  
VP = Visible Presence  
RPa = Responsible Party  
M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
CB = Culture Builder  
Buf = Buffer  
TR = Trainer  
Dev = Developer  
Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 19

Table 19 indicated that there were a limited number of behaviors rated at the almost never or seldom levels by more than one teacher or 14 percent of the primary teachers on any of the three probes per characteristic. They were collaborator (83%) and trainer (33%). All of the remaining statements were rated at the frequently or almost always levels by 72 to 100 percent of the respondents except for model (2X at 58% each), collaborator (28%), monitor (2X at 50% and 43%, respectively), culture builder (2X at 67% each), instructional resource (58%), developer (34%), and buffer (67%). Interestingly, while collaborator received two of the lowest scores on two of the probes, it also received one of the highest scores on this characteristic as indicated above in item 31.

Table 20

Summary of Ecu Grades 4-5 Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses					M
		1	2	3	15 Total		
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D	E	E	14	4.67	
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	D	D	E	13	4.33	
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	D	D	D	12	4.0	
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	D	E	D	13	4.33	
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	14	4.67	
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	D	E	D	13	4.33	
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	D	E	E	14	4.67	
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	D	E	D	14	4.67	
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	D	D	D	12	4.0	
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	*	E	D	9/10	4.5	
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	*	D	E	9/10	4.5	
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	D	E	D	13	4.33	
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	D	E	D	13	4.33	
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	*	D	D	8/10	4.0	
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	E	E	E	15	5.0	
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D	E	D	13	4.33	
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	14	4.67	
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	D	C	C	10	3.33	
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	C	B	A	6	2.0	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Responses			15 Total	M
		1	2	3		
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	D	E	E	14	4.67
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	C	D	E	12	4.0
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	D	E	E	14	4.67
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	D	D	D	12	4.0
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	D	E	C	12	4.0
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	D	D	E	13	4.33
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	D	E	E	14	4.67
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	D	E	E	14	4.67
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	D	E	E	14	4.67
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E	E	C	13	4.33
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	E	E	15	5.0
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	E	E	E	15	5.0
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	E	E	C	13	4.33
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	D	E	D	13	4.33
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	D	E	C	12	4.0
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	D	E	E	14	4.67
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	D	E	E	14	4.67

N = 3

\* = Missing Response

(table continues)



Key: A = Almost Never = 1  
B = Seldom = 2  
C = Sometimes = 3  
D = Frequently = 4  
E = Almost Always = 5

Legend: IR = Instructional Resource  
RP = Resource Provider  
C = Communicator  
VP = Visible Presence  
RPa = Responsible Party  
M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
CB = Culture Builder  
Buf = Buffer  
TR = Trainer  
Dev = Developer  
Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 20

Table 20 indicated that the Grade 4-5 teachers gave Principal Ecu the lowest scores on three of the probes in the areas of trainer and monitor, two of the change facilitation characteristics, and resource provider, one of the instructional leadership characteristics. These scores were all rated at the 4.0 or frequently level. However, Principal Ecu had rated herself at the 5.0 or almost always level on these same probes. Conversely, Principal Ecu rated herself significantly lower on ten of the probes than the Grade 4-5 teachers did. They were in the areas of communicator (2X), responsible party (2X), collaborator, culture builder, developer (2X), monitor, and trainer. There was no significant difference between the principal's rating and the teachers' ratings on the remaining statements within the instructional leadership, school improvement, and change facilitation clusters.

Table 21

Summary of Ecrú Grade 4-5 Teacher Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100	0
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100	0

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	*	Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	*	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	50	50
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	*	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	50	50
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR		0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR		0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	*	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	100	0
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C		0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP		0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa		0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod		0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33	0
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col		1	1	1	0	0	33	33	33	0	0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB		0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	33	33	33
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100	0
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	33	33	33
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	33	0	67
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Frequency					Percent				
		A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	100
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	33	0	67
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf *	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	67	33
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	33	33	33
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	33	67

N = 3

\* = Missing Response

Key:

A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

Legend:

IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 21

Table 21 indicated that almost every statement was rated at the frequently or almost always levels by 100% of the respondents. Only model (33%), collaborator (0%), buffer (67%), trainer (67%), responsible party (67%), culture builder (67%), and monitor (67%) were not as indicated by the results on one of the three probes per characteristic.

Table 22

Summary of Ecu Special Area Teacher Perceiver Survey Responses and Mean Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	45 Total	M
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	D	E	E	E	E	E	C	- *	E	37/ 40	4.63
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	D	D	D	D	E	E	D	C	E	38	4.22
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	C	D	C	D	E	E	D	C	E	36	4.0
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	E	E	C	D	E	D	E	E	C	39	4.33
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	D	- *	D	E	D	E	36/ 40	4.5
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	D	E	E	D	E	D	D	D	E	40	4.44
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	C	D	B	D	E	E	E	C	- *	31/ 40	3.88
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	D	E	E	D	E	E	D	E	E	42	4.67
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	D	E	E	D	E	E	D	E	E	42	4.67
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	C	E	D	D	- *	D	E	D	E	34/ 40	4.25
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	C	E	D	C	E	D	E	D	C	36	4.0

(table continues)



Question	Principal Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	45 Total	M
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	E	E	C	E	- *	E	D	E	D	36/40	4.5
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	C	D	E	D	E	E	C	E	- *	34/40	4.25
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	C	E	C	D	- *	D	D	D	E	32/40	4.0
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	44	4.89
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	D	E	D	E	E	E	D	D	E	41	4.56
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	44	4.89
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	C	D	B	D	E	D	C	D	E	34	3.78
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	D	C	A	B	- *	D	A	A	- *	12	1.71
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	E	E	E	C	- *	E	C	E	E	36/40	4.5
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	- *	D	D	C	E	D	D	D	- *	28/35	4.0
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	E	E	E	C	- *	D	E	D	E	36/40	4.5
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	C	E	C	C	- *	D	D	D	C	29/40	3.63
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	E	E	E	D	- *	D	D	C	E	35/40	4.38
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	E	E	E	E	- *	E	C	C	E	36/40	4.5

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Behavior										45	<u>M</u>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total		
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	E	D	D	D	E	E	D	D	E	40	4.44	
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	E	E	D	D	E	D	E	D	E	41	4.56	
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	D	E	D	E	E	D	E	D	E	41	4.56	
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	E	E	D	E	E	D	C	D	E	40	4.44	
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	E	E	E	D	E	E	D	D	E	42	4.67	
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	D	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	44	4.89	
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	D	E	D	E	- *	E	D	D	- *	31 / 35	4.43	
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	C	E	E	D	E	E	D	D	- *	35 / 40	4.38	
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	C	E	C	C	E	D	C	D	D	30	3.33	
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	E	E	D	E	E	E	D	E	- *	38 / 40	4.75	
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	E	C	D	E	E	E	E	D	- *	36 / 40	4.5	

N = 9

- \* Missing Response

(table continues)

Key: A = Almost Never = 1  
B = Seldom = 2  
C = Sometimes = 3  
D = Frequently = 4  
E = Almost Always = 5

Legend: IR = Instructional Resource  
RP = Resource Provider  
C = Communicator  
VP = Visible Presence  
RPa = Responsible Party  
M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
CB = Culture Builder  
Buf = Buffer  
TR = Trainer  
Dev = Developer  
Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 22

Table 22 indicated that the special area teachers gave Principal Ecu the lowest scores on two probes in the areas of resource provider, one of the instructional leadership characteristics, and monitor, one of the change facilitation characteristics. These probes were rated at (4.0) and (3.33) by the teachers which translated into frequently and slightly above sometimes, respectively. However, Principal Ecu had rated herself at (5.0) on these same statements. Conversely, there were seven probes where the special area teachers rated Ecu significantly higher than she rated herself. They were in the areas of communicator, responsible party (2X), culture builder, monitor, developer, and trainer. There was no significant difference between the principal's rating and the teacher's ratings on the remaining statements within the instructional leadership, school improvement, and change facilitation clusters.

Table 23

Summary of Ecu Special Area Teacher Survey Frequency and Percent Scores

Question	Principal Behavior		Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	*	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	12.5	12.5	75
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP		0	0	1	5	3	0	0	11	56	33
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C		0	0	3	3	3	0	0	33	33	33
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP		0	0	2	2	5	0	0	22	22	56
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	*	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	50	50
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod		0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	56	44
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	*	0	1	2	2	3	0	12	25	25	38
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and in the effort among teachers.	CB		0	0	1	1	7	0	0	11	11	78
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf		0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	33	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	*	Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	*	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	12	50	38
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev		0	0	3	3	3	0	0	33	33	33
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	*	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	12	25	63
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	*	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	25	25	50
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	*	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	25	50	25
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C		0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	11	89
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP		0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	44	56
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa		0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	11	89
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod		0	1	2	4	2	0	11	22	45	22
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	*	3	1	1	2	0	43	14	14	29	0
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	*	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	25	0	75

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	*	Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	*	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	22	56	22
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	*	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	12	25	63
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	*	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	50	38	12
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	*	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	12	38	50
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	*	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	25	0	75
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP		0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	56	44
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C		0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	44	56
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP		0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	44	56
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa		0	0	1	3	5	0	0	11	33	56
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod		0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	33	67

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior		Frequency					Percent				
			A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	*	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	11	89
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	*	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	57	43
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	*	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	12	38	50
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M		0	0	4	3	2	0	0	44	33	22
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	*	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	25	75
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	*	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	12	25	63

N = 9

\* = Missing Response

Key:  
 A = Almost Never  
 B = Seldom  
 C = Sometimes  
 D = Frequently  
 E = Almost Always

Legend:  
 IR = Instructional Resource  
 RP = Resource Provider  
 C = Communicator  
 VP = Visible Presence  
 RPa = Responsible Party  
 M = Monitor

Col = Collaborator  
 CB = Culture Builder  
 Buf = Buffer  
 TR = Trainer  
 Dev = Developer  
 Mod = Model



### Analysis of Table 23

Table 23 indicated that there were only seven probes where fewer than 75% of the respondents rated Principal Ecrú at the frequently or almost always levels. They were communicator (67%), collaborator (2X at 63% and 29%), model ((67%), developer (2X at 67% and 50%), and monitor (56%).

Table 24

Summary of Ecu Aggregated Teacher M Scores In Comparison to Principal Scores

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\bar{n} = 7$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 3$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 9$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\bar{N} = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/-1.0
1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.	IR	4.0	4.43	4.67	4.63	4.56	
2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.	RP	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.22	4.37	
3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.	C	3.0	4.57	4.0	4.0	4.21	+1.21
4. I make frequent classroom observations.	VP	5.0	4.57	4.33	4.33	4.42	
5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.	RPa	3.0	4.71	4.67	4.5	4.61	+1.61
6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.	Mod	4.0	3.86	4.33	4.44	4.21	
7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.	Col	3.0	3.29	4.67	3.88	3.78	
8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.	CB	4.0	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.58	
9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.	Buf	4.0	4.33	4.0	4.67	4.44	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\bar{n} = 7$ K-3 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 3$ 4-5 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 9$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\bar{N} = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goal.	M	3.0	3.67	4.5	4.25	4.06	+1.14
11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.	Dev	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.17	+1.17
12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.	TR	5.0	4.71	4.33	4.5	4.56	
13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	IR	4.0	3.71	4.33	4.25	4.06	
14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	RP	5.0	4.29	4.0	4.0	4.12	
15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.	C	4.0	4.71	5.0	4.89	4.84	
16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.	VP	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.56	4.53	
17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.	RPa	3.0	5.0	4.67	4.89	4.89	+1.89
18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.	Mod	3.0	3.57	3.33	3.78	3.63	
19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.	Col	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.71	1.88	
20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.	CB	4.0	4.33	4.67	4.5	4.47	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\bar{n} = 7$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 3$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$\bar{n} = 9$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\bar{N} = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.	Buf	- *	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.	M	- *	4.0	4.07	4.5	4.35	
23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.	Dev	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.63	3.65	
24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.	TR	5.0	3.67	4.0	4.38	4.06	
25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.	IR	4.0	3.86	4.33	4.5	4.22	
26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.	RP	4.0	4.14	4.67	4.44	4.37	
27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.	C	5.0	4.43	4.67	4.56	4.53	
28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	VP	4.0	4.29	4.67	4.56	4.47	
29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.	RPa	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.44	4.47	
30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.	Mod	- *	4.43	5.0	4.67	4.63	
31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.	Col	5.0	4.71	5.0	4.89	4.84	

(table continues)

Question	Principal Behavior	Principal Score	$\underline{n} = 7$ K - 3 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 3$ 4 - 5 <u>M</u>	$\underline{n} = 9$ Sp. Area <u>M</u>	$\underline{N} = 19$ Total <u>M</u>	+/- 1.0
32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.	CB	3.0	4.0	4.33	4.43	4.25	+1.25
33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.	Buf	4.0	4.37	4.33	4.38	4.35	
34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.	M	5.0	3.57	4.0	3.33	3.53	-1.47
35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.	Dev	4.0	4.29	4.67	4.75	4.56	
36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.	TR	3.0	4.14	4.67	4.5	4.39	+1.39

$\underline{N} = 19$

83% Return

- \* = Missing Response

<b>Key:</b>	A = Almost Never = 1	<b>Legend:</b>	IR = Instructional Resource	Col = Collaborator
	B = Seldom = 2		RPr = Resource Provider	CB = Culture Guider
	C = Sometimes = 3		C = Communicator	Buf = Buffer
	D = Frequently = 4		VP = Visible Presence	TR = Trainer
	E = Almost Always = 5		RPa = Responsible Party	Dev = Developer
			M = Monitor	Mod = Model

### Analysis of Table 24

Table 24 indicated that there were several significant discrepancies between the principal's perception of her behavior in the three research areas. In only one instance, however, was the principal's rating higher than the teachers' aggregated scores. It was in the area of monitor, one of the change facilitations behaviors. All three sub-groups of teachers rated Principal Ecu below her score on the same probe (Statement 34). Mean scores were judged to be significant if they deviated from the principal's score by more than 1.0. There were, however, seven areas where the principal's rating of herself was lower than the teachers' aggregated scores. They were in the areas of communicator, one of the instructional leadership behaviors; monitor, developer, and trainer, three of the change facilitation behaviors; and responsible party (2X) and culture builder, two of the school improvement behaviors. Interestingly, when the discrepant scores were disaggregated, the Grade 4-5 teachers rated the principal lower than both the K-3 and the special area teachers did. At the same time, the Grade 4-5 teachers rated the principal higher than the other groups on other probes than the principal did herself. This supported the hypothesis that different categories of teachers would view the principal differently. This was possibly due to the amount of time the principal spent with each sub-group of teachers.

### On-Site Observations

Direct observation of three effective principals as they engaged in school improvement, instructional leadership, and change facilitation activities provided another source of evidence for this study. Principal Ecu was observed for a total of 20 hours. The five four-hour block arrangement permitted this researcher to observe different time segments in the day-to-day activities of the principal. An

observational matrix protocol was used for each observation in this study (Appendix A).

The observational matrix was generated from a synthesis of the three distinct research arenas described in Chapter II. The purpose of the matrix was to aid the researcher in coding the data during the observation segments. Data collection points were established at half-hour intervals. Related to the model developed in the theoretical section of Chapter II (Selection Of A Theoretical Framework For This Study), it was assumed that the observation matrix would assist the researcher in documenting those principal behaviors as they were observed. The identified codes were (a) observed; (b) not observed, not relevant; and (c) missed opportunity.

Table 25

Summary of Ecrú On-Site Observations

	Total of Code "Observed"							
	30' Time Series Intervals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Visible Presence	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
2. Instructional Resource	2	3	5	4	3	2	2	2
3. Resource Provider	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	2
4. Communicator	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5. Trainer	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2
6. Developer	0	1	2	1	2	3	2	2
7. Buffer	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	2
8. Model	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
9. Collaborator	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
10. Culture Builder	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
11. Monitor	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
12. Responsible Party	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

N = 5

Codes: 1. 0 = Observed  
 2. N = Not Observed, Not Relevant  
 3. M = Missed Opportunity

Analysis Of Table 25

Monitor and responsible party received the maximum of five tallies in each of the half-hour segments. Monitor was one of the change facilitation behaviors.

Responsible party was one of the school improvement behaviors. The fewest number of observations were recorded in the change facilitation cluster with buffer being the lowest. The greatest number of observations were recorded in the school improvement cluster with responsible party being the highest.

#### Archival Records And Documents Examination

Archival records and documents were considered together given the nature of their form. They were examined away from the study site with the exception of the teacher evaluation records which were examined in the principal's office.

An audit analysis form was developed (Appendix H) to assist this researcher in summarizing the information listed in the evaluation records in terms of the 12 principal behaviors that are the basis of this study. This researcher had assumed based upon her experience as a principal that the evaluation records would state the number of minutes over the course of an evaluation year that the case study principal was in the classroom for evaluative purposes. Such was not the case either because of contract language which stipulated the number and length of evaluation visits or it was deemed unimportant by the study principal. Thus, there was no way to ascertain or verify the principal's information on this issue in record form. The on-site observations of Principal Ecu did confirm a very high level of visible presence and monitoring behaviors as did the survey across all three sub-groups of Principal Ecu's teachers.

The audit analysis revealed that of the nine randomly selected teacher personnel files, most of the teachers were rated at the meets district expectations level. Ecu's district required the principal to respond to 14 statements using a three point scale defined by the terms: exceeds district expectations, meets district expectations, and does not meet district expectations. Only one of the randomly selected teacher evaluation files reviewed by this researcher was marked in almost all areas at the



exceeds district expectations level. When questioned about this, Principal E cru responded that the "exceeds were for the truly fantastic performances" in terms of the evaluation statements and that the teachers understood this. This suggested to this researcher that Principal E cru was consistently involved in trying to change teacher behavior by engaging in developing and monitoring behaviors. Principal E cru stated the following on a teacher's formal record in Spring, 1990:

I believe that Miss X needs to become involved in some district offered coursework opportunities such as salary plus coursework or specific curriculum related courses.

Principal E cru's opening year faculty agenda was most revealing in terms of the 12 research behaviors. Of the 9 enumerated topics, 5 related to school improvement goals. Likewise, subsequent agendas and bulletins revealed a heavy emphasis on instructional items. This suggested a principal engaged in the behaviors of instructional resource, communicator, model, culture builder, and responsible party.

Extensive teacher input existed in the form of needs assessments, principal evaluations, and surveys. Samples of weekly newsletters to the parents were reviewed. This data strengthened this researcher's analysis of a principal engaged in communicator and collaborator behaviors.

### Summary

Principal E cru had 18 years of experience in the principalship in the fall of 1990, 8 years of which were at her current building. She was rated as effective by her immediate supervisor, the deputy superintendent. Research by Fullan, Tyler, and Goodlad as reported in previous chapters confirmed that changes required five to seven years minimally to institutionalize. In terms of the research question relative to the relationship between the principal's longevity and the institutionalization of

change, it seemed appropriate to draw the conclusion that changes had been institutionalized and that the school continued to improve as well. On the basis of the surveys and the interviews, it also could be concluded that she displayed all of the behaviors associated with principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement.

Chapter VII will present the cross-case analysis.

## CHAPTER VII

### A STUDY OF THREE PRINCIPALS: A CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

This study was about how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to isolate any factors which were deterrents to change; and isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

The concepts of principal as instructional leader and as organizational change agent had been the focus of study for nearly two decades by a number of scholars. However, until recently, the principal as instructional leader and the principal as organizational change agent were two separate research arenas. The principal as instructional leader research studies focused on what principals did to support teaching and learning. The principal as organizational change agent research studies identified conditions and practices which promoted significant, durable change in educational programs. Specific contributions of the principal were identified

(Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; DeBevoise, 1984; Fullan, 1982; Hord et al., 1987; Rosenblum & Jastrzob, 1980; Sarason, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The merging of the principal as instructional leader research with the principal as organizational change agent research was clearly seen in the school improvement research (Barth, 1990; Fullan, 1982; Goodlad, 1975; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Joyce, Hersh, & McKibben, 1983; and Sergiovanni, 1990).

This chapter is divided into four parts. The first part reports and analyzes the similarities and differences among these three principals in the area of supporting teaching and learning as reflected in the instructional leadership research. The second part describes and analyzes the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in terms of their longevity in the current position and the change facilitation and school improvement research. The third part isolates and compares the deterrents to change that each principal faced and their relationship to longevity in the position. The fourth part compares and contrasts the impact of the Education Reform Act passed by the Illinois General Assembly in 1985 on these principals in terms of their number of years as a principal.

#### How Did Effective Principals Support Teaching And Learning?

As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement. The following four factors were drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Instructional leadership was defined by Smith and Andrews as the principal's focused effort on the improvement of instruction; i.e. improvement of teaching and learning as measured by increased student achievement.

Table 26

Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview Instructional Leadership Data

Principal	Similarities	Instructional Leadership Behaviors	Differences	Instructional Leadership Behaviors
Blue	multi-assessments sharing	instructional resource communicator	restructured delivery of bilingual services  eliminated pull-outs  instituted all heterogeneous grouping	instructional resource
White	multi-assessments sharing observing	instructional resource communicator visible presence	hiring teaching	communicator instructional resource
Ecrú	multi-assessments sharing observing	instructional resource communicator visible presence	talks with students and teachers about student progress	communicator instructional resource

Analysis of Table 26

The similarities among the three principals were striking but predictable in terms of the research within the instructional leadership cluster. All three had been rated as effective in their positions by their immediate supervisors. On the basis of the interviews, the greatest similarities occurred in terms of the communicator and instructional resource characteristics. Resource provider was a commonality from the perspective that it was generally omitted from their responses during the

interviews. This could be explained from the viewpoint that much in the way of human and material resources was readily available in these districts either through district or PTA channels. Thus, acting as a resource provider was not a high priority or of immediate concern.

The differences were due to the uniqueness of each setting and the uniqueness of each principal. This could be explained by the situational view of the principalship described in Chapters I and II. However, the specific differences, regardless of their uniqueness, could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals. Thus, a behavior's absence in the differences column was not viewed negatively. Instructional resource repeatedly occurred in both columns. The biggest difference overall occurred between Principal Blue and her two colleagues. The specific behavior of observing translated as visible presence was missing in her responses but present for White and Ecu as listed in the similarities column. Likewise, illustrations which would denote a communicator behavior were missing from the differences column for Blue only. These differences could also be explained by comparing the numbers of years of experience for each principal which will be discussed more fully in subsequent tables. Since Blue was early into her first principalship and White and Ecu were at mid and end points of their careers, it could be inferred that Blue was interested in structural or organizational issues which were the basic building blocks of schooling. Hence, her energy was focused in the areas of programs and student grouping.

Table 27

Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Instructional Leadership Interview Data

Principal	Similarities	Instructional Leadership Behavior	Differences	Instructional Leadership Behavior
Blue	Encourage Supportive Praise Respect Knows students Knows what's going on Upbeat, positive	Instructional resource	Has teacher apply for training scholarship	Instructional resource
		Visible presence	Routes mail of interest to teacher	Communicator
White	Positive outlook Supportive Encouragement Communicates Respect	Instructional resource	Encourages risk-taking	Instructional resource
		Communicator		
Ecrú	Keeps teachers well-informed Supportive Knows what's going on Praise Respect	Visible presence	Sets clear goals Acquires materials Monitors	Visible presence
		Instructional resource		Resource provider
		Communicator		Instructional resource

### Analysis of Table 27

The key informant interviews tended to verify all of the principals' responses with respect to the question of how effective principals supported teaching and learning. The greatest similarities occurred in terms of the instructional resource characteristic. Both White and Ecrú were described by their teachers in terms which corresponded to the communicator characteristic. One of White's teachers even stated directly that White was a good communicator. Both Blue and Ecrú were described in terms which corresponded to the visible presence characteristic. Ecrú was described in the similarities column on the basis of three of the four characteristics within the instructional leadership cluster. Interestingly, when the differences column was analyzed in conjunction with the similarities then all four characteristics of instructional leadership were observed in Ecrú. In terms of Blue, it could be concluded that Blue's teachers as represented by the key informants had a more complete picture of her in terms of instructional leadership than her own interview revealed about herself.

Generally speaking, the analysis of both Table 26 and Table 27 together revealed that all three principals were instructional leaders in terms of this study's theoretical framework. However, the unique differences could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their specific contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals.



Table 28

Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Survey Data

Instructional Resource	Blue	Blue	Sp. Area	White	White		Sp. Area	Ecru	Ecru		Sp. Area
		K - 3			K - 3	4 - 5			K - 3	4 - 5	
Probe #1	4.0	4.17	3.43	4.0	4.64	4.5	4.83	4.0	4.43	4.67	4.63
Probe #13	3.0	2.92	2.57	4.0	3.7	3.5	4.3	4.0	3.71	4.33	4.25
Probe #25	4.0	3.33	2.86	4.0	4.5	3.83	4.5	4.0	3.86	4.33	4.5
Resource Provider											
Probe #2	5.0	4.17	3.57	5.0	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.22
Probe #14	4.0	3.67	3.0	4.0	4.27	4.3	4.2	5.0	4.29	4.0	4.0
Probe #26	4.0	2.83	2.57	4.0	3.72	3.83	4.5	4.0	4.14	4.67	4.44
Visible Presence											
Probe #4	5.0	4.25	3.14	4.0	3.82	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.57	4.33	4.33
Probe #16	5.0	3.83	3.71	5.0	4.91	4.5	4.67	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.56
Probe #28	5.0	4.17	3.43	4.0	4.2	3.33	4.5	4.0	4.29	4.67	4.56
Communicator											
Probe #3	3.0	3.33	2.57	4.0	3.5	3.67	4.3	3.0	4.57	4.0	4.0
Probe #15	4.0	3.33	3.57	5.0	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.0	4.71	5.0	4.89
Probe #27	4.0	3.33	2.71	5.0	3.9	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.43	4.67	4.56

Key: 1.0 = Almost Never    2.0 = Seldom    3.0 = Sometimes    4.0 = Frequently    5.0 = Almost Always

The probe number corresponds to the survey statement number (See Appendices D and G)

### Analysis of Table 28

The comparison of the principal perceiver survey results with the teacher perceiver survey results were very revealing in light of Smith and Andrews' research (1989) which indicated that a principal was not an instructional leader unless perceived as such by the principal's teachers. This researcher had hypothesized that the perception of the principal as instructional leader would vary among the various sub-groups of teachers. For that reason the data were disaggregated by grade level and special area teachers.

Principal Blue received her highest ratings from the K-3 teachers. Only 2 of the possible 12 statements were rated by the teachers lower than Principal Blue rated herself. A rating was considered significant if it varied by more than 1.0 from the principal's rating. On the other hand, the special area teachers rated 7 of the possible 12 statements lower than Principal Blue rated herself. Overall, the two characteristics which received the highest ratings with only two probes given scores lower than the principal's scores by either of the two sub-groups were instructional resource and communicator. Visible presence and resource provider were rated the lowest by both groups of teachers. However, the K-3 teachers only rated one of the three probes per characteristic below the principal's rating for both visible presence and resource provider. The special area teachers rated all three probes for visible presence and two of the three probes for resource provider below the principal's score. These results supported the hypothesis that the different sub-groups of teachers would view the principal differently. Interestingly, in many cases the principal tended to view herself as performing at the almost always level while the special area teachers viewed her as performing from between slightly below sometimes to slightly below frequently.

Principal White received consistently high ratings which paralleled her own self-evaluations in all areas of the instructional leadership cluster of behaviors. There was only one of the three probes in the communicator category where the K-3 and 4-5 teachers rated her below her own evaluation. White rated herself almost always while the teachers rated her frequently. On the same probe there was no such discrepancy between the special area teachers and the principal.

Principal Ecu received consistently high ratings in all areas of the instructional leadership cluster of behaviors. In several instances, Principal Ecu rated herself lower than the teachers did. In no other case did this occur when the comparison of the instructional leadership behaviors was made among the three principals.

In summary, one possible explanation for these phenomena was the longevity of the principal in the position as it related to both the principal's and the teachers' perception of the principal's performance within the instructional leadership cluster of behaviors. Principal Blue had completed 3 years of her first principalship; Principal White had completed 9 years of her first principalship, and Principal Ecu had completed 18 years of her third principalship.

Table 29

Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Observational Data

Instructional Leadership Characteristic	Total of Code "Observed"					
	Blue*		White		Ecu	
	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Visible presence	100	32	100	40	93	37
Instructional resource	41	13	23	9	58	23
Resource provider	25	8	18	7	48	19
Communicator	100	32	100	40	98	39
* <u>N</u> = 32 (4 visits)			<u>N</u> = 40 (5 visits)			

Analysis of Table 29

The comparison of the observational data collected during the on-site visitations was very revealing in terms of the instructional leadership behaviors. In some instances it tended to contradict the evidence collected through the interview and survey data sources. All three principals received very high percentages in the visible presence and communicator categories. Principal Ecu received the highest percentages in all four instructional leadership categories. All three principals received their lowest percentages in the resource provider area. Principal Blue exceeded Principal White in the percentages accumulated in the instructional resource and the resource provider areas.

One explanation for the contradictions between the teacher survey results and the on-site data could be that since this researcher was not collecting on-site data in terms of contacts with various sub-groups of teachers it could not be expected that the data would yield the same results as the surveys and interviews. Another explanation could be that the survey represented longitudinal data while the five four

hour on-site visits were short, random visits in the early part of the school year and could in no way represent the totality of the relationship between the teachers and the principal in terms of instructional leadership.

Table 30

Summary of Cross-Case Instructional Leadership Documentation Data

Principal	Instructional Issues on Opening Year		Instructional Issues on Successive	
	Agenda		Agendas	
Blue	Yes		No	
White	No		Yes	
Ecru	Yes		Yes	

Analysis of Table 30

The comparison of faculty meeting agendas was equally revealing in terms of the number of years each principal had served in that role and their individualized approach to instructional leadership. Principal Blue's opening year agenda clearly focused on instructional goals for the year. Her subsequent agendas did not. Principal Ecru began the year with an emphasis on instructional goals which extended throughout the year as reflected on the randomly selected agendas. Principal White did not discuss instructional goals at the first faculty meeting but did on all subsequent agendas.

Tales Of Three Principals

In Chapter III a vignette of a principal engaged in the day-to-day tasks of "principaling", written by Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers in 1988, was provided for the reader in order to transition to this study's theoretical framework from the review of the literature. The vignette, one version of a thick descriptive device

known as the narrative text display, was permitted within the parameters of qualitative methodology. It seemed appropriate to use this same technique in the section about how principals supported teaching and learning in their schools in Chapter VII. What follows represented portions of the transcribed field notes from this researcher's first visit to the three sites during the opening weeks of school in the 1990-1991 school year. The purpose of the vignettes was to aid the reader in understanding the situational context and the uniqueness of the three case study principals who were bound together only by their effectiveness as instructional leaders.

### Principal Blue

Friday, August 31, 1990

The aged three story schoolhouse, once upon a time a junior high school, towered above the small asphalt playground which surrounded it. The grounds were neat and free of debris but this observer's eyes were drawn immediately to the windows, brown-tinted, shiny, sleek, modern and incongruous in light of the chiseled notation "1930" on the cornerstone to the left of the front entrance. Principal Blue was already in her office speaking with a preschool teacher at 7:28 a.m. about a parent's concern. It was teacher institute day. There were no children but lots of last minute details to wrap up.

At 7:41 a.m. Blue received a telephoned request from a principal colleague to meet at his school at 8:30 a.m. to discuss the physical education schedule. At 7:53 a.m. the physical education department chairperson called requesting her presence as soon as possible. She complied. Quickly stopping by the secretary's desk to collect sample schedules, respond to a few questions, she was off in a hurry by 8:00 a.m. Seven minutes later, Principal Blue was reviewing the changes the teachers proposed

which would cut teacher travelling time by a third. She praised them for their ingenuity and the proposal was accepted unilaterally because her colleague was not present. She suggested they work together on next year's (1991-1992) schedule and was back in her car and on the road by 8:30 a.m. No meeting this day was held with her colleague to discuss the physical education schedule. She arrived ten minutes late for the institute at her partner school across the playground which housed Grades 4-5.

She rejected talking with her colleagues huddled in the back of the gymnasium and proceeded directly to the area where many of her teachers were seated and joined them. At 9:00 a.m. she asked the host principal to turn off the air conditioning fan so her teachers could hear the presentation. He refused stating that the teachers in workshops upstairs would suffocate because there were no windows.

Several of the teachers inquired of the speaker about the demonstration videos and where to get them. Principal Blue assured them she would get a set of these training tapes for them. One of the teachers offered to make copies. At 9:40 a.m. she spoke with the science coordinator about their immediate acquisition. Blue reported the unfavorable outcome to her teachers during the break at 10:00 a.m. She suggested that perhaps instead of using commercial training tapes for the new science program that she videotape the teacher from their school, who was on the science committee demonstrating "hands-on" science techniques, at work in her classroom and use these videos at faculty meetings. Blue received lots of favorable comments for this suggestion.

After the break at 10:10 a.m. Principal Blue actively participated with her teachers in small groups as they practiced the experiments. She exuded humor, camaraderie, and warmth. Exchanges were made about the usefulness of cooperative learning and "hands-on" science. Principal and teachers were working together.

Despite the heat and humidity, the collective minds were on learning. A common refrain of Principal Blue's was "let's do it" as the ideas were generated and examined by the group.

At 10:45 a.m. Blue left the inservice to return to her building. On the short walk back, the social worker caught up to ask a question about her schedule. The matter was resolved quickly. Blue once again stopped, this time to talk to a passing student. Five minutes later she was answering her secretary's questions about placement and transportation issues.

The interactions began to mount. First, the English as a Second Language teacher asked about materials; then there was a compliment paid to the physical education teacher who entered the office about this morning's collaborative efforts. The interactions continued. Another teacher, an aide, a parent, and a phone call from the same principal who had called earlier about the physical education schedule. This time his inquiry was about reading. Blue explained the decision not to purchase reading workbooks in order to free up money for literature books and classroom libraries.

At 11:12 a. m. she asked the secretary to tell her when the science demonstration teacher returned to the building. Her purpose in this was to compliment the teacher on a job well done and share the videotaping idea with her for their use at the faculty meetings. At 11:27 as this researcher was preparing to leave an incoming call from transportation was transferred to her by the secretary in the midst of a conversation with the head custodian. The various interactions were unending for this busy principal as she began her fourth year in the position.



Principal WhiteMonday, September 10, 1990

Like a sentry standing guard, this principal monitored the comings and goings of all during the noon lunch hour. "Hello, yes this is the principal's office," interrupting her conversation with a teacher. Almost immediately, one learned that this high energy, eight year veteran moved and talked very quickly. Punctuated stops in every space to tell a story, issue a compliment, make a connection, extend a touch were what she was about. This school exuded warmth and caring because the principal exuded warmth and caring towards each and every human being--parent, child, teacher, custodian, and secretary.

Due to the death of a kindergarten teacher's mother and her absence, the kindergarteners needed to be reassured that their teacher did not die and that she would be back very soon. "Mrs. (X) is happy because her mommy is in heaven. When you say your prayers tonight, please think of her. Mrs. (X) will be very happy to know how good you are when she returns."

Between lunch and a 2:30 p.m. parent conference there was no rest. Every room was entered, even the gym class was visited outside in 80 degree heat. "There are 13 new teachers this year. Each one needs reassurance. . . I'm so proud of them. . . X was an aide; X was a student teacher. I prefer to hire people I've seen work. . ." "I'm very proud of this, pointing at a telephone. The teachers wanted a phone at the other end of the building for security reasons when they stayed late. We got it but because I did all the legwork. . . 15 calls to the phone company, preparing the specifications, all with no help from district level. . . The same is true for our new teacher's lounge and computer lab. . . I'm not proud that I waited so long to fix up the teacher's lounge but the staff told me 'Mary, you've worked on staff development,

curriculum, and instruction; now it's about time to work on the facility'. . . It's so important for morale and climate."

Just on time, back in the office for the 2:30 conference with a parent who was relocating to Boston and wanted help in preparing questions to ask the Massachusetts' educators.

At 3:10, freely and unhurriedly, for the first time this visit the principal shared her thoughts about her position with this researcher. Her office was a home, appealing and warm. No institutional accoutrements here beyond the dark paneled but recessed bookshelves. In some ways they were reminiscent of those found in a family room next to a glowing fireplace. Prints and pictures, in elegantly, modern chrome finished frames abounded. Most pronounced was the (X) School Mission Statement behind the principal's desk which no visitor could miss. Also framed and conspicuously placed was the following statement attributed to Anonymous.

An average teacher tells.  
A good teacher explains.  
An excellent teacher demonstrates.  
A superior teacher inspires.

Prints of children and children being hugged were the subjects of the pictures. Knick-knacks, each with a story to tell of friendship, love, and appreciation, began to draw this researcher's attention away from the walls. If the walls could speak, no doubt they would say, 'In this office dwells a principal who loves openly and unabashedly all who enter.'

### Principal Ecu

Wednesday, September 5, 1990

The first sighting revealed a clean, well-kept exterior surrounding a distinctly middle-aged facility. Three flags, hung by the custodian, and waving from the flagpole beckoned all visitors to enter the front door. These nation, state, and district

symbols, flying together as one, foreshadowed an educational organization whose parts were linked by traditional values and community pride.

There was no designated parking space for the principal. Yet customary practice by virtue of unspoken dialogue left the space nearest the door for the principal.

The principal's arrival at 7:25 a.m., the first staff member on the scene after the custodian, set in motion a whirlwind of activity characterized by numerous humorous exchanges. Her first contact was with the custodian, obviously a friend. "Hi, Vaclav. Guess what came to dinner last night? Mrs. X says she saw a mouse run into the closet before the PTA Board meeting. Let's find the mouse." On to her office, a quick deposit of briefcase and lunch and the principal was off and about. A hand written daily memo containing reminders about curricula, instructional procedures, and the day's activities was posted on a cork board by the mailboxes. "Hi, guys" as a trio of teachers entered the office. Back to her inner office to open windows. "I don't use the AC because the teachers and children don't have it. I feel so guilty because of course they are the ones who should have it."

She headed to the stage for the second faculty meeting of the year. "I must be on time. My own goals are past due to the deputy. I told him that since I was about change facilitation and the teachers who will be affected by the change should be involved in shaping the change, I needed time to meet with them to do this. I'll get them to him soon." Twenty-four teachers sat side by side around one large rectangular table made up of four smaller ones. The principal comfortably slid in between two teachers. She explained to me in an aside that she often likes to break the teachers down into smaller work groups and the four smaller tables allowed her to do this quickly and efficiently. Lots of talk about the heat and humidity abounded. Ecu stated, "When I was in your room yesterday, I was reading your lips. The fan was so

noisy." But quickly the focus changed as the principal said, "What we would like to get done today is firm up our school-based management outline to submit. But first since one of our goals is to change the learning center operation under the leadership of our new LRC director, she will speak to us about our progress toward this goal". . . "There's a principals' meeting at 3:45 p.m. today and I'm sure to get more clarification. One thing I know is I don't have all the answers. We will work together to change the concept and flesh it out as the year progresses. Our school likes to feel that we empower each other, cooperate, and communicate. We want to build consensus."

"Does anybody have questions?". . . "That's a real good question. [Ecrú's] school improvement team membership is five-two elected by the faculty, one appointed by the principal, the principal, and one appointed by the group. Do you feel ready to elect today? OK, Maryann and Laura, will you conduct the elections, tabulate the ballots, and give me the results?"..."Let me tell you about last night's PTA board meeting. There is good news and bad. There will be no Halloween carnival [lots of sighs of relief] but they will schedule something for February. It was a good meeting, effective."

' One teacher asked about the PTA purchasing fans for the rooms. "I know where you're coming from but the way they make a decision is based upon how will most kids benefit. . . and with so few days that a fan is really needed, it would not meet this criteria. . . I know it's hot, we all know it's hot. Keep the windows, doors open, lights off." This principal would not allow negative ideas to predominate. The negative was countered with a positive.

From the faculty meeting to the playground at 8:45 a.m. Hugs and hellos to students were repeated continuously throughout this morning's playground vigil. To a worried mother "We'll find Greg a friend. . . What a pretty dress...Let me tie your

shoes. . . " After the last student's entry at 9:00 a.m. and a quick look around before shutting the door, the next stop was the kindergarten room followed by visits to the gym and a Grade Four classroom. "I like these first self-portraits by the kindergartners, you learn so much." A stop in the preschool generated conversation with the teachers about their schedules. "What do you think if we did this. . . It makes sense. We'll have to contact them about this.". . .

By 9:17 a.m. after a comparatively long stay in the gym, the walk ended back at the office where she was late by 12 minutes for a parent conference requested by the parent. "What can I do for you?" "I have a strange request." "OK, we'll open the strange request department. [The parent requested full day programming for her at risk pre-school child.]

"I feel bad because I know where you are coming from but the rules are basically that we don't have dual enrollment. I'll help you explore other options". . . [To a squirming pre-schooler, Ecrú offered to get the child something to do in very soothing tones.] "Here are crayons and paper. The district just won't do it but at the same time I understand your predicament. I'll talk to the guidance counselor and get some options. . . Keep me posted. . . Lots of districts have gone to full-day kindergarten. . . I'll call the principal at Field School and see if there are parents who babysit. . . Your request sounds reasonable and logical, doesn't it? But because of funding it can't be done. . . I'll do what I can."

After the parent's departure, she retrieved the paychecks sitting on her desk and began to "walk the school" at 9:40 a.m. "I don't like the office layout. The principal's office is in the corner. Right now there are no alternatives". . . [I deliver paychecks] "Because principals have so few rewards available to distribute. I use the time to talk to students and see what's going on. It supports an inviting atmosphere. Besides the teachers tell me they appreciate it."

She returned to the office at 10:05 a.m. to meet with the reading/writing aide, a newly created position. "Hunt up a first grade group that is ready and move them," said Ecu. "Hang around with the teachers. Offer your assistance but ease into it. Resist allowing teachers to tell you to test students because I tell the teachers they make the instructional placement decisions. That's why the aide starts later. Mary, I want you to be flexible and accommodating. . . ." The aide asked where she should work. "You must be in the eyesight of the supervising teacher according to the law...I don't give two hoots about it. I'll tell you when ISBE is coming. . . "I spend most of my time solving space problems and I'm not supposed to be doing that. . . "And Mary, you don't need to ask, just walk in. . ."

At 10:20 a.m. a call from a principal colleague was taken. It was a request for furniture. "Sure, I'll get you a goody box together. It's not great stuff but it will work . . ."Dan, what did you do about class size? Oh, an aide. How are you doing regarding the principals' meeting this afternoon? Think about the change models, readiness and awareness levels. . . See ya. . ."

At 10:30 a.m. the preschool teacher stopped in for an update on the 9:15 a.m. parent conference results. Ecu stated, "Also, would you see if there is kindergarten furniture to donate to Dan's school?"...

At 10:35 a.m. a short chat with her secretary caught her up-to-date on the morning's happenings and then Ecu was off to the learning center for a talk with the LRC director. . .

### What Practices Of Effective Principals Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change?

As discussed in Chapters I and II, a common thread of factors could be identified in the research that defined the characteristics of the principal engaged in change facilitation and school improvement. The following eight factors were drawn from the

research studies as characteristics of the principal engaged in change facilitation and school improvement: trainer, developer, monitor, buffer, responsible party, collaborator, culture builder, and model (Barth, 1990; Hord et al., 1987; Joyce, Hersh, & McKibben, 1983; Sarason, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990). Change facilitation was defined by Hord et al. as the principal working directly with teachers who were expected to change (grow). School improvement was defined by Joyce et al. as the principal developing the capability within the school to improve teaching and learning on a self-renewing basis.

Table 31

Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview Change Facilitation Data

Principal	Similarities	Change Facilitation Behavior	Differences	Change Facilitation Behavior
Blue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research based curriculum focus</li> <li>Goal setting</li> <li>Workshops</li> <li>Peer training or coaching</li> <li>Site based staff development</li> <li>Taking classes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trainer</li> <li>Developer</li> </ul>	No unique differences	
White	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research based curriculum focus</li> <li>Goal setting</li> <li>Workshops</li> <li>Teacher evaluation</li> <li>Taking classes</li> <li>Peer training or coaching</li> <li>Site based staff development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trainer</li> <li>Developer</li> <li>Monitor</li> </ul>	No unique differences	
Ecru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops</li> <li>Teacher evaluation</li> <li>Goal setting</li> <li>Taking classes</li> <li>Research based curriculum focus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trainer</li> <li>Developer</li> <li>Monitor</li> </ul>	No unique differences	



### Analysis of Table 31

The similarities among the three principals were striking but predictable in terms of the research within the change facilitation cluster. All three had been rated as effective in their positions by their immediate supervisors. Additionally, all had recently completed doctorates which had exposed them to the research base on change facilitation. On the basis of the interviews, the greatest similarities occurred in terms of the trainer and developer characteristics. Buffer was a commonality from the perspective that it was generally omitted from their responses during the interviews. Both White and Ecu provided responses which indicated a monitor characteristic. This difference could be explained by comparing the numbers of years of experience for each principal which will be discussed more fully in subsequent tables.

Table 32

Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Interview Change Facilitation Data

Principal	Similarities	Change Facilitation Behavior	Differences	Change Facilitation Behavior
Blue	Support of additional training	Trainer	Reallocates money to support the innovation	Developer
	Facilitator	Developer		
White	Supportive of additional training	Trainer	Provides time and protection to practice new learning	Buffer
	Facilitator	Developer		
Ecru	Supportive of additional training	Trainer	No unique differences	
	Facilitator	Developer		

### Analysis of Table 32

The key informant interviews tended to verify most of the principals' responses with respect to the question of how effective principals promoted significant, durable growth or change. The greatest similarities occurred in terms of the trainer and developer characteristics. The teacher interview data source also revealed that no principal was described in terms of the monitor or buffer characteristics. This evidence provided the greatest discrepancy in terms of the research. However, both White and Ecrú described themselves in terms of the monitor characteristic.

The differences were due to the uniqueness of each setting and the uniqueness of each principal. This could be explained by the situational view of the principalship described in Chapters I and II. However, the specific differences, regardless of their uniqueness, could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals. Thus, a behavior's absence in the differences column was not viewed negatively. Interestingly, there was no data supplied by Ecrú's teachers which was applicable to the differences column. There were no significant differences between Blue, the newest principal, and her more experienced colleagues.

Generally speaking, the analysis of both Table 31 and Table 32 together revealed that all three principals were change facilitators to some degree in terms of this study's theoretical framework. The limited number of unique differences could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their specific contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals. On the basis of this data source only there was much less confidence on the part of this researcher about these principals functioning as change facilitators.

Table 33

Summary of Cross-Case Principal Interview School Improvement Data

Principal	Similarities	School Improvement Behavior	Differences	School Improvement Behavior
Blue	Leader training	Responsible party	Student recognition program	Culture builder
	Climate setter	Culture builder	Self-evaluations	Collaborator
	Promote collegiality	Collaborator		
Goal setting				
White	Leader	Responsible party	Student behavior standards program	Culture builder
	Catalyst	Culture builder	Outcome-based instruction	Collaborator
	Team building	Collaborator		
Goal setting				
Ecru	Leader	Responsible party	Research-based instruction model	Culture builder
	Goal setting can make a difference	Culture builder		Model
	Promote Collegiality	Collaborator		

### Analysis of Table 33

The similarities among the three principals were striking but predictable in terms of the research within the school improvement cluster. All three had been rated as effective in their positions by their immediate supervisors. On the basis of the interviews, the greatest similarities occurred in terms of the responsible party, culture builder, and collaborator characteristics. In comparing the results of the principal interviews across the three research arenas (instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement) from which this study's theoretical framework was generated, the greatest number of similarities occurred within the school improvement cluster.

The differences were due to the uniqueness of each setting and the uniqueness of each principal. This could be explained by the situational view of the principalship described in Chapters I and II. However, the specific differences, regardless of their uniqueness, could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals. Thus, a behavior's absence in the differences column was not viewed negatively. Culture builder repeatedly occurred in both columns. Interestingly, E cru exhibited all four research behaviors when the similarities and differences columns were analyzed together. As noted earlier, all three principals exhibited the greatest number of the same school improvement behaviors on the basis of their interviews.

Table 34

Summary of Cross-Case Teacher Interview School Improvement Data

Principal	Similarities	School Improvement Behavior	Differences	School Improvement Behavior
Blue	Total involvement in everything	Responsible party	Seeks grants	Responsible party
	Supportive	Culture builder		
	Teacher evaluations			
White	Supportive	Responsible party	Teacher in classroom	Model
	Monitoring	Culture builder		
	Leader			
Ecru	Teacher evaluations	Responsible party	Gets involved with kids when she visits room	Collaborator
	Monitoring	Culture builder		
	Goal setting		Parent helper	Model
	Supportive			

### Analysis of Table 34

The key informant interviews tended to confirm most of the principals' responses with respect to the question of how effective principals promoted significant, durable change or growth in their schools. The greatest similarities occurred in terms of the responsible party and culture builder characteristics. Interestingly, when the differences' column was analyzed in conjunction with the similarities' column, three of the four school improvement characteristics were reported by the teachers for Ecrú (collaborator added) and White (model added). Blue was consistently viewed in terms of the responsible party and culture builder characteristics.

Generally speaking, the analysis of both Table 33 and Table 34 together revealed that all three principals were engaged in school improvement in terms of this study's theoretical framework. However, the unique differences could still be labeled in terms of the theoretical framework and were provided in the display for their specific contribution to the field in terms of the concrete actions of practicing, effective principals.

Table 35

Summary of Cross-Case Change Facilitation and School Improvement Survey Data

Change Facilitation	Blue	Blue	Sp. Area	White	White		Sp. Area	Ecrú	Ecrú		Sp. Area
		K - 3		K - 3	4 - 5	K - 3			4 - 5		
<b>Buffer</b>											
Probe #9	4.0	3.25	3.14	5.0	4.18	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.33	4.0	4.67
Probe #21	4.0	3.0	2.43	5.0	3.5	3.33	3.83	-	4.0	4.0	4.0
Probe #33	4.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.55	4.5	4.83	4.0	4.37	4.33	4.38
<b>Monitor</b>											
Probe #10	4.0	3.5	3.14	4.0	4.6	3.83	4.3	3.0	3.67	4.5	4.25
Probe #22	3.0	3.42	3.0	4.0	4.36	4.0	5.0	-	4.0	4.07	4.5
Probe #34	4.0	3.33	2.29	4.0	3.64	3.17	4.3	5.0	3.57	4.0	3.53
<b>Developer</b>											
Probe #11	4.0	3.5	2.86	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.17	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0
Probe #23	4.0	3.33	2.86	4.0	4.09	4.4	4.2	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.63
Probe #35	5.0	4.0	3.57	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.83	4.0	4.29	4.67	4.75
<b>Trainer</b>											
Probe #12	5.0	4.33	4.14	5.0	4.4	4.3	4.67	5.0	4.71	4.33	4.5
Probe #24	3.0	3.25	2.43	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.67	5.0	3.67	4.0	4.38
Probe #36	5.0	3.5	3.29	4.0	4.64	4.2	4.5	3.0	4.14	4.67	4.5

(table continues)



School Improvement	Blue	Blue K - 3	Sp. Area	White	White		Sp. Area	Ecru	Ecru		Sp Area
					K - 3	4 - 5			K - 3	4 - 5	
<b>Responsible Party</b>											
Probe #5	4.0	3.67	3.71	5.0	4.6	4.67	4.5	3.0	4.71	4.67	4.5
Probe #17	5.0	4.0	3.71	5.0	5.0	4.67	4.83	3.0	5.0	4.67	4.89
Probe #29	5.0	4.33	3.57	4.0	4.36	4.3	4.83	4.0	4.57	4.33	4.44
<b>Model</b>											
Probe #6	3.0	3.0	2.23	4.0	3.82	3.5	4.67	4.0	3.86	4.33	4.44
Probe #18	3.0	2.5	1.57	3.0	3.1	2.8	4.3	3.0	3.57	3.33	3.78
Probe #29	5.0	4.0	3.43	5.0	4.82	4.5	5.0	-	4.43	5.0	4.67
<b>Collaborator</b>											
Probe #7	4.0	2.92	3.29	5.0	4.45	4.0	4.67	3.0	3.29	4.67	3.88
Probe #19	2.0	1.92	2.0	5.0	4.55	4.67	4.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.71
Probe #31	5.0	3.67	3.57	4.0	4.91	4.83	5.0	5.0	4.71	5.0	4.89
<b>Culture Builder</b>											
Probe #8	5.0	4.0	4.43	5.0	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.0	4.43	4.67	4.67
Probe #20	5.0	3.83	3.14	4.0	4.6	4.67	4.67	4.0	4.33	4.67	4.5
Probe #32	4.0	3.42	3.29	4.0	4.5	4.67	4.67	3.0	4.0	4.33	4.43

Key: 1.0 = Almost Never    2.0 = Seldom    3.0 = Sometimes    4.0 = Frequently    5.0 = Almost Always

- = Missing Response

The probe number corresponds to the survey statement number (See Appendices D and G)

### Analysis of Table 35

The comparison of the principal perceiver survey results with the teacher perceiver survey results were very revealing in light of the research by Hord et al. (1987) and Joyce et al. (1983) about principals engaged in change facilitation and school improvement. This researcher had hypothesized that the perception of the principal engaged in these activities would vary among the various sub-groups of teachers. For that reason the data were disaggregated by grade level and special area teachers.

Principal Blue received her highest ratings from the K-3 teachers in the area of change facilitation. Only 3 of the possible 12 statements were rated by the teachers lower than Principal Blue rated herself. A rating was considered significant if it varied by more than 1.0 from the principal's rating. On the other hand, the special area teachers rated 6 of the possible 12 statements lower than Principal Blue rated herself. Overall, the one characteristic which received the highest rating with only one prompt given a score lower than the principal's score by either of the two sub-groups was monitor. Developer was rated the lowest by both groups of teachers. However, the K-3 teachers only rated one of the three probes per characteristic below the principal's rating for buffer, developer, and trainer. The special area teachers rated all three probes for developer and one each for buffer, monitor, and trainer below the principal's score.

These results supported the hypothesis that the different sub-groups of teachers would view the principal differently. Interestingly, in many cases Principal Blue tended to view herself as performing at the frequently level while the special area teachers viewed her as performing from slightly below sometimes to slightly below frequently.

Principal White received consistently high ratings which paralleled her own self-evaluations in all but one area of the the change facilitation cluster. In the buffer area, five of the nine probes were rated by the teachers below White's ratings on these same probes. Only the K-3 teachers gave White a higher rating on the buffer characteristic. In no other area was there a discrepancy between White's and the teachers' ratings.

Principal Ecu received consistently high ratings which paralleled her own self-evaluations in every area of the change facilitation cluster. However, in the monitor area, three of the nine probes received ratings from the teachers which were lower than Ecu's ratings. In the trainer area, two of the nine probes received ratings which were lower than Ecu's ratings. There were no discrepancies with respect to the buffer and developer characteristics. In several instances, Ecu rated herself lower than the teachers did. In only one other instance, did this same result occur. In the monitor area on probe 22, Principal Ecu received a higher rating from the special area teachers than she gave herself.

Principal Blue received similar ratings from both the K-3 and special area teachers in the area of school improvement. Six of the possible 12 statements were rated by both groups of teachers lower than Blue rated herself. A rating was considered significant if it varied by more than 1.0 from the principal's rating. Overall, only one probe of the three probes per characteristic was rated below the principal's rating for responsible party, model, collaborator, and culture builder by both groups of teachers. This was considered important by this researcher because no one area predominated from the perspectives of both groups of teacher. In other words, there was no variance when these data were disaggregated. In terms of this cluster with this principal only, the hypothesis that different groups of teachers would view the principal was not supported. With respect to whether Blue's school

was being improved, the data were inconclusive. Blue consistently believed that the school was being improved at the almost always level, while the teachers viewed school improvement as occurring from between slightly above sometimes to slightly below frequently on 50 percent of the probes.

Principal White received consistently high ratings in all areas of the school improvement cluster of behaviors. There was only one of the three probes in the collaborator area where the Grade 4-5 teachers rated her below her own self-evaluation. White rated herself almost always while the teachers rated her frequently. On the same probe there was no such discrepancy between the special area and K-3 teachers and the principal.

Principal Ecu received consistently high ratings in all areas of the school improvement cluster of behaviors. In many instances, Principal Ecu rated herself lower than the teachers did. Only in the case of Principal White did this same result occur on one probe.

In summary, one possible explanation for these phenomena was the longevity of the principal in the position as a function of both the principal's and the teacher's perception of the principal's performance within the school improvement cluster of behaviors and its relationship to the institutionalization of change as described in the research of Sarason, 1982 and Fullan, 1982 and reported in Chapter II. Principal Blue had completed 3 years of her first principalship; Principal White had completed 9 years of her first principalship, and Principal Ecu had completed 18 years of her third principalship.

Table 36

Summary of Cross-Case Change Facilitation Observational Data

Change Facilitation Characteristic	Total of Code "Observed"					
	Blue*		White		Ecu	
	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Buffer	0	0	25	10	23	9
Monitor	75	24	93	37	100	40
Trainer	47	15	38	15	33	13
Developer	53	17	38	15	33	13
	*N = 32 (4 visits)		N = 40 (5 visits)			

Analysis of Table 36

The comparison of the observational data collected during the on-site visitations was very revealing in terms of the change facilitation behaviors. In some instances it tended to contradict the evidence collected through the interview and survey data sources. All three principals performed equal to or higher than the 75 percent level on the monitor characteristic. No other characteristic came close to this level of performance on the basis of the on-site observation data source. All three principals received their lowest percentages in the area of buffer.

One explanation for the contradictions between the teacher survey results and the on-site data could be that since this researcher was not collecting on-site data in terms of contacts with various sub-groups of teachers it could not be expected that the data would yield the identical results as the surveys and interviews. Another explanation could be that the survey represented longitudinal, quantitative data while the five four hour on-site visits were short, random visits in the early part of the

school year and could in no way represent the totality of the relationship between the teachers and the principal in terms of change facilitation.

Table 37

Summary of Cross-Case School Improvement Observational Data

School Improvement Characteristic	Total of Code "Observed"					
	Blue*		White		Ecrú	
	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Responsible Party	100	32	100	40	100	40
Model	97	31	100	40	95	38
Collaborator	88	28	98	39	95	38
Culture Builder	88	28	100	40	95	38
	*N = 32 (4 visits)		N = (5 visits)			

Analysis of Table 37

The comparison of the observational data collected during the on-site visitations was very revealing in terms of the school improvement behaviors. In every instance it tended to confirm the evidence collected through the interview and survey data sources. All three principals received very high percentages in all four categories of behaviors. Principal White received the highest percentages but Principal Ecrú did not vary from Principal White by more than five percentage points in any area. Principal Blue's results ranged from 88 percent in the culture builder and collaborator areas to 100 percent in the responsible party area.

Table 38

Summary of Cross-Case Documentation Data

<u>Principal</u>	<u>Years in Principal Position</u>	<u>Teacher Evaluation Ratings</u>
Blue	3	Full range of ratings used
White	9	Full range of ratings used
Ecu	18	Predominance of one rating i.e. "Meets District Expectations"

Analysis of Table 38

The comparison of the teacher evaluation ratings determined by the principal on an annual basis and reflected in the teacher personnel files were less revealing in terms of the number of years each principal had served in that role. There was no doubt, however, that each of the principals viewed using the teacher evaluation process as instrumental in facilitating change and school improvement. Each of the principals, operating within the parameters of the teacher evaluation procedures sanctioned by their districts, used the full range of ratings available to them with the exception of unsatisfactory based upon the randomly selected personnel files selected for review. Principal Ecu tended to use the middle rating of her district's rating scale more than either of the two other ratings permitted by the teacher contract. Both Principal White's and Principal Blue's districts evaluated teachers on the basis of a four point scale and consistently used three of the four ratings available to them.

#### What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?

Michael Fullan (1982) classified potential deterrents to change into four broad categories. Specifically, they were characteristics of the change itself, characteristics at the school level, characteristics at the school district level, and

characteristics external to the local system. They included factors such as the need and relevance of the change, clarity, complexity, quality of the program, the history of innovative attempts, staff development and participation, time-line and information system, the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics, district office support and involvement, and the adoption process.

Table 39

Summary of Cross-Case Deterrents To Change Data

<u>Principal</u>	<u>Years in Principal Position</u>	<u>Deterrents to Change</u>
Blue	3	Initial deterrents - Constraints imposed by grant regulations Teachers' union Lack of district leadership Teachers Money Parents Time District level responsibilities which take time away from building
White	9	Initial deterrents - Teachers Lack of clarity in articulating vision Later deterrents - Teacher strike Programs not supported in entirety by district office On-going deterrents - Too many innovations at once Some teachers Parents Money
Ecru	18	Initial deterrents - Lack of planning in preparing for change Teachers Parents Later deterrents - Teachers On-going deterrents - Inertia Parents Some teachers Time



### Analysis of Table 39

The comparison of the deterrents to change data as reported by the subject principals was very revealing in terms of the change research and the number of years served as a principal. Principal Blue with three years of experience was considered to be in the initiation phase of change as identified by Fullan (1982). Blue reported deterrents to change as a strong teachers' union, lack of district leadership, constraints imposed by grant regulations, the teachers themselves, money, parents, lack of time, and district level responsibilities assigned to the principals which take them away from their buildings. Interestingly, each of Blue's barriers fell into three of Fullan's four categories. The lone exception was characteristics of the change itself.

Both Principal White and Principal Ecu described barriers to change in terms of initial, later, and on-going barriers to change which corresponded to the language used by Fullan (1982), Hord (1987), and Goodlad (1975). Principal White reported that initial barriers to change were teachers and her own lack of clarity in articulating a vision for change. Principal Ecu reported barriers to change as parents, teachers, and her own lack of planning in preparing for change.

Principal White reported later obstacles to change as a teacher strike and changes not supported in their entirety by the district office. Principal Ecu reported later obstacles to change as teachers.

Principal White indicated that on-going barriers to change continue to be some teachers, too many innovations at once, money, and parents. Principal Ecu indicated that on-going barriers to change include inertia on the part of a mature staff including principal and teachers recognized by the district as being good, some teachers, parents, and lack of time to do all that should be done for the students.

Only White and Ecu who were at mid and end points in their careers identified themselves as contributing factors in deterrents to change. This insight was in the mind of this researcher a function of their years of experience in the position as well as their experience in living through a complete change process.

#### Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What Effective Principals Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership?

This research question was designed to address the issue of the impact on the effective principal of the Illinois legislation requiring that a majority of the principal's time be spent on the improvement of instruction. As discussed in Chapters I and II, this requirement was written in broad terms and consequently might be interpreted in a number of ways. What cues did the principal pay attention to? It was further hypothesized by this researcher that the responses of the principal might be related to the number of years in the position and the situational context of the principalship.

Table 40

#### Summary of Cross-Case Impact of 1985 Education Reform Act Data

Principal	Years in Principal		
	Position	Impact of Law	Cues
Blue	3	High	Superintendent
White	9	Low	Superintendent/Self
Ecu	18	Low	Self

#### Analysis of Table 40

The comparison of the data provided by the three study principals and displayed above in Table 40 revealed that each principal viewed the impact of the legislation from a perspective based not only on the the number of years as a principal but also

from when the first principalship appointment occurred. Principal Blue reported that the 1985 legislation had a high impact on how she viewed what she was to do in her position as principal. During the interview she listed 'accountability' as its major impact on the principal. Principal Blue was appointed to her first principalship in 1987.

Principals White and Ecu reported that the law had low impact on what they did as principals. They indicated during the interviews that they had been informed that they were effective by their superiors prior to the law and that nothing had changed since the law. Principal White was appointed a principal in 1982 and Principal Ecu in 1972.

The research of Hall, Rutherford, Hord, and Huling (1984) categorized principals as initiators, managers, or responders depending upon the situation inherent in the context as well as the particular bent of the principal's style. They concluded that all effective principals were not the same. It was in terms of this research which was described more fully in Chapter II, that the cues reported by the subject principals were analyzed. Principal Blue responded to cues external to her, namely the law and her superintendent both responder cues. Principal White responded to the superintendent, an external cue, and her own view of what was the right thing to do, an internal or initiator cue. Principal Ecu reported that she only responded to herself because what she did 'was the right thing'. Clearly, Ecu operated from the initiator perspective. The data provided by these three effective principals confirmed the research of Hall et al. Furthermore, these data confirmed the hypothesis that the number of years in the principalship impacted on how the 1985 law was viewed as well as which cues contributed to principal behavior in terms of school improvement.

Chapter VIII will discuss the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

## CHAPTER VIII

### FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

This chapter is divided into seven parts. The first part reviews the purpose of the study and the study's methodology. The second part presents a summary of the findings. The third part draws the conclusions of the study. The fourth part describes the limitations of the study. The fifth part makes recommendations for possible action. The sixth part suggests questions for further study. The seventh and last part is a very personal one which details what this study meant to the researcher.

#### Review Of The Purpose Of The Study And Its Methodology

This study was about how three effective elementary principals in DuPage County, Illinois improved their schools. The focus was on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals did to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study was the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promoted significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes were to isolate any factors which were deterrents to change; and isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improved instruction and promoted change.

A case study design was selected by this researcher to study principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement efforts at the K-5 level. Yin (1989) concluded that the case study was the design of choice where the questions were "how" or "why"; when the focus was on contemporary events; and when the researcher had little control over behavioral events. Furthermore, according to Yin, the case study was uniquely suited to deal with a full variety of data --documents, interviews, observations, and artifacts. While there had been a tendency to devalue any research strategy other than scientific experiments, Yin argued that this hierarchical rating of research strategies was inappropriate. The researcher should view these designs pluralistically, since there was overlap between and among them. Each strategy could be used to serve exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory purposes, but the case study method was suggested when the situation or phenomenon was not easily separated from its context (Yin, 1989).

Evidence for this study came from six sources, five of which were traditional data sources for the case study: archival records, structured subject interviews, key informant interviews, direct observation, documentation, and surveys. The survey source was derived from quantitative methodology. As a result, while this study was overwhelmingly qualitative in design, it involved a mixed methodological approach. The most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence was the development of converging lines of inquiry or the process of triangulation. Thus, any finding or conclusion in a case study was likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it was based on several sources of information, following a corroboratory mode. In this manner, the potential problems of construct validity also could be addressed because the multiple sources of evidence essentially provided multiple measures of the same phenomenon (Yin, 1989).

The proper selection of the subject principals was crucial to the design of this multiple case study. This researcher requested permission of the superintendent or the principals' immediate supervisor to conduct the study in three DuPage school districts. The superintendent or immediate supervisor was asked to identify an effective elementary principal(s) within their districts. Of the five nominations, three were invited to participate in the study for two reasons. First, the three were selected because they all possessed doctorates and possessed knowledge of the change research. In the early stages of this proposed study, this researcher had considered looking at any practicing, effective principal. Then after a preliminary review of the research, it seemed important to find principals who were considered both effective and had a knowledge of the change research. In short, effective principals with recent doctoral level training were needed. This study's selection process was consistent with the well-known Blumberg and Greenfield study of effective principals originally conducted in 1980. A follow-up was published in 1986. In their longitudinal study, the cases were selected from nominations by the subjects' colleagues and university faculty members who knew the nominees through coursework they had taken.

Secondly, Ralph Tyler, Michael Fullan, and John Goodlad had all researched the concept of time and its relationship to change. Since the change process as conceived by Fullan (1982) could be divided into three distinct phases--initiation/implementation/institutionalization--it also seemed important to select principals who in general terms could be described as initiating changes, implementing changes, and institutionalizing changes based on their number of years in the principalship.

Of the five principals nominated, only three met the two criteria. The principals were similar in that all were female, all possessed earned doctorates, and all had knowledge of the change research. They were different in that Principal Blue had been a principal for 3 years; Principal White for 9 years; and Principal Ecu for

18 years. They also varied in the numbers of teachers and students they supervised. Principal Blue supervised 520 students and 30 teachers; Principal White supervised 490 students and 28 teachers; and Principal Ecu supervised 330 students and 25 teachers.

In summary, this study was basically a multi-case or comparative case study which blended naturalistic, qualitative approaches with some quantifiable evidence. This study was subject to the dangers and weaknesses of construct validity and reliability which were sometimes ascribed to case studies. This researcher was aware of these dangers and used methods suggested by Yin (1989), Miles and Huberman (1984), and Patton (1990) to offset these problems. Data sources included teacher evaluation records, surveys and interviews with principals and teachers, written documentation, student achievement information, and observation. Methods of data collection included auditing, surveying, interviewing, and observing. Methods of analysis included coding, frequency counts, displays in the form of narrative text and tables, and interpretive qualitative analysis of assignment of responses and attribution of observed behaviors to categories defined by the researcher.

In addition, verification of findings was further attempted through triangulation methodologies. Both observer triangulation and methodological triangulation processes were employed in this study. The narrative reports of the findings, or case study and cross-case reports, were laced with documented vignettes to illustrate various points. The overriding goal of this study was to provide a "thick description" of the phenomena.

### Summary Of Findings

The research questions were written to guide this researcher in the collection and analysis of the data. For purposes of this summary, the six original research

questions were reconfigured into four closely related but more broadly stated questions because of the overlap in the findings both in terms of the principal's longevity in a setting as well as the institutionalization of change. Additionally, the principal's efforts to improve the school were viewed in terms of their support for teaching and learning. The first question focused on the principal as instructional leader and what the principal did to support teaching and learning. The second question sought to identify the practices and contributions of the principal which promoted significant, durable change in their school. The third question attempted to isolate the factors which were deterrents to change. The fourth question addressed the impact of the 1985 Illinois educational reform legislation on the practicing, effective principal. The data collected from the three study principals to address these questions were presented in Chapters IV, V, and VI. The cross-case comparisons and findings were presented in Chapter VII. The purpose of this section was to present a summary of the major findings.

#### 1. How Did An Effective Principal Support Teaching And Learning In Order To Improve The School?

A. Regardless of the number of years of experience, the three study principals were found to be instructional leaders engaged in improving teaching and learning within the parameters of the theoretical framework. However, the more years served as principal the higher the consistency of the findings across all data sources.

B. The teachers' perception of their principals' level of performance working at improving teaching and learning varied by the sub-group classification (K-3, Gr. 4-5, Spec. Area) to which the teacher belonged and by the number of years the principal had served in the setting as reflected by the surveys and the interviews.

C. Of the four instructional leadership behaviors (communicator, visible presence, instructional resource, and resource provider) which Smith and Andrews



identified as characteristics of the principal engaged in improving teaching and learning and which were the focus of this study, resource provider consistently received the lowest ratings regardless of the number of years of experience of the principal.

## 2. What Practices Of An Effective Principal Promoted Significant, Durable Growth or Change?

A. None of the three principals exhibited all of the change facilitation behaviors identified as buffer, trainer, developer, and monitor by Hord et al. on a consistent basis across all data sources. Trainer and developer behaviors far exceeded buffer and monitor behaviors. Once again the perception of the principal as change facilitator varied by the teacher sub-group and the number of years the principal had served in the setting.

B. The longer the principal worked with their staff the higher they were rated in both the change facilitation and school improvement behavior clusters on the basis of the teacher surveys and teacher interviews. School improvement behaviors on the part of the more experienced principals received higher ratings than the change facilitation behaviors in both interviews and surveys.

## 3. What Factors Were Deterrents To Achieving Change?

A. The principals' views of deterrents to change varied by the number of years the principal had served in the principalship. The less experienced principal was unable to classify deterrents as initial, later, or on-going barriers and viewed the deterrents as things external to the principal. The more experienced principals were able to classify barriers to change in terms of time and included their own principal miscues as deterrents to change.

B. The principal's relationship with the teachers was viewed as the most significant on-going factor in determining on-going improvement in the school.

4. Did The Education Reform Act Of 1985 Influence What The Effective Principal Did With Respect To School Improvement And Instructional Leadership?

A. All three principals regardless of the number of years of experience exhibited high self-esteem and self-confidence in their performance on the basis of the interviews and surveys. Overall, the 3 year veteran and the 9 year veteran rated their performance higher than the 18 year veteran on the survey.

B Each principal viewed the impact of the reform legislation from a perspective based not only on the number of years as a principal but also from when the first principalship appointment occurred.

C. The less experienced principal responded to external cues which included the reform legislation and the superintendent. The principal in mid-career responded to both external and internal cues but not the legislation. The mid-career principal responded to the superintendent and herself. The long term principal responded only to herself and not external cues of either the legislation or the superintendent.<sup>1</sup>

### Conclusions

By reviewing the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Effective principals evolve through stages of change themselves in terms of their understanding of change and school improvement.

2. Not only the years of experience as a principal but the number of years in the setting are crucial to the institutionalization of change and school improvement.

---

<sup>1</sup>This finding was generated as a result of the structured interview of each of the subjects. There was no corroborative evidence for this finding disclosed by any of the other data sources. However, Kathleen Jensen found (Loyola University of Chicago, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1989) that the Educational Reform Act of 1985 had little or no impact on changing the practices of administrators in the areas of curriculum and instruction.

3. The school improvement behaviors of culture builder, model, collaborator, and responsible party predominate over the change facilitation behaviors of trainer, developer, monitor, and buffer in the more experienced principal.

4. Effective principals are not all alike but all do exhibit high-self esteem and self-confidence.

5. Within a given faculty and regardless of the number of years of experience of the principal, the various sub-groups of teachers will view the principal differently less in terms of instructional leadership and more in terms of change facilitation and school improvement. The greatest congruence between teacher and principal perceptions occurs in the principals with the most experience in their settings.

#### Limitation Of The Study

There were two major limitations to this study of principal leadership in applying the change research to school improvement efforts at the K-5 level. First was the sample size and composition. The conclusions noted could be construed as mere suppositions at this point in time, since the study was limited in scope to three individual cases, which made generalization risky. The principal sample was composed of three DuPage principals, all of whom were female. Two of the subject principals were professional friends of the researcher. A larger, more diverse population might have produced more generalizable data. While the principals represented both elementary and unit suburban school districts, the results certainly could not be generalized to larger city systems. Furthermore, since the study principals were selected because they were effective as judged by their immediate superiors and possessed doctorates, the findings and conclusions were not even generalizable to all female, DuPage elementary principals.

A second limitation of the study was the number of on-site visitations. Twenty hours of on-site visitation for each case study was at best a minimum standard in terms of qualitative research for a dissertation. Ideally, more hours spent at the sites observing the phenomena presented the optimum conditions under which the researcher could understand and interpret the data with greater confidence.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations were based upon the findings of this study, the literature review, and input from the directors of this study.

1. School boards should not establish policies which require the routine intradistrict transfer of principals at three to five year intervals. Such policies will not result in long term change and may work counterproductively to the desired outcome.
2. Principals should clearly communicate to all professional staff that a direct relationship exists between the annual school improvement goals and the teacher evaluation instrument and review.
3. Institutions of higher education who prepare principals should provide richer experiences to the students who would be principals by requiring courses on the change process, social change, psychology, adult learning styles, and the most recent research on teaching and learning in conjunction with opportunities to apply this knowledge.
4. Principals must constantly promote and protect the belief that school improvement is a shared responsibility involving all professional staff (social worker, speech and language, physical education, music, etc.) and that the improvement of teaching and learning is not the exclusive domain of the classroom teacher.

5. Since effective principals go through stages of change within their role as principal and are even more isolated from their peers than teachers as Dan Lortie noted, a locally based network system supported possibly by a university which would provide opportunities for principals to share and reflect on practice is needed.

6. Public laws and school board policies should authorize site-based management procedures. While, as Michael Fullan points out, central office support for change is imperative, legislation and policy must become responsive to the unit in which change can best occur--the individual school.

### Questions For Further Research

There are a number of possible questions for further research.

1. Is it possible that the principal does not exhibit the buffer behavior because first, the principal is trying to prompt change by a confrontation strategy involving an external agent such as a parent or a central office administrator; and second, to the degree that the principal is successful in protecting the teacher who is implementing an innovation, is it probable that the teacher will be unaware of any controversy presented by an external agent and thus unable to observe the buffer behavior in the principal?

2. Is it possible that to the degree the principal is successful in shaping the school culture to promote growth and change that the teachers will be unable to attribute their own growth to the principal at all?

3. As a result of the unexpected finding of this study that the veteran principals exhibited school improvement behaviors more readily than change facilitation behaviors, is there something about the reward structure of the district that prompted this outcome? Or do more veteran principals prefer the more subtle behaviors of collaborator and culture builder over the more overt behaviors of trainer and monitor?

### What This Study Meant To Me

One hopes, after completing a comprehensive study that the findings will not only be informative, and if lucky, useful on several levels. On the personal level, I undertook this study because I am an elementary principal who is seeking to improve her performance in the field I choose to live my life on a daily basis. Neustadt and May in their monograph Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (1986) argue that marginal improvement in performance is worth seeking. Indeed, there is probably no other kind. Roland Barth (1990) writes that his vision of the principal is one who is always learning. He honors the principal who is the head learner. He believes that the principal who is continuing to learn is far more important to the development of a community of learners within the school than what the principal is learning. A major responsibility of the principal in developing a community of learners is to actively engage in their own learning, to make their learning visible to children and to other adults alike, to enjoy and celebrate this learning, and to sustain it over time even when swamped by the demands of others and the work itself.

On the other hand Carl Glickman (1990) writes about several ironies inherent in the quest to improve oneself in the role as principal especially in terms of its direct impact on school improvement. The more the principal improves, the more it is apparent there is more to be improved. Similarly, others have stated that the more one learns, the more one discovers what is unknown. Glickman further observes that the more a principal becomes a model of success, the less the principal becomes a practical model to be imitated by other principals.

Glickman's insights hit home as I reflected on how I could apply all that I learned by observing or shadowing my three colleagues to my own setting and performance. My observations cannot transfer but my insights can. I learned that it

is my responsibility to make this opportunity I was given to observe other principals at work improving schools an on-going, personal, learning experience. It is my responsibility to continue to grow, to learn, to reflect, and to refine practice. School improvement is not dictated from on-high in a top down fashion by public law or even by school board policy. They may be necessary but are certainly not sufficient conditions for improvement to occur. The one overarching truth which emerged from the three settings was that schools get better because of the ways teachers, administrators, and students treat each other. Thus, improvement is a never ending process by principal and teachers in finding ways to combine the latest in research and technology with a contextual knowledge of the students to create the proper mix for the benefit of the students' learning. Thus, this dissertation is not an end but the beginning to a deeper understanding of my role within the community of learners which I am ultimately responsible for creating in concert with my teacher colleagues.

On another level, I hope that this study is in some way beneficial to practicing principals, the subject principals, or those who would be principals. I also hope that a deeper understanding by principals of the role which they live and breathe will contribute to developing a broader perspective by those publics who observe or encounter principals working to improve schools.

## APPENDIX A





## APPENDIX B

CASE STUDY LOG SHEET

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

TIME: IN \_\_\_\_\_ OUT \_\_\_\_\_

SITE \_\_\_\_\_

DATA SOURCE/  
PURPOSES: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT SUMMARY SHEET

## APPENDIX C

## CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

### I. Overview of the Case Study Project

#### A. Statement of the Problem

Illinois principals were mandated to become change agents for reform. This legal requirement, however well-intentioned as public policy, generates at least one critical area which needs examination since a mandate alone does not mean that positive change will necessarily occur. Namely, what lessons can practicing principals, who have been identified as effective by their superintendents or immediate supervisors in larger districts, teach about improving schools? In Illinois, where policy requires principals to devote a majority of their time to tasks of instructional leadership, the concept of instructional leadership is assumed to be self-evident and is not explicitly defined in state law.

#### B. Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to describe and analyze how three effective principals in DuPage County improve their schools. The focus will be on the principal as instructional leader and specifically on what these principals do to support teaching and learning. Of equal importance in this study will be the identification of the contributions and practices of these principals which promote significant, durable change in their schools. Secondary purposes will be to :

1. Isolate any factors which are deterrents to achieving change.
2. Isolate the differences and similarities among the principals' contributions and practices which improve instruction and promote change.

#### C. Theoretical Framework

A common thread of factors can be identified in the research that defines the characteristics of the principal engaged in instructional leadership, change facilitation, and school improvement.

The following four factors have been drawn from the research studies as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal behaving as an instructional leader (Smith & Andrews, 1989):

1. Resource Provider
2. Instructional Resource
3. Communicator
4. Visible Presence

The research has also indicated four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal behaving as a change facilitator (Hord et al., 1987):

1. Trainer
2. Developer
3. Buffer
4. Monitor

The research has also indicated four factors as characteristics of the behaviors of the principal engaged in school improvement (Joyce, Hersh, & McKibben, 1983; Sarason, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990):

1. Model
2. Collaborator
3. Culture Builder
4. Responsible Party

By synthesizing the research findings of these eminent scholars, this study seeks to use this new configuration of characteristics to examine the behaviors of three practicing principals in DuPage County, Illinois, all judged to be effective by their superiors. This study is significant because of its relationship to the practice and training of elementary principals in light of Illinois P.A. 84-126 and the principal's new duty of improvement of instruction. Specifically, this study holds significance because it considers the day-to-day work of the principal. Results of the study may help principals as they attempt to balance the various demands of their role. Better understanding of the role of the principal can assist superintendents as they seek to improve the school system.

This study holds significance for training in that specific responses to the surveys and interview questions by the principals and teachers may provide direction for improving the training of principals in light of the new duties mandated in Chapter 122, Section 10-21.4 of the Illinois School Code.

## II. Field Study Procedures

### A. Research Questions

1. How do principals go about improving their schools?
2. Do principals use knowledge of the change process to improve their schools?
3. If so, how do they apply the theory?
4. Do principals use staff development activities to improve their schools?
5. If so, how do they use them?
6. Does the number of years of experience as a principal relate to how change theory is applied?
7. If a principal has longevity in a setting, have changes been institutionalized?
8. How do principals interpret the meaning of instructional leadership? How do they apply their interpretation to the improvement of their schools?

9. Does the confluence of a vague state policy and local interpretation generate inconsistent or incomplete cues for the principal in matters of instructional leadership?
10. What cues does the principal pay attention to?
11. How does the principal respond?
12. Why does the principal act in a particular way in matters of instructional leadership and school improvement?

#### B. Step One - - - On-Site Observations

Date/  
Completed

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Complete log and contact summary sheet
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Use observational matrix for five four-hour visits x three cases by appointment from 8/31 to 10/26
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Write up field notes; transcribe; type up after each visit; code
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Confirm number of teachers at each site at first visit

#### C. Step Two - - - Document Review

Date/  
Completed

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Complete log and contact summary sheet
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Tell subjects at first on-site visit the types of documents needed to review:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ a. opening year faculty agenda and two subsequent ones
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. student handbook
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. teacher handbook or mission statement
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. any three agendas from prior year
  - \_\_\_\_\_ e. memos to staff, staff bulletins
  - \_\_\_\_\_ f. welcome back letter
  - \_\_\_\_\_ g. needs assessment
  - \_\_\_\_\_ h. parent surveys, parent newsletters
  - \_\_\_\_\_ i. grade level/subj. area agendas and minutes
  - \_\_\_\_\_ j. 1990-91 desk calendar; prior year if possible
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Collect items at third on-site visit. Analyze above listed document documents away from school site
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Tell subjects at first on-site visit the types of archival records needed to review
  - \_\_\_\_\_ a. ISBE school improvement plans
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. principal's annual goals and objectives
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. school budget allocations
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. teacher evaluation records
  - \_\_\_\_\_ e. student achievement data monitored by the principal

- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Arrange appointment time(s) and room space to review records  
 \_\_\_\_\_ on-site. (Plan 2 - 4 hours for this procedure)

D. Step Three - - - Survey/Perceiver Administration

Date/  
 Completed

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Complete log and contact summary sheet
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Schedule time to distribute surveys to subjects and teachers on or  
 \_\_\_\_\_ before Oct. 5. Write cover letter to teachers explaining survey  
 \_\_\_\_\_ procedures. Discuss distribution procedures with each subject.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Teachers will return instrument to researcher via U.S. mail  
 \_\_\_\_\_ by October 12. A stamped envelope will be provided each teacher  
 \_\_\_\_\_ for this purpose. Color code the surveys by case site to facilitate  
 \_\_\_\_\_ sorting and analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Give instrument to subjects to complete on second on-site visit.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Due back to researcher on third site visit
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Collect principal survey on third site visit

E. Step Four - - - Interviews

Date/  
 Completed

- \_\_\_\_\_ 0. Complete the log and contact summary sheet
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Schedule a two hour appointment at first site visit to interview  
 \_\_\_\_\_ subjects
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Tape interviews
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Have tapes transcribed verbatim
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Seek teacher volunteers to participate in key informant  
 \_\_\_\_\_ interviews at fourth on-site visit
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Distribute a flyer to all teachers detailing what is involved; list  
 \_\_\_\_\_ sample questions on flyer and anticipated time needed (15-30  
 \_\_\_\_\_ minutes maximum)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Ask subject principals for input on this procedure
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Prepare key informant information flyer
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Select three key informants at each site
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Schedule key informant interviews
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Tape, type up verbatim, and code the teacher interviews
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_



## F. Step Five - - - Wrap-Up

Date/  
Completed

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Send thank-you notes to subject principals
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Send candy to each teacher lounge
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Arrange time with subjects to review case study report for accuracy

## III. Analysis Plan and Case Study Report

### A. Individual Case Studies

1. List research questions
2. Answer each question with descriptive and explanatory information
3. Analyze by means of narrative displays, tables, charts
4. Write case study report

### B. Cross Case Analysis

1. List research questions
2. Answer each question with descriptive and explanatory information
3. Cross reference the analysis by means of narrative displays, tables, and charts
4. Write the cross-case report

## APPENDIX D

## PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT SURVEY

### PRINCIPAL PERCEIVER

**DIRECTIONS:** The following items deal with views you have about yourself in terms of activities related to instructional leadership, school improvement, and the change process. Read each statement quickly but carefully. Choose just one answer for each item. There are no right or wrong answers so please be as honest as you can. Please do not indicate your identity in any way. All results are strictly confidential. Thank you for your time and cooperation. Use the following key to choose your answers.

A	=	Almost Never
B	=	Seldom
C	=	Sometimes
D	=	Frequently
E	=	Almost Always

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I encourage the use of different instructional strategies.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I promote staff development activities for teachers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I lead formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I make frequent classroom observations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. I collect information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. I often model creative thinking for the staff.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. I seek advice from staff members when making a decision.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I encourage mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. I buffer the school from outside interferences which detract attention from the school's mission.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. I use student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.

- \_\_\_ 12. I encourage and support teachers seeking additional training.
- \_\_\_ 13. I am sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.
- \_\_\_ 14. I mobilize resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.
- \_\_\_ 15. I provide a clear vision of what our school is all about.
- \_\_\_ 16. I am an active participant in staff development activities.
- \_\_\_ 17. I set school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.
- \_\_\_ 18. I demonstrate innovative teaching methods to staff.
- \_\_\_ 19. I involve teachers in the selection of new staff members.
- \_\_\_ 20. I expect teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.
- \_\_\_ 21. I protect teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.
- \_\_\_ 22. I discuss assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- \_\_\_ 23. I provide specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.
- \_\_\_ 24. I incorporate knowledge about how adults learn into school improvement activities.
- \_\_\_ 25. My evaluations of teachers' performance help improve their teaching.
- \_\_\_ 26. I am considered an important instructional resource at this school.
- \_\_\_ 27. I communicate clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.
- \_\_\_ 28. I am accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.
- \_\_\_ 29. I encourage teachers to try out new ideas.
- \_\_\_ 30. I work to improve my performance on an on-going basis.
- \_\_\_ 31. I collaborate with staff to set school improvement goals.
- \_\_\_ 32. I work with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. I communicate with the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. I make regular contact with teachers to evaluate student progress.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35. I support teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36. I take into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.

THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME

## APPENDIX E

**STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS****PRINCIPAL**

The initial questions of the interview are biographical and demographic in nature. The bulk of the questions focus on your role as principal in the areas of instructional leadership, the change process, and school improvement. The entire interview should not exceed two hours. Your answers to the questions are being recorded to facilitate the interview process. The tape will be destroyed once it has been transcribed. All transcriptions will be secured until their use has been exhausted and then destroyed.

**BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:**

- a. # of years in current position?
- b. Total # of years as principal?
- c. Other administrative experiences?
- d. # of years teaching?; subjects and grade levels taught?
- e. Educational training?
- f. Why did you decide to become a principal?
- g. Describe appointment process to current principalship.
- h. How do you keep up to date in the field?
- i. Future goals?
- j. Besides being a principal, are there other responsibilities?

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:**

- a. Size of school?
  - b. # of teachers?; # which you evaluate?
  - c. # of students?
  - d. Describe the district community at large.
  - e. Describe the community your school serves.
  - f. # of dollars spent per child?
1. Discuss several beliefs you hold which are the most important to you in your role as principal.
  2. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the school upon your arrival. What are they now?
  3. What specific actions of yours make you most proud when you reflect upon how you have supported teaching and learning at this school?
  4. What goals do you have for this year with respect to the improvement of instruction? How did you identify them?

5. How do you feel about where the school is now in terms of teaching and learning?
6. Where do you want this school to be one year from now in terms of improvement of instruction?; two years?
7. What measures do you use to assess improvement of instruction?; student achievement?
8. What deterrents or barriers to change have you experienced at this school? Are there dissidents? How many?
9. What is the nature of their oppositional behavior? How do you work with them?
10. Are there any other barriers of an internal nature?
11. Are there barriers of an external nature?
12. What is your greatest strength; weakness as an instructional leader?
13. What is your greatest strength; weakness as a change facilitator?
14. What has been your most significant challenge to date at this school? How did you address it? Why did you select this challenge?
15. Give me two examples of how instruction has been improved at this school since your arrival. What was your role?
16. If you could improve one area of your performance by tomorrow, what would it be?
17. What forms of support do you receive in your efforts to improve your school?  
From district, community, staff?
18. If you could have one additional resource to help improve your school, what would it be? Why?
19. Have any changes been institutionalized since your arrival? If so, which ones and how do you know?
20. Identify some strategies which you have used to improve this school.
21. By what student outcomes do you measure attainment of goals as they relate to the improvement of teaching and learning?
22. In your opinion, how are instructional leadership, the change process, and school improvement related?
23. Does the new state law (1985) impact what you do relative to school improvement? If so, how?



24. What overt direction do you get from your superiors relative to school improvement? improvement of instruction? Any indirect cues? Please elaborate?
25. Is there any additional information you would like me to know about you in your role as elementary principal as it relates to instructional leadership, the change process, or school improvement?

THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME

## APPENDIX F

## STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### TEACHER

The initial questions of the interview are biographical in nature. The bulk of the questions focus on your perceptions of your principal's activities in the areas of instructional leadership, the change process, and school improvement. The entire interview should not exceed one-half hour. Your answers to the questions will be recorded with your permission to facilitate the interview process. The tape will be destroyed once it has been transcribed. All transcriptions will be secured until their use has been exhausted and then destroyed. Your principal will have no access to tapes, notes, or transcriptions. All of your responses are strictly confidential.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:

- a. # of years teaching?
  - b. grade levels taught?
  - c. # of years at current grade level?
  - d. educational training?
  - e. types of committees, both building and district, served on?
  - f. date and nature of last college class or workshop attended?
  - g. # of years working with current principal?
  - h. hired by current principal?
1. Name some things your principal does to support you in your teaching. Please elaborate.
  2. Do you know what your principal's goals are this year with respect to the improvement of instruction? school improvement?
  3. What is your principal's greatest strength in the area of instructional leadership (i.e. works to improve teaching and learning)? How could your principal improve in this area?
  4. Can you identify a significant challenge your principal has faced at this school? How did your principal address it?
  5. If your principal could provide you with one additional resource to help you in your role as teacher (i.e. feedback, training, time, materials, etc.), what would it be? Have you communicated this need to your principal?
  6. Is your principal helping to make this school a better place for you to teach and children to learn? If so, how is she doing this?
  7. In what ways does your principal involve you in the school improvement process?

8. Is there any additional information you would like me to know about your principal in her role as elementary principal as it relates to instructional leadership and school improvement?

THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME

## APPENDIX G

Dear Colleague,

Please find attached to this letter a four page survey and stamped, addressed envelope for your use if you choose to participate in my doctoral study.

I am studying the day to day practices of three DuPage elementary principals in terms of their leadership in applying the change research to school improvement efforts.

Participation by their teachers in this study is crucial to a well-rounded analysis of their work. The more teachers who participate the more valid are the findings.

Your participation is completely anonymous. Please do not indicate your identity in any way if you choose to participate. This survey should only take fifteen minutes or less to complete.

**PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY TO ME IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 12.**

Thank you so much for your consideration of this activity. Your input is very important and your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gail D. Fahey

## TEACHER SURVEY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PLEASE CHECK ONE:

 PRIMARY CLASSROOM TEACHER (K-3) INTERMEDIATE CLASSROOM TEACHER (Gr. 4-5) SPECIAL AREA TEACHER ( SPEC. ED., BILINGUAL, MUSIC,  
ART, READING, LEARNING CENTER, P.E., ETC)

## PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT SURVEY

## TEACHER PERCEIVER

**DIRECTIONS:** The following items deal with views you have about this school in terms of activities related to instructional leadership, school improvement, and the change process. Read each statement quickly but carefully. Choose just one answer for each item. There are no right or wrong answers so please be as honest as you can. Please do not indicate your identity in any way. All results are strictly confidential. Thank you for your time and cooperation. Use the following key to choose your answers.

A	=	Almost Never
B	=	Seldom
C	=	Sometimes
D	=	Frequently
E	=	Almost Always

- \_\_\_\_ 1. My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.
- \_\_\_\_ 2. My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.
- \_\_\_\_ 3. My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student improvement.
- \_\_\_\_ 4. My principal makes frequent classroom observations.
- \_\_\_\_ 5. My principal collects information about the school's performance by using needs assessments, surveys, or personal interviews with teachers and parents on at least an annual basis.
- \_\_\_\_ 6. My principal often models creative thinking for the staff.
- \_\_\_\_ 7. ✓ My principal seeks advice from staff members in making a decision.
- \_\_\_\_ 8. ✓ My principal encourages mutual sharing, assistance, and joint effort among teachers.
- \_\_\_\_ 9. ✓ My principal buffers the school from outside interferences which would detract attention from the school's mission.
- \_\_\_\_ 10. My principal uses student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school's goals.



- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. My principal provides specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) prior to implementation of an instructional change.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. My principal encourages and supports teachers seeking additional training.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. My principal sets school-wide targets for improvement on an annual basis.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. My principal demonstrates innovative teaching methods to staff.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. My principal involves teachers in the selection of new staff members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. My principal expects teachers to constantly seek and assess potentially better instructional practices.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. My principal protects teachers who are accomplishing the goals of the school from complaints by parents or other staff members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. My principal discusses assessment results with staff to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. My principal provides specific support (space, materials, personnel, or equipment) for an instructional change after implementation is underway.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. My principal demonstrates knowledge about how adults learn.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. My principal's evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. My principal is considered an important instructional resource at this school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. My principal encourages me to try out new ideas.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. My principal works to improve her performance on an on-going basis.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. My principal collaborates with staff to set school improvement goals.

- \_\_\_\_\_32. My principal works with staff to examine school and instructional practices in terms of mutually agreed upon values.
- \_\_\_\_\_33 My principal communicates to the community about new instructional practices being implemented in the school.
- \_\_\_\_\_34. My principal makes regular contact with me to evaluate student progress.
- \_\_\_\_\_35. My principal supports teachers in the classroom as they attempt to implement what they have learned in their training.
- \_\_\_\_\_36. My principal takes into account teachers' individual needs and concerns in planning and implementing staff development activities.

THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME

## APPENDIX H

AUDIT ANALYSIS FORM

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Site \_\_\_\_\_

File # \_\_\_\_\_

1. # of observations in a year \_\_\_\_\_ .
2. Duration of time spent in classroom per observation as noted on observation forms.

#	time increments
_____	less than 15'
_____	15' - 30'
_____	30' - 45'
_____	45" - 60 '
_____	60'

3. WRITTEN COMMENTS ANALYSIS

1. visible presence \_\_\_\_\_
  2. instructional resource \_\_\_\_\_
  3. resource provider \_\_\_\_\_
  4. communicator \_\_\_\_\_
  5. trainer \_\_\_\_\_
  6. developer \_\_\_\_\_
  7. buffer \_\_\_\_\_
  8. model \_\_\_\_\_
  9. collaborator \_\_\_\_\_
  10. culture builder \_\_\_\_\_
  11. monitor \_\_\_\_\_
  12. responsible party \_\_\_\_\_
4. Rating \_\_\_\_\_

SPECIFIC WRITTEN COMMENTS OF NOTE

## REFERENCES

- Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. Educational Leadership, 37, 10-14.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of an executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ✓ Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Benis, W., and Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. The strategies for taking charge. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Bentzen, M. M., and Assoc. (1974). Changing schools: The magic feather principle. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change. Volume VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Blumberg, A., and Greenfield, W. D. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership, (2nd ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- ✓ Brandt, R. (1987). On leadership and student achievement: A conversation with Richard Andrews. Educational Leadership, 45, 9-16.
- Brookover, W. B., and Lezotte, L. W. (1977). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.
- Chance, W. (1986). ...the best of educations. Reforming America's public school in the 1980s. Chicago, IL: The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.
- Clark, D., Lotto, L., and Astuto, T. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 51-55.
- ✓ Corbett, H. D., Firestone, W. A., and Rossman, G. B. (1987, November). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school culture. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(4). pp. 36-59.

- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. Educational Leadership, 41. pp. 14-20.
- Edmunds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37. pp. 15-24.
- Education Commission of the States. (1990, February). State policy and the school principal: A summary of case studies from seven states.
- Frazier, C. M. (1987). The 1980s: States assume educational leadership. in The ecology of school renewal. John I. Goodlad, ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- ✓ Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Glickman, C. D. (1990, September). Pushing school reform to a new edge: The seven ironies of school empowerment. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 68-75.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1975). The dynamics of educational change. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Griffin, G. (1983). Introduction: The work of staff development. Staff development: Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- ✓ Guskey, T. R. (1986, May). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 5-12.
- Hall, G. E. (1986). Deriving teaching skills from studies of the implementation of innovations in education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA). R & D Report No. 3224.
- Hall, G. E. and Hord, S. M. (1986). Institutionalization of innovations: Knowing when you have it and when you don't. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (San Francisco, CA: April 16-20). R & D Report No. 3220, pp. 81-106.
- Hall, G. E., and Guzman, F. M. (1984). Sources of leadership for change in high schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April). R & D Report No. 3185.
- ✓ Hall, G., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., and Huling, L. L. (1984). Effects of three principals styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41. 22-29.
- Havelock, R. G. (1973). The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, Inc.

- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., and Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- House, E. (1974). The politics of education innovation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.
- Howey, K. R., and Vaughan, J. C. (1983). Current patterns of staff development. Staff development: Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Huberman, A. M., and Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works, New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education (1984, July). Excellence in the making: A preliminary report.
- Jensen, K. (1989) A study of state mandated educational change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Joyce, B. R. (1981). A memorandum for the future. Staff development/organization development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Joyce, B. R. (1986). Improving America's schools. New York, NY: Longman.
- Joyce, B., Hersh, R., and McKibbin, M. (1983). The structure of school improvement. New York, NY: Longman.
- Joyce, B., and Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages from research. Educational Leadership, 37 . 379-385.
- Joyce, B., and Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40. 4-10.
- Joyce, B., and Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. New York, NY: Longman.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). The change masters. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Lanier, J. W. (1983). Tensions in teaching teachers. Staff development: Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- ✱ Leithwood, K. A. (1990). The principal's role in teacher development. Changing school culture through staff development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Levine, A. (1980). Why innovation fails. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators (AASA).

Lieberman, A. (1982). Practice makes policy: The tensions of school improvement. In Policy making in education. Eighty-first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Ann Lieberman, ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

✧ Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tensions, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 648-653.

Lieberman, A. and Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. in The ecology of school renewal. John I. Goodlad, ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-339.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. C., Crow, G., and Prolman, S. (1983, May) The elementary school principal in suburbia: An occupational and organizational study. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education.

Loucks, S. F., and Hall, G. E. (1979). Implementing innovations in schools: A concerns-based approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA: April 8-12).

McLaughlin, M. B., and Marsh, D. D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers. College Record, 80(1), 69-94.

Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). Principals for 21st century schools. Alexandria, VA: 1990.

Neustadt, R. E., and May, E. R. (1986). Thinking in time: The uses of history for decision makers. New York, NY: Macmillan.

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



- Peters, T., and Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence. the leadership difference. New York, NY: Random House.
- Pipho, C. (1990). State policy and the school principal. Executive Summary. February. Education Commission of the States.
- Rogers, E. M., and Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). Communication of innovations. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, A Division of the Macmillan Company.
- Rosenblum, S., and Jastrzab, J. (1980). The role of the principal in change. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Rosenblum, S., and Louis, K. S. (1981). Stability and change. Innovation in an educational context. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York, NY: Longman.
- ✓ Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan. 67, 31-34.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouson, J., and Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sanders, D. P., and Schwab, M. (1981). A school context for teacher development. Theory into Practice, 4, 272-275.
- Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. Educational Leadership, 47, 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). Ten principles of quality leadership. Educational Leadership, 39, 330-336.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., and Carver, F. D. (1973). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39, 346-352.
- Smith, W. F., and Andrews, R. L. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Tyler, R. W. (1988, April). Making education reform work. The Education Digest, pp. 14-16.

- Weick, K. E. (1976). Education organization as loosely coupled systems. Administration Science Quarterly, 21, 2-4.
- Weinshank, A., Trumball, E., and Daly, P. (1983). The role of the teacher in school change. Handbook of Teaching and Policy. New York, NY: Longman.
- ✕ Wilson, B., and Firestone, W. A. (1987). The principal and instruction: Combining bureaucratic and cultural linkages. Educational Leadership, 45, 18-22.
- ✕ Wilson, K. (1982). An effective school principal. Educational Leadership, 39, 357-361.
- ✕ Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Wood, F. H., Thompson, S. R., and Russell, S. F. (1981). Designing effective staff development programs. Staff development/organization development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- ✕ Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Revised Edition. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

## Vita

The author, Gail Daniels Fahey, is the daughter of Lester Daniel and Mary Geraldine (Roche) Fahey. She was born on June 11, 1947 in Danville, Illinois.

Her elementary and secondary education were obtained in the Catholic schools of Danville, Illinois where she graduated in 1965.

In June, 1969 she received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Social Studies Education from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In August, 1969 she began teaching in Bellwood, Illinois. While teaching at the junior high school, she obtained a Master of Arts degree in American History from the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1972. In 1973, she was appointed language arts-social studies coordinator at the junior high school.

In 1975 she completed the requirements for an Illinois certificate in administration and supervision through the National College of Education in Evanston, Illinois.

In January, 1976 she was appointed to her first full-time administrative position as acting district curriculum coordinator and thus began a series of administrative appointments in Bellwood School District 88 in Cook County, Illinois. In July of 1976 she was appointed to the newly created position of assistant director of curriculum and personnel. One year later she was named federal programs director. In 1980 Ms. Fahey received both a certificate of advanced study degree from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and her first appointment to a principalship as principal of Roosevelt Elementary School.

In 1983 she became principal and district director of curriculum in Medinah Elementary School District 11 in DuPage County where she is currently serving in this position.

Ms. Fahey has made presentations at the annual conventions of the National Council for the Social Studies in Boston in 1972 and the National Staff Development Council in Chicago in 1988. She has also been a panelist at the request of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) for two presentations sponsored by the Urban and Ethnic and Equal Educational Opportunity Sections of ISBE.

Ms. Fahey was a contributing author to an article which appeared in History Teacher in 1972 entitled "Has the Study of Jeremy Belknap Helped or Hurt Mankind" and the co-author of an interview of Ralph Tyler which appeared in the Illinois School Research and Development Journal in Fall, 1989.

Awards and honors have included honorable mention in the 1974 Personal Economic Competence Awards program conducted by Montgomery Ward and Co. and the Illinois Council on Economic Education. In 1983 Roosevelt Elementary School, where she was principal, was a finalist in the For Character awards program conducted by For Character, USA and the University of Illinois at Chicago. In 1988 Medinah South Elementary School, where she was principal, was selected by the Illinois State Board of Education to represent Illinois in the National School Recognition program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

Ms. Fahey holds memberships in the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Illinois Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Association of Elementary School Principals, Illinois Principals Association, and the National Staff Development Council.

The dissertation submitted by Gail Daniels Fahey has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Chair  
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin  
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Barney M. Berlin  
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Human Resource Development, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 2, 1991

Date

Max A. Bailey

Director's Signature