

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: RELATIONSHIP OF PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP
BEHAVIORS TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Betty Williams King, Doctor of Philosophy, 2006

Dissertation directed by: Professor Emeritus James Dudley
Department of Education Policy and Leadership

The purpose of this study was to compare the extent to which leadership behavior of principals differs in schools at risk for reconstitution and in schools judged as meeting state standards; and to determine the extent to which principals in these schools employ frame utilization strategies for school improvement as designed by Bolman and Deal (1992a). The sample population for the study was randomly selected by the school district's Division of Research Evaluation Assessment and Accountability (DREAA). Ten schools were selected to participate in the study: five schools labeled "at risk" and five schools "making adequate progress."

Data collection was performed in 2006. The Leadership Orientation Survey designed by Bolman and Deal (1990) was distributed to principals, immediate supervisors of the principals, teachers, parents, and community representatives who serve on the School Improvement Team (SIT) in each school. The survey measured the extent to which leaders use four frames of leadership: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

Cronbach alpha, a measure of inter-item reliability, was computed for each of the four frames. All were .75 or higher, indicating that the survey was reliable. Inter-scale correlations were computed for schools making adequate progress and for schools at risk. The correlations for teachers, parents, and community representatives for both school groups were strong and statistically significant, most in the .75 to .95 range. For principals and supervisors, the results of the correlational analysis were mixed. Some correlations were strong and statistically significant, .80 to .95, and others were weak and in some cases negative. This may be due primarily to the small number of principals in the study, four in each group of schools. The same limitation was true for supervisors, where there were five in each group of schools. A correlation is a measure of a linear relationship between two variables. It can range from -1.00 to +1.00.

The results of the statistical analysis of the three research questions using independent t-tests indicated that for principals, supervisors, teachers, parents, and community representatives, there were almost no statistically significant differences in the use of the four frames for the schools making adequate progress or for the schools at risk. All of the means indicated that the principals were judged to often use the different frames. The only exception was the human resource frame, where there was a statistically significant difference favoring principals in the schools making adequate progress. The demographics information indicated that the most qualified professionals were found in the schools making adequate progress.

RELATIONSHIP OF PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS
TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND SCHOOL
IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

by

Betty Williams King

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2006

Advisory Committee:

Professor Emeritus James Dudley, Chairperson/Advisor
Dr. Gilbert R. Austin
Dr. Carol Parham
Dr. Frank Schmidlein
Dr. Thomas Weible

© Copyright by
Betty Williams King

DEDICATION

This research project is dedicated to my family who supported and encouraged me throughout this process. Though it was my husband who was aware of my desire to complete the program, my children and other family members were there for me in many ways. Many thanks to former administrators; to colleagues who currently serve as administrators at various levels; to teachers who worked with me over the years and have remained my friends; and finally to the students, who will always be my inspiration for seeking to learn more so that I might do more to provide programs that will result in positive and productive outcomes for them. Again, thank you and much love and appreciation to all of you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere gratitude is extended to many who contributed to the completion of this research study. First, to the chairperson of my committee, Dr. James Dudley, for his willingness to serve in this capacity. His leadership and guidance were invaluable. To my dissertation committee—Dr. Thomas Weible, Dr. Frank Schmidlein, Dr. Carol Parham, and Dr. Gilbert Austin, for clear and purposeful direction throughout the experience. To the Division of Research, Evaluation, Assessment and Accountability in the state where this study was conducted, for their assistance. To the supervisors, administrators, school staffs and others who participated in the study. To the office staff in the Department of Education Policy and Planning at UMCP, who were always congenial, helpful, and most efficient when answering questions regarding "next steps." Finally, to University of Maryland support programs that enabled me to achieve this lifetime goal. Thanks to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vi
Chapter I INTRODUCTION	1
Leadership	4
Pre-Implementation Phase	5
Implementation Phase.....	6
Significance of the Study	9
Statement of the Problem	10
Conceptual Orientation	12
Research Questions	13
Definitions of Terms	13
Limitations of the Study	15
Delimitations	15
Organization of the Study	16
Chapter II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Organizational Behavior in Education	17
Leadership and Management	19
School Reform and Accountability	26
Accountability Models.....	28
State Accountability Models.....	29
Restructured Schools	29
Principals' Role in School Restructuring	30
Leadership for School Change.....	32
Summary	35
Chapter III DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	37
Setting.....	37
School Accountability	38
Sampling.....	42
Data Collection.....	42
Research Questions and Statistical Hypotheses	43
Instrumentation.....	44
Section I: Leadership Behaviors	47
Section II: Leadership Style Use	47
Section III: Overall Rating.....	47
Section IV: Background Information	48
Instrument Reliability.....	48
Statistical Analysis	48

Chapter IV.	FINDINGS.....	50
	Statistical Analysis	50
	Research Questions and Statistical Hypotheses	63
	Research Question 1	63
	Statistical Hypothesis 1.....	63
	Research Question 2	65
	Statistical Hypothesis 2.....	66
	Research Question 3	67
	Statistical Hypothesis 3.....	67
	Demographics.....	70
Chapter V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	75
	Summary	75
	Conclusions	78
	Research Question 1	78
	Research Question 2	80
	Research Question 3	80
	Recommendations	82
Appendix A	Leadership Orientations (Self and Other) Surveys.....	83
References	96

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Inter-Scale Correlations for the Total Group in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames	52
2.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames	53
3.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Teacher Members of the SIT Team in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames	54
4.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames	54
5.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals' Supervisors in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames	55
6.	Inter-Scale Correlations for the Total Group in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames	56
7.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames	57
8.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Teacher Members of the SIT Team in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames.....	58
9.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames.....	58
10.	Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals' Supervisors in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames.....	59
11.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Patterns Among Principals', SIT Team Members', and Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress.....	61
12.	One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Patterns Among Principals', SIT Team Members', and Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Considered At Risk.....	62

13.	Independent t-Test of Principals' Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk.....	64
14.	Independent t-Test of Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk.....	66
15.	Independent t-Test of Teacher Members of the SIT Team's Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk.....	68
16.	Independent t-Test of Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team's Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk.....	69
17.	Demographics of Principals in Schools Making Adequate Progress	70
18.	Demographics of Principals in Schools Considered At Risk	71
19.	Demographics of Principals' Supervisors in Schools Making Adequate Progress	71
20.	Demographics of Principals' Supervisors in Schools Considered At Risk.....	72
21.	Demographics of SIT Team Members (Teachers) in Schools Making Adequate Progress	72
22.	Demographics of SIT Team Members (Teachers) in Schools Considered At Risk	73
23.	Demographics of SIT Team Members (Parents and Community Representatives) in Schools Making Adequate Progress	73
24.	Demographics of SIT Team Members (Parents and Community Representatives) in Schools Considered At Risk	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Schools, now more than ever, are challenged to improve to the extent that every effort is made to ensure the success of all students (No Child Left Behind (NCLB); Maryland State Department of Education, 2003). In the state where this study was conducted, the state department of education has for a number of years instituted school reform initiatives where individual schools are held accountable for student achievement. Under the provisions of the School Improvement Act, the state was authorized to take action that included reassignment/dismissal of the principal and/or placing the school in reconstitution and ultimately under a private or charter contractor (Hall, Wiener, & Carey, 2003). The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act gave federal leverage to the states in their school reform policies, primarily because of the threat of the loss of federal funds to support the implementation of programs for school improvement.

Action by the state in this study is defined as restructuring, a process that begins by identifying schools that are not making adequate progress as measured by a series of state assessments and attendance rates. Schools under local restructuring are given additional assistance from the state and are directed to develop annual school improvement plans. They are then monitored by the state for several years to check on progress made in each school. Only when it is apparent that school improvement is inadequate does the state move toward reconstitution and state take-over.

Placed at high risk as a result of these actions is the school principal. Efforts to improve education relate directly to the quality of leadership provided in the schools. "In study after study, it has been shown that the one determinant of excellence in public schooling is the leadership of the individual school principal" (Action for

Excellence, 1983, p.29). Research on effective schools strongly supports the concept that the school principal is the key figure in a school's success or failure (Austin, 1979; Brookover, 1977; Crowson et al., 1984; Dunlap & Goldman, 1991; Edmonds, 1979; Educational Research Service, 1982; Goodlad, 1984; Lezotte, 1992; Malen & Ogawa, 1988).

The notion of leadership is continually evolving, often moving simultaneously in numerous directions (e.g., leader, manager, administrator). Goldring and Greenfield (2002) argue that the image of the school leader has changed from a "position that was once ideologically grounded in philosophy and religion in the 1800s, to a highly prescriptive manager concerned with efficiency and focused on functional administrative tasks in the mid 1900s, to a behavioral science perspective in the mid to late twentieth century" (p. 1). Having reviewed the long-standing debate about the principalship, Sergiovanni (1991) concludes that while distinctions between management, leadership and administration debates may be useful for theorists, what is key is the recognition that the principalship involves multiple responsibilities and duties. As predicted by Laffey (1980), principals are expected to be "all things to all people." They are expected to be effective managers, and currently, with the focus on student achievement, instructional leaders. However, according to Scott (1983) principals and other significant groups who work with them have expectations regarding the principals' managerial role but disagree significantly about the principal as instructional leader. Reports have noted that principals have resisted changing their role from manager to that of an instructional leader (e.g. Philadelphia School Improvement Project, Kopple, 1985). Moreover, where principals' role transition has been successful, extensive training (Newburg & Glatthorn, 1983) and/or long-term training efforts (Kline, 1987) were necessary.

Instructional leadership responsibilities seem to have emerged from the existence of many instructionally effective schools for poor and minority children reported since the early 1970s (Stevenson, 1987). Clark et al. (1982) aggregated approximately 97 studies of urban school achievement and concluded that this leadership is crucial in determining school success and that this leadership is typically attitudinal and motivational, and capable of engendering an achievement climate. This research gives credence to the decision of federal, state and local policy makers to hold principals accountable for the school's success.

In the state where this study was conducted, there exists a large urban school district of 180 schools of which 95 are currently labeled "at risk". Three of these schools have been taken over by the State and principals have been demoted, reassigned or terminated. The schools in the district are, for the most part, in neighborhoods that house large numbers of students who traditionally do not perform well in school. Their enrollments include large numbers of poor children from non-English speaking families, and large numbers of minority students with special needs. A local press release in the state indicated a concern highlighted by the 1998 student achievement test results, which is lagging performance by many minority students, especially African-American males. The article further stated that an ingredient common to poor performance on state tests and functional tests, low attendance, and high dropout rates is poverty. While both low- and high-performing school systems in the state have made significant progress over the years, a wide gulf still separates the two.

Prior to such action on the part of state and local educational authorities, there should be an effort to document the ineffectiveness of the principal at risk. As Sergiovanni (1991) pointed out, while it might be a fact that good leadership produces positive results, it is difficult to produce facts that are generally accepted about what it

actually entails. For example, while there exists an extensive review of the literature to support the importance of instructional leadership behaviors of the principal, it is not clear in the literature concerning which instructional leadership behaviors are most important. However, it is possible from the same literature to construct, under a number of frames or domains, the instructional leadership behaviors that are most often mentioned as important for principals to implement.

Leadership

There are various models or methods to capture information concerning leadership roles and styles (Cohen et al., 1972; Mintzberg, 1980; Schein, 1984; Yukl, 1989). For example, Sebring and Bryk (2000) posit that "the behaviors and practices of the principal have influence on all aspects of the learning community, which leads to school success" (p.441). They state that the specifics of leadership are not just a listing of the correlates of effective schools; the specifics include behavior and practices related to five domains: Vision, Mission, Culture, Curriculum and Classroom Instruction. They further state that the vision of the principal, the mission of the school and the culture of the organization cannot be separated; one supports and affects the other. Curriculum and Classroom Instruction are critical to student achievement. Promoting student learning is a priority for successful principals. These researchers conclude that as principals perform as instructional leaders, they create an environment for learning, set high standards for teaching and allow teachers to take risks and try new methods of teaching (Sebring & Bryk, 2000).

Following his research on principals and empowerment in schools, Hughes (2004) designed a model for restructuring schools that included guidelines that used both questions and suggestions. The question format seems to be better suited for those items the principal needs to determine or consider. The suggestion format seems

to be more useful for highlighting items that were not fully developed in past practices. Both types of statements reflect the insights of principals in the research study and observations collected in school visits and conferences.

The guidelines are divided into two categories: Pre-implementation and Implementation. The first category focuses on preexisting conditions and considerations that enhance or inhibit the success of the innovations for school improvement; the second category is composed of factors and considerations that appeared during the course of the innovation.

Pre-implementation Phase:

- Autonomy: How much freedom does the school have to make its own decision about curriculum, organization, budget, instructional methods and materials, etc?
- Early staff involvement: If the innovation is the principal's idea, how quickly can the principal expect "buy-in" from the staff; if the innovation originated with the staff, how will the ideas be nurtured, expanded, implemented?
- Community involvement: When will business leaders and community members be invited to join the planning team and what level of participation can be expected?
- Parents: When and how will parents be included in the plans and what level of participation can be expected?
- Project chronicler: Who will serve as the project communicator, who will gather the information related to the project and tell the story?

Implementation Phase

- "Think big, start small": In major change projects, begin with a few volunteer teachers and allow the experiment to evolve. Later expand and encourage other volunteers to join the group.
- Volunteer teachers: Must be strong, enthusiastic teachers who are highly respected by other faculty, and committed to the success of the project.
- Communications: Principals should expect that unpredictable communication networks will emerge where they (principals) might not be invited.
- Trust relationships: Trust relationships will improve when an effective communications network is established and all members believe in the worthiness of the project.
- Risk taking: As trust relationships are established and communications networks are effective, risk taking will become more evident.
- Critical Incident: Some positive or negative event will occur during the course of the innovation that will coalesce the staff.
- Critical mass: Keep track of the number of staff members who truly support the project. At some point, the successful project will have enough support to move ahead on its own. The principal then becomes the facilitator of the group rather than its leader.
- Fatigue: Expect that enthusiasm for the project will wane. The principal should anticipate this eventuality and be prepared to expend additional resources to keep the project moving forward.
- Turnover: Expect and prepare for key staff members leaving during the course of the project.

- Celebrations: Principals should constantly be looking for opportunities to organize celebrations of the school's successful efforts.

This list is not exhaustive but contains the items found to be important to principals who participated in the study of nine schools in restructuring in the state of Arizona (Hughes, 1999).

A series of studies has shown that the ability to use multiple frames as a model for principals in decision making for school change is associated with greater effectiveness for managers and leaders (Bensimon, 1989, 1990; Birnbaum, 1992; Bolman & Deal, 1991, 1992a, 1992b). This researcher has chosen a model designed by Bolman & Deal (1997), who assume an entirely different approach to management and leadership. Their position is "that effectiveness deteriorates when managers and leaders cannot frame and reframe their perspectives. When leaders don't know what to do, they do more of what they know. Leaders must realize there is always more than one way to respond to any organizational problem or dilemma" (p.5-6). Bolman and Deal (1997), in their research, have consolidated major schools of organizational thought into four perspectives and labeled them frames. "Frames are both windows on the world and lenses that bring the world into focus. Frames filter out some things but allow others to pass through easily. Frames help us to order experience and decide what to do" (p. 17). The frames are labeled Structural, Human Resource, Political and Symbolic.

The structural frame emphasizes goals, specialized roles and formal relationships. Structures are designed to fit an organization's environment and technology. Organizations allocate responsibilities to participants and create rules, policies, procedures and hierarchies to coordinate diverse activities. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be improved through restructuring.

The human resource frame envisions an organization comparable to an extended family with individuals with needs, feelings, prejudices, skills and limitations. These individuals have the capacity to learn; however, they also tend to defend old attitudes and beliefs. From the human resource perspective, the challenge is to tailor the organization to the people, to find ways for these individuals to "buy in" to what they are charged to do.

From the political frame perspective, organizations are viewed as arenas, contests, or jungles. Different interests compete for power and scarce resources and bargaining, negotiation, coercion, and compromise are part of everyday life. Coalitions emerge around special interests and also change as issues in the organization change.

The symbolic frames sees organizations as cultures motivated by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes and myths rather than by rules, policies and managerial authority. Assumptions of rationality are not as prominent in the symbolic frame as in the three previous frames. Organization is also theater; actors play their roles in the organization while audiences form their own impressions from what is seen "onstage". Problems arise when participants play their roles badly and when the symbols lose their meaning.

This overview of the four frame models shows that each of the frames has its own image of reality. Some frames may be clearly aligned with policy expectations for principals in the State where this study will be conducted. Dunford and Palmer (1995) found that management courses that taught multiple frames had significant positive effects over the short and long term. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents rated reframing as helpful or very helpful, and approximately 90% felt it gave them a competitive edge. Another series of studies has shown that the ability to use multiple frames is associated with effectiveness for managers and leaders (Bensimon, 1989,

1990; Birnbaum, 1992; Bolman & Deal, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Heimovics, Herman & Jurkiewicz-Coughlin, 1993, 1995; Wimpleberg, 1987).

The ability to employ multiple frame perspectives enhances principals' decision-making skills and develops their ability for creative problem solving according to Bolman and Deal (1992a, 1995). Exploring how principal leadership behaviors are judged will contribute to the knowledge of how principals respond to school reform initiatives. This knowledge may provide implications for future leadership development programs.

Significance of the Study

The school principal's role has been identified as the primary factor contributing to excellence in public schools, regardless of the ethnic or socioeconomic factors of the school community (Zigarelli, 1996). Research on effective schools consistently indicates how vital the principal is to a school's ongoing success. Many studies (Barker, 1997; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Goodlad, 1955; Murphy, 2001) have claimed that good principals are the most important key to school reform. Emphasis on testing as a means to hold schools accountable reflects the perspective that effective school leadership and good teaching are measured by student achievement (Clark, 1995). Proponents of the testing movement suggest that there is general agreement among education professionals about just what should be taught to each and every student. However, despite the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) the ideas associated with testing and the accountability movement are highly debatable (Weisman et al., 2005). Clear connections are not made between school improvement and accountability policies.

In summary, this research study is significant in that it proposed to address the need to document the extent to which leadership behaviors differ among principals in

schools "at risk" and principals in schools that have made adequate progress as judged by state standards. There was a need to clarify the daily behaviors and practices of the principal and to provide insight into how the principal makes leadership decisions and makes judgments about school improvement and how to get the job done (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which leadership behaviors of principals differ in schools at risk for reconstitution and in schools judged as meeting state standards; and to determine the extent to which principals in these schools employ frame utilization strategies for school improvement as designed by Bolman and Deal (1992b). The study proposed to gather data from three sources—the principals, the immediate supervisor of the principals, and the teachers and parents and community members who work with the principal on the School Improvement Team in the schools.

Schools and their leaders are currently under increasing pressure to make the nation's schools more effective as a means of helping to ensure its future competitiveness. Since there is compelling evidence that schools make a difference in determining the achievement of children in school and in later life, the effort to make schools and educators who manage the educational process more effective is a worthwhile goal.

In efforts to achieve this goal, the school principal plays an important role in implementing and maintaining effective instructional programs within a school (Fullan & Stieglebauer, 1991; Hanson & Smith, 1989). The principal's belief about students' abilities to learn and teachers' ability to teach affect long-range and everyday teaching and learning processes (Greenfield, 1991). The principal is actively involved in

decision making about instruction and must attend to instructional objectives as well as instructional strategies. The principal is responsible for collecting information and using data in a manner that keeps everyone in the school well informed about the performance of teachers and students (Weisman et al., 2005). Principals are responsible for providing ongoing professional development for teachers at their schools. Effective principals work hard to build staff capacity for leadership so that teachers not only grow and develop professionally, but they can assume more leadership responsibilities in the school (Sergiovanni, 2000).

One impact of the reform movement of the last decade is to involve as many people as possible in local school decision making. This shared decision making reflects a less centralized approach to school leadership and requires a great deal of collaboration and trust (Midgely & Wood, 1993). Collaborative decision making means many things and takes many forms, depending on the people involved; therefore the role of the principal changes as situations and circumstances change.

The situational leadership approach examines relationships among leader and subordinate behaviors, characteristics, and the situation. Among those leaders who must have the ability to adapt their leadership behavior to the needs of the situation are school principals (Glatthorn & Newberg, 1984; Thornberry, 1986). Furthermore, because the school principal has the dual responsibility for management functions and instruction, the situations he or she must deal with require an ability to be flexible when responding to the behavior of subordinates (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; DeBevoise, 1984; Kuch, 1983; Scott, 1983).

As a principal of a school under restructuring, he or she must reconcile the demands and initiatives of the state with those of the local system to bring about school improvement (Schools for Success, 2002). The state in which this study was conducted has for many years held individual schools responsible for the success of

their students. Therefore, principals in these schools are charged to improve student achievement among all student groups.

Since research into the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of the school principal and school effectiveness has not yet been clearly established, a problem has emerged that needs further study. Moreover, inasmuch as everything concerning how the school principal can provide the most effective instructional leadership is not yet understood, researchers must continue to examine which strategies used by the principals might contribute to school effectiveness at all school levels—elementary, middle and high.

Conceptual Orientation

This study was anchored in perspectives on the principalship and on factors that shape how principals define and respond to their roles with respect to school reform. Research conducted on this topic does not contain refined theories, but it does contain descriptions of how the principal's role is changing, and how principals respond to some of the changes and challenges of the position. Some writers identify factors that might shape how principals define and carry out their role (Fullan et al., 1993, 1999a, 1999b, 2001; Ladd & Walsh, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Other studies reveal how school leaders attempt to implement reform policies and still other studies evaluate principals' behavior from multiple perspectives (i.e., organizational and/or political perspectives) in an effort to categorize leadership practices demonstrated in school reform initiatives (Lindle, 1999). This study drew from the literature that speaks to how principals view school improvement, how principals make decisions about school reform, how they build capacity for leadership in the schools, and ultimately what strategies they use for decision making.

Research Questions

To gather data for this study, the following questions were asked of principals, the immediate supervisor of the principals, and the SIT team members (teachers and parents and community representatives). A frame-utilization schema developed by Bolman and Deal was used to gather data to answer the questions:

1. From the perspective of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?
2. From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?
3. From the perspective of SIT team members, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

Definitions of Terms

Adequate Yearly Progress - states decide whether schools are making adequate yearly progress through a five-step process. The state sets academic standards aligned with the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC). If a school does not make AYP for six years, the alternate governance plan must be implemented. This plan might include demoting the principal and "zero-basing" the staff (all staff must reapply for their positions). New administrators are assigned to the school.

Frame Utilization: a process by which leaders order their experiences and make informed decisions; framing helps filter out some things and allow others to pass through. Frames represent a "lens" through which principals might view their leadership behavior. For example, if principals can determine that their focus seems to provide a structure that includes rules, regulations, and standards, or if time is spent on gathering data to analyze progress made by teachers and students and they seek to design curriculum based on the data, then one might conclude that these principals' behavior reflects the use of the structural frame (frames are discussed later in the text). For this research study the frames are structural, political, human resource and symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 1995).

School Assessment Program - the State assessment tests administered in reading to grades 3, 5, 8, and 10; in math to grades 3, 5, and 8; and in geometry to students enrolled in a high school geometry course (2002- 2003). In 2003-2004, the tests were also administered in reading and math to grades 4, 6, and 7.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 - the most recent effort by the federal government to influence educational policy and practice. This law, a revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act first passed in 1965, provides mandates in ten categories that cut across schooling in America. Embedded in these categories are state accountability systems, required testing programs, and rules and regulations that mandate standards for teachers that states are required to meet. States are also accountable for student achievement and for the achievement of low-income students, students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, limited-English-speaking students and students with disabilities.

Reconstitution - the final step in the school improvement process as designed by the school system of this research study. This step signifies that when schools fail

to make adequate progress as determined by state assessment tests, intervention by the State is likely.

Restructuring - a term that replaced "reconstitution" in the school improvement process. In the past, the state identified low-performing schools for local and state reconstitution. Restructuring involves at least one of the following: (1) replacing all or most school staff who are relevant to the failure to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP); (2) contracting with a management company to operate the school; (3) Reopening the school as a public charter; or (4) Other major restructuring actions that involve significant changes to staffing and governance.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted in ten elementary schools randomly selected by the research department of a large urban area in a mid-Atlantic state. Five schools labeled "at risk" and five schools that made adequate progress as determined by state standards were studied. The ten schools selected were in three administrative areas.

Data were collected from teachers who serve on the School Improvement Team rather than all of the teachers in the school. Similarly, data were collected from community members who serve on the School Improvement Team rather than those who serve on the PTA or other school committees.

Delimitations

The decision to select elementary schools for the study was based on available time and resources of the researcher. Since accessibility to principals and faculty is critical for data collection, limiting the study to elementary schools seemed logical.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I provides an overview of the research effort. Chapter II portrays a review of related literature. Chapter III explains the design of the study. Chapter IV describes the findings of the research. Chapter V summarizes the findings and presents conclusions from the study and makes recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which leadership behaviors of principals differ in schools at risk for reconstitution and in schools judged as meeting state standards; and to determine the extent to which principals in these schools employ frame utilization strategies for school improvement as designed by Bolman and Deal (1992b). This chapter includes a review of the literature relevant to organizational behavior in education, leadership and management, school reform and accountability. The leadership of the school principal will be discussed within each of these categories.

Organizational Behavior in Education

Robert G. Owens (2004) reminds us that in a place called "school," people live and work. Not unlike other social organizations, the world of the school has power, structure, logic and values, which combine to exert strong influence on the ways in which individuals perceive the world, interpret it, and respond to it. Simplified, "the behavior of people at work in an educational organization, individually as well as in a group, is not merely a reflection of their idiosyncratic personalities but it is influenced by the social norms and expectations of the culture that prevail in the organization" (p.2). One might also add, by the culture of the community that the school serves.

Educational programs have been influenced by different paradigms, perspectives or worldviews about issues of behavior in educational organizations (Bloom et al., 1956; Edmonds, 1966; Lezotte, 1992; Schein, 1985; Sizer, 1992; Skinner, 1968). The fact that people use different views in trying to understand human behavior in organizations simply means that educational leaders will be

confronted with conflict and controversy as a normal part of daily work. It is evident from studies and reports relevant to school leadership and school performance that there is no one paradigm to unify and give direction to those concerned about teaching and learning in our schools. Because there is no one overarching paradigm, it becomes necessary for educational leaders to think through the issues and develop a clear understanding of their own position on the different, often conflicting, points of view (Owens, 2004). It is clear that the old order of education is giving way and that schooling will continue its rapid processes of change in the future.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, a new paradigm signed into law on January 3, 2002, sought to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity in education by imposing new top-down bureaucratic laws and regulations. It also ushered in a new era for educational leaders, one in which school leadership is expected to be driven by data from educational outcomes as measured by individual state assessment tests.

According to Owens (2004), the passage of this act "has everything to do with the day-to-day realities of being a leader in the schools and anyone who would be an effective leader in the schools of America's future must have a clear understanding of the assumptions and beliefs that underlie the arguments of those on both sides of the confrontation" (p. 20). While a top-down leadership style is supported in the No Child Left Behind Act, contemporary scholarly thought about leadership is dominated by the recognition that change, complexity and uncertainty are dominant characteristics of today's school environments and the need to find new and better ways to lead is imminent. "At a time when school reform demands leadership rather than bureaucratic command, schools should be evolving from top-down hierarchical management toward a more collaborative, collegial, participative form of leadership" (Owens, 2004, p.274).

Leadership and Management

The study of leadership and management has a long history. The concept of effective leadership prompts the question, by whose standards? The concept of leadership using scientific methods is relatively new, and Orozco (1999) notes that, as in other organizations, school leadership can be viewed from the perspective of teachers, students, supervisors, parents and the community, which might complicate the process of confirming the most important qualities of leadership. Greenberg and Baron (1997) describe the complexities of leadership when they note that "leadership resembles love. It is something most people believe they can recognize but often find difficult to define" (p.433). Leadership is partially based on the positive feelings that exist between leaders and subordinates and involves non-coercive influence (Greenberg & Baron, 2000). For Cashman (2000), "leadership is authentic self-expression that creates value, it is not seen as hierarchical—it exists everywhere in organizations" (p.20).

Historically, school leaders have been portrayed as people in charge of a school who have the sole responsibility for leading those who work for them to success. This kind of school leader has the expectation that when he/she leads, others will follow. More recent views of leadership involve persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and pursue a common goal that is important for the group (Hogan et al., 1999). They express that leadership is persuasion, not domination; persons who can require others to do their bidding because of their power are not leaders. Leadership only occurs when others willingly adopt, for a period of time, the goals of the group as their own.

Research from the last two decades has also shown a strong link between effective leadership and effective organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1994; Boyan, 1988; Griffiths, 1988; Lezotte, 1997; Sergiovanni, 1995). Hogan et al. (1999) assert that a

"growing body of evidence supports the common sense belief that leadership matters" (p.34). Fullan (2002) expresses that schools need leaders who can change "what people in the organization value and how they work together to accomplish it" (p.34). Fullan (2002) continues by saying the schools "need leaders who can create a fundamental transformation in the learning cultures of schools and of the teaching profession itself" (p.18). Beach and Reinhartz (2000) note that "leadership is essential to promoting student achievement and creating a vision of success for the total educational program" (p.72).

A causal and definitional link exists between leadership and team performance, posit Blanchard, Hybels and Hodges (1999), who also note that leadership is about serving and starts on the inside and moves outward to serve others. Such leadership has the interest of others in mind, nurtures growth and development in others, is willing to listen, and thinks less about self while held accountable for performance. Lambert (1998) suggests that leadership involves "learning together and constructing meaning and knowledge collectively and collaboratively to reflect on and make sense of work in the light of shared beliefs and create actions that grow out of these new understandings" (pp.5-6).

The task of running a complex operation is administration—a task with two dimensions. One dimension, embracing activities related to change, is leadership. The other dimension, encompassing productive efforts to manage a status quo in which people can work comfortably, is management (Hughes, 2004). Hughes introduces the ABC rule (Accelerator, Brake and Cruise control) and further explains that the good administrator reads the context correctly and knows how much pressure to apply, when to apply it and why. In running complex organizations, the person in charge must attend to both leadership tasks and management tasks. The successful principal administers a complex organization that is part of a larger social and political

context. When exercising leadership skills, the administrator helps establish the goals, mission, and shared vision for the organization itself and for the organization within the larger context. When the vision is shared, management can generate processes and structures to guide goal attainment.

One of the most influential calls for educational leaders to have such a vision is found in Standards for School Leaders proposed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) of the Council of Chief State School Officers as a basis for licensing school administrators in the United States. These standards were developed in a two-year collaborative effort by numerous individuals from the ranks of state education agencies and representatives of professional associations. Published in 1996, they have a nationwide impact on qualifications required for issuing licenses to educational administrators. These standards are compatible with the guidelines of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The first of these standards calls for the school administrators to have a "vision of learning" that shapes the educational programs they may advocate, as well as the ways in which they work with others in seeking to bring the vision to reality. Educational leaders should have such a vision, and their professional behaviors should be shaped and guided by it.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) defined vision as "an uncommon ability to visualize a better future for an organization" (p. 32). The National Board Policy for Educational Administration (1990) has as one of its elements for School Building Leadership, *Develops a Vision*. Candidates develop a vision of learning for a school that promotes the success of all students, base this vision on relevant knowledge and theories, and articulate the components of this vision for a school and the leadership processes necessary to implement and support the vision."

The school leader develops a vision of learning from the culture of the organization and establishes a mission for the school community. The vision is the

primary and major influence on both the mission and the culture. Vision can be defined as foresight and forethought. It is the dream of where the school principal wants the school to be in the future. If it is a shared vision, it exceeds what the principal wants; it is now what the staff, students, parents and community leaders want. Given that the No Child Left Behind Act holds the principal accountable for what everybody wants, the shared vision strategy is important. The mission is the charge—how to achieve the vision. Deal and Peterson (1999) wrote that the mission is "the focus of what people do" (p.23). The culture in a school reflects the vision and the mission of the school. In defining culture, Deal and Peterson (1999) state that "it consists of the stable, underlying social meanings that shape beliefs and behavior over time" (p.3). In other words, it is the way things happen in a school. The vision is the dream; the mission is how to achieve the dream; and the culture is impacted by the realization of the vision as the mission is accomplished. Culture involves values, beliefs, mores, tools for establishing goals, and the way in which people are valued or devalued.

Smith and Andrews (1989) explain that "communication of vision is perhaps the most important way for a principal to exert effective leadership—to leave no doubt about school priorities" (p. 16). These principals know what to expect for the school and students and are able to infect others with that dream, a positive and beneficial contagion. Perhaps these principals can do nothing more important for their teachers and staff than to create a process for forging and reworking the vision or mission of the school. Traditionally, schools have not been places where adults can easily share the collegial relationships that are essential to leadership, as distinct from management, and teacher empowerment. An effective school principal "demonstrates a strong interest in promoting collegiality and shared leadership, an interest in shifting

the norms of the school's culture from the traditional to more collaborative ways of working together" (Owens, 2004, p. 274).

Powell (2004), in her research on the behaviors and practices of successful principals working with "at risk" schools, found that the school vision, mission and culture are important to the success of the school. She found that it is difficult to separate the three because one supports and affects the others. She also found other research that supports this claim. For example, it is the vision of the school that leads the way to accomplishing the goals of the school (Uchiyama & Wolf, 2002). Dufour and Eaker (1998) state that the shared vision motivates the staff to work together and gives a sense of direction for what they want to accomplish in the future. The U. S. Department of Education (1999) stated that education leaders today must have a vision of where their school is going and have a plan for getting there.

During this period of reform and change, the vision of school leaders is especially important. Edwards (1998) found the vision of the principal a key factor in implementing change in a high-involvement school. In this quantitative study, the researcher completed a case study of an elementary school under school renewal in southwestern Virginia. From relevant data regarding student achievement and the need for improvement, the principal began to develop her own vision about the future of the school, which evolved with the efforts of the school staff. This shared vision led to participatory and shared leadership in the school that was a significant factor in implementing school change.

The vision of the school principal influences the mission of the school. Everyone needs to understand the mission of the school in order to realize the vision. As Papalewis and Fortune (2002) stated:

Above all, leadership and stewardship in a school mandate the development of a clear mission. This does not mean that only the

principal is aware of the mission statement. It means that as school leader, the principal must involve everyone in the school in recognizing, enforcing, and implementing the mission statement. The statement must become a daily concrete objective. (p. 12)

Papalewis and Fortune (2002) also cited examples of successful schools in which the goals that reflect the mission statement are displayed in every classroom. In these schools everyone knew the direction of the school and the posted goals in the halls and classrooms reflected their knowledge and commitment.

The vision is the foundation of the culture of the school. The culture reflects the vision of the principal and staff and illuminates the way of life in a school. The principal is the key in determining the culture (Barth, 1990). Successful school cultures are focused on the learning of all students (Deal & Peterson, 1999) and everyone knows that learning comes first (Druan & Butler, 1987). When learning is the central purpose of schooling, and all work is focused on this purpose, a school is likely to be successful (Maehr & Parker, 1993).

In successful schools, there is a culture that shows everyone focused on teaching and learning. Connell (1999) described these schools as a place where everyone is involved in the work of the school. In her study of high-performing and high-poverty schools, she found that a staff focused on engagement in the school is an important aspect of school success. She stated:

Of primary importance is the principal's engagement in a school. There is no high-achieving school where the staff is not serious about their work and where they are not focused. One can sense that people in a building are moving in the same direction. Everyone knows their job and why they're there... even the lunch-room aide. In low-achieving schools, everyone is an island unto themselves. (p. 17)

Clearly from the research, the vision of the principal is the key element in school leadership. With a vision, the leader is then able to influence the mission of the school and create a culture of learning that will promote success for all students.

Hughes (2004) further explains a school's culture. He states "a school's culture is a representation of what its members collectively believe themselves to be: It is their self-concept. It reflects what they value and what they express to others as being 'important around here'"(p. 65). Culture is a shared reality constructed over time; cultures may be cohesive or fragmented, strong or weak, and functional or dysfunctional depending on the degree to which the same reality is shared by organizational members (Morgan, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1990).

It is clear that schooling has reached a turning point and the need for cultivating creative cultures is at hand (Hughes, 2004).

The principal has emerged as the energizer and facilitator of this process. Purposeful direction depends on the leader's ability to inspire the creative contribution of all members of the organization.

Leadership must become reciprocal as leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of moral consciousness and improvement of social order. Creative leaders recognize that excellence is facilitated through a bonding of purposes and values rather than through imposed structures designed to streamline, predict and quantify set objectives. A creative culture then is characterized by participants who examine current practices in relation to organizational needs. (p. 81)

Blumberg (1989) explains that the successful principal applies the "craft of administration" by balancing the art of leadership and the science of management to improve curriculum, instruction, and other important elements of school. He adds that by purposefully adding elements of a specific school setting into the general model, a

principal can categorize and assess important site-specific school improvement actions.

Barker (1992) posits that applying new ideas to the challenge of future paradigm shifts is not just changing the rules of the game, but is the formulation of a new game. He notes that the administrator manages within a paradigm but leads between paradigms. School leadership has become increasingly more complicated and vital to ensuring school success and soliciting substantial participation from faculty, staff and students. In responding to higher standards of increased student progress, school leaders recognize that they alone cannot be the sole instructional leaders but must coach, mentor, and empower faculty and staff in the pursuit of reform and renewal. As school leaders continue to adapt to their changing roles, effective leadership skills will be essential and the real challenge is providing the type of leadership skills necessary to assist schools in expanding their traditional boundaries (Green, 2001). Lambert (2002) notes that for decades, educators have understood that they are all responsible for student learning, but more recently administrators have come to realize that they are responsible for their own learning and the learning of their colleagues as well.

School Reform and Accountability

The term *accountability* is frequently used in discussions about education, and it is a term that appears to have different meanings to different people. The fundamental dictionary definition suggests that being accountable involves being responsible and/or providing explanations (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1996). When the term is applied to educational leadership, it means that leaders must be responsible for all student learning and use data to inform the successes or failures of the instructional process. Accountability simply means that school leaders can no

longer be willing to defer to or blame others for school inadequacy and that they must be willing to do whatever it takes to make sure that all students are academically successful. Schmoker (2001) says it is time to acknowledge an ever-increasing body of evidence that points to the fact that accountability promotes higher achievement. He goes on to say that accountability and school improvement are linked because as school leaders take greater responsibility for successes as well as failures, their schools begin to improve. Greenlee and Bruner (2001) have observed that "while many may view standardized testing as just the monitoring piece of accountability, it can raise organizational and instructional capacity when the assessments require higher cognitive levels of performance from students" (p.2). They go on to point out that when aligned with curriculum goals, "standards and assessments do not have to result in just 'teaching to the test'" (p.2), but can also serve to influence the teaching-learning process. The dilemma for school leaders becomes one of balance.

In this new era of accountability, Underwood (2001) notes that "the only stable aspect of school as an institution is a persistent, constant, repetitive drumbeat of reform (p. 72). With the publication of *A Nation At Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), schools began an ever-evolving process of change and reform. The school reform measures have embodied changes in assessment and accountability strategies that have led to a clearer articulation of what students need to know and be able to do. This increased emphasis on student learning and student success means that school leaders "must implement better methods and materials, not just apply consequences for failure" (Slavin, 2000/2001, p.23). Systemic and comprehensive reform approaches that are performance based have characterized the process (Comer, Ben-Avie, Haynes, & Joyner, 1999). These approaches provide school leaders with "well researched, readily replicable whole-school reforms to help

improve teaching and learning in under-performing schools" (Slavin, 2000/2001, p.25).

School leaders must use appropriate and available student data to ensure that systemic reform leads to fundamental changes in the instructional materials and practices in elementary and secondary classrooms. Fullan (1999a, 1993) suggests that, on the basis of his research and observations, an elementary school can make progress in school improvement in three years, a high school in six years, and an entire school district in eight years.

Accountability Models

In the last two decades, accountability in public education has been the focus of much research (Berman & Gjelten, 1984; Bryk & Hermanson, 1993; Darling-Hammond, 1991; Glickman, 1990; Harrington-Lueker, 1990; Hill & Bonan, 1991). Today, little is left to chance and not only have many states adopted various forms of statewide assessment measures, but recent national legislation has mandated testing in grades three through nine. With the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, states are required to "develop assessments aligned with state standards and to be accountable for students' annual academic progress. States and school districts must develop yearly report cards documenting the success of their students meeting achievement goals" (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2002, p. 1).

The results by district, usually in the form of student performance on state-mandated tests, are often reported to the public. Statewide assessment measures are generally aligned with the respective formal state public school curriculum and are designed to assess not only what has been taught, but more importantly what students have been learning. The assessment results are normally tied to each state's

accountability system, which may involve accreditation ratings or sanctions as well as funding. For Holcomb (2001), the following five questions serve to guide school leaders in their efforts to improve educational accountability and ensure learning for all:

1. Where are we now?
2. Where do we want to go?
3. How will we get there?
4. How will we know we are there?
5. How can we keep it going? (p.7)

State Accountability Models

Several states have received recognition for their accountability systems based on the level of student achievement on the statewide assessment programs. Alabama, California, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas have earned recognition for their strong curriculum standards and accountability systems (Finn & Petrilli, 2000). Additionally, Florida's model, which includes the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, is not only aligned with the state curriculum standards, but requires students to demonstrate understanding at higher cognitive levels (application, analysis, or evaluation) (Greenlee & Bruner, 2001).

Restructured Schools

Restructuring refers to the process of changing the basic structure of a school. Hughes (1999) asserts that many have ignored this dictionary definition and applied the word to mean any change in programs, instructional techniques, or teaching arrangements. He says that confusion and lack of understanding have resulted from this application. Restructuring defined in this manner forces one to turn away from traditional notions about the organization of schools. It means that the "production

line" paradigm of classical organizational theory must be replaced with a different model. He further indicates that most of our schools are organized in a manner similar to an assembly line in a factory. For example, 25 or 30 students and a teacher work together for approximately nine months. Then the group moves along to another teacher and the nine-month cycle is repeated. Should a student fail to keep up with the other members of the group, he or she is simply recycled through the entire nine-month experience, often with the same teacher.

In a reform effort in Arizona, restructuring means changing this assembly line model; restructuring has meant the adoption of a more static model where students of various ages work with the same teacher over a multiple-year period. As the student demonstrates the acquisition of the knowledge, skills and behavior expected of students in the setting, he or she moves individually to the next multiple-age, multiple-grade setting. Groups are not moved; individuals move as they are ready.

At Abraham Lincoln High School in Denver, the school community (principal, teachers, and community leaders) decided that the existing organization of the school's departments did not serve the students well nor did it enable the school to offer programs the students in the school needed. The decision was then made to abandon the departments in favor of a "school within a school" structure. Each "school" was designed to serve the learning needs of a particular segment of the student population and no two schools were alike (Hughes, 1999).

Principals' Role in School Restructuring

The exercise of leadership involves working with and through people, individually and in groups, to achieve organizational goals. When the goals of the organization emphasize demands for quick responses to rapid, pervasive change in the environment while dealing with emerging problems arising from the need for change

that are ambiguous and ill-understood, and the outcomes of possible alternative solutions are knowable in advance, problems arise for school administrators. The two issues of stability and change are inseparable from every decision in which the educational leader is involved. Educational leaders have a theoretical choice between using traditional bureaucratic methods to work with and through others or using collaborative methods. On the one hand, the fast-paced world of school administration seems to demand that the leader make decisions quickly and move on to other pressing business. On the other hand, it is clear that healthy organizations find strength in opening up participation in decision making and empowering relevant people on the staff to contribute to the quality of the decisions made.

While the research reveals several decision-making models, (i.e., rational decision making, participative decision making, theories of decision-making practices), the summary of decision making in this chapter focuses on the personal decision-making style of the school administrator because of its inevitable impact on the behavior of others. This emphasis on the responsibility of the administrator for the nature and quality of the decision-making processes used in an organization is compatible with the contemporary view that the administrator is a key actor in the development of the culture of the school organization.

Recent research suggests that academic people and administrators tend to think about administrative work in different ways. Research argues that much of the in-service training for administrators that emphasizes so-called models for decision making is little more than an effort to train administrators in formal methods of reflective thought; the assumption being that with such training, one can improve the decision-making behavior of administrators by improving their skills in logical thought (Owens, 2004). Karl Weick (1983) offers possibilities and states that "when administrators tour, read, talk, supervise and meet with each other, all these actions

contain thought and, indeed, they are ways in which administrators do their thinking" (cited in Owens, 2004, p. 299).

In considering the ways in which administrators think about their work, it is important to realize that the organizational environment in which the work is done is characterized by ambiguity, uncertainty, and disorder. Situations that require decisions are often fluid and difficult to analyze and are subject to a number of interpretations, often conflicting (Owens, 2004). In the daily flow of action, administrators typically engage in brief, spontaneous, face-to-face, verbal interaction with others. They are constantly "fighting fires" (Owens, 2004, p.300).

Under conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty, in school administrators' attempts to shift from traditional methods to participative methods in decision-making, a new sense of administrative wisdom has emerged. Traditionally, it was believed that only limited power was available in the school organization and that the wise administrator would garner all that was possible. Empowering teachers and others to participate in decision making would be viewed by the administrator as losing power by giving it away to others. Contemporary empowering administrators understand that one gains power by sharing it with others because in collaborative efforts, the power available to the group multiplies (Owens, 2004).

Leadership for School Change

The role of manager is essential for the school principal and is probably the most important aspect of school leadership. Katz and Kahn (1966), in their classic text on organizational behavior, divide management skills into three major categories:

1. Technical - derived from sound management techniques
2. Human - derived from harnessing available social and interpersonal resources.

3. Conceptual - derived from expert knowledge about matters of education and schooling.

Sergiovanni (1991) added two other areas of management for school administrators:

1. Symbolic - derived from focusing the attention of others on matters of importance to the school.
2. Cultural - derived from building a unique school culture.

Fullan and Stieglebauer (1991) add a sixth dimension of school management—the principal as a *change agent* and *facilitator*. In all six areas of leadership, the principal attempts to organize the school's mission or goals by (1) building collegiality among teachers, (2) forging partnerships with the parents, community residents, and community institutions, and (3) manipulating symbols, resources, and rewards toward common goals (Blake & Pfeiffer, 1993).

There are several recently released studies of school leadership for school change across different countries including the United States that provide clear, but not necessarily easy, messages. For example, Bryk and his colleagues (1998) have been tracing the evolution of reform in Chicago since 1988. Their findings reveal that in schools that evidenced improvement over time (about one-third of 473 elementary schools),

Principals worked together with a supportive base of parents, teachers and community members to mobilize initiative. Their efforts broadly focused along two major dimensions: first, reaching out to parents and community to strengthen the ties between local school professionals and the clientele they are to serve; and second, working to expand the professional capacities of individual teachers, to promote the formation

of a coherent professional community, and to direct resources toward enhancing the quality of instruction. (Fullan, 2001, p. 142)

Collaboration is a key characteristic of school change and school success. Successful principals empower staff through collaboration and shared leadership. They encourage risk taking and problem solving (Davenport & Anderson, 2002). Bell (2001), in a report from a symposium on high-performing, high-poverty schools in Sacramento, California in December 2000, discussed reasons for the high performance of the schools. A dialogue between nationally known researchers, such as Joyce Epstein from the Johns Hopkins University and Patricia Davenport from the American Productivity and Quality Center, and the school participants concluded the session with lessons learned for future work. In addition to restating the value of strong principal leadership, they emphasized that effective site leadership is an integral part of how schools conducted business.

Bolman and Deal (1984) assert that leaders view their world through a framework of preconditioned lenses and filters. This framework shapes how situations are defined and determines what actions are taken. However, correct diagnosis of a given situation is the critical step in determining the appropriate response from the leader. "A faulty diagnosis will rarely produce an effective response, and misreading a situation can undermine even a leader of exceptional stature and skill (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p.1).

Bolman and Deal (1984) developed four frames that portray the way leaders think and act in response to everyday issues:

- The human resource frame focuses attention on human needs.
- The structural frame focuses on organizational goals and efficiency
- The political frame emphasizes competition for scarce resources.
- The symbolic frame focuses on imagery, symbols and culture.

Bolman and Deal's research indicates that leaders rarely use more than two frames. They determined that leaders most often used the human resource frame while the least used frame was the symbolic. Research found a relatively consistent view of leaders' self-perception of orientation and subordinates' views of that orientation (Bolman & Deal, 1977). Their research revealed a relationship between the leader's orientation and Bennis and Nanus' (1985) concept of leadership and management. Their research also found that the four orientations were predictor variables for leader effectiveness and managerial effectiveness as perceived by colleagues and subordinates. The structural orientation was found to be the best predictor of managerial effectiveness; symbolic orientation was found to be the best predictor of leader effectiveness, but the worst predictor of managerial effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1977). Additional studies that have used the Bolman and Deal model for determining school leadership behaviors in school improvement are Fleming (2002), Fears (2004), and Hoo-Balade (2004).

Summary

The Bolman and Deal frame utilization schemata was selected to gather data to determine leadership behaviors of school principals because of its close alignment with management and leadership theories and orientations from research studies cited in the literature. Each frame can be linked to leadership styles and behaviors of school principals. For example, the central concept of the Structural Frame is related to rules, goals, policies, and task orientations that are embedded in leadership and management requirements for principals. The Human Resource frame has as its focus human needs and relationships (staff, students, parents, and community). Collegial relationships are necessary where people work comfortably. Understanding the culture of the school community is key for the school leader; to be able to visualize a better future for the

organization has relevance for the Symbolic Frame. Finally, school leaders must understand that leadership is not domination through coalitions of power, but by persuasion. Leaders must understand the central concept of power and conflict in the school setting—Political Frame. Therefore, the Bolman and Deal frame utilization strategy will be used for data collection for this study.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Literature related to the study of school reform and student performance suggests that principal leadership is critical to school change (State Department of Education, 2000). This study was designed to investigate the extent to which principals employ frame utilization strategies, as designed by Bolman and Deal (1997), when making judgments and management decisions for school improvement. The sample population for this study was composed of ten elementary school principals; five principals in schools considered at risk and five principals in schools making adequate progress as judged by state accountability standards. The methodology used for gathering data for this study and the statistical analysis proposed are presented in this chapter. The research questions and statistical hypotheses, a description of the sample population to be studied, and a description of the instrumentation used in this study are also presented.

Setting

The urban school district where this research study was conducted has a total student population of 85,468. In the last ten years, the student population has declined by 23,291 students (21%). The white, non-Hispanic population has declined by 48% and the African American population has declined by 17%. The only group to increase its enrollment is the Hispanic group, which has experienced a 256% increase. However, this is a small group in comparison. Its numbers have increased from 456 in 1997 to 1,623 in 2006. In 2006, school demographics were .08% white, 89% African American, .02% Hispanic, .006% Asian/Pacific Islander, and .003% American Indian/Alaskan Native.

The school district is divided into seven areas. Four of them contain only elementary schools or elementary/middle schools. In Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4, there are a total of 113 elementary schools and K-8 schools. In Areas 5, 6, and 7, there are middle schools, district-wide high schools, and neighborhood high schools. There are a total of 192 schools in the district.

School Accountability

This state's accountability program provides the data that were used to assess school effectiveness in this study. The history surrounding the accountability program is noteworthy. In 1989, the governor of this mid-Atlantic state appointed a commission to examine ways to measure the performance of the public schools in the state and to develop strategies for improvement. Outlined in the report of the Governor's Commission on School Performance (Sondheim et al., 1989), accountability efforts are guided by three fundamental premises:

- All children can learn
- All children have the right to attend schools in which they can progress and learn
- All children shall have a real opportunity to learn equally rigorous content. (p.3)

The commission made recommendations aimed at promoting flexibility and change in addressing school improvement. Recognizing that experience and circumstances would inevitably dictate change, the commission developed a set of assumptions and established a set of guidelines that were to be the framework to assess schools. This framework of educational assessment included a "vital core" of student achievements in which uniform statewide measurement is possible (Sondheim, et al., 1989). Recommendations included compiling data about (1) the

accomplishments of graduates of this state's high schools; (2) the percentage of students completing a rigorous academic program; (3) the percentage of average daily attendance; (4) the percentage of students meeting state standards in reading, mathematics, writing, science and social studies.

Following the commission's report, the State Department of Education developed the State School Performance Program (SSPP) to measure school performance and student achievement. The SSPP yields a school score rather than an individual student score. The SSPP provides a system of public accountability with results of individual school and district performance announced in a variety of publications. The SSPPs bring a "new, more authentic form of accountability" (SDE, 1999) that seeks to measure academic, application and interpersonal skills. Schools not showing adequate progress toward meeting the state standards are identified by the State Department of Education. These schools are eligible to receive additional support in the form of state-aided technical assistance, additional funding, or reconstitution.

Since 1994, the State Board in the mid-Atlantic state of this study has identified over 95 schools as "reconstitution eligible." Historically, though student achievement has improved, the number of schools not making adequate progress continues to increase (i.e., new schools were added to the list each year). For example, in 1994, when schools were assessed using the state performance assessment tests, two high schools were placed on probation; in 1995, one elementary school and two middle schools were identified; in 1996, 23 elementary schools, five middle schools and three high schools were identified; in 1997, five additional elementary schools, one middle school and two high schools were identified; in 1998, 16 elementary schools and eight middle schools; in 1999, five elementary schools and one intermediate school were identified. For the year 2000, no additional schools

were identified for local reconstitution but in 2001, four elementary schools and three middle schools were identified (SDE, 2003). Currently, test results from the new state accountability system indicate that while elementary schools show progress, few schools show adequate progress (Local Paper, June, 2005, p. B2).

Since 2003 the term "reconstitution" is no longer used to refer to schools on probation. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, a three-year-old education reform law, schools that fail to meet state standards for six consecutive years must restructure by: (1) replacing all or most of the staff, (2) reopening as a public charter school, (3) contracting the operation of the school to an outside entity, or (4) adopting a different "governance structure." However, the state has developed its own plan to help schools improve. Currently, the state has combined these separate processes into one statewide process of improvement and schools are currently categorized as "Schools Making Progress" and "Schools Not Making Progress" or "at risk."

Recent changes to the state's accountability system increased the focus on subgroup (ethnicity and gender) performance and fulfilled the requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The cornerstone of the state's accountability system is Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and replaces the School Performance Index as the method by which the state tracks academic progress and makes accountability decisions. Schools must show that students are making progress in reading, math and a third measure, as determined by the state assessment program. In the elementary schools, the additional measure is attendance. The State Board of Education has set performance standards as Basic, Proficient and Advanced.

Under regulations, if schools fail to adequately improve, the district can identify these schools as subject to state takeover. This is not an immediate action, however; local school districts can submit school improvement plans for each identified school in the district, and if the state approves the plan local districts

continue to run the schools, implementing the plans under the "Local Board Reconstitution" (Making Accountability Work, 1998, Advocacy for Children and Youth). For the 2005-2006 school year, three schools were "zero-based." This means that new principals were assigned in each of the schools. All staff were required to reapply for positions in the school.

School systems in the state have developed individual plans for school improvement. The urban area of this research study has devised categories for elementary school improvement: Year One (Improvement, 5 Schools), Year Two (Improvement, 21 Schools), Year Three (Corrective Action, 1 School), Year Four (Restructuring Planning, 10 Schools) and Year Five (Restructuring Implementation, 56 Schools). During the 2004-2005 school year, the urban school system continued an aggressive plan to support and hold accountable schools at various levels of school improvements determined by the State reporting of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Of the 61 schools identified for restructuring planning and/or restructuring implementation, 10 schools (8 elementary schools and 2 K-8 schools) exited from improvement status and 17 schools met AYP.

Schools in years 1 and 2 of school improvement lose basic levels of autonomy and are supported by ongoing and intensive oversight and monitoring via systemic initiatives. Schools in corrective action lose school level autonomy and are supported by ongoing and intensive area and central office review team monitoring, professional development, systemic initiatives and mandated intervention programs. Schools in restructuring/planning lose autonomy at the area office level, receive coaching from external partners for professional development fidelity and receive support and oversight from an external review team. Schools in restructuring/implementation lose autonomy at the area office level, receive coaching from external partners for professional development fidelity, receive support and oversight from an external

review team, and provided a Restructuring Implementation Specialist for monitoring and oversight in the implementation of the school's restructuring plan.

Sampling

For this study, ten elementary schools were randomly selected to participate by the research department of the urban district where this study was conducted. The ten schools were selected because they possess a distinctly urban character, that is, they are located in older sections of the city, and are either in the midst of or are in close proximity to urban poverty and blight. Poverty indicators are high. All of the schools are Title I schools meaning they qualify for free and reduced price meals. Percentages of students in the schools who receive free and reduced price meals are above 70% and student mobility rates are at 39% or higher. The ten schools are under the management of three area executive officers. Five of the elementary schools were considered to be at risk and five were judged to be making adequate yearly progress. This researcher assumed that the responses from the principals, supervisors, teachers and community members on the School Improvement Team were truthful and unbiased in their answers.

Data Collection

Once permission was received from the committee to proceed with the study, the researcher completed the Human Subjects Form required by the university. Upon receiving that approval, the researcher scheduled a meeting with the Area Executive Officers (AEOs), the immediate supervisors of the principals. The AEOs agreed to contact each of the principals in their respective areas to inform them of the research project and to request their participation in the study. The letter outlined the procedures to be followed in collecting the data. There were about 20 teachers in each school. However, not every teacher in the school served on the School Improvement

Team. The number of these teachers varied from school to school. The teachers as well as other staff and community members who served on the SIT received a survey and a pre-addressed envelope in which to return the survey. The principals and the immediate supervisors of the principals also received a copy of the survey and a return envelope. The researcher had hoped to receive completed surveys from at least 70% of the teachers and other members on the SIT, and a 100% return from the principals and supervisors. In each of the school categories, four of the five principals returned the survey and all supervisors responded.

Research Questions and Statistical Hypotheses

1. From the perspective of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?
 - H1. From the perspective of the principals, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.
2. From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?
 - H2. From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of

principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.

3. From the perspective of SIT team members, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

H3. From the perspective of SIT team members, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.

Instrumentation

Bolman and Deal (1997) identify four frames that categorize leadership behaviors (Structural, Human Resource, Political and Symbolic). In their research they have consolidated major schools of organizational thought into four perspectives and labeled them frames. "Frames are both windows on the world and lenses that bring the world into focus. Frames filter out some things but allow others to pass through easily. Frames help us order experiences and decide what to do" (p. 16). The structural frame emphasizes goals, specialized roles and formal relationships. Structures are designed to fit an organization's environment and technology. Organizations allocate responsibilities to participants and create rules, policies, procedures and hierarchies to coordinate diverse activities. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be improved through restructuring.

The human resource frame sees an organization comparable to an extended family with individuals with needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations. These individuals have the capacity to learn; however, they also tend to defend old attitudes and beliefs. From the human resource perspective, the challenge is to tailor organizations to the people, to find ways for these individuals to "buy in" to what they are charged to do.

From the political perspective, organizations are viewed as arenas, contests, or jungles. Different interests compete for power and scarce resources and bargaining, negotiation, coercion, and compromise are part of everyday life. Coalitions emerge around special interests and also change as issues in the organization change.

The symbolic frame sees organizations as cultures motivated by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes and myths rather than by rules, policies and managerial authority. Assumptions of rationality are not as prominent in the symbolic frame as in the three previous frames. Organization is also theater; actors play their roles in the organization while audiences form their own impressions from what is seen onstage. Problems arise when participants play their parts badly and when the symbols lose their meaning.

This overview of the four-frame model shows that each of the frames has its own image of reality. Some frames may seem clear while others might be confusing. The creators of this model assert that as managers learn to apply all four, they should develop a greater understanding of the organization. Dunford and Palmer (1995) found that management courses that taught multiple frames had significant positive effects over the short and long term. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents rated reframing as helpful or very helpful, and approximately 90% felt it gave them a competitive edge. Another series of studies has shown that the ability to use multiple frames is associated with effectiveness for managers and leaders (Bensimon, 1989,

1990; Birnbaum, 1992; Bolman and Deal, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Heimovics, Herman, & Jurkiewicz-Coughlin, 1993, 1995; Wimpleberg, 1987).

The Bolman and Deal (1992a) framework has been used in research studies in the United States and Singapore. The investigation combined qualitative and quantitative methods. The researchers used interviews and the Leadership Orientations (Self and Others) Survey instrument to gather data. Two samples were taken.

The study had similar findings among the United States sample and that of Singapore: (a) all four frames were positively associated with the measures of effectiveness, (b) the structural frame was a better predictor of managerial than leadership effectiveness, while the reverse was true for the symbolic frame, and (c) the effective school manager is someone oriented toward structure and symbols. Both the qualitative and quantitative results suggest that the ability to use multiple frames is critical to principals' effectiveness as both manager and leader.

In 1992, the organizational frames of Bolman and Deal were used to determine factors that school superintendents and individuals who work in school administration in Tennessee considered important to effective leadership. The frames were examined with regard to the relationship of Tennessee superintendents' leadership styles and the perception of the superintendents' leadership styles by superordinates and subordinates. The Leadership Orientations Survey was used to identify superintendents' self-assessments of frame use and perceptions of superintendents' frame use by superordinates and subordinates. The findings indicated that the multiple frame use was a predictor of management and leadership effectiveness as perceived by the respondents.

The Leadership Orientations Survey (Appendix A) is designed to measure the extent to which leaders use the four frames. Bolman and Deal parallel versions of the

instrument, one for leaders (Self) and the other for supervisors and teachers (Others). For the purposes of this study, the parallel versions are Self (for principals to rate themselves) and Others (for ratings from the SIT Team—teachers, parents, and community representatives, and the principals' immediate supervisors). Both versions have four sections representing the four frames.

Section I : Leader Behaviors

Rating scales for this section range from 1, never to 5, always, for leaders' behaviors. The total instrument contains 32 items. Each frame is measured by eight items. For each individual, scores for each of the frames may range from a minimum of 8 to a maximum of 40.

Section II: Leadership Style Use

The second section includes six items that rank the style of the principal from 1 to 4. For example, for each item, respondents are asked to describe the leadership style of the principal. Each of the choices corresponds to one of the frames: choice A corresponds to the Structural Frame, choice B corresponds to the Human Resource Frame, choice C to the Political Frame, and choice D to the Symbolic Frame. These scores provide a range from 6 to 24 points for each of the frames.

Section III: Overall Rating

This section includes two one-item measures—perceived effectiveness as a manager and perceived effectiveness as a leader, comparing the principal to other principals with comparable levels of experiences and responsibilities. Respondents are asked to rate the principal from 1 (least) to 5 (most).

Section IV: Background Information

This section provides demographic information about the respondents. This information asks each respondent to specify gender, age, education level, and number of years' experience in his/her present position. School Improvement Team members were asked two additional questions: (1) To identify themselves as a teacher, parent, community representative, or other, and (2) to specify the number of years served on the School Improvement Team.

Instrument Reliability

Bolman and Deal originally reported the reliability of the instrument in 1991 and assessed the internal consistency of the instrument and the subscales by computing Cronbach alphas. The instrument was tested by comparing the rating of 94 leaders and 556 of their colleagues and subordinates. Bolman and Deal computed Cronbach alphas for each of the four frames: structural, .92, human resources, .93, political, .91, symbolic, .93. These numbers reflect the high inter-item reliability of the instrument.

Statistical Analysis

The researcher computed Cronbach alpha inter-item reliabilities on the four sections of the survey for the principals, supervisors, and teachers. The results were compared with Bolman and Deal's originally computed Cronbach alphas. Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were computed across the four frames of the Bolman and Deal survey for principals, supervisors, and SIT Team members.

The researcher computed independent t-tests to look for differences between the principals' judgments of themselves in schools identified as being at risk, and in schools identified as making adequate progress. Analysis of variance and independent t-tests were also used to look for differences between the SIT Team members'

judgments of principals in schools judged as being at risk and in schools identified as making adequate progress. Independent t-tests were used as well to look for differences between the supervisors' judgments of principals in schools judged to be at risk and in schools identified as making adequate progress. The researcher used the .05 level of statistical significance to accept or reject the statistical hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This researcher investigated the relationship between patterns of principal leadership orientations as judged by principals, school improvement team members (teachers, parents, and community representatives), and principals' supervisors. A conceptual framework based on the four frames of leadership (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) developed by Bolman and Deal (1991) was used as the basis for identifying the leadership orientations of principals. This chapter presents the findings regarding the principals' frame utilization.

Principals, school improvement team members (teachers, parents, and community representatives), and principals' supervisors completed the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Survey to elicit information about their own judgments of leadership orientations. This framework has been used for classifying and analyzing behaviors and styles that leaders use to manage organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The survey was designed to categorize responses according to Bolman and Deal's (1991) four styles of leadership. Survey responses from principals provided insights relative to how they view their own behaviors. Additionally, survey responses from SIT Team members and principals' supervisors provided insights about how they viewed the behaviors of their respective principals.

Statistical Analysis

The first statistical analysis the researcher did was to establish the reliability of the Bolman and Deal survey. Gliner and Morgan (2000) state "if each item on a test has multiple choices, such as a Likert scale, then Cronbach alpha is the method of choice to determine the inter-item reliability" (p. 316). Cronbach alphas were

computed for each of the four frames. The Cronbach alpha for the first leadership frame, structural, was .92; for human resource, it was .90; for political, the Cronbach alpha was .75; and for symbolic, it was .93. All of these Cronbach alphas were statistically significant at the .001 level and indicated that the instrument has high inter-item reliability for the items comprising each frame. The researcher compared these Cronbach alphas with those computed by Bolman and Deal. They were very similar: structural frame, .92; human resource, .93; political, .91; and symbolic, .93. These data indicate that if a person took the same survey a second time, the responses would be very similar to the responses given the first time.

Next, the researcher computed correlation coefficients among the four frames of leadership for the total group, and for principals, SIT Team members and principals' supervisors of schools labeled both "at risk" and "making adequate progress." The correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of association between two variables. It reflects how closely scores on two variables go together (Shavelson, 1988, p. 139). These correlation coefficients are displayed in Tables 1 through 10. In interpreting these tables, the researcher used an established set of criteria to make judgments about the significance of the correlations. First, a level of $<.05$ was used to identify statistically significant correlations. Second, the correlations themselves were judged in the following manner. If the correlation was between 0.0 and 0.30, it was judged to be weak. If it was between 0.31 and 0.70, it was considered modest. If it was above 0.71, it was judged to be strong (Gliner & Morgan, 2000).

The inter-scale correlations presented in Table 1 show that for the total group of schools making adequate progress, there was a strong linear relationship among the four frames of the Bolman and Deal instrument: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. These four frames have a common underlying factor concerned with school leadership. All six of the correlations were above .72 and were statistically

significant beyond the .001 level, indicating a strong association among them. This means, for instance, that if a respondent chose option 4 (often) for judging structural leadership, he or she would likely choose "often" for human resource leadership if there was a strong linear relationship, as Table 1 indicates did exist.

Table 1

Inter-Scale Correlations for the Total Group in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (38)	.75 (38) P=.001***	.81 (38) P=.001***	.82 (38) P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (38)	.72 (38) P=.001***	.80 (38) P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (38)	.93 (38) P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (38)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Table 2 presents the correlations for the principals of the schools making adequate progress. The reader is advised to use caution in drawing any conclusions from this table, since it is based on responses from only four principals. In general, correlations should be based on 30 or more respondents. These results indicate that three of the correlations were statistically significant: structural and political, structural and symbolic, and political and symbolic. This finding shows high agreement among these principals on the frequency with which they use the frames. The other three were not statistically significant; interestingly, they were negative, indicating no agreement among the principals in terms of frequency of use.

Table 2

Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (4)	-.76 (4)	.95 (4)	.97 (4)
		P=.237	P=.047*	P=.034*
HUMRESLO		1.00 (4)	-.82 (4)	-.72 (4)
			P=.182	P=.276
POLITLO			1.00 (4)	.99 (4)
				P=.013*
SYMBLO				1.00 (4)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

For teacher members of the SIT team in schools making adequate progress, all six of the correlations were statistically significant at beyond the .01 level. These correlations are displayed in Table 3. For the parents and community representatives at these schools, all of the correlations were strong and statistically significant (Table 4). The correlation coefficients presented in Tables 3 and 4, for teachers, parents, and community representatives, indicate that there was a strong linear relationship among the four frames as measured by the Bolman and Deal survey. All of the correlations shown in Tables 3 and 4 were .70 or higher. These findings indicate strong agreement among the teachers, parents, and community representatives about the frequency with which principals use the different frames.

Table 3

Inter-Scale Correlations for Teacher Members of the SIT Team in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (15)	.87 (15) P=.001***	.79 (15) P=.001***	.79 (15) P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (15)	.79 (15) P=.001***	.87 (15) P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (15)	.96 (15) P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (15)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Table 4

Inter-Scale Correlations for Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (14)	.70 (14) P=.005**	.77 (14) P=.001***	.82 (14) P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (14)	.62 (14) P=.019**	.82 (14) P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (14)	.82 (14) P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (14)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

The correlation coefficients for the principals' supervisors in schools making adequate progress are presented in Table 5. Again, the reader is cautioned against

drawing firm conclusions from these data, since they are based upon five responses from supervisors. The data indicate that only three correlations were statistically significant. They were structural and political, structural and symbolic, and political and symbolic. Interestingly, these are the same three correlations that were statistically significant for the principals. Since these correlations are very strong, all above .88, the data would indicate that there is a strong linear relationship between the variables listed above. The principals' supervisors see the principals using these frames with very similar frequencies as they perform their school leadership duties.

Table 5

Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals' Supervisors in the Schools Making Adequate Progress on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (5)	.30 (5)	.88 (5)	.89 (5)
		P=.621	P=.049*	P=.042*
HUMRESLO		1.00 (5)	.45 (5)	.46 (5)
			P=.448	P=.431
POLITLO			1.00 (5)	.97 (5)
				P=.01**
SYMBLO				1.00 (5)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

The data in Table 6 present correlations for the total group of at-risk schools for the four leadership frames of Bolman and Deal. The data show that all of the correlations were strong and statistically significant. The inter-scale correlations show that for the total group of at-risk schools, there was a strong linear relationship among the four frames of the Bolman and Deal instrument: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. These four frames have a common underlying factor

concerned with school leadership. All six of the correlations were above .73 and were statistically significant beyond the .001 level, indicating a strong association among them.

Table 6

Inter-Scale Correlations for the Total Group in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (37)	.81 (37)	.73 (37)	.84 (37)
		P=.001***	P=.001***	P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (37)	.76 (37)	.92 (37)
			P=.001***	P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (37)	.81 (37)
				P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (37)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

The correlation coefficients for the principals in at-risk schools are presented in Table 7. The reader is cautioned against drawing firm conclusions from these data since they were based upon the responses of only four principals. In all cases the correlations were weak and not statistically significant. The data indicate that there was no relationship between the principals' responses to the different frames of the Bolman and Deal survey as it concerned their school leadership functions. These findings suggest that there was great uncertainty on the part of the principals in at-risk schools as to when and how they should use the different frames.

Table 7

Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals in the At-Risk Schools on the Four LeadershipFrames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (4)	.23 (4) P=.771	-.28 (4) P=.725	.89 (4) P=.113
HUMRESLO		1.00 (4)	-.46 (4) P=.538	.24 (4) P=.754
POLITLO			1.00 (4)	.14 (4) P=.86
SYMBLO				1.00 (4)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

For teacher members of the SIT team in at-risk schools, all six of the correlations were statistically significant at beyond the .01 level. These correlations are displayed in Table 8. For the parents and community representatives at these schools, all of the correlations were strong and statistically significant (Table 9). The correlation coefficients presented in Tables 8 and 9, for teachers, parents, and community representatives, indicate that there was a strong linear relationship among the four frames as measured by the Bolman and Deal survey. All of the correlations shown in Tables 8 and 9 were .77 or higher. These findings indicate strong agreement among the teachers, parents, and community representatives about the frequency with which principals use the different frames.

Table 8

Inter-Scale Correlations for Teacher Members of the SIT Team in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (13)	.77 (13) P=.01**	.84 (13) P=.001***	.82 (13) P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (13)	.83 (13) P=.001***	.95 (13) P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (13)	.92 (13) P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (13)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Table 9

Inter-Scale Correlations for Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (15)	.90 (15) P=.001***	.86 (15) P=.001***	.86 (15) P=.001***
HUMRESLO		1.00 (15)	.89 (15) P=.001***	.92 (15) P=.001***
POLITLO			1.00 (15)	.94 (15) P=.001***
SYMBLO				1.00 (15)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

The correlation coefficients for principals' supervisors in at-risk schools are presented in Table 10. The data indicate that five of the six correlations were strong

and statistically significant; one, structural and human resource, was not statistically significant. Again, the reader is cautioned against drawing firm conclusions from these data, since they are based upon five responses from supervisors. For the five correlations that were statistically significant, the data show that there was a strong linear relationship between the variables measured.

Table 10

Inter-Scale Correlations for Principals' Supervisors in the At-Risk Schools on the Four Leadership Frames

	Structural Leadership Orientation	Human Resource Leadership Orientation	Political Leadership Orientation	Symbolic Leadership Orientation
STRUCTLO	1.00 (5)	.84 (5)	.93 (5)	.94 (5)
HUMRESLO		P=.072 1.00 (5)	P=.021* .93 (5)	P=.017* .93 (5)
POLITLO			P=.021* 1.00 (5)	P=.024* .93 (5)
SYMBLO				P=.023* 1.00 (5)

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

The data on correlation coefficients indicate that for teachers, parents, and community representatives, there was a strong linear relationship in the frequency of use of the different frames of the Bolman and Deal instrument. For principals and supervisors, the data are less clear, primarily because of the small number of respondents.

The researcher next did an analysis of variance to look for differences among the means of the four frames of Bolman and Deal (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) across the four groups of respondents (principals, teachers, parents and community representatives, and principals' supervisors). Analysis of

variance is the appropriate statistic to use when an independent variable has more than two levels (in this case, groups). Tables 11 and 12 present the results of the analysis of variance to determine whether there were statistically significant differences among the four frames used by the principals of the schools making adequate progress and the schools considered at risk, as judged by the principals, teachers, parents and community representatives, and principals' supervisors. The data indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in patterns among the judgments of principals, SIT Team members, and principals' supervisors.

Since the analysis indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the means for either the at-risk schools or the schools making adequate progress, the researcher decided to use a finer-grained analysis and therefore conducted a series of independent t-tests. The results of this analysis are presented in Tables 13 through 16 in the following section on the research questions.

The researcher used independent t-tests to answer the research questions. The purpose of the t-test for independent means (schools making adequate progress and schools at risk) is to help the researcher decide whether the observed difference between two sample means arose by chance or represents a true difference between populations (Shavelson, 1988).

Table 11

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Patterns Among Principals', SIT
Team Members, and Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' Frame
Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress

Structural Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	109.78	36.59	1.56	.22
Within Groups	34	796.12	23.42		
Human Resource Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	149.19	49.73	1.99	.13
Within Groups	34	851.68	25.05		
Political Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	78.95	26.32	.92	.44
Within Groups	34	969.89	28.53		
Symbolic Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	174.17	58.06	1.87	.15
Within Groups	34	1,055.23	31.04		

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Patterns Among Principals', SIT
Team Members, and Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' Frame
Utilization in Schools Considered At Risk

Structural Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	16.23	5.41	.13	.94
Within Groups	33	1,400.79	42.45		
Human Resource Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	54.47	18.16	.31	.82
Within Groups	33	1,953.21	59.19		
Political Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	154.71	51.57	.99	.41
Within Groups	33	1,717.56	52.05		
Symbolic Dimension					
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3	78.50	26.17	.40	.75
Within Groups	33	2,162.26	65.52		

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Research Questions and Statistical Hypotheses

Research Question 1

From the perspective of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

Statistical Hypothesis 1

From the perspective of the principals, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.

The data presented in Table 13 indicate that for principals, there were no statistically significant differences on the structural, political, or symbolic frames. There was a statistically significant difference on the human resource variable. The principals of schools making adequate progress had a statistically significantly higher mean than did the principals of the at-risk schools. The statistical hypothesis was accepted for structural, political, and symbolic orientations. It was rejected for human resources.

It is important to note that the means in Table 13 are all high. There were eight statements to judge for each frame and five options from which to choose. This means that the means could range from 8 to 40. Most of the means are between 31 and 33, which means the respondents felt that the principal often used the frame. It is also important to note that the standard deviations for the at-risk principals in three of four cases are two to five times larger than those for the principals of the schools making adequate progress.

Table 13

Independent t-Test of Principals' Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in
Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk

<u>Structural Dimensions</u>						
	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	4	34.00	1.83			
				.91	6	.40
At Risk	4	32.75	2.06			
<u>Human Resource Dimensions</u>						
	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	4	35.75	.96			
				3.22	6	.02*
At Risk	4	33.00	1.41			
<u>Political Dimensions</u>						
	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	4	32.50	1.92			
				.23	6	.83
At Risk	4	33.75	10.72			
<u>Symbolic Dimensions</u>						
	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	4	33.50	2.65			
				1.92	6	.103
At Risk	4	29.75	2.87			

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Research Question 2

From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

Statistical Hypothesis 2

From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.

The data presented in Table 14 show that there were no statistically significant differences in the judgments of principals' immediate supervisors concerning frame utilization. It is, however, interesting to note that in two of the four comparisons, the supervisors gave the principals higher ratings in the at-risk schools than in the schools making adequate progress. It is worthy of note that the standard deviations for principals of at-risk schools as judged by the supervisors were three times larger than those for the principals of the schools making adequate progress. The researcher hypothesizes that the reason for the much larger standard deviation in the at-risk schools is that the principals' supervisors were much less confident of their judgments about the principals in the at-risk schools compared with the judgments about the principal in schools making adequate progress, particularly on the dimension of human resource. It should be further noted that the supervisors' standard deviations on all of the dimensions are much larger than the principals' judgments. The statistical hypothesis was accepted. There were no statistically significant differences.

Table 14

Independent t-Test of Principals' Supervisors' Judgments of Principals' FrameUtilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At RiskStructural Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	5	33.00	7.04			
				.16	8	.87
At Risk	5	32.20	8.32			

Human Resource Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	5	31.60	2.70			
				.15	8	.88
At Risk	5	32.20	8.13			

Political Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	5	29.80	6.10			
				.20	8	.85
At Risk	5	29.00	6.48			

Symbolic Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	5	28.80	6.50			
				.09	8	.93
At Risk	5	29.20	7.82			

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Research Question 3

From the perspective of SIT team members, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

Statistical Hypothesis 3

From the perspective of SIT team members, there are no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards.

The data in Table 15 show that for teacher members of the SIT team, there were no statistically significant differences in the means between schools making adequate progress and schools at risk. Therefore, the statistical hypothesis was accepted. It is again noted that the standard deviations in the at-risk schools are considerably larger than those in the schools making adequate progress. This again indicates a level of uncertainty and a surprising level of variance on the part of the teachers in at-risk schools who are judging their principals' use of the four frames.

The data for Table 16 show that for parents and community members of the SIT team, there were no statistically significant differences between schools making adequate progress and schools at risk. The statistical hypothesis was therefore accepted. In Tables 15 and 16, the standard deviations for the at-risk schools are larger than for the schools making adequate progress.

Table 15

Independent t-Test of Teacher Members of the SIT Team's Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v. Schools Considered At Risk

Structural Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	15	33.80	5.80			
				.42	26	.68
At Risk	13	32.77	7.25			

Human Resource Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	15	33.47	7.13			
				.91	26	.37
At Risk	13	30.62	9.50			

Political Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	15	32.13	6.39			
				1.25	26	.22
At Risk	13	28.62	8.49			

Symbolic Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	15	33.00	6.73			
				.83	26	.41
At Risk	13	30.23	10.65			

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

Table 16

Independent t-Test of Parents and Community Representatives of the SIT Team's
Judgments of Principals' Frame Utilization in Schools Making Adequate Progress v.
Schools Considered At Risk

Structural Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	14	37.14	3.01			
				1.83	27	.07
At Risk	15	33.93	5.86			

Human Resource Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	14	37.00	2.88			
				1.94	27	.06
At Risk	15	33.33	6.48			

Political Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	14	34.21	4.28			
				1.02	27	.32
At Risk	15	32.47	4.93			

Symbolic Dimensions

	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	D.F.	2-Tail Sig.
Adequate Progress	14	35.57	4.22			
				1.40	27	.17
At Risk	15	32.80	6.17			

P = < .05*; <.01**; <.001***

In concluding this section, it is important to point out that for the principals, supervisors, teachers, parents, and community members, the number in any one of the groups was quite small. Therefore, it was much more difficult to find statistically significant differences. This is particularly true for principals and supervisors, where there were only four or five respondents in a group. There was a great deal of variance in judgments about the principals of at-risk schools and their use of the four frames. This was true for the principals themselves, their supervisors, teachers, parents, and community representatives.

Demographics

Tables 17 through 24 present demographics for principals, supervisors, and SIT Team members (teachers, parents, and community representatives) both for schools making adequate progress and schools considered at risk.

Table 17

Demographics of Principals in Schools Making Adequate Progress

Gender					
Male	1				
Female	3				
Years in Education	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
			1		3
Years in Current Job	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
	2	1	1		
Educational Level	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
			1	3	
Age	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
			1	3	

Table 18

Demographics of Principals in Schools Considered At Risk

Gender						
Male	1					
Female	3					
Years in Education						
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	
				1	2	1
Years in Current Job						
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	
	2	2				
Educational Level						
	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D	
				1	2	1
Age						
	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+		
	2				2	

Table 19

Demographics of Principals' Supervisors in Schools Making Adequate Progress

Gender						
Male	0					
Female	5					
Years in Education						
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	
	5					
Educational Level						
	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D	
					5	
Age						
	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+		
	5					

Table 20

Demographics of Principals' Supervisors in Schools Considered At Risk

Gender					
Male	2				
Female	3				
Years in Education					
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
					5
Educational Level					
	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
				3	2
Age					
	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
					5

Table 21

Demographics of SIT Team Members (Teachers) in Schools Making AdequateProgress

Gender					
Male	1				
Female	14				
Years in Education					
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
	2	3	10		
Member of SIT Team					
	Teacher	Support Staff	Comm. Rep.	Other	
	14	0			
Years on SIT Team					
	1	2	3	4-5	6+
	8	1	2	2	2
Educational Level					
	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
	1	3	6	5	
Age					
	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
	2	4	2	7	

Table 22

Demographics of SIT Team Members (Teachers) in Schools Considered At Risk

Gender					
Male					
Female 13					
Years in Education	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
	7	2	2		2
Member of SIT Team	Teacher	Support Staff	Comm. Rep.	Other	
	13	0			
Years on SIT Team	1	2	3	4-5	6+
	5	2	2	3	1
Educational Level	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
		7	5	1	
Age	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
	8		2	3	

Table 23

Demographics of SIT Team Members (Parents and Community Representatives) inSchools Making Adequate Progress

Gender					
Male 2					
Female 12					
Years in Education	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
	2		2	2	7
Member of SIT Team	Teacher	Parents	Comm. Rep.	Other	
		5	9		
Years on SIT Team	1	2	3	4-5	6+
	5	1	1	4	3
Educational Level	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
	1	5	2	5	1
Age	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
		2	2	10	

The principals and supervisors in both groups of schools seem to have similar backgrounds. The data on teachers show some important differences in favor of the schools making adequate progress. These differences are found in years in education and level of education. There are few if any important differences among the community representatives.

Table 24

Demographics of SIT Team Members (Parents and Community Representatives) in Schools Considered At Risk

<u>Gender</u>					
Male	3				
Female	12				
<u>Years in Education</u>	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
	2		2	3	5
<u>Member of SIT Team</u>	Teacher	Parents	Comm. Rep.	Other	
		5	9		
<u>Years on SIT Team</u>	1	2	3	4-5	6+
	4	1	2	4	3
<u>Educational Level</u>	Gr. 12+	BA/BS	MA	MA+30	Ph.D/Ed.D
	2	5	3	3	
<u>Age</u>	22-30	31-40	41-50	51+	
		2	3	9	

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which leadership behaviors of principals differ in schools at risk for reconstitution and in schools judged as meeting state standards, and to determine the extent to which principals in these schools employ frame utilization strategies for school improvement as designed by Bolman and Deal (1992). Schools, in recent decades, have been challenged to improve to the extent that every attempt is made to ensure the success of all students (No Child Left Behind, 2003). The reform movements mandated by the state highlight the role of the school principal. Efforts to improve education relate directly to the quality of leadership provided by the school principal.

Research has shown that the one determinant of excellence in the schools is the leadership of the individual school principal (Action for Excellence, 1983, p. 29). While there are various models or methods to capture information concerning leadership roles and styles, Sebring and Bryk (2000) posit that "the behaviors and practices of the school principal have influence on all aspects of the learning community, which leads to school success" (p.441). Further, the principal's belief about students' abilities to learn and teachers' ability to teach affect long-range and everyday teaching and learning processes (Greenfield, 1991). The principal is actively involved in decision making about instruction and must attend to instructional objectives as well as instructional strategies. Recent research on school reform advocates involving as many people as possible in local school decision making. This shared decision making reflects a less centralized approach to school leadership and

requires a great deal of collaboration and trust (Migely & Wood, 1993).

Collaborative decision making takes many forms, depending on the people involved; therefore, the role of the principal changes as situations and circumstances change.

Bolman and Deal (1984) assert that principals view their world through a framework of preconditioned lenses and filters. This framework shapes how situations are defined and determines what actions are taken.

This study was designed to investigate the extent to which principals employ frame utilization strategies as designed by Bolman and Deal (1997) when making judgments and management decisions for school improvement. In their research, they have consolidated major schools of organizational thought into four perspectives and labeled them frames. The structural frame emphasized goals, specialized roles and formal relationships. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be improved through restructuring. The human resource frame sees an organization comparable to an extended family with individuals with needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations; from the human resource frame, the challenge is to tailor organizations to the people, to find ways for these individuals to "buy in" to what they are charged to do. From the political perspective, different interests compete for power and scarce resources and conditions emerge around special interests and also change as issues in the organization change. The symbolic frame sees an organization as cultures motivated by rituals, ceremonies, heroes and myths rather than by rules, policies and managerial authority. Assumptions of rationality are not as prominent in the symbolic frame as in the three previous frames.

The sample population for this study was composed, first, of ten elementary school principals; four of five principals both in schools considered at risk and in schools making adequate progress as judged by state standards responded to the survey. In addition, the immediate supervisors of the principals in both groups and

members of the School Improvement Team (teachers, other staff and community members) also responded to the survey. The Leadership Orientation Survey (Appendix A) was used for data collection. This instrument is designed to measure the extent to which leaders use the four frames. Bolman and Deal parallel versions of the instrument—one for leaders (Self) and the other for supervisors and teachers (Others). For this study, the parallel versions are Self (for principals to rate themselves) and Others (for ratings from the principals' immediate supervisors and from the SIT Team—teachers, parents, and community representatives). The response rate was 80% from the principals, 100% from the immediate supervisors, and 72% from the SIT members.

Cronbach alphas, a measure of inter-item reliability, were computed for each of the four frames as well as correlation coefficients computed among the four frames. All of the Cronbach alphas were statistically significant at the .001 level and ranged from .75 to .93. The researcher concluded that the Bolman and Deal instrument had strong inter-item reliability. The only exception was the political frame, where the Cronbach alpha was only .75 and would be called modest.

The inter-scale correlations show that for the total group in schools making adequate progress, there were strong correlations among the four frames of the Bolman and Deal instrument, all of which were statistically significant beyond the .001 level. For the principals of schools making adequate progress, three of the six correlations were statistically significant. These correlations need to be viewed with caution, since they are based on only four principal responses. For teacher members of the SIT, all six of the correlations were statistically significant at or beyond the .01 level. For the parents and community representatives, all of the correlations were strong and statistically significant. For the principals' supervisors, only three of the

correlations were statistically significant. These correlations also should be viewed with caution, as they are based on only five supervisor responses.

For the total group of the at-risk schools for the four leadership frames, the data show that all of the correlations were strong and statistically significant. The correlations for the principals in at-risk schools in all cases were weak and not statistically significant. Again, the small number of principals responding may make drawing conclusions difficult. The correlations for both groups on the SIT were strong and statistically significant. The same was generally true for the principals' supervisors in at-risk schools, where the correlations were strong and statistically significant with one exception. These correlations should be viewed cautiously, as they are based on only five supervisor responses.

In all cases except for the principals themselves and their supervisors, the correlations were in the .70 to .95 range. This means that about 49% to 90% of the variance was shared by the four frames. For principals, particularly in the at-risk schools, the correlations were weak and in many cases not statistically significant. The researcher concluded that this may be the result of the small number of principals in the sample, four in each group, or it may reflect a greater variance in the principals' responses.

Conclusions

Research Question 1

From the perspective of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

For principals there were no statistically significant differences on the structural, political, or symbolic frames. There was a statistically significant difference on the human resource variable. The principals of schools making adequate progress had a statistically significantly higher mean than did the principals of the at-risk schools. The statistical hypothesis was accepted for structural, political, and symbolic orientations. It was rejected for the human resource orientation.

The researcher concluded that the higher means for human resource orientation may mean that the principals in schools making adequate progress may view their school organizations as an extended family and seek to tailor the organization to the needs of the people. There was no greater emphasis on any one dimension but a well-balanced approach was taken by the principal across these four important dimensions concerned with leading and managing an elementary school. On the political dimension, the standard deviations for the at-risk schools were five times larger than for the principals in schools making adequate progress. This finding led the researcher to conclude that there was a great deal more variance (uncertainty) in the responses of the principals in at-risk schools than there was in schools making adequate progress.

Inter-scale correlations for principals in both groups were computed between frames and revealed low and in some cases negative correlations. The researcher believed that there are two possible reasons for these findings. One is that the number of principals responding was very small, only four in each group. Second, the standard deviation (variance) is much higher for the principals in the at-risk schools. The researcher tentatively concluded that principals in at-risk schools were less confident about their abilities to use the frames than were the principals in the schools making adequate progress.

Research Question 2

From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

From the perspective of the immediate supervisors of the principals, there were no statistically significant differences in the means of principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) between schools labeled at risk and in schools making adequate progress as judged by state standards. However, in two of the four comparisons, the supervisors gave the principals higher ratings in the at-risk schools than in schools making adequate progress. The statistical hypothesis was accepted. There are no statistical differences.

In the case of principals' supervisors in schools making adequate progress, only three of the six correlations were statistically significant. In the at-risk schools, five of the six correlations were statistically significant. The standard deviations (variance) were larger in the at-risk schools compared to the schools making adequate progress. The principals' immediate supervisors gave the principals similar ratings on the four frames of the Bolman and Deal survey. The researcher concluded that the differences that exist may be due to the small number of raters, five for each principal. The large variance associated with each frame may be the result of a different orientation by the supervisors. This is an area that needs further study.

Research Question 3

From the perspective of SIT team members, to what extent are there differences in principals' frame utilization (structural, human resource, political and symbolic orientations) in schools labeled "at risk" and in schools "making adequate progress" as judged by state standards?

For teacher members of the SIT, there were no statistically significant differences in the means between schools making adequate progress and schools at risk. Therefore, the statistical hypothesis was accepted.

For parents and community members of the SIT, there were no statistically significant differences between schools making adequate progress and schools at risk. The statistical hypothesis was accepted.

The correlations for members of the SIT, whether teachers, parents, or community representatives, were all high and statistically significant beyond the .001 level. This was true for both the schools making adequate progress and the at-risk schools. This led the researcher to conclude that the SIT members felt there was a strong relationship between the four frames identified by Bolman and Deal. The standard deviations (variance) were greater for the principals of at-risk schools than for principals of schools making adequate progress.

The teachers, parents, and community representatives gave the principals very similar ratings for their use of the four frames in both groups of schools. There was considerably more variance in the responses of the teachers, parents, and community representatives in the schools at risk than was true for the schools making adequate progress. The researcher therefore concluded that there was greater variance between the teachers, parents, and community representatives' judgments about principals in the at-risk schools than in the schools making adequate progress.

The researcher's major conclusion is that the principal of a school considered at risk is viewed as more uncertain about his/her ability to use the four frames of the Bolman and Deal survey or that their actual frame orientation differs based on the decisions they are called to make in their different schools. The kinds of decisions a principal faces in a school making adequate progress perhaps allow him or her to be more concerned with being an instructional leader while the principal of a school at

risk may have to spend considerably more of his or her time and energy on trying to help the students, teachers, and parents meet the expected goals of the state program.

Recommendations

The researcher recommends that a similar study be conducted in another urban, suburban, or rural area and that the numbers of principals, supervisors, and School Improvement Team members be significantly increased.

The researcher recommends that measures other than state-mandated test results be used to identify schools that are making adequate progress and schools that are labeled at risk.

The researcher recommends that findings from this study and other studies of the principal based on the Bolman and Deal survey be used in future professional development programs for school principals.

The researcher recommends that a mixed study be done using quantitative and qualitative measures that examine the complexities of principals' decision-making styles in more depth.

Appendix A

Leadership Orientations (Self and Other) Surveys

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)¹

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style.

1. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate *how often* each of the items below is true of you. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

A	B	C	D	E
Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always

Following this example, you would answer "A" for an item that is never true of you, "B" for one that is occasionally true, "C" for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on. Please use the attached Scantron sheet to record your answers.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Think very clearly and logically.					
2. Show high levels of support and concern for others.					
3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.					
4. Inspire others to do their best.					
5. Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.					
6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.					
7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.					
8. Am highly charismatic.					
9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.					
10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.					

¹1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal

	A	B	C	D	E
11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.					
12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.					
13. Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.					
14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.					
15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.					
16. Am highly imaginative and creative.					
17. Approach problems with facts and logic.					
18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.					
19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.					
20. Communicate a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.					
21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.					
22. Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.					
23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.					
24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.					
25. Pay extraordinary attention to detail.					
26. Give personal recognition for work well done.					
27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.					
28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.					
29. Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.					
30. Am a highly participative manager.					
31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.					
32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.					

II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person you are rating. For each item, give the letter "d" to the phrase that best describes the ratee, "c" to the item that is next best, and on down to "a" for the item that is least like the ratee. Please use the attached Scantron sheet to record your answers.

	A Least	B Somewhat	C Next best	D Best
My strongest skills are:				
33. Analytic skills				
34. Interpersonal skills				
35. Political skills				
36. Ability to excite and motivate				
The best way to describe me is:				
37. Technical expert				
38. Good listener				
39. Skilled negotiator				
40. Inspirational leader				
What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:				
41. Make good decisions				
42. Coach and develop people				
43. Build strong alliances and a power base				
44. Energize and inspire others				
What people are most likely to notice about me is my:				
45. Attention to detail				
46. Concern for people				
47. Ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition				
48. Charisma				
My most important leadership trait is:				
49. Clear, logical thinking				
50. Caring and support for others				
51. Toughness and aggressiveness				
52. Imagination and creativity				
I am best described as:				
53. An analyst				
54. A humanist				
55. A politician				
56. A visionary				

III. Overall rating

Please use the rating scale below to answer questions 57 and 58 on the Scantron sheet.

A
B
C
D
E
Bottom 20%
Middle 20%
Top 20%

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

	A	B	C	D	E
57. Overall effectiveness as a manager.					
58. Overall effectiveness as a leader.					

IV. Background Information

Please use the Scantron sheet to record your answers.

59. Are you: (A) Male (B) Female

60. How many years have you been in education?

A
B
C
D
E
0-5
6-10
11-15
16-20
21+

61. How many years have you been in your current job?

A
B
C
D
E
0-5
6-10
11-15
16-20
21+

62. Indicate your educational level.

A
B
C
D
E
Grade 12+
BA/BS
MA
MA+30
Doctorate

63. To what age group do you belong?

A
B
C
D
22-30
31-40
41-50
51+

Your responses are confidential. If you wish to receive the results of this study, please complete the section below:

Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (OTHER)²

This questionnaire asks you to describe the person that you are rating in terms of leadership and management style.

1. Leadership Behaviors

You are asked to indicate *how often* each item is true of the person that you are rating. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

A	B	C	D	E
Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always

Following this example, you would answer "A" for an item that is never true of the person you are rating, "B" for one that is occasionally true, "C" for one that is sometimes true, and so on. Please use the Scantron sheet to record your answers.

Be discriminating! The results will be more helpful to the ratee if you think about each item and distinguish the things that the ratee really does all the time from the things that s/he does seldom or never.

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Thinks very clearly and logically.					
2. Shows high levels of support and concern for others.					
3. Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.					
4. Inspires others to do their best.					
5. Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.					
6. Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships.					
7. Is a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.					
8. Is highly charismatic.					
9. Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.					
10. Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.					

²1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal

	A	B	C	D	E
11. Is unusually persuasive and influential.					
12. Is able to be an inspiration to others.					
13. Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures.					
14. Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.					
15. Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict.					
16. Is highly imaginative and creative.					
17. Approaches problems with facts and logic.					
18. Is consistently helpful and responsive to others.					
19. Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.					
20. Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.					
21. Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results.					
22. Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.					
23. Is politically very sensitive and skillful.					
24. Sees beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.					
25. Pays extraordinary attention to detail.					
26. Gives personal recognition for work well done.					
27. Develops alliances to build a strong base of support.					
28. Generates loyalty and enthusiasm.					
29. Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.					
30. Is a highly participative manager.					
31. Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.					
32. Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.					

II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person you are rating. For each item, give the letter "d" to the phrase that best describes the ratee, "c" to the item that is next best, and on down to "a" for the item that is least like the ratee. Please use the attached Scantron sheet to record your answers.

	A Least	B Somewhat	C Next best	D Best
The individual's strongest skills are:				
33. Analytic skills				
34. Interpersonal skills				
35. Political skills				
36. Ability to excite and motivate				
The best way to describe the ratee is:				
37. Technical expert				
38. Good listener				
39. Skilled negotiator				
40. Inspirational leader				
What this individual does best is:				
41. Make good decisions				
42. Coach and develop people				
43. Build strong alliances and a power base				
44. Energize and inspire others				
What people are most likely to notice about this person is:				
45. Attention to detail				
46. Concern for people				
47. Ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition				
48. Charisma				
This individual's most important leadership trait is:				
49. Clear, logical thinking				
50. Caring and support for others				
51. Toughness and aggressiveness				
52. Imagination and creativity				
This person is best described as:				
53. An analyst				
54. A humanist				
55. A politician				
56. A visionary				

III. Overall rating

Please use the rating scale below to answer questions 57 and 58 on the Scantron sheet.

A
B
C
D
E
Bottom 20%
Middle 20%
Top 20%

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate this person on:

	A	B	C	D	E
57. Overall effectiveness as a manager.					
58. Overall effectiveness as a leader.					

IV. Background Information

Please use the Scantron sheet to record your answers.

59. Are you: (A) Male (B) Female

60. How many years have you been in education? (If you are not a teacher, leave blank.)

A
B
C
D
E
0-5
6-10
11-15
16-20
21+

61. As a member of the school improvement team, are you a:

A
B
C
D
teacher
parent
community
other

rep.

62. How many years have you been on the school improvement team?

A
B
C
D
E
1
2
3
4-5
6+

63. Indicate your educational level.

A
B
C
D
E
Grade 12+
BA/BS
MA
MA+30
Doctorate

64. To what age group do you belong?

A
B
C
D
22-30
31-40
41-50
51+

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (AEO)³

This questionnaire asks you to describe the person that you are rating in terms of leadership and management style.

1. Leadership Behaviors

You are asked to indicate *how often* each item is true of the person that you are rating. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

A	B	C	D	E
Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always

Following this example, you would answer "A" for an item that is never true of the person you are rating, "B" for one that is occasionally true, "C" for one that is sometimes true, and so on. Please use the Scantron sheet to record your answers.

Be discriminating! The results will be more helpful to the ratee if you think about each item and distinguish the things that the ratee really does all the time from the things that s/he does seldom or never.

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Thinks very clearly and logically.					
2. Shows high levels of support and concern for others.					
3. Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.					
4. Inspires others to do their best.					
5. Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.					
6. Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships.					
7. Is a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.					
8. Is highly charismatic.					
9. Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.					
10. Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.					

³1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal

	A	B	C	D	E
11. Is unusually persuasive and influential.					
12. Is able to be an inspiration to others.					
13. Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures.					
14. Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.					
15. Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict.					
16. Is highly imaginative and creative.					
17. Approaches problems with facts and logic.					
18. Is consistently helpful and responsive to others.					
19. Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.					
20. Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.					
21. Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results.					
22. Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.					
23. Is politically very sensitive and skillful.					
24. Sees beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.					
25. Pays extraordinary attention to detail.					
26. Gives personal recognition for work well done.					
27. Develops alliances to build a strong base of support.					
28. Generates loyalty and enthusiasm.					
29. Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.					
30. Is a highly participative manager.					
31. Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.					
32. Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.					

II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person you are rating. For each item, give the letter "d" to the phrase that best describes the ratee, "c" to the item that is next best, and on down to "a" for the item that is least like the ratee. Please use the attached Scantron sheet to record your answers.

	A Least	B Somewhat	C Next best	D Best
The individual's strongest skills are:				
33. Analytic skills				
34. Interpersonal skills				
35. Political skills				
36. Ability to excite and motivate				
The best way to describe the ratee is:				
37. Technical expert				
38. Good listener				
39. Skilled negotiator				
40. Inspirational leader				
What this individual does best is:				
41. Make good decisions				
42. Coach and develop people				
43. Build strong alliances and a power base				
44. Energize and inspire others				
What people are most likely to notice about this person is:				
45. Attention to detail				
46. Concern for people				
47. Ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition				
48. Charisma				
This individual's most important leadership trait is:				
49. Clear, logical thinking				
50. Caring and support for others				
51. Toughness and aggressiveness				
52. Imagination and creativity				
This person is best described as:				
53. An analyst				
54. A humanist				
55. A politician				
56. A visionary				

III. Overall rating

Please use the rating scale below to answer questions 57 and 58 on the Scantron sheet.

A
B
C
D
E
Bottom 20%
Middle 20%
Top 20%

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate this person on:

	A	B	C	D	E
57. Overall effectiveness as a manager.					
58. Overall effectiveness as a leader.					

IV. Background Information

Please use the Scantron sheet to record your answers.

59. Are you: (A) Male (B) Female

60. How many years have you been in education?

A
B
C
D
E
0-5
6-10
11-15
16-20
21+

61. Indicate your educational level.

A
B
C
D
E
Grade 12+
BA/BS
MA
MA+30
Doctorate

62. To what age group do you belong?

A
B
C
D
22-30
31-40
41-50
51+

Reference List

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2002,February). Governmental relations update. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- Andrews, R.,& Soder, R. (1987). Principal instructional leadership and school achievement. Educational Leadership, 44, 9-11.
- Anyon, J. (1997). Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Austin, G. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for excellence. Educational Leadership, 37, 10-14.
- Austin, G. (1985). Research on exemplary schools. New York: Academic Press.
- Ball, S. (1987). The micropolitics of schools. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Baltimore Sun, June 30, 2005, p. B2.
- Barker, J. A. (1990). The power of vision: Discussion guide. Burnsville, MN: Charterhouse Learning Corporation.
- Barker, J. A. (1992). Future edge. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Barker, J. A. (1997). How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is? Human Relations Journal, 50(4), 343-362.
- Barr, R., & Bizar, M. (Eds.) (2001). School leadership in times of urban reform. Erlbaum Associates, Inc. New Jersey.
- Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass..
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (2000). Supervisory leadership: focus on instruction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bell, J. A. (2001). High-performing, high-poverty schools. Leadership 31(1), 8-11.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B., (1985). Leaders: Strategies for taking charge. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. Review of Higher Education, 12, 107-123.

- Bensimon, E. M. (1990). Viewing the presidency: Perceptual congruence between presidents and leaders on their campuses. Leadership Quarterly, 1, 71-90.
- Berman, P., & Gjelten, T. (1984). Improving school improvement: A policy evaluation of the California school improvement program. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1975). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. IV: The findings in review. Santa Monica, CA.: The Rand Corporation.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blake, P., & Pfeiffer, S. (1993). School business partnerships. NAASP Bulletin, 77, pp. 29-33.
- Blanchard, K., Hybels, B., & Hodges, P. (1999). Leadership by the book. New York: William Morrow.
- Blasé, J. (1991). The politics of life in schools. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bloom, B. S. (1984). The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-on-one training. Educational Leadership, 41.
- Bloom, B. S., Forst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay.
- Blumberg, A. (1989). Administration as a craft. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1977). Reframing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. Human Resources Management, 30, 509-534.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E., (1992a). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. Education Administration Quarterly, 28, 314-329.

- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992b). Reframing leadership: The effects of leaders' images of leadership. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. Campbell (Eds.), Impact of leadership. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1994). Looking for leadership: Another search party's report. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30(1), 77-96.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1995). Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.
- Bowles, B. D. (1990). The silent crisis in educational leadership. The Education Digest, 5, 12-14.
- Boyan, N. J. (1988). Describing and explaining administrative behavior, In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman.
- Brookover, W. B. (1977). Creating effective schools. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.
- Bryk, A. S., & Hermanson, K. L. (1993). Educational indicator systems: Observations on their structure, interpretation, and use. Review of Research in Education, 19, 451-484.
- Bryk, A., Sebring, P., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S., & Easton, J. (1998). Charting Chicago school reform. Boulder, CO. Westview Press.
- Cashman, K. (2000). Leadership from the inside out. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence Publishing.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1994). Principal's leadership as a critical factor for school performance: Evidence from multi-levels of primary schools. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5, 299-317.
- Christensen, G. (1993). The changing role of the principal in the move from a traditional school to an accelerated school. CERAS: Stanford, CA.

- Clark, D. L., et al., (1982). Factors associated with success in urban schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 467-470.
- Clark, D. L., & Astuto, T. (1995). Activators and impediments to learner centered schools. Theory into Practice, 34(4), 244-249.
- Clune, W. (1993). The best path to systemic educational policy: Standard/centralized or differential/decentralized? Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis, 15(3), 233-254.
- Cohen, M., et al. (1972). Instructionally effective schools: Research area plan. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210 801).
- Comer, J. P., Ben-Avie, M., Haynes, N. M., & Joyner, E. T. (1999). Child by child: The Comer process for change in education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Comer, J. (1989). Child development and education. Journal of Negro Education, 5, 125-143.
- Connell, N. (1999). Beating the odds: High-achieving elementary schools in high poverty neighborhoods. New York: Educational Priorities Panel. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 441 913).
- Crowson, R. L., McPherson, R. B., & Pitner, N. J.. (1986). Managing uncertainty: Administrative theory and practice in education. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Cuban, L. (1976). Urban school chiefs under fire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cuban, L. (1988). Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 695-696.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-13.
- Danielson, M. L. (2001). How principals perceive and respond to a high-stakes accountability measure. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). Policy uses and indicators. Paper prepared for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Davenport, R., & Anderson, G. (2002). Closing the achievement gap: No excuses. Houston, Texas: American Productivity & Quality Center.

- Day, C. et al. (2000). Leading schools in times of change. Buckingham, England. Open University Press.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). Shaping school cultures: The heart of leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. Educational Leadership, 14-20.
- Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. (1999). The principalship. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Druin, G., & Butler, J. A. (1987). Effective school practices and at-risk youth: What research shows. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education.
- Drury, D. W. (1999). Reinventing school-based management. Alexandria, VA. National School Board Association.
- Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED426 472)
- Duke, D. L. (1988). Why principals consider quitting. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(4), 308-313.
- Dunford, R., & Palmer, I. (1995). Reframing and organizational action: The unexplored link. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 9(6), 12-25.
- Dunlap, W. H., et al. (1991). The goal is control. Agenda, 14, pp. 24-26.
- Dunlap, D. M., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(1), 5-29.
- Dwyer, D. C., Lee, G. V., Rowan, B., & Bossert, S. (1983). Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management. Far West Laboratory: San Francisco.
- Dwyer, D. C., Lee, G. V., Rowan, B., & Bossert, S. (1984). The principal's role in instructional management: Five participant observation studies of principals in action. Paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association, Montreal. Far West Laboratory, Instructional Management Program.
- Edmonds, R. (1966). Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement. Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling. (ERIC ED 170 394).
- Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership, 40, 4-11.
- Edmonds, R. (1986). Characteristics of effective schools. In U. Neiser (Ed.), The school achievement of minority children. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; pp.89-111.
- Education Commission of the States. (1983). Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver, CO: Author.
- Educational Research Service (1982). The role of elementary school principals: a summary of research. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Edwards, J. D. (1998). Toward democracy: A case study of high involvement in one elementary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Elmore, R. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. Washington, DC: The Albert Shaker Institute.
- Elmore, R., & Sykes, G. (1992). Curriculum Policy. Handbook of research on curriculum. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Fears, A. A. (2004). A study of school-based leadership and the school improvement process for elementary schools that have demonstrated high and low student achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union Institute and University Graduate School.
- Finn, C. E., & Petrilli, M. J. (2000, January). The state of state standards. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Fleming, N. J. B. (2002). A study of principal and teacher judgments of principal leadership orientations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depth of educational reform. New York: Falmer Press.

- Fullan, M. (1998). The meaning of educational change: A quarter of a century of learning. In A. Hargreaves et al. (eds.), International Handbook of Educational Change. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. pp. 214-228.
- Fullan, M. (1999a). Change forces: The sequel. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (1999b). Learning from the past: Directions for the future. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed). Teachers College Press, Columbia University, N.Y.
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. Educational Leadership, 50(8), 15-20.
- Fullan, M., Bennett, B., & Bennett, C. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. Educational Leadership, 47, 13-19.
- Fullan, M., & Stieglebauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed.) New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Glaser, J. S. (1991). Feminism and professionalism in teaching and educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27, 321-342.
- Glatthorn, A. A., & Newberg, N. A. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 60-63.
- Glickman, C. D. (1990). Open accountability for the 90s: Between the pillars. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 38-42.
- Gliner, J. A., & Morgan, G. A. (2000). Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Goldring, E., & Greenfield, W. (2002). The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century. 101st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldring, E., & Pasternak, R. (1994). Principals' coordinating strategies and school effectiveness. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5, 239-253.
- Goodlad, J. L. (1955). The individual school principal: Key setting and key person. Educational Leadership, 13(1).
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Green, R. L. (2001). Practicing the art of leadership. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenberg, R. A., & Baron, J. (1997). Behavior in organizations (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenberg, R. A., & Baron, J. (2000). Behavior in organizations (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenfield, W. (1987). Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. pp. 56-74.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1991). Toward a theory of school leadership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Greenlee, B. J., & Bruner, D. Y. (2001). State assessment rediscovered: Can accountability tests initiate better reading? Wingspan, 14(1), 2-5.
- Griffiths, D. (1988). Administrative theory. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman.
- Hall, G. E. (1979). The concerns-based approach for facilitating change. Educational Horizons, 57, 203-209.
- Hall, G. E. (1988). The principal as leader of the change facilitating team. Journal of Research and Development, 22(1).
- Hall, D., Wiener, R., & Carey, K. (2003). What new AYP information tells us about schools, states, and public education. Washington, DC: The Education Trust.
- Hallinger, P. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1995). The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995. In K. Leithwood (Ed.) The International Handbook of Research on Educational Leadership and Administration. New York: Kluwer Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A view of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32, 5-44.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. American Journal of Education, 94, 328-355.

- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1992). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental education reform. Special Edition of Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 330-349.
- Hanson, J. M., & Smith, R. (1989). Building-based instructional improvement: The principal as an instructional leader. NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 10-16.
- Harrington-Lueker, D. (1990). The engine of reform gathers steam: Kentucky starts from scratch. American School Board Journal, 177(9), 17-21.
- Heimovics, R. D., Herman, R. D., & Jurkiewicz-Coughlin, C. L. (1993) Executive leadership and resource dependence in nonprofit organizations: A frame analysis. Public Administration Review, 53, 419-427.
- Heimovics, R. D., Herman, R. D., & Jurkiewicz-Coughlin, C. L. (1995). The political dimension of effective nonprofit executive leadership: Nonprofit management and leadership. Public Administration Review, 5, 233-248.
- Hill, P. T., & Bonan, J. (1991). Decentralization and accountability in public education. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1999). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. In L. Orozco (Ed.), Educational Leadership. Bellvue, WA: Coursewise.
- Holcomb, E. L. (2001). Asking the right questions: Techniques for collaboration and school changes (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoo-Ballade, M. (2004). Principal leadership and effective schooling for ESL students. The George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Hord, S., et al. (1998). Taking charge of change. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Hoyle, E. (1982). The micropolitics of educational administration. Educational Management and Administration, 10(2), 87-98.
- Hughes, L. W. (1999). The principal as leader. New York: Macmillan.
- Hughes, L. W. (2004). The principal as leader (2d ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Merrill, Prentice-Hall.
- Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, K. (1993). Toward an explanation of variation in teacher perceptions of transformational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32, 512- 538.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Kelley, C. & Protsik, J. (1997). Risk and reward: Perspectives on the implementation of Kentucky's school-based performance award program. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33, 474-505.
- Kline, W. A. (1987). A collegial approach to developing leadership. Educational Leadership, pp. 70-71.
- Knapp, M. (1997). Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation implementation and professional learning. Review of Educational Research, 67(2), 227-266.
- Knapp, M. et al. (1998). Converging reforms and the working lives of frontline professionals in schools. Educational Policy, 12(4), 397-418.
- Kopple, H. (1985). Replicating success: School district of Philadelphia. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kuch, W. T. (1983). The role of the elementary school principal as building manager and instructional leader. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh). Dissertation Abstracts International, 442 353-A.
- Ladd, H. F., & Walsh, R. P. (2002). Implementing value added measures of school effectiveness: Getting the incentives right. Economics of Education Review 21, 1-17.
- Laffey, J. L. (1980). The role of the elementary school principal in the school reading program: Research and Practice. Reading Teacher, pp.632-636.
- Lambert, L. (1998). Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. Educational Leadership, 50(8), 37-40.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1995). Expert problem solving: Evidence from school and district leaders. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10, 451-479.

- Leithwood, K. & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. Education Policy, 12, 325-346.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Changing leadership for changing times. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Lezotte, L. (1982). Staff development and the research on effective schools. Syracuse University, National Council of States on Inservice Education, 4(14).
- Lezotte, L. (1992). Creating the total quality effective school. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lezotte, L. (1997). Learning for all. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lindle, J. C. (1999). Academic perspectives on the study of micropolitics in leading school reform. School Leadership & Management, 19(2).
- Lindle, J. C. (2000). School-based decision making: A review of research on the Kentucky Education Reform. Lexington: Kentucky Institute for Education Research.
- Lipham, J. M. (1982). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary Schools.
- Lunenberg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). Educational administration: Concepts and practices. Belmont, WA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Maehr, M. L., & Parker, S. A. (1993). A tale of two schools and the primary task of leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(3) 233-239.
- Malen, B. (1995). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Lyaton (Eds), The study of educational politics. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Malen, B. (1999). On rewards, punishments, and possibilities: Teacher compensation as an instrument for education reform. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 12(4), 387-94.
- Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. L. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10, 251-270.

- Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Kranz, J. (1989). An analysis of site-based management as an education reform strategy. Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah.
- Mann, D. (1976). Making change happen. Teachers College Board.
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2003, April). School improvement act. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), 171-178.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). The Rand Change Agent Study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19(9), 11-16.
- Midgely, C., & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond site-based management: Empowering teachers to reform schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 245-252.
- Mintzberg, H. (1980). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintrop, H. (2003). The limits of sanctions in low performing schools: A study of Maryland and Kentucky schools on probation. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11(3).
- Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In P.W. Thurston and L.L. Lotto (Eds.), Advances in educational administration. 1B. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Murphy, J. (2001) The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders. The AASA Professor, 24(2), 2-4.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Newburg, N., & Glatthorn, A. (1983). Four case studies of effective junior high principals. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Newmann, F., King, B., and Young, P. (2000). Professional development that addresses school capacity. Paper presented at AERA.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002, Jan. 8). United States Congress. Public Law 107-110, 115 Stat.1425.

- Orozco, L. (1999). Perspectives: Educational leadership. Boulder, CO: Coursewise.
- Owens, R. G. (1970). Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Owens, R. G. (2004). Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Papalewis, R., & Fortune, R. (2002). Leadership on purpose. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Powell, S. T. (2004). Leadership and school success: The behaviors and practices of principals in successful at-risk schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 427-452.
- Rand Change Agent Study. Federal programs supporting educational change, Volumes 1-5. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. 1974-75.
- Richardson, M., Short, P., & Prickett, R. (1993). School principals and change. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York & London.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1991). Teachers workplace: The social organization of schools. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp.341). New York: Longman.
- Sarason, S. (1990). The predictable failure of education reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sarason, S. B. (1996). Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1984, Winter). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. Sloan Management Review, 25.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd. ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Schmoker, M. (2001). The results fieldbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. Basic Books. New York, N.Y.
- Scott, G. H. (1983). Actual and ideal management, instructional leadership, and community relations functions of the elementary school principal in the Baltimore County Public Schools as perceived by selected others. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1337-A.
- Sebring, P. B., & Bryk, A. S. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. Phi Delta Kappan, 81(6), p. 440-443.
- Seifert, E. H., & Beck, J. J. (1981, March). Elementary principals: Instructional leaders or school managers. Phi Beta Kappan, 62, 528.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1979). Rational bureaucratic, collegial, and political views of the principal's role. Theory in practice (Thematic Issue: The role of the principal as instructional leader) 16(1), 12-20.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1995). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2000). Changing educational change. Education Week Commentary, 27.
- Shavelson, R. J. (1988). Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(3), 178-182.
- Short, P. M., Greer, J. L., & Michael, P. (1991). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. Journal of School Leadership, 1(2), 127-139.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

- Sizer, T. R. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Skinner, B. F. (1968). The technology of teaching. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Slavin, R. E. (2000/2001). Putting the school back in school reform. Educational Leadership, 58(4), 22-27.
- Smith, M., & O'Day, J. (1990). Systemic school reform. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing (pp. 233-267). London: Fulmer Press.
- Smith, W. F., & Andrews, L. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smith, S. S., & Michelson, R. A. (2000). All that glitters is not gold: School reform in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22(2), 101-127.
- Sondheim, W. et al. (1989). The report of the Governor's Commission on School Support. Annapolis, MD.
- Spillane, J., et al. (2000). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributive perspective. Educational Researcher, 31, 23-28.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributive perspective. Educational Researcher, 30(3), 23-38.
- Stedman, J. (1994). Goals 2000: An overview and analysis. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Stevenson, M. B. (1987). Instructional leadership: Teacher perceptions of elementary principal leadership behaviors. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 3028-A.
- Sykes, G. & Plastrik, P. (1993). Standard setting as educational reform: Trends and issues. Paper # 8, Washington, DC. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). Schools make a difference: Lessons learning from a ten-year study of school effects. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Thomson, S. A. (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: National Commission for the Principalship.
- Thornberry, T. (1986). Towards a dynamic theory of delinquency. Indiana University, 1984.
- Tracy, D. (1990). The power pyramid: How to get power by giving it away. New York: Morrow.
- Tripses, J. (1998). An examination of the principal's role in managing the paradox of state mandated improvement and accountability. Planning and Changing, 29(4), 237-250.
- Uchiyama, K. P., & Wolf, S. A. (2002). The best way to lead them. Educational Leadership, 59, 80-83.
- Underwood, T. L. (2001). Reflections on assessment, accountability, and school reform. The Clearing House, 74(4), 172-174.
- United States Department of Education. (2001). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Public Law 107-110. Washington, DC: Author.
- Van de Grift, W. (1989). Self perceptions of educational leadership and mean pupil achievements. In D. Reynolds, B. P.M Creemers, & T. Peters (Eds.), School Effectiveness and Improvement, pp.227-242. Cardiff/Groningen: School of Education/RION.
- Van de Grift, W. (1990). School effectiveness and school improvement. Educational Leadership and Achievement in Elementary Education, 1(3), 26-40.
- Weatherley, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform. Harvard Educational Review, 47(2), 171-197.
- Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus. (1996). M. Agnes (Ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Weick, K. E. (1983). Managerial thought in the context of actions in the executive mind (Suresh Srivastia, Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. p. 22.
- Weisman, I. M. (2005). New directions for community colleges, presidents and trustees in partnership: New roles and leadership challenges, No. 98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Wimpleberg, R. K. (1987). Managerial images and school effectiveness.
Administrators' Notebook, 32, 1-4.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). Leadership in organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). Can they do that? A guide to your rights on the job. New York: Lexington Books.