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ABSTRACT

This study examined new means for conceptualizing leadership in schools from a non-centrist perspective. Specifically, leadership in schools was conceived of, and studied as, an organizational construct rather than a set of personal attributes associated with positional authority. This non-centrist view of leadership is termed leadership density (Sergiovanni, 1987; Ellett, 1996), and it is metaphorically represented in the study by a characteristics of a small jazz combo.

The primary focus of the study was the development of a new conceptual model of leadership, grounded within the small jazz combo metaphor. In an attempt to understand leadership from this new perspective, linkages between professional elements of school culture and the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators, and the degree of leadership density in schools were studied.

Using the quantitative (survey) results, four contrasting schools were selected for in-depth, qualitative case studies to better understand the meaning of leadership density, as derived from the small jazz combo metaphor, in the everyday life of schools.

Considered collectively, the results of the study provided initial support for further elaborating a theory of leadership density grounded in the small jazz combo metaphor. The quantitative results were generally in the direction predicted by the study. The qualitative results, while not clearly documenting any school yet operating from a small jazz combo perspective, did serve to corroborate many of the quantitative findings. Collectively, the findings of the study support the small jazz combo metaphor as a viable conceptualization that captures many of the dynamics believed necessary for the creation and facilitation of leadership density in schools.
The results are discussed in view of their implications for theory, future research, and practice. Implications for the further study of professional school culture, linking culture to leadership density, self-efficacy theory and leadership density in schools, teacher and administrator preparation and certification programs, school accountability and reform models, and the evolution of school leadership are discussed. Finally, a set of recommendations is provided for enhancing the development of leadership density in schools of tomorrow.
CHAPTER 1: A NEW MODEL FOR LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOLS

Overview

Aristotle concluded that some are destined to be leaders from birth. The belief that leadership is charged to "the great person" has enjoyed a long and storied history. In fact, the great person idea has been a predominant influence on conceptions about and research on leadership in organizations (particularly schools) during the past century. There is little doubt that Aristotle's conclusion carries some validity as history is replete with examples of ordinary men performing extraordinary feats. But, these feats are generally performed in times of crisis, something schools do not wish to cultivate as a normal part of their climate.

Even though research has begun to reconceptualize schools as complex social organizations, the notion of leadership being nested in a formal position has remained a fairly common conceptual thread. Even recent studies, with their call for transformational leadership, seem to be operating from a leader centrist view, in spite of their claims otherwise. In view of national calls for school change, improvement, and reform, it seems timely to address leadership from a different perspective. The perspective discussed in this proposal is termed leadership density, a term first used by Sergiovanni (1987), and further articulated by Ellett (1996).

Concept of Leadership Density

Leadership density is not nested within the conception of the leader as great person, or what will be referred to as the leader centrist view. Instead, the non-centrist view of leadership proposed in this study suggests that leadership can be understood as a dynamic process requiring nontraditional school structures emanating from school culture and behavioral interactions among members of the organization. New, nontraditional structures
include creating new opportunities for teachers to learn from one another, and adequate time
to do so. Roles for teachers will be broadened to include structures not included in typical
school culture (e.g., teachers observing and advising each other or meeting as small groups
to discuss issues of teaching and learning). The stronger the culture and the greater the
quantity and quality of leadership role taking by organizational members, the greater the
density of leadership within the organization.

**Components of Leadership Density**

This study investigated three components believed necessary for the creation and
facilitation of leadership density. They are:

- school culture
- teacher efficacy
- administrator efficacy

Using these variables to study leadership recognizes that leadership does not occur
in a contextual vacuum. In schools, leadership is an inextricable part of the school
environment, and the school environment is greatly influenced by a school’s shared norms,
beliefs, and values (culture). The culture of a school is therefore a powerful mediator in the
behavior exhibited within a school and any change in leadership will depend upon changing
tightly held beliefs about the need for hierarchical and centrist leadership.

Self-efficacy is an individual variable that has a rich theoretical history and
considerable empirical support (Bandura, 1997). Certainly, many other variables could be
suggested as impacting the type and degree of leadership occurring in schools and
undoubtedly some deserve further study. However, by grounding the study of leadership
density within these three basic variables, it is believed that a substantive first step will be
taken to understanding leadership density as well as providing a theoretical framework for further study.

Following are brief rationales why the variables of school culture, teacher efficacy, and administrator efficacy were chosen for this study. These variables will receive expanded attention in Chapter 2.

**Rationale for Variables’ Inclusion in the Study**

Leadership in schools can not take place independent of school culture since a school’s culture determines who leads, how acts of leadership will be interpreted, and what responses are in order to the leadership acts. Traditionally, school cultures have embraced strongly centrist leadership, and the hierarchical structure in most schools is supported by a culture that believes the principal is boss and the faculty function in a techno-rational mode (Sergiovanni, 2000).

This study proposes the traditional, centrist view of who we are and what we do will need to evolve. However, school cultures that firmly embrace leader centrist ideas will be hard pressed to change (or even attempt to change) the way they operate until compelling evidence is offered that there are viable alternatives. This suggests that leadership density in schools will not be found unless there is first a school culture that values the individual and collective talents of its staff.

The belief of administrators and teachers within a school that their efforts will have an impact upon teaching and learning is also a critical aspect of school culture. The belief that one’s efforts can produce desired levels of personal attainment is known as self-efficacy, and is a construct of Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997). Importantly, a large body of research exists which consistently demonstrates that self-efficacy provides
a powerful means of explaining human behavior (Bandura, 1997). Since changing human behavior is a goal of leadership, it is pointless to speak of effective leadership if teachers and administrators in a school do not believe that decisions they make will produce positive results.

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is the core theoretical construct for understanding human behavior. As such, it should be an important consideration in changing leadership modes and models in schools. To move from a classical leadership hierarchy to a denser form of leadership requires that teachers strengthen their beliefs in their ability to make important decisions that may have little to do with their traditional roles in schools. Similarly, administrators will need to believe that relinquishing traditional responsibilities vested to them will strengthen their own personal capabilities to reach school goals.

Using the rationale set out above, a reconceptualization of leadership will be articulated that moves away from traditional, centrist perspectives and towards a new, non-centrist view of leadership known as leadership density.

The Need for New Perspectives on Leadership

Over the past century there have been many reform efforts aimed at changing the roles of both administrators and teachers in American schools (Hallinger, 1992; Cuban, 1988). Given all these efforts, significant reforms in the way that schools are organized and operate might be expected. Though the typical school in America is poised on the brink of the 21st century, its organization and leadership have much in common with schools of years past, despite all the efforts at reform (Cuban, 1988; Murphy, 1991; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 2000).
Even after protracted efforts of school reform, typical schools are abundant and reflect a rational factory model in which students assemble in lines or groups and dutifully troop from room to room while receiving discrete bits of knowledge at each stop until the day is done. This procedure is repeated for a prescribed number of days until the student is deemed worthy of promotion to the next grade (formerly because of adequate teacher marks and in a more recent and perhaps ominous vein, because of standardized tests). In this context, the view of school reflects the perennial question about the appropriate means and ends of schooling, and what role leadership plays as an important input in affecting school outcomes.

**Evolution of School Leadership**

From this traditional, rational model of school leadership, the principal is responsible for overseeing the process of schooling, much like a foreman on the assembly line. Within the traditional, rational model of schooling, the goal of learning is not so much defined as a learning process, but as an end product. Some critics of modern schooling have noted this may be a great way to make widgets, but it seems to be inadequate for understanding schools as complex social systems and for educating something as multifarious as a human being (e.g., House, 1998; Sacks, 1999).

The traditional, factory model of education has been amply documented by Tyack (1974). Primarily due to its industrial superiority, America enjoyed financial success and productivity as the country moved from the 19th to the 20th century. Because of the success and prosperity of America’s industries, it was only natural that schools would use factories as their model for operations. After all, schools were in the business of providing future workers to further propagate America’s industrial might. Since this was the case, it seemed
appropriate to emulate the environment in which future workers would be expected to
perform. However, Tyack contends that the factory model was not prepared to deal with
increased concern for diversity and egalitarian ideals as the 20th century moved forward.

Slowly, after many years, schools recognized that changes were needed if the
educational and social needs of an increasingly diverse population were to be adequately met.
As a result, schools, and the leaders within them, began to seek alternative ways to provide
quality educational opportunities for all. Changing demographics and social and political
demands led to considerable rethinking about the purpose of schooling (ends) and the
importance of leadership in reshaping schools to reflect these desired outcomes.

Those attempting school reform have not been insensitive to the need for evolving
leadership which is capable of meeting the growing demands being placed upon schools.
Over the past four to five decades, evolving conceptions of the role of school leaders (almost
always the school principal) have seen four broadly defined roles emerge: (a)
bureaucrat/manager, (b) instructional leader, (c) transactional leader, and d) transformational
leader. Within the historical, traditional model of schooling and the scientific management
paradigm, principals were viewed as bureaucratic managers. As such, they were responsible
for overseeing the job performance of subordinates in much the same manner as a foreman
monitors an assembly line. By their presence and positional authority, principals were
invested with the responsibility of assuring that personnel were managed efficiently and
were effectively working towards meeting school goals.

Beginning in the 1970's, as schools began to answer to increasingly diverse interests,
principal leadership expanded beyond the prior bureaucratic/manager expectations to include
the process of instruction (Beck & Murphy, 1993). Instead of being a passive observer of
teaching, principals were now expected to become actively involved in evaluating day-to-day instructional processes. The principal was viewed as an instructional leader, a highly qualified member of the staff who acted as a quality controller, insuring that teaching efforts were of sufficiently high caliber to be acceptable.

According to recent descriptions of research on effective schools (e.g., Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000), the most effective instructional leader (principal) is one that makes frequent and short visits to classrooms on an unscheduled basis to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of individual teachers and the staff as a whole. Interestingly, the call for principals as leaders to make frequent and short classroom visits has not been widely adopted by administrators in the field. Hoy and Miskel (1991), for example, note the average principal spends only about 10% of his/her time in the classroom.

Recent research has begun to question prior conceptualizations of the principal’s role, particularly in view of concern for school change processes. Principals have begun to be viewed not only as bureaucratic managers and instructional leaders, but as catalysts for change (change agents) as well. As in a chemical reaction, where a catalyst is added to hasten a reaction between predetermined reactants, principals were viewed as being most useful when they facilitated solutions arrived at from top-down decision making (Murphy, 1991).

This handing down of mandates from higher authorities was occurring even as the conceptualization of principals as leaders was moving from simple cause and effect to more complex models which take into account the myriad of inputs that can affect leadership decisions (Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1988; Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Pitner, 1988). Understandably, the top-down approach to implementing change severely limited the buy-in...
of administrators and educators alike at the local level and little long-term, meaningful organizational change was realized.

Noting the lack of response to the call for instructional leadership and the increasingly complex environment of schools (e.g., Hallinger, 1992), theorists began to conceptualize leadership within a contingency framework, building upon early research in the 1940's and 50's that attempted to identify traits leaders possess. This earlier (and later) literature (e.g., Stogdill, 1948; 1981) reviewed hundreds of studies that attempted to identify traits of effective/successful leaders, with rather equivocal results.

Building upon rather mixed findings from leadership trait research, subsequent theorists and researchers attempted to specify the conditions or situations that allow for certain types of leadership to be effective at specific times. This contingency theory of leadership has probably been most reflected in the work of Fiedler (1967; 1993) and Teddlie and Reynolds (2000).

**New Leadership**

In the 1980s and on into the 1990s, leadership and organizational theorists in education and other settings developed what has been termed the New Leadership approach (Bryman, 1992). These researchers and writers employed a variety of terms to describe the new kinds of leadership with which they were concerned: transactional leadership, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, visionary leadership, and (more simply) new leadership. Together, these perspectives depicted an organizational leader who leads through articulating a vision for the organization reflecting a way to accomplish an overall organizational mission and the associated values necessary to accomplish this vision.
Thus, according to Bryman, this New Leadership conceptualizes organizational (school) leaders as leaders of meaning rather than in terms of an influence (over others) process. Most prominent among these conceptions of leadership are models of transactional and transformational leadership. These perspectives on leadership are most articulated in the work of Burns (1978), Bass (1985), and Bass and Avolio (1990; 1993). According to Bass (cited in Bryman, 1996), transformational leadership consists of four key components:

- Charisma: Developing a vision, engendering pride, respect and trust;
- Inspiration: Motivating by creating high expectations, modeling appropriate behavior, and using symbols to focus efforts;
- Individualized consideration: Giving personal attention to followers, giving them respect and responsibility; and
- Intellectual stimulation: Continually challenging followers with new ideas and approaches.

Transactional leadership consists of two basic components:

- Contingent rewards: Rewarding followers for conformity with performance targets; and
- Management by exception: Taking action mainly when task-related activity is not going according to plan.

While quite popular in the recent leadership literature, these models of leadership remain grounded in leader centrist conceptions.

In more specifically generalizing these New Leadership notions to school principals, Hoy and Miskel (1996) state that the transformational leader: 1) Recognizes the need for change; 2) Creates new visions and commitments to visions; 3) Concentrates on long-term
goals; and 4) Inspires others to transcend their interests for organizational goals. There is an obvious move away from the simple listing of attributes seen in previous studies of leadership towards language that better captures the complexities of leadership.

However, close examination reveals that these transformational attributes are further examples of a leader centrist paradigm, closely linked in concept to earlier leadership models seeking a “great leader.” In this conception of leadership, change and direction still emanate from a central source (the principal) instead of from the organization as a whole, or perhaps from sub-elements within the larger organization. Consider Hoy & Miskel’s (1996) description of a transformational leader and an analysis of how their call for new leadership is still firmly grounded within the great person tradition.

- Recognizes the need for change-Change happens whether we recognize the need for it or not; it is inevitable (Fullan, 1993). To recognize the need for change strongly implies that the direction of change should also be recognized by the transformational leader. This implication is borne out by the next point.

- Creates new visions and commitments to visions-Vesting the creation of visions and the organization’s subsequent commitment to these visions to one person is clearly leader centrist, and is tightly linked to the concept of the great leader that has been so prevalent in earlier writings. It is from this reference point that the context of the next point must be considered.

- Concentrates on long-term goals-This statement should be viewed from the perspective that the visions created by the great leader should become institutionalized as goals. Additionally, the whole notion of concentrating on long-
term goals illustrates a linear, means/ends model where projects can begin and outcomes can be predicted with a high degree of certainty. Clear vestiges of the factory model of schooling are seen in this element of leadership, a model that transformational leadership purportedly disavows.

- Inspires others to try and transcend their interests for organizational goals-The fourth tenet is predicated by the philosophical underpinnings of the previous three. Now that the leader has decided change is needed, created a vision of how to bring about change, and created long-term goals so all will know if they are changing correctly, it stands to reason the leader's final obligation is to convince others that they should accept this whole process and actively embrace it.

Thus, the transformational leader is one who attempts to: influence others through transmission of a vision to others (subordinates) in the organization, mold organizational members to fit the vision, and finally, assume responsibility for building an organization where people continually expand their capabilities (Senge, 1996). The leader centrist notion that a person is responsible for defining the type and direction of organizational change still seems quite apparent in this current, popular conception of school leadership.

On the other hand, research is increasingly acknowledging the advantages of some type of collective decision making (e.g., Ellis & Fouts, 1994; Lambert, 1998; Senge, 1990). However, this research has not enjoyed widespread acceptance into how leadership is practiced in schools. A formidable barrier to any form of collective decision making taking hold and flourishing in organizations is noted by Senge (1990). In his analysis of leadership in business, he concludes collective decision making is often abandoned in times of crises...
as leaders fall back into established norms of centrist decision making, returning to styles of leadership that have already been proven to be unproductive. Given the eroding public confidence in public schools, it is not hard to imagine leadership within schools becoming more and more centrist, even while research indicates the advantages of moving towards collective decision making.

Due to the shortcomings of current conceptions of leadership and the lack of progress obtained through their implementation, this study proposes an alternate view which moves away from centrist notions of leadership towards collective decision making. Furthermore, this study posits that the reason why we reform again and again (Cuban, 1990) is because past efforts have failed to understand the power and importance of the metaphors being used to suggest the means by which reforms could be realized. Improving existing efforts at reforming leadership will require changing metaphors currently accepted as proper models for how leadership should occur.

Metaphors, Schools, and Leadership: A Historical Perspective

To understand the current state of normative beliefs for school leadership, it is useful to examine metaphors that fit current models. Lakoff and Johnson (1981) make a compelling argument for the impact of metaphors upon cognition. They argue that metaphors are not just a matter of language, but instead, that our thought processes themselves are largely metaphorical. Their conceptualization extends metaphors beyond the mere use of words to suggest a likeness or build an analogy and broadens the understanding of metaphors to include how we think, perceive things, and ultimately how we act on these perceptions.
Lakoff and Johnson’s argument for the role of metaphors in thought processes can be seen when the concept “argument” and the metaphor “argument is war” are considered. “All my arguments were destroyed,” “He demolished my argument,” “That argument will get wiped out,” are examples Lakoff and Johnson use to illustrate their point. Intrinsically, we know that arguing is done in such a way that it reflects “argument as war.” We defend our position while attacking the opponent’s. There is a winner and loser, at least in formal debate. Strategy is planned and shifted as the argument unfolds. Expert citations are brought in as reinforcement to bolster a position. Imagine rethinking the metaphorical basis of argument as “argument as peace?” Clearly metaphors are powerful forces in the way we form our conceptual frameworks.

At present, a metaphor representative of leadership in schools (and nearly all social organizations) is classical music (Smith & Ellett, 1999). In classical music, a composer creates a master plan, one that is replicated as faithfully as possible by a group of musicians who depend upon a conductor to apprize them if their interpretation is correct. Each time a classical orchestra plays a piece the goal is the same— to reproduce the composer’s work as faithfully as possible, with as little deviation as humanly possible.

There are close parallels to this process in school leadership today. Policy is generally composed by individuals not directly involved with schools (i.e., state departments or school boards). These policies are handed down to schools where the conductor (the principal) is expected to interpret the policy as faithfully as possible. Teachers (the orchestra) then play the policy, trying to reproduce what they are given as reliably as the orchestra interprets the score. From this perspective, one best solution exists for leadership
decisions and this solution is expected to emanate from an outside source. Clearly, to rethink the classical music metaphor, and to develop new metaphors for leadership in schools will require changing the culture within and perhaps outside of schools as well.

This study posits that effective leadership is multi-faceted. Under normal circumstances, it should not damage the morale or esprit de corp of the school. It is able to react quickly and effectively to unexpected perturbations. Effective leadership actively embraces the need and opportunity for change; it values self-reflection and evaluation of each person. Effective leadership has vision, but is not bound so strongly to this vision that there is no ability for improvisation, risk taking, and evolution of the vision. Effective leadership uses the individual and collective talents of school personnel in a manner most conducive to creating desired levels of personal and school attainments. In short, effective leadership mobilizes and brings to bear from within the school appropriate responses to both problems and opportunities.

As stated earlier, the classical metaphor, with the principal acting as conductor of the orchestra, provides a useful means to describe current efforts at broadening leadership. Transformational leadership has been referred to as leading from the back of the band, and Iwanicki (1999) has called for principals to conduct their symphonies. Metaphorically, as well as practically, both of these notions seem somewhat misguided.

To lead from the back of the band, or to conduct a symphony, it is necessary to have the whole band assembled at one time. In terms of a school faculty, the teachers/orchestra members are never assembled together at one time (except perhaps in infrequently scheduled faculty meetings). How then can they be led from the back of the band, or the symphony
conducted? Schools are not structured to educate in this manner. Instead of picturing school faculties operating as orchestras, it is more proper to think of schools having many small jazz combos playing simultaneously, each striving to play “sweet music” (Smith & Ellett, 1999) by creating and facilitating effective teaching and learning opportunities.

The inability to assemble the orchestra raises doubts regarding the application of a centrist model of leadership to schools. How can any centrist model be sensitive to the simultaneous needs, wants, and abilities of the musicians/teachers (not to mention the students)? The inability of new models of leadership (e.g., transformational, transactional, and charismatic leadership) to break out of centrist leadership modes has created a disjuncture between theories of leadership and their practice. To ask one person to assume the responsibility (be the conductor) for the myriad of responsibilities in a school (e.g., school site management, discipline, instructional leadership, school/community relations, restructuring of culture, accountability, and so forth), is both overwhelming and inefficient. Yet, school principals are responsible for all of these areas, and more as well. Certainly, leadership is needed in all of the areas noted above (as well as many more within schools). But, it is doubtful that effective leadership will be realized by placing ultimate responsibility for decision-making in all these areas upon one person.

Small Jazz Combo: A New Metaphor for Leadership

Small jazz combos typically create high levels of leadership density in their musical performances. Musicians in a small combo jazz band have no single leader, although most small combos may have a “leader” that takes more solos, or who the band is named after. This suggests that leadership in small jazz combos is not a shared commodity, but rather is
based upon the collective needs, abilities, and commitments of the band members. Dynamic and fluid leadership within small jazz combos requires a high degree of cohesion since each person responds to the musical nuances expressed by the other members. The small size of the group, coupled with a high degree of cohesion, provides a rapid response system to unexpected perturbations that arise in the music.

Small jazz combos are very well equipped to spontaneously seize musical opportunities. They are constantly striving to find new ways to improve their performance. As such, they focus more upon the process of playing rather than a predetermined outcome such as a note-for-note classical score. In fact, creative improvisation is a necessary quality for the success of the band. Such improvisation changes from performance to performance, although the basic melody and some “riffs” remain the same. Small combo jazz, like leadership density, is fluid, dynamic, and continually influenced by new structures (Smith & Ellett, 2000a). In the small combo environment, change is constant and is a positive force which feeds future creative efforts.

A small combo jazz band is professionally committed to use individual and collective talents to produce high quality music. Similarly, leadership in schools that reflects the small combo jazz metaphor is also committed to using individual and collective talents to produce high quality educational opportunities and learning for students (Smith & Ellett, 2000). The concept of leadership density demands it. In this study, the small jazz combo metaphor for leadership in schools will be used as a conceptual basis to develop an original measure of leadership density.
Caveats for the Small Jazz Combo Metaphor

As with any metaphor, care needs to be exercised that this new metaphor for school leadership is not over extended. Certainly any school will find itself in situations that require strong, centrist, decision making. As well, it is recognized that positional authority in schools is mandated by policy, board rule, or law. As previously defined in this chapter, positional authority is not the same as leadership. There are also occasions of crisis or time constraints which may require immediate decision making by a single individual (usually the school principal). However, this study argues these matters are different and far removed from the teaching and learning process, which requires leadership density, a different form of leadership in schools than that which typically exists.

Schools dense in leadership (those having many small combos playing simultaneously) are not without reasonable constraints. Small combo jazz bands have much freedom to experiment. But, the experimentation is always constrained by the melody of the song and any solo played is bound by musical theory. Additionally, the small combo player must have reasonable expertise since there is no large ensemble of musicians (as in a classical orchestra) to mask the lack of expertise or a poor performance.

As with small jazz combos, schools creating more dense forms of leadership should be on guard against the potential for discordant learning activities. As the small jazz combo must be guided by a song's melody, schools rich in leadership density will be guided by a quality teaching and learning environment (Ellett, 1997). Understanding theory is critical in both music and schools. Musicians will use theory to guide and constrain their selection of notes while schools will use theory in areas of learning (Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1993) and
human behavior (Bandura, 1997) to inform their attempts to create quality teaching and learning environments.

**Summary**

Historically, theories of leadership have tended to focus upon "the leader" and as such have emanated from a "leader centrist" perspective. Leadership in schools has paralleled these theories by typically viewing the principal as the "school's leader". This centrist view of leadership, and specifically school leadership, has begun to evolve as researchers have begun to think of schools as complex social organizations. Currently, much of the leadership literature is devoted to New Leadership (e.g., transformational, transactional, and charismatic leadership). However, close examination of all of these iterations in leadership still reveal a dominant, centrist perspective.

This study attempts to break out of the leader centrist assumptions which have dominated earlier studies by reconceptualizing leadership through the metaphor of small jazz combo with the result being termed leadership density. Further, this study is an effort to answer Immegart's call (1988) to move from studies of leaders towards studies which investigate leadership theory.

**Statement of the Research Problem**

New conceptions of leadership are needed to further theory development in research on leadership in schools. This study is designed to address this need by developing a leadership framework which is grounded in the study of new leadership structures and processes framing leadership in schools rather than the study of school leaders.

There has been considerable research completed on teacher and student self-efficacy beliefs and the role these beliefs play in teaching and learning. However, there are no known
studies which investigate administrator self-efficacy beliefs. Furthermore, no conceptual framework exists that links teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs, school culture, and leadership density in schools. This study addresses this void in theory by developing and refining a conceptual framework linking these variables.

No quantitative measures of leadership density or administrator self-efficacy beliefs are known. This study addresses this problem through the creation and testing of quantitative measures of these constructs.

**Purpose**

Much has been written and said about how schools should be evolving (i.e., into professional learning communities which operate from a non-centrist perspective). However, literature on school leadership still emanates primarily from a centrist perspective and fails to provide a usable conceptual framework from which perspectives of non-centrist leadership can be explored. This study explores new conceptions of leadership (leadership density) within the context of social cognitive theory (self-efficacy, school culture) as an alternative to existing leader centrist conceptions of leadership (e.g. transactional and transformational). This study is the first known of its kind and is therefore exploratory in nature. Its purposes are to:

- Develop a conceptual framework linking leadership density, teacher efficacy, administrator efficacy, and school culture;
- Develop original measures of leadership density and administrator efficacy; and
- Examine linkages and interactions between the study variables using appropriate quantitative and qualitative methods;
Significance of the Study

Schools still closely follow a centrist model of education (e.g. Tyack, 1974; Doll, 1993). This centrist model closely parallels a marching band metaphor of education, with reliance upon the leader/conductor for guidance, and is still widely used even though current theories of learning (e.g. Bandura, 1997; Brooks & Brooks, 1993) contradict many of the centrist model's beliefs and do not map onto the marching band metaphor very well. Given the incongruence of current theory with practice, and the rather unproductive successes of previous attempts to reconceptualize schools and schooling (e.g. Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1992), this study seems particularly timely since it directly addresses these theoretical shortcomings and offers plausible alternatives.

Given the ill fit of the marching band metaphor to what is now known about learning in organizations, alternative models for teaching and learning need to be devised. To accomplish this, it will be necessary to advance new metaphors which replace outdated ones (Lakoff & Johnson, 1981). This study proposes replacing the classical orchestra metaphor for school leadership with another borrowed from the musical field – specifically small jazz combo. Significantly, this is the first known study to try and understand leadership both within and outside the classroom from this new metaphorical perspective. Additionally, this study is significant because it should broaden our understanding of how leadership density, teacher and administrative efficacy, and school culture are related, and it begins to build a nomological net (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) among these variables. The building of nomological networks is of particular importance given the absence of a comprehensive theory for how these variables may interact. This study is also significant since it is the first attempt to develop a measure of administrator self-efficacy beliefs.
Study Variables

Conceptual/Operational Definitions

For each variable in the study a conceptual definition is given, immediately followed by an operational definition.

Independent Variables

Culture

The conceptual framework of this study views school culture as an embedded system of shared norms, beliefs, and values which result from the interactions of individuals and groups of individuals (Cavanagh, 1997). Extending this notion, Owens and Steinhoff (1988) build a theoretical framework of organizational culture which includes an analysis of the interactions that can take place within a school. They include:

- The history of the organization;
- Symbolic myths and stories about the organization;
- Espoused values and beliefs of the organization;
- Expectations for behavior in the organization;
- Rites and rituals which have symbolic value in the organization; and
- Heroes and heroines that symbolize the organization.

Given the theoretical framework of this study, it is expected that a collegial, collaborative culture reflecting norms of professionalism that embrace individual and collective talents of organizational members will be linked to leadership density. The aforementioned facets of school culture were utilized as a part of this study in an effort to understand relationships among culture, teacher and administrator efficacy, and leadership density.
Operational Definition

For the purposes of this study, elements of professional school culture were measured by the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD). (See Appendix A; Chapter 4 contains a description of this instrument.)

Self-Efficacy

According to Bandura (1997), people guide their lives by their beliefs regarding their personal efficacy. He defines self-efficacy as: “Perceived beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (p. 3).”

Efficacy is an important personal construct within Bandura’s social cognitive theory of learning (1997) that mediates linkages between the environment and behavior. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy beliefs:

- influence the courses of action people choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, how long they will persevere in the face of obstacles and failures, their resilience to adversity, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands, and the level of accomplishments they realize (p. 3).

In this study, teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to move away from a centrist form of leadership towards a school with greater leadership density were measured.

Operational Definition

Teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to move away from a centrist form of leadership towards a school with greater leadership density were measured in this study. No specific measures of these forms of self-efficacy beliefs are...
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known to exist. Therefore, original measures were developed in this study to address this specific need. (See Appendix A; Chapter 4 contains a description of this instrument.)

**Dependent Variable**

**Leadership Density**

In this study, and from the perspective of leadership density (Ellett, 1996), leadership is culturally embedded and necessitates the development of individual and collective self-efficacy beliefs in the capability to move away from centrist modes of leadership. Within this context, leadership is defined as purposeful role taking on the part of organizational members, either individually or collectively, that moves the organization toward accomplishment of goals. The greater the collective and individual role taking in leadership activities by organizational members, the greater the leadership density. Thus leadership density is an organizational construct.

Density is borrowed from physics and indicates the distribution of a quantity per unit of space. Therefore and for example, when decision making responsibilities are dispersed among members of the organization according to their needs, expertise, and commitment (including the critical decisions alluded to by Selznick, 1957), leadership density is increased.

Metaphorically, leadership density is best represented by small jazz combo. The relationship between the small jazz combo metaphor and leadership density is further explicated in the text in Appendix B.

**Operational Definition**

Leadership density was operationalized in this study with a newly developed measure (See Appendix A; Chapter 4 contains a description of this instrument).
Research Hypotheses and Rationales: Phase I

The major research hypotheses framing the proposed study are provided below along with a theoretical rationale for each hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1**

There are statistically significant, positive, bivariate relationships between leadership density and elements of professional school culture.

Within social cognitive theory and the model of triadic reciprocal causation framing the study, the interaction between person, environment, and behavior is dynamic and ongoing. As schools become more dense in their leadership characteristics, changes in roles, opportunities for new learning, shared activity, decision making responsibilities, sharing of knowledge, and so forth will occur. These behavioral changes and attendant role taking by teachers and others are embedded within the core norms, values, beliefs, and interests reflected in the culture (environment). Thus, a move away from centrist leadership characteristics towards greater leadership density requires cultural changes reflecting norms of professionalism (collaboration, collegial teaching and learning). Therefore, schools characterized by high leadership density should also possess strong professional culture characteristics.

**Hypothesis 2**

There are statistically significant, positive, bivariate relationships between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy beliefs.

Within social cognitive theory and the model of triadic reciprocal causation framing the study, the interaction between person, environment, and behavior is dynamic and ongoing. As schools become more dense in their leadership characteristics, changes in roles,
opportunities for new learning, shared activity, decision making responsibilities, sharing of knowledge, and so forth will occur. Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) posits that major changes in behavior (e.g. teachers taking on new roles) only occur with changes in the strength of self-efficacy beliefs. Thus, a move away from centrist leadership characteristics towards greater leadership density is theoretically contingent upon the strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs by teachers. Therefore, schools characterized by high leadership density should also possess teachers with strong self-efficacy beliefs towards leadership density.

**Hypothesis 3**

There are statistically significant, bivariate relationships between leadership density and administrator self-efficacy beliefs.

Within social cognitive theory and the model of triadic reciprocal causation framing the study, the interaction between person, environment, and behavior is dynamic and ongoing. As schools become more dense in their leadership characteristics, changes in roles, opportunities for new learning, shared activity, decision making responsibilities, sharing of knowledge, and so forth will occur. Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) posits that major changes in behavior (e.g. administrators taking on new roles) only occur with changes in the strength of self-efficacy beliefs. Thus, a move away from centrist leadership characteristics towards greater leadership density is theoretically contingent upon the strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs by administrators. Therefore, schools characterized by high leadership density should also possess principals with strong self-efficacy beliefs towards leadership density.
Hypothesis 4

The combination of school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy accounts for significantly more variation in leadership density among schools than any of these variables considered singularly.

The framework for this study suggests that leadership density in schools is culturally embedded and necessitates strengthening teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs. Additionally, the framework suggests reciprocal interactions between self-efficacy, school culture, and leadership density. If strengthening efficacy and developing elements of professional culture are both important correlates of leadership density then the combination of these variables should be more potent in predicting and explaining leadership density than either variable operating alone.

Research Questions and Theoretical Rationales: Phase II

Research Question 1

How involved are teachers in decision-making regarding teaching and learning?

Schools involved in the creation and facilitation of leadership density should have high teacher involvement in making decisions, particularly in the area of teaching and learning.

Research Question 2

How does the principal perceive his/her role in terms of providing leadership for the school?

It is important to see how the principal perceives his/her role. If the principal has highly centrist notions regarding leadership decisions then it is unlikely that a school culture
will be in place that expects and allows teachers to make leadership decisions based upon their talents and needs.

**Research Question 3**

Does the principal provide leadership opportunities for teachers?

Being open to non-centrist leadership is not enough. Increasing leadership density requires opportunities for teachers to make substantive decisions.

**Research Question 4**

Are teachers working cooperatively and collegially towards school goals?

Density is borrowed from physics as a means to depict an amount of a substance per unit of volume. High teacher cooperation and collegiality suggests that many important decisions regarding the attainment of school goals will take place at these times, provided the school culture allows and expects this to occur.

**Research Question 5**

Is small group planning by teams of teachers evident?

The dynamics of small groups are much different than large ones. Leadership density is best facilitated by small groups where those involved are expected and allowed to make leadership decisions based upon their needs, talents, and commitment.

**Research Question 6**

How willing are teachers to step outside of traditional roles to assume leadership responsibilities?

Traditional leadership structures in schools have placed teachers in well defined roles. Typically, teachers are passive recipients of policy and are somewhat removed from
leadership decisions. Schools with high leadership density will create new structures and opportunities for teachers to lead themselves and each other. Instead of maintaining high levels of personal autonomy, teachers involved in creating and facilitating leadership density will recognize the systemic nature (Senge, 1990) of their work.

Supplemental Research Questions

There are a variety of supplemental research questions that will be addressed through analyses of the data to be collected in the proposed study. These include (but are not limited to):

- What is the factor structure of the empirically derived constructs for the various measures developed (i.e. teacher and administrator beliefs on self-efficacy) for the study?
- How reliable are the data derived from the study?

In addition to these sample questions it is expected that results of various data analyses will generate additional questions of interest.

Assumptions and Limitations

- Self-report responses are valid indicators of the variables measured.
- Respondents will complete the measures truthfully.
- Participation in the study within schools will be high enough to aggregate data at the school level.
- The quantitative analysis of the data will yield sufficient information to develop profiles of contrasting schools for the case studies to be developed in Phase II of the study.
• Common method variance does not unduly affect the results.
• The results are only generalizable to schools with characteristics similar to those studied (e.g. geographical location, level, size, demographics).

Summary

Chapter 1 presents a brief overview of the literature relative to the components of the conceptual framework guiding this study. It provides a conceptional rationale for the linking of school culture, teacher efficacy, and administrator efficacy to leadership density and articulates how these three constructs are expected to operate in a triadic and reciprocal manner. Additionally, Chapter 1 presents the research hypotheses and questions which will be used to guide the study.

Chapter 2 follows and presents a rationale for the conceptual framework of this study.
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY

This study addresses a need in the leadership literature for an alternative conceptual framework of non-centrist leadership. A conceptual framework was developed for this study that serves to organize linkages between school culture, teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership density. The study is based upon the following observations and hypotheses:

- Metaphorically, classical music provides an accurate model for current conceptualizations of leadership;
- Schools organized according to a classical music perspective will operate predominantly from a leader centrist mode;
- Schools that vest leadership decisions to staff based upon their individual and collective talents, needs, and commitment are operating from a non-centrist mode of leadership;
- Metaphorically, this new form of leadership is best represented by small jazz combo;
- The result of leadership based upon the small jazz combo metaphor is leadership density;
- Schools high in leadership density will exhibit heightened use of the individual and collective talents found within the school; and
- Schools that consistently utilize the individual and collective talents of their staff (e.g., those that operate with high leadership density) provide an environment better suited to producing and maintaining high professional norms and standards at all levels of interaction (classroom, teacher to teacher, teacher to administrator, etc.).
The conceptual model developed for this study is triadic and reciprocal. That is, each element of the study (leadership density, school culture, and the self-efficacy of teachers and administrators) impacts the other two. The triadic, reciprocal model was developed by Bandura (1997), and is useful for understanding human agency. As seen in figure 2.1, Bandura attributes human behavior to three classes of determinants: environment (E), personal factors (P), and behavior (B).

![Figure 2.1: Bandura's Triadic, Reciprocal Model of Human Agency](image)

Bandura notes there is a functional dependence between events in the triadic, reciprocal model. Each of the determinants can be seen to be interactive and bidirectional in their influence. The degree of influence for these determinants will vary depending upon the activity and the circumstances. Additionally, the mutual influence that arise from these determinants may not emerge as one holistic entity. Each causal factor may experience a time lag before its impact is felt upon human agency.

As seen in figure 2.2, the model for leadership density in this study is also triadic and reciprocal. School culture is conceptualized as an environment variable (E), teacher and administrator self-efficacy as personal factors (P), and leadership density as behavior (B). Of course, other salient factors beyond these three variables could be identified for study, but
it is believed these three study variables will provide a substantive first step in understanding leadership density and its potential value to schools.

![Triadic, Reciprocal Model of Leadership Density In Schools](image)

**Figure 2.2: Triadic, Reciprocal Model of Leadership Density In Schools**

Conceptually, the model for leadership density provides a basis for addressing and understanding in a causal manner (i.e., functional dependence between events) much of what is currently being called for in school reform and restructuring efforts. For example, the formation and facilitation of schools that value and nurture effective teaching and learning for all students, involvement of faculty with decision-making in areas of instruction, increased commitment by administrators and faculty for creating effective teaching and learning environments, movement towards thinking of the organization as a system where events are seen as inter-related instead of isolated, utilization of current best practices in teaching, and teachers assuming roles of action researchers by engaging in self and peer critiques are examples which, to some extent, are all grounded within the functional dependence between school culture, teacher self-efficacy, administrator self-efficacy, and leadership density.
The following sections further articulate why it is expected the variables of school culture, teacher self-efficacy, administrator self-efficacy, and leadership density will act as triadic, causal determinants upon one another.

**School Culture, Leadership Density, and Meaningful Change in Schools**

Due to the leading economic role America has enjoyed, citizens have generally believed education in the United States was second to none. This philosophy governed American schools until the mid 1980's, when critics of schools began to question literacy levels of emerging graduates (Ginsburg & Wimpleberg, 1987), mainly because America was believed to be losing status as a world power (National Commission on Excellence In Education, 1983).

Looking for answers, a series of studies were begun to analyze why American schools were on the decline (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984). This was the beginning of an intense, protracted attempt in school reform extending to the present time. Using economic decline as justification, states began to pass copious amounts of laws designed to mandate positive change in schools (Underwood, 1990).

The results of all these mandates were generally much less than spectacular, primarily due to the top-down orders that ignored the culture and context of the schools impacted (Sizer, 1984; Cuban, 1984; Elmore, 1987). Critics argued persuasively that reform is unlikely unless it takes into account a school’s organization, governance, and instructional processes (Murphy, 1991). This recognition birthed the second phase of school reform, where teacher beliefs were examined to determine how traditional beliefs could be harmonized with perceived needs for change (Lester & Onore, 1990).
The aligning of a school’s culture with change mandates has been referred to as restructuring (Ellis and Fouts, 1994). Conceptually, restructuring posits schools improve when they systematically examine their rules, roles, and relationships (Murphy, 1991) to create a culture that better addresses the needs of the served clientele (Schlechty, 1991).

To change school culture is to change the normative embedded beliefs, assumptions, and values of the teachers and staff working there (Leiberman, 1995). Early efforts to address school culture were generally insensitive to the complexity of change and the likelihood of failure if internalization of attempted reforms is not realized (Fullan, 1993; Fuller, Wild, Rappoport, & Dornsbusch, 1982; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987). Seeing schools as complex organizations which will not change in any meaningful fashion until a culture emerges that will support reform efforts represents a radical departure from earlier input/output efforts at reform. As such, most efforts at reforming schools now take into account the culture and complexity of the impacted institution.

By its very nature, the culture of a school tends to be resistant to change. Certain norms within schools are, as Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) assert, so deeply ingrained that they are held in an almost sacred regard. Mandates that conflict with these norms are often met with compliance that is superficial or insignificant.

One proof of these norms’ longevity is the remarkably similar form and function of schools today as compared to those of a hundred years ago (Sizer, 1984). During this time, education has seen many reforms and innovations: cooperative learning, whole language, scaffolding, mentoring, site-based management, school accountability, etc. Some of these trends and innovations have been incorporated into widespread use, but this has not resulted in substantive change in the actual mode of teaching and learning for the typical school.
Rather than changing school culture, it may be more accurate to say school culture at most schools absorbed these reform efforts in a buffer-like manner. Just as a buffer is able to bind free ions and render them ineffective for altering pH, a school’s culture performs a similar function, absorbing any effort to introduce disequilibrium into the system. The primary difference in this analogy is the buffer can be readily identified and its buffering mechanism easily subjected to analysis. School culture, on the other hand, is much more intangible and difficult to capture (Stoll & Fink, 1996).

A widely held belief and assumption about schools is that changing school leaders (principals) can automatically change schools and make them more productive and effective. In fact, it would be fair to say that this assumption is a cultural norm, where many intrinsically believe the statement to be true, although little data is available to support the contention.

Despite the fact the assumption sounds quite logical, and in spite of some heroic stories about school principals and school change (e.g., Joe Clark), close examination of the quality of many of today’s schools, and the attendant calls for increased educational productivity and school accountability in many states, suggests that traditional models of leader centrist influence on schools are not working very well. When coupled with typically high levels of personal and organizational resistance to change that typify most schools, as well as the historically documented and rhythmic phases of reform (Cuban, 1990), the influence of school leaders on effecting meaningful, productive, and lasting school and cultural changes seems rather suspect. And, the failure of centrist leadership to affect substantive change in schools and school culture can also be extrapolated to organizations in general.
The ambiguity, unpredictability and lack of leader effects on organizational outcomes has recently been posited in non-school contexts as well (Gardner, 2000; Pfeffer, 1997). Thus, the tacit assumption that principals as leaders of schools, through their transactions with subordinates and communications of organizational vision, can make schools more productive and effective is coming under attack from research that deals directly with schools as well as studies done on organizations in other contexts.

Recently, Allen et al. (1998) proposed new challenges for leadership in organizations that reflect dynamic future societal concerns and trends. These include globalization, increasing stresses on the environment, increased speed and dissemination of information and general scientific and social change. They make the point that these new challenges will require rethinking leadership in view of its purpose rather than its definition. If this perspective is correct, and if it translates to schools as organizations, then what seems needed are new ideas about leadership in (and of) schools—ideas that move away from the history of leader centrist models developed and researched to date. As previously argued by Immegart (1988), what is needed are theories and empirical studies of leadership itself instead of more studies of school leaders. Thus, this study embraces Immegart’s call and argues that newer models of leadership (in this case leadership density) will replace traditional (leader centrist) models of leadership only as school cultures (as we know them today) change.

Peters and Waterman (1982) put forth the view (though leader centrist) that successful leaders can manipulate culture. Linstead & Grafton-Small (1992) take the position that leadership is filtered through organizational cultures in which the meanings ascribed to it are filtered through the imaginative consumptions of culture. In other words,
organizational members are not simply passive recipients of leader behavior and leader communications. These are interpreted through members' personal experiences and individual and shared norms, beliefs and values that are derived from these experiences. This expanded view of leadership and organizations: (a) questions the legitimacy of leader centrist views of leadership, (b) "loosens the bonds of the rational model of leadership research" (Bryman, 1996), (c) emphasizes the importance of organizational cultures, and (d) calls for newer conceptions of leadership theory and research. The triadic, reciprocal model for this study embraces the expanded view of leadership expressed above and recognizes the pivotal role played by school culture in the creation and facilitation of leadership density.

Moving from a centrist view of leadership to a more dense conception of school leadership requires not only an understanding of school culture but self-efficacy beliefs as well. The section that follows provides an overview of the relationship of self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators to meaningful change in schools and the relationship between self-efficacy and leadership density.

**Teacher and Administrator Self-Efficacy, Leadership Density, and Meaningful Change in Schools**

In this study, the construct of self-efficacy, as reflected in Bandura's work (1997), has been selected as an important variable for study in the creation and facilitation of leadership density. As Bandura (1997) notes, self-efficacy is a task specific concept. Therefore, this study attempts to measure the self-efficacy of teachers and administrators in regards to their beliefs in their personal abilities to create and facilitate leadership density within their school.

Bandura defines self-efficacy as: "...beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (p.3)." The study of self-
efficacy beliefs within Bandura’s broader social cognitive theory (1997) has created substantial theoretical discussion and empirical research. Recent, comprehensive reviews of self-efficacy literature (Pajares, 1996; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy, 1998) provide considerable evidence that teaching and learning are strongly linked to teacher and student self-efficacy beliefs. Additionally, self-efficacy beliefs are an important determinant in human agency. According to Bandura (1997), self efficacy influences:

• The courses of action people choose to pursue;
• How much effort people will put forth in a given endeavor;
• How long they will persevere in the face of obstacles and failure;
• People’s resilience to adversity;
• Whether someone’s thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding; and
• How much stress and depression is experienced in coping with taxing environmental demands.

It seems reasonable that moving from top-down, centrist models of leadership to leadership which is more dense will require changes in both teacher and administrator beliefs about their individual capabilities to take on new roles, change behaviors, and develop and implement new leadership structures and processes. It is almost a certainty that moving from centrist leadership towards leadership density will be neither easy or quick, given the strength of some established cultural norms (e.g., high degrees of teacher autonomy and high levels of job isolation).

To change long held, firmly established beliefs, people will need to believe productive change can be realized through directed efforts at changing these norms. These efforts will create new roles, new structures, and new learning opportunities for teachers and
administrators alike. Both will need to be able to overcome obstacles and deal with the accompanying stresses (for example: giving up teacher autonomy or working with someone that may be disliked but doing so because it is believed what will be accomplished is worthwhile) that creating leadership density will entail.

Principals working to create schools high in leadership density will have to hold strong beliefs that they can help teachers redefine their roles. Bandura notes: “If people believe they have no power to produce results, they will not attempt to make things happen” (pg. 3). It may be necessary for principals to “think out of the box” and provide unique experiences for teachers which help to build their own self-efficacy beliefs for assuming leadership.

According to Bandura, any principal attempting to change leadership patterns in their school will have these decisions mediated by the degree to which it is believed the school can move towards leadership density. Likewise, teachers would also be influenced by their beliefs about a school’s ability to increase its leadership density. For example, if a teacher believes they will have little hope in changing another teacher’s actions (i.e., a self-doubting mentor teacher), then there is little chance of positive change and leadership density increasing. By analogy, a person that does not believe they can play a high C on the trumpet will not persist in their efforts. This strongly suggests that high efficacy beliefs for executing and organizing actions which will increase leadership density and quality teaching and learning environments will be necessary for both administrators and teachers if meaningful and sustained change is to occur.

Through the four sources of self-efficacy — enactive mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states (all of which receive
attention in the literature review) — individuals will have opportunity to increase their self-efficacy pertaining to their beliefs about creating and facilitating leadership density. For example, a teacher with high self-efficacy for decision making may model appropriate leadership skills, or create an enactive mastery experience which is designed to heighten another teacher’s own self-efficacy levels in decision making. Or, the feeling of success one experiences when a task is performed well, along with the accolades of one’s colleagues that acknowledge the task’s completion may provide opportunity for enhancing self-efficacy as it pertains to enhancing leadership density at a school.

**Why Small Jazz Combo?**

The cornerstone of this study on leadership is the small jazz combo metaphor. The metaphor is believed to be a powerful tool for conveying the complexities that are a part of leadership decisions within organizations. As Senge (1999) argues, language defines our activities and purposes. From this perspective, the small jazz combo metaphor for leadership is appropriate for rethinking school leadership.

Schools displaying small combo jazz leadership are implementing leadership consistent with the concept of leadership density (Ellett, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1987; Smith & Ellett, 1999). The concept of leadership density implies that school leadership can be best understood from an organizational perspective rather than from the traditional leader centrist perspective traditionally derived from concern for positional authority. A similar call has recently been made to conceptualize and measure supervision in schools from an organizational climate perspective (Claudet & Ellett, 1999). Schools rich in leadership density are guided by a central theme or melody, as are small combo jazz groups. A quality teaching and learning environment is the constant and enduring melody of a school rich in
leadership density. Teachers and administrators within the school acquire leadership based upon individual and group needs, expertise, and professional and moral commitment. Schools with strong leadership density have parallels with the characteristics of small combo jazz groups such as:

- A strong sense of individual and group/organizational efficacy (all members believe they can play good notes and that the group can make good music as well);
- A school culture that reflects the primacy of maintaining a strong teaching and learning environment (though one might depart occasionally from the melody through improvisation, the melody should always be recognizable);
- A curriculum heavily grounded in social constructivist learning for both students and teachers (each jazz combo member puts his/her own signature on the music played);
- An exciting and robust social environment and climate (combo jazz players are enthusiastic, engaged and highly involved in the dramatic content of the music);
- A level of teacher autonomy that allows for creativity but not at the expense of accomplishing group goals (no small jazz combo player can play as he/she pleases without regard for the melody and the group’s total performance);
- Adequate breadth and depth of professional and pedagogical content knowledge (small jazz combo musicians can not simply stand up and play notes without a broader understanding of the music);
- Cooperativeness and collaboration among group members (listening and musically responding to others in the jazz combo plays an important part in the overall quality of the music produced);
• A sense of collective ownership and contributions (each player in the small jazz combo recognizes that the whole of the music is greater than the sum of individual contributions to the music);

• A sense of leadership that is constantly evolving, acquired, dynamic and not ruled by committee (in a small jazz combo the pianist may shorten a solo because the guitarist is having an exceptionally hot and creative night...and the next night the guitarist might do the same for the saxophone player);

• An emphasis upon the process of obtaining an outcome rather than working towards a scripted predetermined end;

• Small groups of teachers working without the encumbrances associated with larger groups; and

• High levels of dependence upon each person’s contributions and abilities.

The parallels between schools dense in leadership and small combo jazz suggest ways in which the concept of leadership density in schools seems consistent with the small combo jazz metaphor proposed. These parallels bring to the fore the difference between schools rich in leadership density and more traditional conceptions of schools and school leadership. The traditional school is driven by external goals, developed off-site with little or no input from teachers (the orchestra members) or the principal (the maestro). The traditional school operates within a highly constrained input/output system. What the children should know at the end of the year has already been determined and success in attaining goals is measured by standardized tests. Students are expected to operate in a traditional school as third and fourth chair orchestra members, faithfully duplicating the expected score from curriculum...
guides, worksheets, and chapter reviews while the teacher conducts the classroom enterprise (perhaps the string or brass instruments) and the principal conducts the entire symphony.

As previously noted, a small combo jazz school would be characterized by a curriculum that views learning as an ongoing process (not an outcome), and one that embraces social constructivism, mastery demonstrations similar to jazz recitals, creative contributions, individual learning portfolios and projects, and the like. Standards would not be imposed by outside sources in the same way that the conductor controls the orchestra’s performance. Rather, standards would be part and parcel of the educational process, inseparable from the efforts to meet them. Standardized tests in this kind of educational environment would serve as diagnostic tools to see how the music may be improved, rather than obstacles to overcome before promotion or graduation occur.

In schools characterized by leadership density, teachers would be working in small groups, each group using the quality teaching and learning environment as a parameter (core melody) for their improvisations and experimentations. Large schools would have many jazz combos playing simultaneously, creating rich and robust atmospheres for learning. In addition, and much like a manager works with a jazz band, the principal could help teachers keep up with educational needs (audience demands) and trends (popular tunes and new styles of music).

Small groups create expectations for teachers that go far beyond the traditional atmosphere in schools where teachers close their door and do their own thing with little external input. Iwanicki’s (1999) call for principals to conduct their symphony overlooks the fact that principals never have all of their musicians play before them at the same time. For example, if a school has 50 teachers and the principal observes two teachers per day for the
entire school year (highly unlikely), then 48 teachers are “conductorless” every day. Any staff looking to the principal as the conductor of their music will be woefully lacking for guidance. On the other hand, if teachers see themselves as responsible for creating sweet music (a quality teaching and learning environment) then the standards for excellence become internalized and part of the school’s culture. Rather than creating a school without standards, a small combo jazz environment requires teachers to look beyond themselves as individuals and to work creatively, but in concert with their colleagues, thereby facilitating a collaborative and professional organization. Standards emerge from creative practice, continuous learning and appreciation of individual differences, not from externally imposed values of what schools should accomplish or ought to be...or through rigorous work inspection by the principal. As Fullan (1993) has reminded us, the quality of schooling and performance standards are culturally imbedded in most schools. Thus, politicians and others can not mandate what matters. Goals and performance standards in a small jazz combo are both collective and individual, created internally, and emanate from the cultural norms reflected by the musicians and inherent in the music.

It seems reasonable to conclude that tasks requiring large groups that have predetermined outcomes are well-served by centrist leadership. But, does a leader centrist perspective best serve schools, where broad consensus suggests that individual learning is facilitated by small group size? Extending the question of the appropriateness of a leader centrist perspective to the faculty/administrator level, it is appropriate to ask whether the fluid, dynamic instructional decisions that teachers constantly make are best facilitated by a leadership perspective that depends upon a conductor? Conducting requires certainty within the process of producing an expected outcome. It seems impossible to produce a
score/lesson for learning that a teacher can readily conduct because the learning process never contains the certitude of a classical score.

Admittedly, strong, centrist leadership may be needed when large group activities are undertaken, a standard procedure or routine needs to be implemented, or when there is a crisis (e.g., as in war). However, in the everyday life of most schools, none of these scenarios are common, and therefore centrist forms of leadership may not be needed or may not be appropriate to accomplish the ends of schooling. Centrist leadership can be useful in schools when administrators make decisions which lessen the procedural burdens of teachers and increase time allocations for teaching and learning. A principal correctly managing the paperwork and non-instructional burdens for teachers to free up time for teaching and learning may very well operate from a strongly centrist perspective in these matters. However, these matters are different and far removed from the teaching and learning process...which requires leadership density...a different form of leadership in schools than that which currently exists..

Summary

This chapter is devoted to explaining the importance of school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy in creating and maintaining high levels of leadership density. These variables are located in a triadic, reciprocal causation model similar to Bandura’s (1997) model of human agency and are hypothesized as key elements in the utilization of the individual and collective talents within a school towards creating and maintaining high professional norms for teaching and learning.
Chapter 3 will review literature in the fields of self-efficacy, school culture, and leadership. Literature on leadership will be reviewed from the organizational and psychological literature as well as literature specifically pertaining to leadership in schools.
CHAPTER 3: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 3 of the study presents a review of related literature in the professional bodies of literature for school culture, self-efficacy, and leadership. The literature review for self-efficacy and leadership includes a historical perspective from both within and outside the field of education in order to provide clarity and context to current educational practices.

The literature cited in this chapter is representative of pertinent research done in all of these fields and has been chosen for its relevance to the conceptualization of constructs and linkages this study lays out in Chapters 1 and 2. Literature on self-efficacy is reviewed first, with particular emphasis paid to Albert Bandura's work in this area. Literature relating to school culture is reviewed next with the literature on leadership receiving final attention.

Self-Efficacy

Research in the field of self-efficacy for teaching has followed two primary strands. The RAND corporation studied efficacy as the extent to which teachers believed they could control the reinforcement of their actions. In other words, whether control or reinforcement lay within themselves or within the environment (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Albert Bandura (1997) proposed a differing model of efficacy where teacher efficacy is viewed as a type of self-efficacy and self-efficacy is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3).

Bandura positions self-efficacy as a powerful mediator in his triadic, reciprocal model of causation (fig. 3.1). According to Bandura (1997), people's beliefs in their self-efficacy can have diverse effects upon the influence exercised over what they do (e.g. human agency). Referring to self-efficacy beliefs, Bandura (1997) states:
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Such beliefs influence the courses of action people choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, how long they will persevere in the face of obstacles and failures, their resilience to adversity, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, how much stress and depression they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands, and the level of accomplishments they recognize (p. 3).

Figure 3.1: Bandura’s Triadic, Reciprocal Model of Human Agency

Clearly Bandura’s view of self-efficacy beliefs provides a powerful mediating factor in the courses of action people choose. And importantly, Bandura’s view of self-efficacy receives a prominent place in the extant literature, due in part to its theoretical richness as well as the abundance of confirming empirical evidence obtained through numerous studies.

Bandura (1997) notes that the literature has, at times, mistakenly viewed self-efficacy and locus of control as essentially the same phenomenon. However, he makes a conceptual distinction which shows that perceived self-efficacy has little relation to locus of control (1991). This distinction further allows for social cognitive theory to differentiate between outcome expectancy and self-efficacy. According to this differentiation, efficacy represents
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a conviction held by a person that he or she can orchestrate actions which are necessary to perform a task while outcome expectancy would be the person’s estimate of the consequences of performing that task (Pajares, 1996). Bandura’s clear delineation between an outcome expectancy and one’s perceived self-efficacy provides theoretical clarity and makes his view of self-efficacy appropriate for this study.

Bandura’s view of self-efficacy is grounded in his larger theory of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997). In his theory, Bandura differentiates between an agent and an object. An agent is one that acts upon his/her environment and an object is one that acts upon themselves. In social cognitive theory, human agency is mediated by three factors: behavior, internal personal factors (cognitive, affective, and biological events), and the external environment. These factors are triadic and reciprocal in that they are interactive determinants of influence upon one another.

Although the effects are interactive, their relative influence may vary by activity and circumstance. One’s belief in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action which will produce given attainments (or their self-efficacy) is a crucial component of human agency. The degree to which effort will be expended, how long one will persevere in the face of obstacles or failure, and resilience to adversity all depend upon one’s perceived self-efficacy for a task.

Bandura’s view of behavior broadens and extends the reductionist, behavioralist view of behavior perhaps best articulated by Skinner (1971). Bandura postulates the exercise of self-influence provides a means for an individual to contribute to what they become and what they do. Additionally, Bandura contends that human agency may react proactively as well
as reactively, a point of contention for operant behavior theory which postulates behavior as a consequence of stimulus and response.

Bandura (1997) notes that self-efficacy is commonly misconstrued as concerning itself solely with specific behaviors for specific situations. Although self-efficacy may be related to domain particularity, it does not necessarily follow that behavioral specificity is a result. Bandura notes three levels of assessment generality. The most specific does indeed measure perceived self-efficacy for a particular performance under a particular set of circumstances. But, an intermediate level can occur, measuring self-efficacy for a class of performances under a class of conditions. Finally and most generally, there is a global measure of self-efficacy that has no specificity to activity of conditions.

In a specific case of self-efficacy, such as perceived teacher self-efficacy, the most reliable measure of performance measures performance with high specificity. Measuring a context specific self-efficacy such as teacher self-efficacy allows for the testing of theoretical propositions about the processes through which personal efficacy can alter particular courses of action.

**Sources of Self-Efficacy**

Bandura identifies four principal sources of information from which personal efficacy expectations arrive. They are: enactive experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective arousal.

**Enactive Mastery Experiences**

Enactive mastery experiences are the most influential source of efficacy information available to a person because they provide the most authentic source of evidence whether one
can master the task at hand. Successes build a robust belief in one’s efficacy while failures tend to undermine one’s self-efficacy, particularly if failure occurs before any type of efficacy has been established. Alternatively, successes that come too easily may also cause lowered self-efficacy because many that achieve success with ease are often discouraged by failed efforts. However, when failure is properly framed, it provides opportunities to turn failure into success and also provides a means for honing one’s capabilities to exercise self-control over future similar events. When people become convinced they can persevere over tough times, they typically bounce back stronger and quicker from setbacks than those with lower self-efficacy.

Enactive experiences may also be guided. That is, someone else is responsible for walking an individual through a task. This source of efficacy is not as powerful as a personal mastery experience but it is more effective at creating heightened levels of self-efficacy than modes of influence which rely solely on vicarious experiences, physiological stimulations, or verbal persuasion.

For heightened efficacy to occur, it is necessary for people to be provided with effective rules and strategies and to be convinced the effective implementation of these tools will facilitate task attainment levels. Specifically, teaching children cognitive strategies which they apply to a task does not enhance a student’s self-efficacy. However, when the students are reminded they are exercising better control over an academic task by using these strategies, and when feedback conveying the success as evidence the strategies were applied well is given, there is a substantial enhancement of children’s efficacy beliefs and their subsequent intellectual attainment. Therefore, skill transmission and feedback alone
achieves little with individuals having strong self-doubts about their capabilities. In these cases, skill transmission with social validation of personal efficacy can produce large benefits and these improvements are more likely to endure if skill development emphasizes a child's personal power to produce results through the use of the skills.

Although performance successes generally raise efficacy beliefs, this is not always the case. Changes in perceived efficacy result from a cognitive processing of the diagnostic information that a performance conveys about ability instead of about the performance per se. For efficacy to be enhanced, there needs to be a connection made between a successful performance and the resultant cognitive improvement.

The effect of mastery experiences upon perceived self-efficacy is further mediated by pre-existing self-knowledge structures. A person with low perceptions of self-efficacy tends to view success as outcomes of hard work rather than evidence of their capability. Episodes requiring perceived large expenditures of effort may then be avoided. On the other hand, individuals with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to focus in on a success being a product of their heightened capabilities rather than the effort expended.

Preset, low levels of self-efficacy can be very difficult to dislodge. People with low self-efficacy tend to enlist activities from their past as supporting evidence for their low self-efficacy beliefs. Dislodging a low personal efficacy is a difficult task which may require high levels of persistence, requiring compelling feedback that unequivocally and explicitly refutes a pre-existing belief in one's capabilities.

When a task is undertaken, the perceived difficulty of that task greatly determines the degree of value found in success. Mastery of difficult tasks contributes significantly to the
raising of one’s personal efficacy. But, when formidable and unaccounted for challenges arise in the process of mastering a task there may actually be a lowering of personal self-efficacy. For example, a person may sign up to take a driver’s education course and not realize that high-speed, collision avoidance maneuvers are included. Even though the course may be completed successfully, the singular success may leave a person shaken instead of emboldened.

When most new tasks are undertaken, the difficulty of the task is unknown. As the complexity of a new task increases, successful mastery requires the use of previously learned sub-skills. This ambiguity adds uncertainty about one’s ability to reach a desired level of attainment for the activity. In this case, prior similar experiences may be used to gauge how difficult a task may be.

Difficult tasks requiring much outside assistance to complete do little to heighten personal self-efficacy since the successes are more likely to be attributed to the assistance rendered than one’s own ability to reach a desired level of attainment. Similarly, when an activity is undertaken under adverse conditions, failure has weak efficacy implications. However, a severe squelching effect on self-efficacy is found when one tries hard and fails under optimum conditions for a task that is known to be easy.

The degree to which one is willing to expend effort influences the degree to which one reaches a personal level of attainment. Nicholls and Miller (1984) found that effort expenditure can be contextually sensitive, with adults generally viewing high expenditure of effort as evidence of low ability (thus lowering self-efficacy for the activity) unlike children where high effort is often directly associated with the attainment of ability. Surber’s research
(1985) indicates differences in self-efficacy are not so much due to age groups but are more a function of individuals, finding many adults that believed effort and ability were related.

Self-efficacy is also impacted by the biases one's self-monitoring system imposes upon memories. If one is predisposed to remembering their poorer performances or vice versa then a skewed self-efficacy perception may result. Because memory reconstructs the past rather than offering a literal reproduction of it, young children, with a small memory bank to draw from, will typically favor the most recent experiences to shape their self-efficacy. Adults, on the other hand, tend to hold on to well-entrenched events from the past and disregard contradictory evidence provided by more recent activities unless compelling evidence can be given that the old information should be discarded.

**Vicarious Experience**

Another source of personal efficacy beliefs are vicarious experiences, which provide opportunities for modeled behavior and which serve to mediate for self-efficacy levels. Since most complex tasks have no absolute measuring system of adequacy, people must rate their own personal capabilities in relation to others. It is in these instances that social comparisons operate as a primary factor in determining one's capabilities for a particular task (Goethals & Darley, 1977; Suls & Miller, 1977).

The notion of using social comparisons for comparing personal capabilities has ramifications for classrooms. In order to minimize the creation of a hierarchy of ability within a classroom, effort should be extended towards creating objectively set goals. When modeling is used to illuminate these goals, self-efficacy tends to be enhanced more by peers rather than by those perceived to be very different, particularly when cognitive rehearsal of
the goal occurs (Maibach & Flora, 1993). Schunk & Hanson (1989) extend this idea by reporting that self-modeling obtained under specialized conditions can be helpful for self-determination of one’s abilities as well as self-efficacy enhancement.

Vicarious information has a heightened impact upon self-efficacy when there is heightened uncertainty about one’s own capabilities. When personal experience about an activity is lacking, modeled indicators tend to receive heavier emphasis as a source of efficacy beliefs. Also, when low self-efficacy is evident due to personal experience, modeling may create attendant gains in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Even when high self-efficacy is present it can be enhanced if modeling is perceived as providing a better way of doing things.

Filming or recording someone (i.e., self-modeling) who has exhibited skill deficiency in an activity has proven a useful technique for raising self-efficacy, even if the subject knows editing has occurred. The experience of viewing or hearing oneself perform a task has been demonstrated to boost performance and self-efficacy levels when measured against a baseline (Dowrick, 1991). Dowrick & Jesdale (as cited in Bandura, 1997) report viewing self-modeling of earlier successes has also been useful in increasing resiliency from setbacks and defeats as well as operating as an intervention for depression.

As noted, the degree to which modeling impacts a person’s self-efficacy often depends on the degree of similarity or dissimilarity perceived between the subject and model. Typically, when performance similarity is seen as high between subject and model, the impact on self-efficacy is more significant (Wood, 1989). The same principle holds when attributes are considered rather than comparative performances. People tend to develop
stereotypes based upon age, sex, gender, and so forth even though there may be great variability within the stereotype grouped for the performance. For example, self-efficacy in women for athletic activity tends to increase when an activity is modeled by a nonathletic female versus an athletic male (Gould & Weiss, 1981).

Typically, appraisal of personal efficacy is based upon many factors instead of a single modeling episode. From this extensive data base, people are able to discount a particular performance as atypical while ascribing more force to those attainments secured by multiple participants (Perry & Bussey, 1979). As might be expected, modeling from several sources tends to develop a higher level of perceived self-efficacy than the observance of a single modeling episode of a task (Schunk, Hanson, & Cox, 1987).

Modeling efforts generally display one of two techniques: mastery modeling or coping. Mastery modeling generally entails a calm and efficient display of personal attainment while coping moves gradually from trepid beginnings to eventual mastery modeling. Some research (e.g., Kazdin, 1973; Meichenbaum, 1971) suggests that modeling by coping boosts efficacy beliefs more than mastery modeling, particularly when the observers are somewhat unsure of their own abilities and see the coping example as being more relevant to their own circumstances.

Coping modeling tends to provide resilience in personal efficacy under conditions that require high degrees of effort and perseverance and determination of success or failure is long-term rather than immediate. This finding should serve as a caveat for anyone attempting school reform, since these are precisely the conditions associated with restructuring and redefining schools as effective organizations.
**Verbal Persuasion**

Verbal persuasion is perhaps the most utilized technique for student motivation in today’s schools. Verbal persuasion is easy to provide in that it requires little time to prepare and most teachers are quite comfortable with the concept. Schunck & Cox (1986) have done extensive studies on the effects of evaluative feedback and report prearranged attributional feedback positively impacts self-efficacy regardless of actual performance.

Giving students feedback accentuating personal capabilities has also been demonstrated to increase perceived efficacy. The same pattern existed when improved capabilities was attributed to effort, although the self-efficacy gains were lower than when personal capabilities were highlighted. In early stages of skill development, ability feedback has an especially notable impact on personal self-efficacy development (Schunk, 1984).

Of considerable interest to teachers is the evidence that sustained verbal feedback attributing success to hard work conveys a message that one’s talents are limited, requiring much effort and perseverance to overcome these limitations (Schunk & Rice, 1986). Studies done in this vein (e.g., Schunk, 1983) demonstrate that persuasory feedback which raised children’s beliefs in their efficacy resulted in a higher level of competence eventually achieved. Perceived self-efficacy seems to override the effects of skill development in regards to performance accomplishments. Believing in one’s ability to perform a task carries more weight than the actual ability itself since effort expenditure and perseverance are more closely related to perceived self-efficacy.

Verbal persuasion is a form of inferential appraisal. When this appraisal is imparted from someone presumed to possess competence in an area it tends to carry increased value.
When tasks require more perseverance than talent (which is often the case), verbal persuasion from a respected source can play an important role in maintaining efficacy beliefs and eventual realization of a task's completion. If a person places great confidence in their own self-appraisal then it is unlikely the verbal persuasions of others will override that confidence, even when the appraiser is admired or respected.

Simply telling someone they have the necessary skills to succeed does not make it so. To raise a performer's belief in his/her abilities it is necessary to frame the pursuit's success as contingent upon acquirable or refinnable skills. Additionally, modeling of the skills and structured activities which provide for step mastery help to ensure high levels of initial success while simultaneously providing necessary feedback for further improvement.

Appraisals tend to be most effective and believable when they differ moderately from a person's attainment levels at that time. Those persuaded they can succeed are more likely to embrace alternate strategies or to work harder to attain their goals. If the appraisals are inflated then the diagnostic credibility of the appraiser is impaired. Social persuasion is best presented as part of a multifaceted strategy of self-development which includes mastery experiences, modeling, explicit feedback, and manageable short-term goals.

**Physiological and Affective States**

How we feel is an important part of our judgement regarding our capabilities. This is particularly true of tasks requiring physical activity. Overly aroused states of tenseness or agitation are generally not conducive to producing successful efforts. Therefore, people tend to experience lower perceived self-efficacy when physical arousal is viewed as stemming from personal inadequacies. This is not to say that some ambivalence or trepidation is not
normal. For example, actors and athletes often become highly agitated and nervous prior to a performance. However, the tension subsides soon into the performance and for those with higher levels of self-efficacy these feelings tend to be catalogued as a natural reaction to a pending performance. Those with low self-efficacy are more likely to carry these feelings of trepidation and anxiety throughout the performance and consequently find their functioning suffers as a result.

As a general rule, moderate levels of physical arousal are most facilitative of positive physical performance. Too much stress may reduce a performance’s quality while too little may result in under preparation or a lackadaisical effort. If physical arousal has been linked to lowered performance in the past then it is quite likely that future events which generate anxiety will have lowered levels of self-efficacy while high achievers may seen the anxiety as a source of energy (Hollandsworth, Glazeski, Kirkland, Jones, & Van Norman, 1979).

Not surprisingly, one’s mood has been demonstrated to have an effect upon self-efficacy (Eich, 1995; Isen, 1987). People’s moods tend to mediate the rate at which things are learned. Typically, people learn faster and recall things better if the things they are learning are congruent to the mood they are in (Bandura, 1997). Intense moods tend to produce the most positive results, except for despondency which retards nearly every learning activity.

According to Bower (1981), activating memories in the brain facilitates recollection of the events connected to it and can often be contingent upon a person’s mood. If these connected events are remembered as failures, then it is likely to have a debilitative effect and these types of negative memories are most likely to arise when a person is in a bad mood.
Alternatively, successes or failures can trigger memories which cue similar memories. In effect, Bower posits two modes of mood-biased recollection. The first relies upon the arousal state of the individual while the latter view posits the specific failures or successes act as a cognitive catalyst.

In conclusion, a sense of personal self-efficacy is a complex and interactive cognitive process which takes into account information which is conveyed enactively, vicariously, socially, and physiologically. Efficacy beliefs are specific to context, although high achievers probably enjoy higher general levels of perceived self-efficacy than others. Additionally, efficacy beliefs may vary from day to day depending upon circumstance, mood, and the like. However, once personal self-efficacy beliefs are formed and become deeply entrenched they tend to be difficult to dislodge, requiring specific and compelling feedback which contravenes presently held beliefs. Taken together, the facets which influence self-efficacy play a large part in a person's self-agency.

**Culture and Its Relationship to Restructuring Schools**

Research on schools as complex organizations has established the importance of a viable, productive school culture and all that it encompasses towards creating effective teaching and learning environments. The interactions between individuals, groups of teachers, administrators and others, and the production of common perceptions and shared meanings among the various groups which reflect collectively held beliefs, attitude and values all coalesce into the broad construct of school culture (Cavanagh, 1997).

It is now apparent that significant restructuring can not occur within a school unless the norms, values, and beliefs (culture) are given their due attention (Goodman & Kurke,
1982; Fullan, 1993, 1999; Fuller, Wild, Rappoport, & Dornbusch, 1982). Because of school culture's centrality to restructuring, it has provided a useful lens for studying the development and structure of schools (Brandt, 1991; Deal, 1990; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Greene, 1991; Rossman, Corbett, & Firestone, 1988; Snyder & Anderson, 1986). Researchers are now seeking to describe and understand existing cultures within schools and then use this information to help bring about heightened productivity (Johnson, Snyder, & Anderson, 1992). Deal (1987) notes that school effectiveness is inextricably linked to school culture with changes in culture necessarily preceding the realization of subsequent gains in school effectiveness.

Reculturing (Hargreaves, 1995), or changing the norms, values, and beliefs held within a school can be very difficult. According to Hargreaves (1995), reculturing a school includes breaking down old patterns where teachers typically work in isolation as well as minimizing the balkanization of the school where groups of teachers often work together with little personal interaction. Both of these conditions tend to create fragmented professional relationships which do not facilitate building trust and collaboration.

Hargreaves (1995) also proposes five broadly typed cultures: traditional, welfarist, hot-house, anomic, and effective. Traditional cultures exhibit low staff cohesion and high control while welfarist cultures tend to demonstrate high cohesion and low control. Hot-house cultures have both high cohesion and high control while anomic cultures are just the opposite. Hargreaves' fifth alternative is most optimal, where optimal levels of cohesion and control are found accompanied by high expectations and widespread support between members of the school in facilitating achievement of expectations.
Erickson (1987) proposes another view of school culture where it is represented as an interpretive framework that contains three varying means through which cultural knowledge is possessed and shared. From this perspective, cultural knowledge is first found in small bits which are spread throughout the school. Secondly, a more generalized core of common knowledge is found which guides collective behavior and finally, there is a broad sharing of knowledge which relates to positions of status, power, and authority within the school.

At the first level, bits of knowledge form a large data pool from which individuals and groups access and contribute information. Although all groups and individuals contribute to this pool of information, none are aware of all the information present. The second level of culture is where the core symbols and constructs which organize beliefs are found. These are the shared beliefs, visions, and norms generally alluded to when culture is discussed. The most generalized cultural concept notes the variation that occurs in the knowledge base of the groups and individuals drawing from the knowledge pool and that organizational differences may occur due to these variations. The constant flux that emerges from these knowledge variations creates cultural change, with continual creation and emergence of cultural norms, values, and beliefs. If the cultural flux is positive, then the school’s culture is moving towards a positive restructuring of school culture.

Maxwell and Thomas (1991) take a differing view that culture is expressed through the behavior of groups and individuals. They visualize a simultaneous and reciprocal process where ideas, beliefs, and values are developed to give meaning to behaviors. In their
interactive model of culture, Maxwell and Thomas posit four reciprocative elements: The belief system, the value system, the group value system, and the resulting behavior.

The belief system underscores the unspoken assumptions and understandings of the organization. This unstated knowledge then guides and influences the formation of the value system, which begins to prioritize issues as to their relative importance to the organization. Prioritizing issues facilitates development of a group value system whereby a set of norms, standards, and beliefs are established for the organization. These norms, values, and beliefs then guide subsequent behavior towards newly encountered circumstances.

A great deal of the literature relating to school culture attempts to understand how successful restructuring of school culture can be accomplished. Dufour and Eaker (1998) detailed the following strategies for successful restructuring:

- Articulation, modeling, promotion, and protection of identified shared values;
- Systematic engagement by all within the organization in reflective dialogue which searches for contradictions in endorsed values and daily operations;
- Continually informing staff with stories that reflect the shared values at work; and
- Recognition and uplifting of shared values through ritualized activities.

Previous attempts at school improvement and restructuring typically focused on aspects of school that deal with day-to-day operation such as rules, procedures, and policies. Although more recent literature do not place as heavy an emphasis upon day-to-day elements of schooling it is still recognized that changes in these areas can affect school culture (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). Fullan (1993) contends restructuring is more powerful and lasting when teachers and administrators begin to seek positive change and then discover their day-
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to-day elements require reorientation in order to match newly emerging norms, values, and beliefs.

**Senge’s Seven Disabilities**

An oft stated goal of a productive school culture is the emergence of a professional learning community (Senge, 1990). Senge envisions successful learning organizations as those that learn faster than their competitors. He sees organizations in general suffering with learning disabilities that block positive restructuring and culture building. Further, Senge contends these disabilities are often undetected in companies, which leads to economic stagnation and possible extinction. Senge gives seven disabilities which can emerge within any organization (pp. 18 – 25).

• **I AM MY POSITION**

Senge notes most people describe the tasks they do every day (e.g. the structural elements of the job alluded to by DuFour & Eaker) instead of the purpose behind the job. This lack of vision is often coupled with a feeling of impotence in regards to personal ability to affect change. Consequently, when people are tightly bound by job description they tend to assume little responsibility for projects requiring multi-level interactions. And, of course, when things go wrong, it is typical to blame someone else when people think their job is their position.

• **THE ENEMY IS OUT THERE**

This disability is an outcropping of “I AM MY POSITION” syndrome. By failing to note how one’s actions extend beyond the boundary of their position it is typical to blame external factors rather than to actively seek equally probable internal causes. External and
internal factors are generally part of the same system, but “THE ENEMY IS OUT THERE” mentality makes it very hard to realize this.

- **THE ILLUSION OF TAKING CHARGE**

  Solving problems before they become full-blown crises is certainly advisable. However, much of what is called “taking charge” may in fact be reactive rather than proactive. If taking charge tends to equate with fighting the enemy out there then it is a reactive stance, no matter the spin placed on it. According to Senge, true proactive problem solving occurs when there is attention given to how we contribute to our own problems.

- **THE FIXATION ON EVENTS**

  Organizations tend to revolve around events: the current budget, impending staff cuts, accountability, and so on. Additionally, most businesses in America tend to fixate upon short-term goals and quarterly profits, which can blur any long-term attempt at creating vision and culture towards substantial, ongoing change (House, 1998). When an organization focuses on events it tends to cause event explanations which in turn emphasizes the immediate over the eventual. This point is particularly pressing because Senge asserts most organizations face a higher threat from slow, gradual processes that have not been fully realized as opposed to the sudden events which often garner the most attention.

- **THE PARABLE OF THE BOILED FROG**

  Frogs are adapted to respond to sudden and imminent threats to survival. Thus, if a frog is placed quickly into hot water it will immediately try to scramble out. However, if a frog is immersed into comfortable water which is gradually warmed, it will remain in the water until it is overcome by heat and killed. So too with organizations, according to Senge.
If an organization is not sensitive and adaptable to subtle changes it will likely find itself in the frog’s predicament of slowly being “boiled alive.” For an organization to be sensitive to long-term threats which are often subtle will require attention to the ethereal as well as the readily evident.

**THE DELUSION OF LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE**

Direct experience provides the most powerful avenue for learning (Bandura, 1997; Senge, 1990) because it allows one to determine a course of action and then gauge its consequences. Often times the consequences may not be observable until some time well into the future. When this happens, learning from experience is not possible since there is no way to assess whether a decision was good or bad. To insulate themselves from this predicament, most organizations create hierarchies or divisions of labor. But this is not without its risks. Divisions of labor may cut off contact between people that are critically involved with a task or job (as often occurs with administrators and teaching staff within schools). This movement towards an isolationist environment may impede efforts to create heightened communication, input, and talent development (e.g. leadership density) among staff.

**THE MYTH OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM**

Management teams are supposed to be mobile, first-response, tactical squads. They are designed to cut through the impediments created by structural hierarchies within an organization. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Personal gain often takes precedence over the goals of the group, a point House (1998) articulates. And, according to Argyris (1990), most management teams work well with routine problems but tend to
collapse when the issues become complex, embarrassing, or threatening. Agyris goes further by stating most people with responsibility tend to insulate themselves from uncertainty and ignorance (sort of like a baseball umpire that makes a judgement call really loud so it seems like it was certain). Consequently, many management teams are awash in skilled incompetence, or the maintenance of keeping themselves from learning.

Clearly Senge argues from a cultural perspective in his effort to understand and describe threats to successful restructuring in organizations. Much of what he says generalizes very well to schools as organizations also. With current emphasis upon site-based management, instructional teams, transformational leadership, and short-term goals (e.g. end of year standardized tests) schools are subject to many of the same internal and external threats to successful reculturing as organizations in general.

Interestingly, and as a caution to those interested in improving schools, businesses undergoing restructuring often resort to traditional, centrist leadership if change does not come quickly or if problems arise in the restructuring efforts (Senge, 1990). There is a touch of irony in a business or school deciding a bold vision of change is necessary and, when obstacles arise, abandoning the vision to return to previously abandoned centrist leadership assumptions which in turn strengthens norms, values, and beliefs that previously were found to be untenable.

Leadership

A Historical Perspective

Early research into leadership was conducted primarily in the business arena. These studies were done in order to try and understand what effective leadership is and how it can
be replicated. Leadership studies of the present typically seek answers to these issues as well. In short, leadership continues to be an elusive subject (Pfeffer, 1997). Most typically, conceptions and definitions of leadership are considered to reflect three major elements: (a) An attribute ascribed to a position or office; (b) A characteristic of a person; and/or (c) An actual behavior (Katz & Kahn, 1978). These components of leadership are seen in varying degrees within the definitions of leadership offered by Hoy and Miskel (1991).

- To lead is to engage in an act that initiates a structure-in-interaction as part of the process of solving a mutual problem;

- Leadership is power based predominantly on personal characteristics, usually normative in nature;

- The leader is the individual in the group given the task of directing and coordinating task-relevant group activities;

- Leadership is the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives or for changing an organization's goals and objectives; and

- Leadership takes place in groups of two or more people and most frequently involves influencing group members behavior as it relates to the pursuit of group goals.

Judging from the various perspectives on leadership displayed above, it is obvious disagreement still exists over how to conceptualize leadership. As long as there is disagreement over conceptualization there will also be a problem with the operationalization of effective leadership as well.
A review of early leadership work reveals these concerns to be founded. Initial studies tended to be rather simplistic, employing rather unsophisticated theory and methodology (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). Given their shortcomings, it is not surprising little substantive knowledge would result from these initial studies. However, they did begin a systematic attempt to understand leadership though, and as such are an appropriate starting point for a discussion of leadership.

In broad categories, there are four areas of leadership study that have been undertaken. These are: trait approach; style approach; contingency approach; and new leadership approach (Bryman, 1996). Each will be discussed in some detail in the following sections.

**Trait Theory**

The leader trait approach was the first major theoretical framework to emerge in the scientific study of leadership (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Yukl, 1998). The idea being certain attributes could be differentiating factors between leaders and followers. So began the first wave of leadership studies. Height, weight, physical appearance, self-esteem, emotional stability, intelligence, eloquence, and creativity are examples of traits identified and studied. The assumption implicit in these studies is some people will emerge as natural leaders by virtue of their qualifications, bringing to mind the scarecrow, tin man, and the lion from the *Wizard of Oz*.

Stogdill (1948) conducted an extensive literature review of these early studies from the 1930s and 1940s. After reviewing over 100 studies from this era, Stogdill found little in the literature to substantiate the assumption that traits make the leader. Stogdill (1948, p.
64) concluded: “A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits . . . the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers.” The reason Stogdill made this statement was the body of research up till that time indicated leaders were slightly taller and a little bit smarter than everyone else.

Stogdill’s review had a chilling effect upon subsequent efforts to study leadership traits. However, industry did see fit to use trait analysis as a basis for selecting managers and subsequently continued to conduct trait research (see Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986). This continuing effort led to methodologically and theoretically improved research studies that were able to enjoy some success in extending the traits under investigation to include specific administrative and technical skills germane to the roles of administrators and managers. In this regard, the study of leadership traits was furthered and has become an area of interest in subsequent research such as Kenny and Zaccaro’s (1983) study where the variance for traits in leadership was suggested to range between 49% and 82%.

The authors contend the upper and lower-limits found in their study may involve the ability to perceive the needs and goals of a group and accordingly adjust one’s approach to the group. If this is true, the limits are not a function of any one specific personality trait but are instead a result of contingencies, thereby linking, at least in this study, trait studies with contingency studies (which receive attention later in the literature review) such as those conducted by Fiedler (1993).

Stogdill revisited his initial findings on leadership traits with a 1974 review that encompassed 163 studies from 1949 to 1970. In this review, Stogdill softened his initial
rejection regarding leadership traits and offered some generalizations. He concluded that responsibility, drive to complete task, vigor, persistence, willingness to take risks, originality, initiative, self-confidence, sense of personal identity, high stress tolerance, efficacy, ability to influence others, and ability to structure interactions were generally found in effective leaders (Stogdill, 1974). However, it should be noted Stogdill is not returning to the suppositions of early trait research. He is not advocating that some leader traits are absolutely necessary for effective leadership, a supposition that has not been substantiated in several decades of trait research (Schriesheim & Neider, 1996). Rather, Stogdill is suggesting certain traits increase the likelihood, not the certitude, a leader will be effective.

There are detractors to Stogdill's assertions. Lord, DeVader, and Alliger (1986) maintain Stogdill overgeneralized his findings and that in fact, several traits emerge as being significantly related to leadership perceptions: intelligence, masculinity-femininity, and dominance. The authors contend their findings may negate the need to invoke contingency theories of leadership. Other studies (see Gratzinger, Warren, & Cooke, 1990) also approach leadership from a trait perspective, attempting to answer whether a particular leadership style differentiates effective and ineffective managers.

An evaluation of trait research reveals progress in identifying traits and skills more so for managers than leaders (Yukl, 1998). Additionally, studies focusing on leadership traits have generally categorized behavior so broadly that it is difficult to quantify results (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). There is now an ongoing effort to develop more useful content categories, as per Yukl's (1989) argument for fourteen categories of leadership traits. Besides the broad categorization of behavior, studies of leadership traits have also had
methodological problems by tending to ignore situational differences that may influence leader behavior.

**Style Approach**

Research into style of leadership signaled a shift from the study of the personal characteristics of leaders to their behaviors as leaders (Bryman, 1996). The most known of these studies were probably those done by Ohio State. These studies used a 150 item list that appeared to be good examples of leadership. Factor analysis of these items indicated subordinates tended to perceive their superior's behavior in one of two broadly defined categories: consideration, and initiating structure (Yukl, 1998).

The Ohio State Studies, through their groundbreaking use of questionnaires, have been an influence upon further leadership studies. Leadership behavior is typically measured by subordinates filling out questionnaires, with the scores correlated against certain criteria measures obtained at the same point in time. However, Bass (1990) and Fisher & Edwards (1988) note this methodology has produced weak and inconsistent results, with some studies showing subordinates more satisfied with a structuring leader while other studies found either an opposite relationship or no significant relationship at all. Most studies employing the Ohio State methodology have concluded subordinate satisfaction positively correlates with consideration (Fleishman & Harris, 1962). Unfortunately, little else can be posited, primarily because the questionnaires have not established a direction of causality (Yukl, 1998). Although style approach research has methodological shortcomings, it does recognize that there are contingencies which influence leadership, a point addressed in the next section.
Leadership and Contingency Theory

After the proliferation of trait studies in the 1930s and 1940s fell short as a grand theory for understanding leadership, researchers began to consider the contextual sensitivity of situations in which leadership occurs. These situation-type variables were studied to see what sort of contexts favor certain leadership decisions (and the leaders responsible for them) over others. Hitler was, by any measurement, a highly influential leader. So was Gandhi. Who could argue their leadership styles and traits were similar? Hitler’s leadership decisions represent the most cruel and heinous side of humans. Gandhi, on the other hand, exemplifies concern for all individuals. As wildly dissimilar as these men were, they were both effective leaders for their context. Hitler would not be considered the ideal for a Boy Scout Troop Leader. Similarly, it is doubtful that Gandhi could organize and run a war-time platoon of soldiers. The styles of both men, although strikingly different, were effective in their context.

Of interest to contingency theory researchers would be the situation-type variables that allowed Gandhi and Hitler to emerge as leaders. Studies of contingency theory followed several approaches, but eventually three main theories emerged: Fiedler’s contingency model; House’s path-goal theory; and Vroom, Yetton, and Jago’s normative decision model of leadership (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996).

Fiedler’s Contingency Model

The first contingency model of leadership belongs to Fred Fiedler. His early work (1964, 1967) identified three variables associated with contingent leadership: 1) an orientation towards other workers; 2) a variable called situation favorability; and 3) criteria
to measure effectiveness outcomes. These three variables were eventually consolidated into two main factors: a leader's attributes (formerly called style); and a leader's situational control, formerly known as situational favorability (Ayman, Chemers, & Fiedler, 1997).

The contingency model is, by design, multi-level and multi-source. Measures of the leader's motivational orientation are based upon individual's perceptions of how a leader responds. The characteristics of a situation are measured both from the perspective of the leader, the subordinates, and the experimenters. Outcomes are normally assessed at the group level, generally centering around group performance (Fiedler, 1978), supervisor ratings, and averaged follower satisfaction (Rice, 1981).

Fiedler adapted his earlier research (1964; 1967) to distinguish for two basic leader orientations: concern for workers (relationship orientation), and concern for work accomplished (task orientation). Fiedler admits these categorizations are simplistic, but suggests this should not be the major focus of criticism for his work. He argues the major controversy exists with traditional leadership training which assumes leaders should be forceful and decisive, responsible for planning, coordinating, directing, and evaluating subordinate efforts. In short, the traditional view as framed by Fiedler says the leader should think and ultimately be responsible for his workers. The opposing view, emerging from a human relations perspective, stresses the importance of democratic, group oriented leadership.

Fiedler (1989) notes his own research has produced inconsistent results regarding leader orientation. These inconsistencies demanded a reformulation of theory which could adequately explain the seemingly contradictory findings. Looking at the data as a whole, it became necessary to postulate that groups with different tasks seem to require different
leader attitudes. Given this, it follows the direction and magnitude of the correlations will be contingent upon the nature of the task.

Fiedler posits three aspects which will frame the contingencies present for a given work situation: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Leader member relations looks at the relationship of the leader to the group. If the leader is liked and respected by his subordinates, then he/she enjoys considerable power. High levels of respect and attractiveness by subordinates to the leader generally means little appeal to official rank is necessary. Subordinates follow because they trust the leader's motives and decision-making abilities.

Task-structure is a measure of the degree to which a task is structured. Tasks that are high in structure can easily be enforced through a hierarchical organization. For example, the platoon member not following orders will finally wind up in front of the regiment's commander if insubordination persists. Tasks that are high in structure lend themselves to a sort of input/outcome menu, where certain actions cause certain reactions.

Low structure tasks require a completely different orientation. For unstructured tasks, the leader must rely upon available resources to inspire and motivate the workers. The mandates and reinforcement of superiors within the organization become less important as the task becomes more unstructured. In effect, the leader dealing with an unstructured task has less power than one operating within a highly structured task environment.

Position power refers to the power inherent in a leader's position. This component is independent of the leader's personal relations with his/her subordinates. Position power includes the rewards and punishments available to the leader, the formal authority vested by
formal arrangement, and the organizational support conferred upon the leader's decisions. The military is a clear user of position power, with a firm and entrenched hierarchy for decision making and accountability.

Using these three components of leadership contingency, Fiedler felt he was able to unravel the apparent inconsistencies within earlier research on leadership. Positing that the three components decrease in importance from top to bottom (leader-member most important, position power least important), Fiedler was able to generalize that a leader scoring low on the least preferred co-worker scale (LPC) generally work best in highly favorable and unfavorable group-task situations while high LPC worker could be expected to perform best in the intermediate situations. As such, Fiedler contends his contingency model can serve as a basis for fitting a leader's attributes and style to a particular situation they are best suited to deal with.

It would be expected that any theory making such bold claims would meet with resistance. Graen, Alvares, Orris, and Martella (1971) argue much of Fiedler's work fails to achieve statistical significance, and that researchers not associated with Fiedler tend to get weaker results than Fielder's colleagues. Furthermore, the LPC has come under fire as an invalid instrument for measuring a leader's style or orientation (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977; Schriesheim, Bannister, & Money, 1979). Critics point to Fiedler's changing of his interpretation of LPC scores in a rather arbitrary fashion and they point out many researchers still are uncertain what the LPC means. Fiedler (1978) argues the LPC measures a leader's motive hierarchy. Rice (1978) however, suggests the LPC actually measures value-attitude more so than a hierarchical interpretation of leadership orientation (Yukl, 1998).
In most of Fiedler’s work, the leader provided both the LPC score as well as the obtained measure of leader-member relations. This interdependence has been criticized by Kerr & Harlan (1973) as confounding situational measures with LPC scores.

Finally, whether the task is actually an independent variable has been questioned by some (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). Since the leader can change the task, it is questionable that it exists as a true independent variable.

Due to these and other criticisms, Fiedler’s contingency theory of leadership has lost some of its original luster. However, his notion that situational elements are germane to any systematic analysis of the causes of leader effectiveness remains at the core of nearly all succeeding research.

**House’s Path-Goal Theory of Leadership**

Robert House’s path-goal theory of leadership was initially presented in 1971, building upon an early version of the theory by Evans (1970). It presents a view of leadership in terms of expectations rather than contingencies and attempts to explain how worker satisfaction and performance is influenced by leader behavior (Yukl, 1998).

House postulated subordinate job performance and satisfaction depends upon what he called valences and expectations. Valences, as defined by House, are by-products of the work environment; resulting from an interaction between leader behavior, subordinate characteristics, and environmental factors (House, 1971). House borrows a chemical term, where an atom’s tendency to enter into a reaction is denoted by its valence. Similar to a chemical reaction, workers also show varying tendencies to “react” or undertake assignments. Higher valences indicate a positive work environment, where leader behavior is supportive and environmental factors are favorable. When a worker reacts favorably to
these components, the valence is high. Subordinate expectations are directly proportional to valence — when valence is high, job expectations are high. According to House’s theory, effective leadership produces a high degree of valence and expectations in subordinates.

The driving force behind path-goal theory is leadership behavior or style. In a refinement of the theory, House and Dressler (1974) identified four types of leadership behavior:

- **Supportive leadership.** A humanistic style of leadership that places high priority on the well-being and needs of subordinates. Emphasis is upon interpersonal relations and a positive, friendly work climate.

- **Directive leadership.** Characterized by the use of specific guidance towards subordinates. Rules and regulations gain greater emphasis in an effort to communicate clearly to subordinates what is expected of them.

- **Achievement-oriented leadership.** Performance goals are common and used as referents to monitor job performance and progress towards goal attainment. Improvements are constantly sought by emphasizing excellence in performance.

- **Participatory leadership.** Shared decision making best describes this style of leadership. Participatory leaders actively solicit input from subordinates before making final decisions.

According to path-goal theory, effective leaders recognize subordinates rank task attractiveness according to expected satisfaction and outcomes. Effective leaders acknowledge this phenomenon and attempt to modify subordinate perception in positive ways to facilitate high work productivity and the probability of its attainment.
Path-goal theory research has generally focused on whether directive or supportive leadership is most appropriate for task attainment. Research into these questions has generally broken out into two camps of tasks: structured and unstructured. Directed leadership seems to be most beneficial when tasks are ambiguous and unstructured (House & Dressler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974; Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976). However, there is also some research showing supportive behavior is most appropriate for unstructured tasks (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976; House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974). Very little research has been conducted on participatory and achievement-oriented leadership styles. According to Indvik (as cited in Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1986), results have been generally encouraging.

A major criticism of path-goal theory is its inability to predict or describe how major variables are likely to interact (Osborn, 1974). Additionally, the model treats the four styles of leadership as discrete even though it is quite likely leaders employ aspects of all styles to varying degrees (Yukl, 1998). Additionally, the methods in which workers make decisions may not be adequately described by any expectancy theory model. The methodology employed in some studies has also come under criticism (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996).

Vroom, and Yetton's Normative Decision Model of Leadership

The normative model of decision making attempts to explain the overall effectiveness of a decision by filtering it through several intervening variables: decision acceptance, decision quality, and decision timeliness (Yukl, 1998; Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). Decision acceptance measures how much subordinates are willing to commit to implement a decision and is a function of the input workers have had into a decision. High decision acceptance can be expected if workers have had direct input into the final decision as
opposed to being told by an outside consultant what needs to be done (an interesting aside for the distinguished educators currently working in the field with "poor performing schools" as consultants in Louisiana’s current accountability system).

Once a decision is reached, its impact is measured by decision quality. According to Yukl (1998), decision quality is important when there is large variability among choices and the pending decision will have important ramifications for group performance. There is a tension between decision quality and decision acceptance. If subordinates have differing objectives than leadership, the normative model suggests consultation may provide higher quality decisions than joint decision making because the leader retains control over the final choice.

Vroom & Yetton (1973), identified five basic decision-making styles that are available to leaders with multiple subordinates. The choices include two varieties of autocratic decision making (AI & AII), two varieties of consultation (CI & CII), and one group decision making choice (GII). Each of these styles are defined as follows:

AI. The leader solves the problem alone, using information available at the time.

AII. The leader obtains needed information from subordinates and then makes the decision independent of others. The subordinates are not part of the evaluation process, they play no part in generating alternatives or possible consequences.

CI. The problem is shared with relevant subordinates individually. There is no group consultation and the decision is solely the leader’s. The decision may or may not reflect the input of the relevant subordinates.
CII. The leader meets with subordinates as a group, but decision making is still vested solely with the leader.

GII. The leader and subordinates meet as a group both to discuss the problem and to arrive at a solution. The leader acts like a chairman, trying not to influence the group to adopt his/her preference and willing to accept and implement the group’s decision.

The normative model provides a decision tree into which situational variables and decision rules are applied. A series of questions is answered about the nature of the problem, and the leader arrives at a style that is most appropriate for the situation.

**Vroom and Jago’s Revised Model**

In response to criticisms that the original model failed to include such important details like time constraints, amount of subordinate information, and the proximity of subordinates to the leader, Vroom and Jago (1988) presented a revised model. The Vroom–Jago model streamlines some of the procedures in the decision-making process, but it does not indicate which of the remaining choices at the end of the procedure is best. The revised model is designed to allow a leader to determine the relative importance of certain criteria and to reduce the feasible set to a single procedure.

A number of studies have been undertaken to evaluate the Vroom–Yetton model (Crouch & Yetton, 1987; Ettling & Jago, 1988; Field & House, 1990; Jago & Vroom, 1980; Vroom & Jago, 1978). As a rule, these studies compared decisions made according the Vroom–Yetton model with decisions made without the use of the model. Normally, leaders were asked to describe examples of successful and unsuccessful decisions. These decisions...
were then analyzed for the situation represented and the leader's decision is compared to what the Vroom–Jago model suggests.

In general, results were favorable and supported the model. Vroom and Jago (1978) reported a mean success rate of 62 percent for the model versus a 37 percent success rate for decisions made independent of the model. Yukl (1998) suggests preliminary findings such as these are promising but in need of further verification and replication.

Yukl (1998) notes the Vroom–Jago model is perhaps the most complete and best supported of the situational theories of leadership. The model includes intervening variables and identifies important aspects of the moderators between behavior and outcomes. However, the model is still subject to criticisms. Yukl (1998) comments many decisions cannot be made as the result of using a discrete decision tree. Often, multiple meetings of different groups at varying times with differing circumstances are needed to reach a decision. The model is not complex enough to work at this level. Yukl also notes some types of decision making are excluded. Leaders often use “trial balloons” to test tentative outcomes, yet this leadership style which falls somewhere between AI and CI is not found. According to Field (1979) and Crouch & Yetton (1987) the model lacks simplicity and elegance, erroneously assuming skills needed to use the model are found in all leaders. Field claims the model would be easier to understand and therefore implement if more focus was placed on distinctions between autocratic, consultative, and joint decision making procedures instead of the subvarieties (AI vs. All or CI vs. CII). Field claims these types of subdistinctions are unnecessary and the model should focus more on the distinction between telling and selling made by Hersey and Blanchard (1984) and Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958).
Literature reviewed up to this point has addressed trait, behavior, and contingency frameworks for leadership. Nearly fifty years of these types of studies has failed to provide a consensus for any sort of widely generalizable conceptualization for the leadership process. This is partly due to conceptual and methodological problems and the lack of strong empirical support. Because of the importance leadership plays in organizations, research has begun to reach beyond these traditional areas of research into rather unexplored territory, attempting to broaden our conceptual understanding of what leadership is. The following section will explore these emerging theories of leadership.

**Emergent Leadership Theories**

Most early theories of leadership failed to account for the reality of a leader’s behavior changing depending on which person they were working with. However, it is clear that leaders vary their behavior according to which subordinate they are working with. An attempt to incorporate this reality into leadership study has resulted in the leader-member exchange theory (LMX).

**LMX**

Originally known as the vertical dyad linkage theory (Dansereau, Graen, and Hage, 1975), LMX focuses the interactions found within leader/subordinate dyads. The basic premise of LMX is most leaders establish a group that is trusted. This group assumes most of the responsibilities and receives most of the meaningful input from the leader. The “out group” is isolated from the inner workings of the organization, unlikely to be a part of any meaningful decisions.

Out members are generally given mandates based upon authority, coercive power, and a limited degree of rewards. In return, out members are expected to comply with their
formal role requirements. Rewards for the out group are generally limited to standard benefits for the job.

The in group is much more likely to receive assignments that are interesting and of significant benefit to the organization. These subordinates are expected to work longer, harder, and exhibit a higher degree of loyalty to the organization and the leader. Through repeated reciprocal reinforcement of behavior (Skinner, 1971), both the leader and subordinate strengthen the exchange cycle of opportunity/reward implicit in the in relationship.

Yukl (1998) claims the early version of LMX is more descriptive than prescriptive, describing a typical process of roles being defined without explaining the detriments/advantages to having in-groups and out-groups. McClane (1991) and Yukl (1989) point out sharply defined lines between the ins and outs are likely to create hostility and animosity within the organization. Out groupers may be unwilling to work at a minimum level of cooperation necessary for success, much less go “the extra mile” when the occasion warrants.

Graen and Uhl Bien’s 1995 revision of LMX has noted the prescriptive shortcomings of the original model and added effective leadership requires meaningful LMX with all subordinates, not just a few favorites. This does not mean all employees receive the exact same treatment. Rather, an atmosphere of trust, respect, and loyalty exists with all employees, even though some may still be charged with additional duties. Yukl (1998) points out this creates an environment where subordinates gain responsibility based on professional considerations rather than favoritism.
Charismatic and Transformational Leadership Theories

Beginning in the early 1980's, research into organizational leadership began to actively investigate the effects of leader charisma upon organizational effectiveness. Weber (1947) used charisma to describe influence based on followers' belief the leader has personal qualities which vest in that person leadership authority. Leadership is exercised because of what others perceive in the leader, rather than the formal holding of power.

A refinement of the term charisma has taken place as literature developed which addressed charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanugo, 1987; Trice & Beyer, 1993; Willner, 1984). Like Weber, most theorists view charisma as a function of follower perceptions. However, this perception is influenced by the context of leadership and the need(s) of the follower(s). Following are three major schools of charismatic leadership.

House's Charismatic Leadership Theory

House's (1977) theory is primarily concerned with traits of the leader. He proposed charismatic leaders have the ability to profoundly affect followers. Because of this, they willingly follow the charismatic leader, enamored by his/her attributes. Within this context, House argues charismatic leaders are likely to have a high need for power, a high degree of self-confidence, and a strong conviction in their beliefs.

Charismatic leaders are likely to exhibit behaviors that increase follower trust (e.g., talk/boast of past accomplishments, exude self-confidence, stress assurance of success). In addition charismatic leaders are likely to appeal to deeply held core values of followers and to relate these values to their own ideological goals. A vision of what the future could be “if only those listening would follow me” is probable. A great deal of the power held by charismatic leaders is in their ability to communicate to others that what I (the leader)
possess can be had by you (the follower) if you will only do what you are told. Charismatic leadership tends to flourish in arenas where personal gain is possible (as in profit opportunities for an organization) or in times of crisis (war, depression).

Drawing upon House's 1977 work, Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) made an extensive revision of House's charismatic leadership theory. The revised version attempts to explain why follower self-interest is often subrogated by the wishes/views of the leader. Drawing upon Shamir's (1991) work on motivation, the researchers assumed behavior is an expression of a person's feelings; a person's self-concept is composed of social identities and values; people will intrinsically work to enhance their sense of self-worth and esteem; and people will balance their self-worth and esteem with the components that make up self-worth and esteem.

**Conger and Kanungo’s Charismatic Leadership Theory**

Conger and Kanungo’s (1987) charismatic leadership theory tends to focus on the followers, rather than the leader as proposed by House. Conger and Kanungo propose charismatic leaders arise when subordinates see what is proposed as visionary and requiring self-sacrifice. To the followers, the vision is radical but doable. Conger and Kanungo further propose charismatic leaders emerge more from individual rather than participatory decision making attempts. In a later refinement of the theory by Conger (1989), the charismatic qualities of the leader is a joint determination of the followers’ attribution of his/her behavior, skill, and circumstances of the situation.

**Bass’s Transformational Leadership**

Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1990) postulated transformational leadership is comprised of four behavioral components: charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and
individualized consideration. Charisma is seen as the ability to arouse strong feelings of identification within followers; inspiration as the degree to which followers are actually touched to participate; intellectual stimulation includes things which make followers active participants; and individualized consideration includes behaviors that boost follower morale, self-confidence, and buy-in.

According to transformational theory, follower behavior is strongly influenced by the four factors mentioned above. There is a willingness for followers to transcend their own short-term and individual goals to work towards the higher good of the organization. Workers feel elevated beyond being employees and begin to see themselves as part of a mission. Subsequently, motivation begins to be described in terms of organizational achievement rather than more base responses such as salary.

There is an inherent risk with any type of charismatic leadership. Hitler, Jim Jones, and David Koresh are all examples of charismatic leaders, able to fan emotional flames and zealotry for a cause. A number of studies highlight this darker side of charismatic leadership (Conger, 1989; Kets, deVries & Miller, 1985; Raskin & Fazzini, 1990; Yukl, 1989). Whatever the place for charismatic leadership in organizations, there seems to be a need to understand how it arises in crises as well as its positive and negative potential.

Notably, the new leadership models move away from the typical input/output models seen in earlier research. Although this makes empirical studies more difficult, the new leadership studies tend to reflect a truer picture of how leadership and influence tend to interact within an organization, recognizing there is a rational and emotional aspect to leadership unlike earlier studies which tend to attack the rational side only. Finally, there is an increasing awareness of the collective processes that go on in organizations as opposed
to the simple leader/follower conceptualization of earlier studies. However, there is not enough empirical evidence yet to make any conclusive evaluative statements about the collective worth of these new leadership efforts. The jury is still out on their ability to describe, conceptualize, and predict effective leadership.

**Leadership and Jazz: An Emerging Model of Leadership**

Interestingly, there have been recent efforts to utilize jazz as a metaphor for organizational leadership. Depree (1992) speaks of “leadership jazz” as a means of conducting business through leadership, followership, teamwork, touch, and voice. Depree directs his attention primarily towards components of the jazz metaphor that are rather generic. That is, they do not correlate very well with the subtle nuances found within small jazz combos but are instead more representative of jazz as an art-form. For example, Depree describes jazz and leadership as art forms that both require freedom and technique, improvisation and rules, and inspiration and restraint. Additionally, Depree speaks of beauty and harmony as being essential to a well-run business.

Although Depree does articulate some of the realities of jazz (i.e. the tension between freedom and technique, or improvisation and rules), he frames a resultant centrist leadership. Depree speaks of the leader’s dependence upon the members of the band and the leader’s ability to inspire others to see new possibilities. Depree’s emphasis upon “the leader” places him closer to literature on transformational leadership as opposed to the call for decentralized leadership based upon the small jazz combo metaphor developed and proposed for this study.

Besides Depree, there have been other efforts made at utilizing jazz as a metaphor for structuring organizations. Meyer, Frost, & Weick (1998) report on a 1995 symposium, *Jazz as a Metaphor for Organizing in the 21st Century*. The authors note that presentations
focused on the relevance of the jazz metaphor to thinking about and within organizations. However, analysis of their writing fails to reveal any in-depth discussion taking place about small jazz combos per se and, as stated, leadership itself was not the focus of the symposium as much as how organizations might be structured to facilitate the jazz metaphor.

While neither Depree’s nor Meyer, Frost and Weick’s writings flesh out their play on jazz as a metaphor for organizations and organizational leadership by extending it to the level of small jazz combo, there is acknowledgment of the potential for the metaphor’s use as a guide for change (although small combo jazz bands may disagree with the authors over just what exactly guided change is). This study proposes to extend and deepen the application of the jazz metaphor towards organizations in general, and schools in particular.

The past fifty years or so has seen extensive efforts made to understand leadership within organizations. In that time, there has been an evolution away from simpler cause and effect models to more complex models that are more accurate representations of real life scenarios. However, from the perspective of this writer, one thing remains clear throughout the entire lineage of organizational leadership studies: the leader and the subordinate. Even new models of charismatic and transformational leadership employ core assumption of a leader, and subsequently they go about trying to find out how a leader impacts organizational behavior.

The following section of the literature review will address leadership in schools, metaphorical bases for evolving roles of leadership through the past 70 years or so, its evolution to the present day, and current thinking on where leadership in school is and where it is heading.
Leadership and Schools

As mentioned in Chapter 1, there has been an evolution of principal leadership away from the manager/bureaucrat towards more holistic leadership such as transactional or transformational leadership (Hallinger, 1992). Beck and Murphy (1993) extend the analysis offered by Hallinger about the evolving role of principals by chronicling metaphors used to describe the role of the principal from the 1920's until the 1990's. Their analysis provides a fruitful opportunity to further understand how leadership and the role of the principal have intersected and how, until recently, the principal's role has been conceptualized as being "the leader."

Metaphors and the Principalship

The 1920's and 30's

According to Beck and Murphy, the 1920's and 30's found principals being described in terms of being both spiritual and social leaders; closely linked to what were viewed as timeless truths and values. Essentially, principals of that day were often assigned nearly religious roles with descriptions of their jobs speaking to the love of truth and right along with cultivation of the appreciation of beauty. Eaton (1986) analyzes writings from the period and finds that many times the role of the principalship was simultaneously discussed in almost beatific terms. Clubberly, as cited in Eaton (1986) wrote of principals whose purity in the quest for school efficiency and human perfection is akin to the endeavors of the godly Sir Gwayne. It seems that principals were often viewed as divinely sanctioned agents for America realizing its role as "a nation most favored."

Corporate to the principal as spiritual leader was the picture of the principal as a scientific manager, responsible for employing the latest techniques to create and manage
effective, productive, and efficient schools. In a foreshadowing of today’s emphasis upon standardized tests, principals were expected to utilize intelligence and achievement tests developed during World War I as a factual data base for increasing school efficiency and productivity (Beck and Murphy, 1993). Tyack and Hansot (1982) argue there was a melding of small town pietism and science into the role of the principal during this era. According to the authors, many in America actively believed their nation had been selected by God as a redeemer nation to the world and education was seen as a vehicle by which the nation would fulfill its destiny. Scientific principles of management were seen as consonant means by which America’s manifest destiny could be facilitated.

The 1940’s

The 1940's found America embroiled in World War II. Not surprisingly, principals during that era were expected to be the school’s democratic leader on the home front, demonstrating democratic ideals and leadership (Beck & Murphy, 1993). In keeping with the times, much of the rhetoric surrounding the principalship was couched in military terms. This imagery was generally more closely related to democratic rather than authoritarian leadership with teachers, students, and parents expected to participate in school related affairs in much the same way as everyone was expected to pitch in with the war effort (Parker, 1986).

Schools during the 1940's were expected to further the democratic socialization of America. Schools were expected to transmit important values found within the larger society (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennison, 1987). The 1947 ASCD Yearbook (as cited in Beck & Murphy, 1993), notes that schools can no longer limit themselves to teaching
reading, writing, and arithmetic. Rather, education must become a force which improves the lives and quality of living for all kinds of peoples.

The 1950’s

Great change marked the decade of the 1950's within the field of education (Culbertson, 1988; Griffiths, 1988; Tyack & Honsat, 1982). World War II was over but almost immediately afterwards the threat of communism arose – first as the Korean Conflict and subsequently as the Cold War. America began to compare its own system of governance and leadership with that of countries behind the Iron Curtain and almost without exception felt Americans felt democracy was a superior form of government to communism (Randall, in Selznick, 1957). Also, the end of World War II had been realized by science’s unlocking of the atom, an event which heralded an ensuing decade of heightened interest in using science to further society. This reliance upon science extended to all areas of society, including schools and school leadership. Leaders in education attempted to develop and test theories in much the same manner as researchers within the field of biology, physics, or mathematics (Culbertson, 1988).

Science was not the only factor exerting considerable influence over the 1950's. America’s social conscience was awakening regarding inequalities existing within the country. The Brown v. Board of Education case in 1954 served as a watershed event for calling into question the most fundamental tenets upon which schools were operating. The awakening in America that justice and opportunity should be extended to all of her citizens served as a catalyst for a more open systems approach to administration (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennison, 1987).
America's heightened interest in science, a shift towards social justice, and unprecedented economic prosperity resulting from America's post-war industrial output all served to guide the metaphorical themes associated with school leadership during the 1950's. Principals were expected to be able to utilize data to demonstrate educational, sociological, and psychological benefits of educational programs. They were to function as expert managers, drawing upon business research to guide their schools in much the same fashion as CEOs. By analyzing, prioritizing, and delegating tasks, principals were responsible for creating smooth and efficient operations.

All of this was occurring while the nation was awash in unprecedented wealth. Because of the business sector's successes, it was only natural that schools would emulate their practices in a quest for heightened productivity. The nation was enjoying a general feeling of superiority and confidence in "the American way," social problems notwithstanding. When Russia beat America in the race to space, it signaled a drastic change in the way education would be viewed by this nation.

America was shocked in 1957 when Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space. Till this watershed event, Americans had assumed their educational system was securely entrenched as a model for all others to emulate. Using the factory as metaphor, America utilized a school system that channeled students, assembly line fashion, through a curriculum designed to present material in discrete, disconnected bits (Tyack, 1974).

Until Sputnik, the American way of schooling was generally held in high regard, with little thought given to systemic change (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Sputnik was perhaps the first shot fired that registered a solid hit on America's system of education. Political response was immediate and predictable — America had lost her technological edge, and
schools were easy targets for finger pointing. It was lamented that schools were not teaching rigorous enough courses in math and science and for the first time, the federal government became more than a bit player in the American educational system, creating and funding programs such as Title I in an effort to bring American schools “back up to speed.”

If Sputnik provided an avenue for the loss of confidence in the nation’s public school systems, the desegregation efforts of the 1960’s provided a floodgate. In an effort to equalize the gross inequalities found in previously segregated systems and to increase student achievement, massive amounts of federal dollars were infused into American schools. The belief was simple and intuitive (and to a great extent, unfounded) better facilities and learning environments will manifest increased learning.

The 1960’s

It was the turbulent atmosphere of the times that framed the guiding metaphors for the principalship during the 1960’s. With the shock of Russia winning the race to space still fresh, it was only natural that principals would be viewed as accountable leaders. However, perhaps for the first time accountability was widely accepted to include responsibility for student progress (Traxler, as cited in Beck & Murphy, 1993). Accountability was framed within a metaphor of the principal as a user of science (Beck & Murphy, 1993). During the 1960’s schools followed the path of business success and rapidly evolved in size from small neighborhood schools to large, complex organizations. These complex organizations required principals able to manage the conceptual tools required to lead large groups of students and staff in a changing world (Glass, 1986).

Given the move towards accountability, there was an almost inevitable inward turn in the ranks of the principal. Principals were expected to function as protectors of the
bureaucracy (and therefore of their own personal interests). Teachers were beginning to clamor for a larger voice in the issues of schooling. Boyan (1969) proposed that teachers should only have a say when the issues were not administrative in nature. According to Boyan, principals have a responsibility to guard their rights to make decisions in areas of administration while allowing teachers a part in issues of supervision.

The 1970's

The 1970's saw increased federal involvement in local schools and the rise of numerous special interest groups (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987). These were perhaps the two driving forces which opened schools to outside governance and scrutiny. Metaphorically, principals were viewed as community leaders, imparters of meaning, and positive facilitators of relationships (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

Due to the outside forces coming to bear upon public schools, principals were expected to behave as community leaders, extending their scope of leadership beyond the school doors into the community at large (Burden & Whitt, 1973). Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) even go so far as to argue the role of community leader may be the most important one of the principal. They argue principals must be prepared to assume leadership roles alongside those operating outside the schools and by so doing fulfill their civic leadership responsibility.

The administrative literature of the 1970's places a great deal of emphasis upon schools offering meaningful experiences to students (Macdonald & Zaret, 1974). The bureaucratic expectations found in the 1960s were ebbing. With the calls of special interest groups for attention to their issues, principals were pressured to develop flexible structures that accommodated the person instead of the system. Indeed, meaningful leadership
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respected, honored, and valued, individual ideas and gave them the opportunity to develop and mature (Berman, 1977).

Since schools were now expected to encourage its students' holistic development, it follows that principals would need to be positive facilitators of relationships. Principals were expected to work towards positive emotional experiences for both students and faculty. And, in almost a utopian fashion, if a school engendered a high level of understanding, empathy, and strong liking between staff and students then conflicts would seldom arise and when they did, would likely be eliminated very quickly (Burden & Whitt, 1973; Jordan, 1970).

Other authors were not as prone to dramatize the interpersonal aspect of the principalship but they still offered much emphasis to its importance. Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) call on principals to utilize a human resource model of administration while others (e.g., Berman, 1977; Patterson, 1977) emphasize the need to facilitate positive relationships. In essence, the goal for a facilitative principal was the inclusion of every school group in a drive towards establishing positive staff and student interactions (Burden & Whitt, 1973).

**The 1980's**

Just as in the 1970s, the 1980s found schools open to the community. Unlike the 1970s, when principals were expected to reach out into the community the 1980s found the community reaching into the school. In particular politicians and business people began to exert increasing influence upon practice in schools. In essence, the flow of influence shifted. Principals were no longer leaders utilizing their own vision to actively shape communities. The direction of influence had now shifted to where the community (i.e., politicians and business in particular) reached into schools in efforts to shape and lead those who were heretofore considered school leaders (Murphy, 1990a). A feeling that schools were failing
and direct, outside intervention from the business and political arenas was needed began to grow rapidly during the 1980's.

Such high levels of interest from outside the school brought with them attendant metaphors. Principals were expected to act as change agents, producers of a vision which would realize the reforms called for by politicians and business people. Principals were also expected to be instructional leaders, active experts in effective teaching and learning strategies.

Change was obviously a high priority in the 1980's. *A Nation At Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) enunciated a grim view for America's economic future due to the ill-preparedness of graduates from America's public schools. Retrospect shows “Risk's” conclusions to be unfounded. Instead of entering a prolonged period of economic decline, America has enjoyed a sustained cycle of unprecedented economic prosperity, ending 1998 as the number one rated economy in the world (Sacks, 1999). However, the fallout from “Risk” as well as the general mood of the public propelled principals into change agent roles.

A change agent's call is to provide the impetus for organizational change. And, by so doing, transform the organization in the process. Critical to the change agent role is a compelling vision that empowers others to excel (Bennis, 1984). The notion of changing/transforming leadership can be found in much of the literature of the 1980's (e.g. Achilles, 1987; Dwyer & Smith, 1987; Goodlad, 1984; Murphy, 1990b)

Change in itself is of little benefit unless a vision guides the change process. Visionary principals are future oriented. Greenfield (1987) emphasizes the importance of imagination of going beyond mere goals and objectives to the moral awareness to a standard
of educational excellence. Barth (1987, 1988) stresses the need for visionary leadership as well as the need for recursive thought (Doll, 1993) on how to continually amend and adapt the vision to emerging circumstances.

Perhaps the two dominant themes of literature dealing with educational leadership in the 1980's were accountability and transformational leadership (which was needed to bring about accountability and right “failing” schools). In the 1980's, much ado was made about a causal linkage between failing schools and economic decline (see National Commission on Excellence in Education, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy for examples of warnings of educational decline impacting America's economic prosperity). This causal linkage is typically viewed as being unidirectional, since schools receive scrutiny when economic decline is expected while receiving little or no credit when the economy is vibrant (Sacks, 1999).

Clearly, literature from the 1980s expected the principal to be accountable, visionary, and effective in bringing about positive school change and student achievement (as measured by standardized tests) was viewed as the cornerstone for measuring success or failure. The job of the principalship was rapidly blossoming into a complex, multi-faceted task. Interestingly, as the descriptions of the task became more and more complex the metaphors used to describe the type of leadership required to implement these tasks tended to become more and more centrist. This is not unexpected, since the language used to describe schools during the 1980s evoked a crisis mind-set and, as in all crisis, strong central leadership is expected and is most likely to emerge from these conditions. The irony is that many of those calling for new leadership recognized the ever growing responsibility list for principals was becoming too complex for any one person to successfully complete, and did not intend for...
the change process to be so highly centrist in nature as evidenced by their own words (e.g. Barth, 1990; Fullan, 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

**The 1990's**

The 1990's and the metaphors which prevail for describing school leadership are both highly dependent upon the accountability and transformational movements of the 1980's. As noted, critics of American schools often cite an impending (real or imagined) economic crisis as proof that schools are failing (House, 1998, Sacks, 1999). Responding to the critics, Cuban (1994) asked why they did not change gears and praise schools based upon America's economic prosperity. Cuban's conclusion is the drive for educational accountability was based upon myth which was created for political gain. He argues that the economic boon of the 1990's exposes the self-serving political logic which was used to create a non-existent educational crisis.

Even if the crisis is imagined and manufactured (Berliner & Biddle, 1996), it has still served as a powerful engine for formulating the metaphors found within educational leadership. Inevitably, the call for transformational leadership has brought about requirements for restructuring. Principals of the 1990's may be thought of as social architects, responsible for the restructuring of schools to meet the ever diversifying population (Beck & Murphy, 1993). However, as previously noted by numerous scholars (e.g. Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1988; Fullan, 1993, 1999; House, 1998) schools are remarkably adaptive and resistant to changes in their hierarchy and structure. The social architect agent is also expected to be a moral agent, sensitive to the needs of those comprising the diversifying school population (Beck & Murphy, 1993).
Besides social architects, the 1990's found a call for principals to operate as organizational architects. That is, as shapers of the post-industrial school and the changing needs technology has placed upon modern education (Beck & Murphy, 1993). This effort is also constrained by the inertia typically found within schools whereby what has been done typically defines how things will be done in the future. Schools of the 1990's began to feel the strains of attempting to successfully educate an increasingly diversified population. "Successfully educate" began to take on new meaning as well, since standardized tests were a national phenomenon by the 1990's and the cornerstone of most state efforts for accountability (McNeil, 2000). Given the ever increasing expectations for schools, some observers as well as researchers are questioning whether schools will be able to provide all that is being asked of them from a human capital perspective (Traub, 2000).

Reviewing the metaphorical themes used to describe the principalship reveals a diversity of images. The 1920's saw principals as spiritual leaders, infused with the obligation of helping America obtain her manifest destiny. As the industrial revolution took hold, principals were seen as business managers, responsible for the efficient operation of the factory/school. World War II saw principals as soldiers, serving their country in a time of crisis by extolling American virtues. It was during this time that psychology began to gain status and the role of the principal became that of social scientists, up-to-date on interpretation and implementation of techniques which served to successfully mold behavior.

When these themes began to ebb, the roles of principals began to change rapidly in response to calls for school improvement. Towards the last few decades of the 20th century principals were expected to be instructional leaders, change agents, and transformational
leaders, commissioned with the restructuring and revitalization of schools to the satisfaction of the business world, politicians, and an increasingly skeptical public.

When a situation moves towards a crisis (real or perceived), typically leaders begin to exert more direct influence over decisions that are made (Senge, 1990). Therefore, calls for restructuring schools in more democratic fashion may be falling on many deaf ears as principals scramble to protect their own self-interests. Although, as this literature review has demonstrated, there has been a consistent call for decentralizing school leadership, the events and atmosphere found within the typical school of the 21st century may be conspiring to create an opposite effect, curbing substantive evolution of the developing role of the principal.

**The Current State of Educational Leadership**

Instead of relying upon individualized specialists to solve problems, business and industry is now cognizant of the need for systems which can work towards solving problems (Gardner, 2000; Senge, 1990, Wheatley, 1992). This systematizing of leadership is often attempted in business through the formation of leadership teams. However, simply forming teams is not a sufficient strategy for evoking a systems approach, a point of articulated earlier in the literature review.

By integrating systems thinking and the attendant criteria to effective leadership teams—personal mastery, mental models, and team learning—Senge believes a shift of mind occurs. This shift of mind facilitates a restructuring of the way things are done and heightened productivity ultimately occurs. In essence, systems thinking, when applied to schools, utilizes leadership teams in an effort to restructure norms, values, and beliefs within a school with the goal of improving teaching and learning.
Glasser (2000) applies current thinking on business and organizational leadership to education and concludes non-coercive lead management is needed. Glasser indites school systems for being slow to move away from boss-management leadership models that have been tried and found wanting in the business world (although business has also been slow to leave behind the boss-management model). He suggests a differing form of leadership he terms lead-management. Lead management has two basic tenets. First, the manager is responsible for ensuring a future for the workers as well as a consistency and sense of purpose for the organization. Second, workers work in systems which strive to produce the highest quality product at the lowest possible cost. This is done while the manager works on the system while this transpires. In other words, the manager is solely responsible for the system as a whole and its improvement. Using this principle, Glasser states that administrators have far more responsibility than teachers for improving and maintaining the educational system.

According to Glasser, when a manager works on a system, he/she engages in four essential elements of lead-managing. The leader constantly tries to match the skills and needs of the workers with current job requirements; the leader models correct performance while soliciting worker input for ways to improve; the leader gets workers to engage in self inspection and evaluation with the understanding that workers know a great deal about what their job requires as well as possible ways to improve it. Finally, the leader facilitates work production by demonstrating commitment to providing a positive work atmosphere.

Glasser extends the lead-management model of leadership into schools using an Algebra I class as an example. Much of what he provides as suggested practice is in place in many schools and the benefits are well known (e.g. small, cooperative grouping, teacher
solicitation of student input, self-evaluation by students, and so on). But, Glasser is either the quintessential optimist or is indulging in hyperbole when he asserts that his model of leadership would remove discipline problems from classrooms. He maintains: “There would be no coercion and, therefore, no discipline problems, as they do not occur in a noncoercive atmosphere” (pg. 35).

Ogawa and Bossert (2000) take a similar view of Glasser in that they too believe leadership of schools now requires a systemic approach, where leadership is an organizational quality rather than a prescribed position of power or authority. Specifically, Ogawa and Bossert contrast leadership from a technical-rational perspective, where emphasis is upon performance and goal attainment, and an institutional perspective, which accentuates social legitimacy and organizational survival.

The institutional perspective of leadership is largely cultural (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000). Leaders assuming an institutional perspective are instrumental in adopting a school’s structure to mirror sought after cultural rules. Then, other members of the school are engaged in activities which shape and reinforce shared values and beliefs. The focusing effect that follows helps to produce a commitment to shared values and beliefs which in turn leads to coordinated efforts at improvement.

Technical-rational perspective on leadership tend towards a higher level of hierarchy and emphasis upon goal attainment than the institutional perspective. The technical-rational view holds that leadership functions to positively influence organizational performance by impacting the behavior of those within the organization (Pfeffer, 1977). From the technical-rational perspective, organizational performance means goal attainment. This emphasis upon goal attainment has already been articulated to some degree in this paper and is found in
many of the seminal studies of leadership such as Ohio State and Michigan Universities, Fiedler’s contingency model of leadership, and House’s path-goal theory (Yukl, 1998).

Secondly, the technical-rational perspective on leadership views leadership as emanating from roles or offices. Important decisions are made at the top of hierarchical organizations by those in the highest managerial positions. The belief that leadership emanates from vested positions is found in studies of school leadership, where nearly all are performed using superintendents or principals as the objects of study (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000).

Thirdly, the technical-rational perspective on leadership assumes that leaders acquire or possess certain traits or attributes that make them effective leaders (e.g., Steers, Porter & Bigley, 1996; Yukl, 1998). Instructional leaders are expected to establish the primacy of goal attainment and develop formalized pathways by which goal attainment occurs (House & Podsakoff, 1994).

In their final analysis, Ogawa and Bossert conclude that subsequent changes in school leadership will center more upon schools as educational communities which necessitate the sharing of responsibilities to create positive and ongoing change. Sergiovanni (1994) notes that changing from the predominant technical-rational perspective to one that is more culturally sensitive requires changing the metaphors before the theories they are linked to can change. Given this search for new metaphors, Ogawa and Bossert opine that: “Perhaps a different conception of leadership is emerging, one that sees it everywhere” (pg. 55).

Some recent attempts at defining school leadership have drawn from both technical-rational and institutional perspectives. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was held to develop and affirm a set of universal standards by which effective
school leadership can be measured. The standards have at their core student learning as a
goal and set out from a technical-rational perspective how these goals can be implemented
through the use of effective communication, consensus building, systems theory, and so on
(ISLLC, as cited in Jossey Bass, 2000). But, the standards also include the institutional
perspective of leadership, referring to the school administrator as an educational leader who
advocates for and sustains a school culture that is conducive to student learning and
professional growth. By weaving these two strands together, ISLLC standards are intended
to address what the conference saw as universals for effective school leadership—the need to
simultaneously be strong educators, moral agents, and valuers of people as individuals and
the larger educational community.

Marsh (2000) envisions three critical perspectives emerging in educational leadership
for the 21st century. First, the cultural/school transformation perspective is viewed where the
school principal becomes the transformational leader (e.g., Fullan, 1993).

Sergiovanni (1994) views transformational leadership in terms of building, bonding,
and banking. Building alludes to empowerment of others, and charisma which raises levels
of motivation and performance. Bonding uses a covenant principle to illustrate how workers
and managers together bond together in a moral commitment towards the betterment of
educational goals and purposes. Banking refers to institutionalizing improvements so they
become second nature in a school, thereby extending Senge’s (1990) work on learning
organizations to the school level. Further, Sergiovanni tends to emphasize the institutional
perspective for leadership with his emphasis on values, norms, and beliefs.

Marsh identifies a strategic/results perspective as a driving force in school leadership
for the 21st century. From the strategic/results perspective, schools are being held highly
accountable for student learning (usually as measured by standardized tests) while simultaneously being given broad discretion over how to achieve these results (Marsh, 1995; Odden, 1995).

This type of leadership requires planning backward from intended results so the strengths of the school as a learning organization are utilized. Nested within the implementation of strategic/results leadership is the understanding of the need to engage in structured and ongoing reform, a process which Odden (1995) feels will require a team-oriented approach to problem solving.

The third perspective Marsh believes will be present in 21st century school leadership is the linkage of management functions with enhanced technological capabilities. How to effectively marry the potential of technology with the realities of management support in a holistic manner will be a key issue for the 21st century leader.

Fullan (2000) emphasizes the tremendous and rapid change occurring within the role of the principalship. Government, business, parents, and community have all demanded ready access to schools, often with somewhat differing agendas. This milieu of competing interests makes principals and other leaders vulnerable to simple recipes for success, according to Fullan. Unfortunately, those supplying the “simple recipes” do not have a proven record of success. In fact, the history of school improvement (as well as business) is littered with failed attempts which have been top-down, externally driven, and insensitive to the subtle and often far-removed forces which Senge (1990) investigates.

Such an environment leaves a leader in a Catch-22. They are supposed to give power away while simultaneously maintaining control, and tap the talents of individuals while maintaining a common core of values, norms, and beliefs (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 106).
1996). Such paradoxes have caused some to conclude that there is no external answer to the question of how best to change one's own particular and dynamic circumstances (Farson, 1997; Mintzberg, 1994).

Fullan argues that leaders in this continuous state of disequilibrium (Prigogine, 1980) will necessarily have to act as active researchers (Schon, 1983), crafting, testing, and refining their own unique theories of change. In short, leaders cease the search for the silver bullet and embrace their own complex circumstances. Fullan argues that it is not enough to realize that research on increasing student achievement suggests collaborative work environments, professional learning communities, continued focus on instruction and its improvement, and maintenance of linkages to external standards are all critical means to an end. To know where you would like to be is quite different from knowing how to get there, a point often lost on those that cite correlates of effective schools (Edmonds, 1979) as prescriptive without reflecting on the difficulty of realizing them.

Whether Fullan's view of leadership is realistic is another matter. He basically contends systems should be able to tolerate failure (as long as success is actively being sought). But, the politically charged environment most schools face simply does not allow this. Fullan may have created another conundrum: the leader as risk taker in an atmosphere that punishes taking risks. For his ideas to succeed, concerned interest groups will need to demonstrate a degree of faith in schools and their leaders.

Besides his analysis of the technical-rational and institutional aspects of leadership, Thomas Sergiovanni allots considerable attention to the moral element of leadership (Sergiovanni, 1994). Sergiovanni (2000) asserts that studies and theories of leadership are
overly dependent upon the classical notion of leadership, or the direct form of leadership where one successfully manipulates events and people to achieve stated goals.

Moral leadership, a form of stewardship, refocuses leadership towards affective means instead of the bureaucratic mandates given by superiors. Those practicing moral leadership tend to emphasize the moral connections that exists between students, faculty, and staff. These connections serve to motivate actions because they increase awareness of the needs of children and the significance of the roles played by staff and administration in trying to help students meet their needs.

Moral leadership necessarily requires going deeper than learning curriculum based material. It means that those working with kids are sensitive to their home life, their fears, dreams, and so on. Sergiovanni (2000) cites an example where a principal went to check on a child and wound up helping to clean the house she visited. This servant leadership is necessary to meet the increasing diversity of schools along with the accompanying growth in the emotional and physical needs of students, according to Sergiovanni.

Within Sergiovanni's model, exercise of moral leadership does not operate independently from the more traditional responsibilities. Direct leadership still takes place, but as previously noted, it is guided more by the moral elements of the situation instead of bureaucratic mandates. Greenleaf (1977) provides a base for Sergiovanni's assertions. Greenleaf maintains that moral leadership allows and facilitates those within the school to define their needs in their own way. As teachers become more sensitive to their own needs, they exercise moral leadership by increasing their commitment to the goals, beliefs, and values of the school and community thereby sharing the burden of leadership.
Moral leadership calls into question many accepted practices found in schools. For example, awarding of zeros may be rethought in terms of the moral consequences of allowing a student to willingly fail. Sergiovanni discusses alternatives to this example and suggests such moral leadership may be a powerful facilitator for producing an empowered community which is no longer willing to accept failure as status quo. This type of moral leadership shifts emphasis from behavior to meaning and by so doing establishes the moral element of leadership as an integral part of understanding leadership.

Summary

Current literature is recognizing how complex schools as organizations and therefore the leadership roles within schools have become. Drawing from work such as Senge's (1990), much of the current literature for school leadership proposes utilizing leadership teams as viable alternatives to more highly centrist views of leadership. Still, these teams gather their direction, goals, and vision primarily from “the leader” and as such are suspect to actually producing a divested form of leadership. Additionally, much of the emerging literature still falls under Immegart's (1988) caveat that leaders are being studied instead of developing theories of leadership.

There are some, such as Sergiovanni for example, that are actively inquiring about the humanistic side of leadership, but they speak of the traditional duties of leadership (e.g. supervising instruction and directing others) and sharing the burden of leadership (which is a somewhat different perspective) almost simultaneously. Little if any literature on leadership currently takes an active interest in seeking to understand leadership from a small jazz combo perspective or from the attendant idea of creating leadership density.
From the perspective of this writer it appears much of the emerging literature on school leadership is very similar to what has passed before, although the clear lines of distinction between goals oriented and culture oriented leadership have been blurred. Nevertheless, much attention is given in the most recent literature to the leader and as such, little has changed from a historical perspective.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology and procedures to be employed in this study.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This research study was designed to explore relationships among self-efficacy beliefs, organizational culture, and a new conception of leadership in schools. The design of the study required the use of both quantitative (self-report surveys) and qualitative (case study) methods. Phase I of the study was designed to collect self-report data from teachers and school principals. Phase II of the study was designed to develop more detailed and in-depth case studies of four schools selected after analysis of Phase I data. These schools were selected to provide more in-depth information that could be integrated with the results of quantitative data collected in Phase I.

This chapter describes the research design framing the study, and the quantitative and qualitative methodologies used to test hypothesized relationships among the study variables. Also, this chapter describes the quantitative and qualitative methodologies used to answer general and supplemental research questions. Procedures used to identify schools and to collect qualitative data for in-depth case studies is detailed in the chapter as well. This chapter includes the general research design, a description of the measures used, data collection procedures, data analyses to refine the study measures, to test the hypotheses and research questions, and to complete the in-depth qualitative case studies. The methodology as described is separated in two separate parts. Phase I describes quantitative methods, while Phase II describes qualitative methods. The quantitative methods described in Phase I were designed to test the Research Hypotheses previously stated in Chapter 1. The qualitative methods that are described in Phase II were designed to answer the Research Questions also stated in Chapter 1.
Research Design

Overview

The design for Phase I of this study was an ex post-facto design in which the variables were assigned and not manipulated. The study was designed to study the relationships among school culture, teacher self-efficacy beliefs, administrator self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership density.

The design for Phase II of the study was Yin’s (1994) Type 4 design, where multiple units of embedded analysis (leadership density, school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy) were studied in multiple cases.

Phase I

Independent Variables

Independent variables in this study followed by the measures which were used to operationalize with Phase I of the research design were: School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEO-LD) and Teacher and Administrator Self-Efficacy (TEBS-LD) (Original measures devised for this study).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is a measure of Leadership Density (The Leadership Density Inventory (LDI), an original measure devised for this study).

Sample

A purposeful sampling strategy was used in the study to select participating elementary and middle schools. A particular concern was identifying a varied set of schools from among districts demonstrating school performance scores of “academically acceptable.” The strata for the sampling framework included school level and geographical location. The
total sample included 43 schools from two participating districts. The two districts are located in Louisiana and are considered suburban/rural school districts. All principals (n=43) and all teachers (n=1278) in each of these 43 schools were requested to participate in the quantitative phase (survey) of the study.

**Measures**

Three quantitative measures were developed or adapted for the study. Each of these measures was presented in a ratings scale format. The measures were designed to assess teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of dimensions of professional school culture, self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership density. The sections that follow describe each of the three measures used.

**School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD)** The measure of professional school culture used in the study was a third generation revision of the School Culture Elements Questionnaire originally developed for use in Australian schools by Cavanagh (1997). The original SCEQ consisted of eight subscales, each defined by eight groups of eight items classified into the following domains: Professional Values, Teachers as Learners, Collegiality, Mutual Empowerment, Collaboration, Shared Vision, School-wide Planning, and Transformational Leadership. Subsequent revisions of the SCEQ using factor analyses with three large samples of teachers (n=1250 to 4060) reduced the SCEQ to 51 items and three salient factors: Vision/Leadership, Professional Commitment, Collegial Teaching and Learning (Ellett, Rugutt, & Cavanagh, 2000). Alpha reliabilities computed for these three factors were .90, .88, and .86, respectively. Subsequently, the 51 item version of the SCEQ was shortened to 20 items by Olivier (2001) and Bobbett (2001) by examining item factor loadings from the Ellett, et al. study (2000). 
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reported measurement reliabilities for three factored dimensions of the 20 item version of the
SCEQ as follows: Shared Leadership (.96), Collegial Teaching and Learning (.88), and
Professional Commitment (.88). Because of concern about the length of the survey task in
this study and given the purposes of this study, the twenty item version of the SCEQ was
reduced to 15 items using the item factor loadings in the Ellett, et al. (2000) study. In
reducing the SCEQ items from twenty to fifteen, items within factors were deleted that
demonstrated the lowest item factor loadings.

The original SCEQ (Cavanagh, 1997) and subsequent revisions (Ellet, et al, 2000;
Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001) measure teacher perceptions of the behavior of organizational
members from which inferences about the school culture and characteristics are made.
Appendix A includes the fifteen items for the version of the SCEQ (the SCEQ-LD) used in
this study. The response format for the SCEQ-LD was a four-point, forced-choice, Likert
scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree. In responding to each item,
teachers were to make two judgements: 1) How the school culture actually is; and 2) How
the teacher would prefer the school culture to be.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs (TEBS-LD) A new measure of teacher self-efficacy
beliefs was specifically designed and developed for this study. While some measures of
teacher efficacy can be identified in the literature (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy,
1998; Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Olivier, Bobbett, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1998), none was
considered adequate for the purposes of this study. The measure required for this study was
one that integrated self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) with recent conceptions of leadership
density in schools (Ellett, 1996; Smith & Ellett, 2000). Therefore, a new self-efficacy
measure was developed called the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Form

114
Initially, this measure consisted of 25 items designed to measure teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to organize and execute courses of actions necessary to facilitate the development of leadership density in their schools. Appendix A includes the 25 items operationalizing the initial TEBS-LD measure.

In responding to each item, teachers used a four-point, forced choice Likert scale ranging from 1 = Very Weak Beliefs in my capabilities to 4 = Very Strong Beliefs in my capabilities. Specifics pertaining to the development and piloting of these 25 items are described in a separate section below. A classroom-based form of the TEBS recently used by Bobbett, 2001; Dellinger, 2001; and Olivier, 2001 is considered a more direct measure consistent with self-efficacy theory than those recommended by authorities in the field (e.g., I Can, My Confidence In, My Capability To) (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, these new measures of teacher self-efficacy beliefs use a Likert response format rather than a 10-point or 100-point scale for tasks graded in terms of difficulty as recommended by Bandura (1997).

**Administrator Self-Efficacy Beliefs (AEBS-LD)** A new measure of administrator self-efficacy beliefs was specifically designed and developed for this study because no existing measures were known. The measure required for this study was one that integrated self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) with recent conceptions of leadership density in schools (Ellett, 1996; Smith & Ellet, 2000). Therefore, a new self-efficacy beliefs measure for school principals and/or other school administrators called the Administrator Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Form (AEBS-LD) was developed for this study. Initially, this measure consisted of 24 items designed to measure school administrators’ self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action necessary to
facilitate the development of leadership density in their schools. Appendix A includes the 24 items operationalizing the initial AEBS-LD measure.

In responding to each item, administrators used a four-point, forced choice Likert scale ranging from 1 = Very Weak Beliefs in my capabilities to 4 = Very Strong beliefs in my capabilities. Specifics pertaining to the development and piloting are described in a separate section below. This new measure of administrator self-efficacy beliefs uses a Likert response format rather than a 10-point or 100-point scale for tasks graded in terms of difficulty as recommended by Bandura (1997).

Leadership Density Inventory (LDI): The concept of leadership density grounded in the small jazz combo metaphor (see Chapters 1 and 2) is a new way of thinking about leadership in schools. Therefore, it was necessary in the study to develop a new measure to operationalize this construct. The strategy in developing the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) was to first identify salient features of small jazz combos and school corollaries of each feature reflecting leadership structures and processes in the school organization. Subsequently, sets of items operationalizing each school organizational characteristic were written. These items were submitted to a panel of three higher education faculty members familiar with the small jazz combo metaphor and the concept of leadership density in schools. A conceptual definition for leadership density was provided and was used by the panel members to make judgements as to whether the LDI draft items were measurement indicators of the leadership density construct. A set of items was written to reflect each school organization corollary of the small jazz combo characteristics. Appendix B shows linkages between small jazz combo characteristics, their school organizational corollaries, and the 32 items developed for the LDI. Appendix C includes the conceptual definition of
leadership density and the task instructions for verifying the LDI items as indicators of the construct. The results of the expert panel review strongly affirmed the LDI items as indicators of the leadership density construct. Thus, the original total set of 32 items was included in the larger study.

As with other measures used in the study, respondents used a four-point, forced-choice Likert Scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree to respond to each of the 32 items on the LDI. The instructions and the complete set of LDI items can be found in Appendix A.

Pilot of the LDI

Because the LDI was a new measure developed specifically for the study, it was necessary to complete a small pilot study to affirm that the task instructions and item statements were understandable and clear. Thus, a draft version of the LDI that included task instructions and the 32 items was piloted with a small sample of teachers (n=8). The LDI, along with the SCEQ-LD and TEBS-LD was included in a survey packet which was reviewed by this small group of teachers. With few exceptions, the task instructions for all measures and the item statements were understandable and sufficiently clear to be used in the larger study. Only a few minor grammatical corrections were made as a result of the teacher panel’s review.

Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative Measures

Quantitative data in Phase I of the study was collected through a combination of mail out and direct data collection procedures. Individual survey packets were developed for each respondent. Each packet for teachers consisted of a demographic information form, the LDI,
TEBS-LD, and the SCEQ-LD. The packet for school administrators consisted of a demographic information form, the LDI, AEBS-LD, and the SCEQ-LD. Besides filling out the AEBS-LD, administrators were asked to complete the entire teacher packet (LDI, TEBS-LD, SCEQ-LD) by making a prediction of what they believed the typical teacher response would be at their school. A judgement for each item was made using the same four-point, forced-choice Likert scale ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree. Data were collected using procedures assuring that the anonymity of all participants and schools was protected. The response forms for the various measures (see Appendix A) were converted to electronically scannable forms through the Measurement and Evaluation Center at Louisiana State University.

Survey packets were sent to all teachers and the principal in each participating school in early to mid-spring, 2001. Respondents were requested to complete the survey tasks, place their materials in a sealed envelope, and return to a central location to be picked up by the researcher. To enhance the return rate, a mid-week phone contact was made with each participating school as a reminder of time lines for completing the survey task. A few respondents were provided two to three additional days to complete the task. These packet were mailed directly to the researcher upon their completion.

**Data Analyses**

The survey data were electronically scanned to data files through the Measurement and Evaluation Center at Louisiana State University. The data files were checked for accuracy and completeness, and a small number of cases was deleted owing to large amounts of missing data, obvious invalid responses (e.g., scores of 1’s or 4’s for all items). In cleaning the data set, the number of cases deleted was extremely small (less than .02%). A variety
of data analyses were completed in Phase I (quantitative phase) of the study. These analyses included the following:

- Descriptive statistics to document characteristics of the sample and the measures;
- A series of principal components to operationally define and empirically examine latent constructs comprising the study measures;
- A series of internal consistency reliability analyses (Cronbach-Alphas) of the empirically derived factors of each measure;
- Bivariate (Pearson product moment) correlations to test the research hypotheses;
- Additional bivariate correlations to examine relationships within and among the study measures and to answer supplemental questions of interest (e.g., relationships between administrator and teacher perceptions of school culture);
- Multiple regression analyses to explain leadership density in schools as a function of dimensions of professional school culture and self-efficacy beliefs; and
- Canonical correlation analyses to explore multi-variate (correlational) relationships between various linear combinations of the empirically derived factors of the study measures.

**Phase II**

**Sample**

Phase II of the study utilized qualitative methods to explore events in the everyday life in a selected number of schools. The qualitative phase was designed to provide further meaning to the major variables framing the study (leadership density, school professional culture, self-efficacy beliefs) and to relationships among these variables as viewed through the ongoing experiences of teachers and administrators. A primary objective of the
The qualitative phase of the study was to investigate how leadership density varies among schools and its relationships to elements of professional school culture and teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs. The qualitative phase of the study was designed to collect school site interview and observation data to further inform the results of quantitative analyses completed in Phase I of the study.

Schools were selected for the study based upon inspection and sorting of returned surveys from administrators and teachers by items considered to be the most critical indicators of leadership density in schools. The initial strategy was to identify schools that might be particularly strong on important indicators for leadership density (e.g., In this school, teachers willingly take on leadership roles when they arise.). This strategy was used under the assumption that high levels of leadership density are rare. Thus, selecting highly contrasting cases is improbable.

The inspection and sorting procedure began by examining raw survey data from school principals. This strategy was used because of the belief that strong principal facilitation for teacher leadership is crucial to the creation and development of leadership density in a school. After sorting and ranking principal responses, faculty responses were screened to determine the extent to which teachers within a school indicated their involvement in, and willingness to, assume leadership roles. Based upon this initial screening process, three schools were chosen from the sample for case studies. In addition to the three schools selected from the sample, another school (from an urban school district) was selected for case study based upon its established reputation for demonstrating high levels of teacher leadership.
The results of inspecting and sorting the survey data resulted in the selection of three schools that appeared to possess the strongest levels of leadership density. Two of these three schools were configured as K–5 elementary schools. The third was a K–8 school. The fourth school in the sample was a school selected due to its established reputation for working to empower teachers in leadership decisions and was therefore likely to exhibit strong characteristics of leadership density. In order to obtain data from a middle school level, case studies at the K–8 school were performed in the 7th and 8th grades.

Within each school, from four to eight teachers were selected for focus group and/or interviews based upon their work schedules and availability. The total number of teachers interviewed within the four schools was twenty-two. The range in the number of teacher interviewed across schools was from four to seven.

The total number of classroom observations performed in the four schools was thirty-nine (thirty-nine different teachers). The percentage of teachers observed within the four schools ranged from approximately 15% to 30%. In addition, the principal in each school was individually interviewed. Each principal was also observed performing elements of their daily job roles (e.g., interacting with teachers, monitoring student behavior, informal interaction with students, etc.).

Protocol

According to Yin (1994), the development of a protocol is essential for developing multiple-case studies such as those performed in this study and is an effective strategy for increasing the reliability of case study research. A protocol was designed and approved before case studies began and served as a guide for the procedures and general rules followed at all case study sites. The protocol for the case studies is located in Appendix D.
**Measures**

Classroom observations, teacher focus groups, individual interviews with teachers, individual interviews with principals, and observation of the life of the school (i.e. faculty lounge, lunchroom, recess etc.) were utilized to collect data during the qualitative phase (Phase II) of the study. The measures used to collect and organize data were as follows:

**Classroom Observation Measure**

Patton's (1990) Dimensions of Variations in Approach to Observations was used as a guide for classroom observations. Patton identifies five dimensions of observation: the role of the researcher, the portrayal of the researcher's role, the portrayal of the purpose of the research to others, the duration of the research observations, and the focus of the observation. Each dimension is briefly discussed below.

**Role of the Researcher** Researchers may operate on a continuum of full participant in the observation to an unattached outsider (Patton, 1990). Given this study's focus of leadership density, and in the specific instance of classrooms, a teacher's ability to create and facilitate dense leadership within their classroom, data were collected by the researcher assuming a role of partial participation. This role allowed the classroom events to transpire in a more typical fashion than data collection procedures that might use more objective, but probably more intrusive techniques.

**Portrayal of the Research Role** Partial disclosure of the researcher's role was explained to teachers. Such disclosure procedures communicate to teachers that the researcher is not interested in evaluating the teacher's skills but was more interested in recording classroom conditions, events, and personal dynamics as they naturally occurred.
This role was emphasized in the observations to minimize potential anxiety and stress and intrusion on classroom.

**Portrayal of the Purpose of the Research**  To enhance comfort levels and reduce personal anxiety of teachers, it was explained that the whole classroom environment was the focus of the observation, not just the teacher’s performance. However, teachers were not informed that the more specific purpose of the observation was to observe teacher and student roles in creating and facilitating leadership density in the classroom.

**Duration of the Observations**  Observations were of sufficient duration to provide trustworthy data (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998) for the research results. All observations completed were for at least a minimum of thirty minutes and some for the full length of a lesson (i.e., 50 minutes). To add to the generalizability of the classroom observation data, observations were completed across classrooms reflecting teaching and learning in core curricula (e.g., math, language arts, social studies).

**Focus of the Observations**  Since leadership density can emerge under a variety of conditions, the focus of the observations was rather broad and holistic. Therefore, an observation checklist was not used. Rather, observations were particularly focused upon what teachers do to foster leadership density in their classrooms. Observation data were scripted by the researcher into sets of observation notes using paper and pencil.

**Interview Framework for Individual Teachers and Principals**

A semi-structured interview framework was specifically developed for the study to collect information pertinent to understanding the leadership density construct in the four sample schools. The interview questions were developed by the researcher and two higher-education faculty familiar with the purpose and scope of the study. The strategy in using the
The interview framework was to use the questions to focus open-ended discussion about characteristics of leadership density from the perspective of individual and small groups of teachers. The researcher took handwritten notes of teacher comments that provided information pertinent to understanding leadership density. Other comments were frequently recorded as well. However, the primary focus was on understanding the leadership density construct. In addition to the standard interview questions, teachers were asked to make predictions about how their principal would answer questions when interviewed. The semi-structured interview guide and questions is included in Appendix D.

The semi-structured interview guide was also used to obtain information pertinent to understanding leadership density from the principal in each of the four schools. The guide was used as a stimulus for conversation in a manner similar to its use with teachers. After responding to questions pertinent to the principal's role in the school, principals were asked to predict how they thought teachers would respond to the interview questions in their interviews.

**Informal Observation Records**

In addition to observations and interviews completed with teachers and principals it was of interest in the qualitative phase of the study to complete informal observations of the everyday life events, conditions, and interactions in each of the four schools. The researcher spent a considerable amount of time in each school visiting a number of settings (e.g., teachers lounge, school cafeteria, playground) to record observations and scenarios characterizing normative factors in the school organization. Teachers and the principal in each school were informed that this data collection activity would occur but they were not
specifically informed about its purpose. Its purpose was to collect information about leadership density roles outside of classrooms in the larger school setting.

**Data Collection Procedures**

**Individual and Focus Group Interviews**

Teachers and school principals were contacted and mutual times were arranged for completing interviews. The initial focus of the interviews was to explain the general purpose of the study (i.e., a study of school leadership), the anonymity of the interviewees, the procedures to be used, the approximate amount of time required, the role of the interviewer, the expectations for interviewees, the confidentiality of the data, and other standard procedures. The interviews, attendant discussions, and data recording required approximately 60 minutes to complete. An attempt was made to keep the interviews as efficient as possible, while at the same time, remain focused on the interview questions to collect targeted information pertinent to understanding leadership density. Approximately 4 hours per school was required to collect the interview data for a total of approximately 16 hours.

**Classroom Observations**

Classroom observations were a minimum of 30 minutes in length and approximately half were for a full period (50 minutes) for a total observation time of about 17 hours. Informal observations completed by traveling through the larger school setting required approximately 2 hours per school for a total of 8 hours. During the informal observations of the larger school context, events, conditions, and interactions reflecting elements of leadership density (or the lack of it) were recorded by the researcher using paper and pencil. The total time required to complete all interview, classroom observation, and school-wide
data collection activities for the qualitative phase of the study was approximately 6 hours per school for a total of 24 hours.

**Data Analyses**

Data analyses for case studies performed in the study relied on theoretical propositions (Yin, 1994) that were specifically believed to be associated with the formation and facilitation of leadership density (i.e., teachers need time to meet in small groups, principals must be open to teacher leadership, etc.) Since these theoretical propositions were developed a priori, they served as a deductive pathway (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Tashakorri & Teddlie, 1998) for data gathering and analyses. Furthermore, the theoretical propositions guiding the study made data collection more efficient by focusing attention on certain data (Yin, 1994).

Analyses of data used pattern-matching logic as described in Yin (1994). Leadership observed in schools was compared with theorized patterns of leadership density to examine the levels of density present in each school's leadership. Furthermore, notes from classroom observations and focus interviews were analyzed to determine trends, themes, similarities and differences within the data. Within classrooms, observations were performed to see if attributes of small jazz combos such as playing in harmony, valuing the contribution of others, and ability to improvise were present. And, since members of jazz combos generally play well off of each other, it was also of interest to get a feel for how well teachers could predict principal responses and vice versa.

Information obtained at each school was used to inform the next case study. As themes, trends, similarities, and differences emerged, there was an effort to identify the core findings which could inform an enrich the quantitative phase of the study.
Summary

This chapter contains the methodology used in the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. It includes the research measures for the quantitative phase of the study, how the measures were first developed and then administered to the study sample. In addition, the chapter includes the research measures used in the qualitative phase of the study, how they were developed and then administered to the study sample. Chapter 5 provides the major findings of the quantitative phase of the study.
CHAPTER 5: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter includes the results of the study derived from quantitative analyses of the survey data. Results are presented that pertain to: a) demographic characteristics of the sample schools and survey participants; b) descriptive statistics for the measurement items; c) refinement of the measures used to operationalize the dependent and independent variables; d) tests of the research hypotheses, and e) pertinent supplemental analyses of the data. The results of the qualitative phase of the study are presented in Chapter VI.

Summary of Characteristics of the Sample

Table 5.1 summarizes characteristics of the two school districts and schools participating in the study. District I had 15 participating schools. Of these 15 schools, four are elementary (K-5), five are primary (K-4), and six are middle schools (5-8 or 6-8). Schools in District I ranged in size from a low of 473 to a high of 661. Included in the summary table is a listing of the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch by school for each district.

District II had 29 schools participate in the study. Of these schools, two are lower elementary (K-2), two are upper elementary (K-4), fourteen are elementary (K-4 or K-5), six are middle schools (5-8 or 6-8), one is K-8, two are 7-12, and two are K-12. Schools in District II ranged in size from a low of 354 to a high of 804.

A summary of teacher response rates to the survey measures is shown in Table 5.2. The table includes the number of survey packets provided for each school (based upon the number of teachers in each school), the number of completed surveys returned, and the
Table 5.1

School and School District Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School #</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th># Faculty</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>% Free Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District II:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentage of return (return rate) for each school in each of the two districts and for the total sample. As can be seen in the table, return rates for schools ranged from a high of 100% (district II, school # 24) to a low of 28% (district II, school # 27). The return rates by district were fairly consistent with an overall return rate of 55% for school district 1 and 65% for school district two. There were 987 surveys returned from both districts out of a possible 1632, giving an overall return rate of 60%.

Table 5.2
Summary of Teacher Response Rates By School Type and District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School #</th>
<th># Faculty</th>
<th>Packets Returned</th>
<th>% Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District II:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5.3 summarizes demographic characteristics for the total sample by gender, ethnicity, content area, teaching situation, grade primarily taught, total years experience, and total years employed at current school. The percentage of respondents that were female and male was 91.5% and 8.5% respectively. Of those responding to the survey, 91.9% of the total sample are white (W). African-Americans (B) made up the next largest segment of the sample, with 75 respondents and 7.7% of the sample. Of the 987 respondents, one person marked Hispanic (H), and three responded as “other” (O). No one reported themselves to have Asian (A) heritage. Nearly 80% of the respondents teach in regular education classrooms with the remainder working either in self-contained, special education classrooms (10.7%), administration (1.4%), or as counselors, librarians, speech therapists, etc. (8.0%). Table 3 provides the full summary of demographic characteristics for the total sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13 missing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Situation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained, regular education classroom</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmentalized, regular education classroom</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Classroom</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24 missing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary education</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Music</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67 missing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Primarily Taught</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85 missing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Completed</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's +30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 missing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample for Each of the Survey Measures

Descriptive statistics for each of the survey measures used in the study for the total sample of teachers are summarized in Tables 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6. Percentages of the maximum possible scores for each measurement item are included to convert item means to a standard 100 point scale to ease comparisons and interpretations of the findings.

School Culture Elements-Leadership Density Questionnaire (SCEQ-LD)

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and percentages of the maximum possible scores, and mean differences (preferred mean minus actual mean) for the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD) for the total sample are included in Table 5.4. Actual item means ranged from a high of 3.47-“Teachers value and believe it is important to help each other when problems arise,” to a low of 2.73-“Teachers value and believe it is important to spend productive time with the principal informally
discussing ways to improve the school.” Preferred means ranged from a high of 3.85-
"Teachers value and believe it is important to help each other when problems arise, " to a low of 3.49-"Teachers value and believe it is important to spend time in professional reflection about their work.” Standard deviations (an index of the degree of consensus among teachers) ranged from a high of .80-“Teachers value and believe it is important to spend productive time with the principal informally discussing ways to improve the school,” to a low of .60-“Teachers value and believe it is important to give priority to helping their students develop higher order thinking skills.” For the most part, the findings in Table 5.4 show that the SCEQ-LD item scores are somewhat negatively skewed. All actual item means were above the four-point scale midpoint of 2.5. For the total item set, percentages of the maximum possible item scores ranged from 87% to 68%. Mean differences for actual and preferred items ranged from a high of .78-“Teachers value and believe it is important to spend productive time with the principal informally discussing ways to improve the school,” to a low of .31-“Teachers value and believe it is important to openly share problems with each other.” As can be seen from the table, “actual” scores produced lower means and larger standard deviations than the “preferred” scores.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD)**

Table 5.5 presents a summary of descriptive statistics for the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale. Means, standard deviations, and percentages of the maximum possible scores and mean differences for the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD) for the total sample are included in Table 5. Item means ranged from a high of 3.56-“My beliefs in my capabilities to successfully work with other teachers in small groups to accomplish school goals are,” to a low of 3.05-“My beliefs in my capabilities to overcome negative community influences upon students are.” Standard deviations ranged from a high
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of .67—“My beliefs in my capabilities to successfully work with other teachers in small
groups to accomplish school goals are,” to a low of .51—“My beliefs in my capabilities to
create an effective learning environment where commitment and perseverance are modeled
to all students are.” Table 5 shows that the TEBS-LD item scores are negatively skewed,
with all item means above 3.0. For the total item set, percentages of the maximum possible
item scores ranged from a high of 89% to a low of 76%.

Table 5.4

Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Actual: Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>% Max</th>
<th>Preferred: Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>% Max</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*teacher perceptions of actual school culture
*teacher perceptions of preferred school culture
% Max computed by dividing item mean score by 4 (maximum possible rating)
\( \bar{x} \) diff. = Preferred Item \( \bar{x} \) minus Actual Item \( \bar{x} \)

**Leadership Density Inventory (LDI)**

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and percentages of the maximum
possible scores) for the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) for the total sample are included
in Table 5.6. Item means ranged from a high of 3.53—“In this school, the principal has the
Table 5.5

Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEBS-LD Item Number</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>%Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

final say on all important decisions,” to a low of 2.01—“In this school, teachers are told how to teach.” Standard deviations (an index of the degree of consensus among teachers) ranged from a high of .87—“In this school, opportunities for teachers to plan in small groups are built into the schedule,” to a low of .50—“In this school, teachers encourage students to share their knowledge with other students in the class.” Item scores for the LDI tend towards a negative skew, with 30 of the 32 item means being 2.5 or greater. For the total item set, percentages of the maximum possible item scores ranged from a high of 88% to a low of 50%.
Table 5.6

Leadership Density Inventory (LDI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>%Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Components (Factor) Analyses of the Study Measures

The three survey measures for teachers used in the study were subjected to a series of principal components analysis procedures to identify items operationalizing latent constructs comprising these measures. It should be recalled that two of the measures administered to teachers were new measures specifically designed for the study (the TEBS-
LD and the LDI). Therefore, it was of interest to explore the nature of the empirically-derived constructs comprising these new measures. The SCEQ-LD measure was also subjected to principal components analysis procedures since it was a shortened version of an SCEQ measure used in other recent studies (Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001). The Administrator Self Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Form (AEBS-LD) was also a new measure specifically designed for this study. Principal components analyses were not completed for this measure however, owing to the small sample of school principals participating in the study (n=31).

For each of the factor analyses completed, a series of decision making rules was established for retaining items on particular factors, and for deleting other items. These rules were as follows:

1. Consider an item for a retention on a particular component only if the item/factor loading (rotated factor structure coefficient) is at, or exceeds a value of .33;

2. For items loading at least .33 on more than one factor, retain the item on a factor only if the difference in the two highest squared loading (coefficients of determination) is at or exceeds a value of .10;

3. Disregard (do not retain) items loading below a value of .33; and

4. Disregard (do not retain) items loading on more than one factor for which the difference between the two highest squared loadings is less than .10.

These decision making rules were used to examine the results of all factor analyses to determine appropriate item/factor locations.

Final factor solutions considered most appropriate for each measure were accepted after examining the distribution of item loadings across various factors extracted, skree plots
of the results, and the total variance explained in different solutions. The general analysis strategy employed in each principal components analysis was to first complete an unconstrained solution [to identify the maximum number of factors that could be extracted that exceeded the default option of a factor accounting for at least one percent of the total variance in the solution (Kaiser’s Stopping Rule)], followed by a one-factor solution, and then iteratively completing multiple factor solutions. Because of assumptions made about the conceptual and functional independence of latent constructs comprising the measures, orthogonal rotations (Varimax procedures) were used to establish final item loadings across factors. The results of the separate factor analyses completed for each measure are described in the sections that follow.

**Analysis of the SCEQ-LD**

Table 5.7 includes the results of a three-factor, principal components solution for the revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire (SCEQ-LD) measure. This three-factor solution accounted for a total of 61.8% of the total variance in the data. Using the decision rules explicated above for retaining items on particular factors, all 15 of the SCEQ-LD items were retained. The first factor accounted for 49.1% of the variance and was comprised of 6 items with loadings (factor structure coefficients) ranging from .71 (Item #4) to .63 (Item #6). Four items were retained on the second factor, which accounted for 6.4% of the total item variance. Loadings on this third factor ranged from .77 (Item #5) to .65 (Item #7). A third factor was comprised primarily of 5 items with loadings ranging from .84 (Item #15) to .51 (Item #12). This third factor accounted for 4.3% of the total item variance. The item numbers in Table 7 can be cross-referenced for content with the complete SCEQ-LD measure included in Appendix A.
The patterning of the item/factor loadings and the content of the SCEQ-LD items was examined and the three latent constructs identified were termed as follows: Factor I (Professional Commitment) (PC); Factor II (Commitment to Teaching and Learning) (CTL); and Factor III (Vision and Leadership) (VL).

Table 5.7

Summary of a Three Factor, Rotated Factor Structure Solution for the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density Measure (SCEQ-LD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCEQ-LD Item</th>
<th>Communcality</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Percentage of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Variance Explained 61.8
Analysis of the TEBS-LD

The results of a four-factor principal components analysis of the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Form (TEBS-LD) is shown in Table 5.8. For the table total, only 2 of 25 items were not retained given the decision rules used to identify appropriate item/factor placements. This analysis identified four salient factors that accounted for a total of 55.2% of the total variance in the solution. Factor I accounted for 40.9% of the total item variance and consisted primarily of 6 items with loadings ranging from .71 (Item #7) to .53 (Item #10). A second factor extracted accounted for 5.4% of the total variance and retained 9 items with loadings ranging from .69 (Item #1) to .49 (Item #9). Factor II in this solution retained 4 items with actor structure loadings ranging from .73 (Item #21) to .53 (Item #19). This third factor accounted for a total of 4.9% of the total variance in the solution. A fourth salient factor was extracted in this solution and it accounted for a total of 4.1% of the total item variance. Four items were retained to operationalize this factor with loadings ranging from .77 (Item #23) to a low of .51 (Item #4). The item numbers in Table 8 can be cross-referenced for content with the TEBS-LD measure included in Appendix A.

The patterning of the item loadings across the four factors in this solution and a review of associated item content generated the following labels for the latent constructs measured: Factor I (Leadership of Learning (LOL); Factor II (Personal Leadership (PL); Factor III (Leadership Management) (LM); Factor IV (Leadership Resilience) (LR). Table 5.8 follows with a summary of the principal components factor analysis for the TEBS-LD.
Table 5.8

Summary of a Four Factor, Rotated Factor Structure Solution for the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Measure (TEBS-LD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEBS-LD Item</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor | Eigen Value | Percentage of Variance Explained |
-------|-------------|----------------------------------|
I      | 10.22       | 40.9                             |
II     | 1.35        | 5.4                              |
III    | 1.22        | 4.9                              |
IV     | 1.02        | 4.1                              |

Total Variance Explained | 55.2
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Analysis of the LDI

A series of principal components analyses was also completed with the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) measure. Given the decision rules established for retaining items on various factors, the distributions of item loadings across factors, and the variance explained in various solutions, a six-factor solution was accepted as best representing latent constructs measured by the LDI. The results of this six-factor solution are included in Table 5.9. As shown in the table, these six factors collectively accounted for a total of 47.92% of the variance in the solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDI Item</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
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### Analysis of Factored Dimensions and Reliability Coefficients for the TEBS-LD, SCEQ-LD, and the LDI

Table 5.10 contains summaries of the means, standard deviations, and means expressed as percentages of maximum possible scores for factored dimensions of the TEBS-LD, SCEQ-LD, and the LDI. As can be seen in the table, percentage maximums of the mean scores for the SCEQ-LD factored subscales ranged from a high of 80% (professional commitment) to a low of 66% (teaching and learning). Standard deviations for the SCEQ-LD factored subscales ranged from a high of 3.70 (vision/leadership) to a low of collegial...
teaching/learning (2.55). Reliability coefficients ranged from a high of .84 (vision and leadership) to a low of .81 (collegial teaching and learning).

The TEBS-LD had a small range of percentage maximums of mean scores for the factored subscales with a high of 85 (personal leadership) and a low of 77 (leadership management). Standard deviations for the factored subscales of the TEBS-LD ranged from a high of 4.41 (personal leadership) to a low of 2.30 (leadership management). Alpha reliability coefficients for the TEBS-LD ranged from a high of .87 (personal leadership) to a low of .74 (leadership resilience).

Percentage maximums for the factored subscales of the LDI were closely clustered with five of the six values ranging between 80% and 75%. Interestingly, the percentage maximum for authoritative decision making was only 59% (an expected outcome from the theoretical perspective of this study). Alpha reliabilities for the LDI ranged from a high of .79 (empowerment) to a low of .57 (adaptability). The alpha reliabilities for the LDI provide evidence for the need for further clarification and enhancement of the constructs being measured by the instrument. Full results for the means, standard deviations, and means expressed as percentages of maximum possible scores for factored dimensions of the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD), the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD), and the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI), as well as the respective reliability coefficients for each measure can be found on the next page in Table 5.10.
Table 5.10

Means, Standard Deviations, Means Expressed as Percentages of Maximum Possible Scores, and Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Factored Dimensions of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and LDI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>$\bar{x}/%_{\text{Max}}^a$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCEQ-LD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment (5)$^b$</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Leadership (5)</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Teaching/Learning (4)</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEBS-LD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of Learning (6)</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership (8)</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Management (4)</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Resilience (3)</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LDI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork (8)</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (5)</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (5)</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Volunteerism (4)</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structure (4)</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Decision Making (3)</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a \bar{x}/%_{\text{Max}} = \text{subscale } \bar{x} \text{ score divided by subscale maximum possible score (i.e., } \# \text{ items on subscale multiplied by 4)}$

$b \text{ Number items comprising subscale}$

**One-Factor Solutions of the Measures**

To explore the higher order construct validity characteristics of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and LDI measures, a one-factor solution for each measure was also completed. At issue in these analyses was the extent to which the total set of items for each measure loaded at or above .33 on a single, linear combination of the items. This single linear combination of items operationalized the higher order latent construct reflected on each measure (i.e., professional school culture, teacher self-efficacy, leadership density). The results of these analyses can be found in Table 1 in Appendix A.
For the SCEQ-LD, a one-factor solution accounted for 49.1% of the total item variance. In this solution, all 15 items loaded on a single linear combination at or above .33. Also, for the one-factor solution of the TEBS-LD, all 25 items loaded at or above .33 on the single factor extracted. This linear combination of the variables (items) accounted for a total of 40.9% of the total item variance. For the one-factor solution of the LDI, eight of 32 items failed to meet the minimum loading criterion for retaining items on a factor (.33). This one-factor solution accounted for a total of 23% of the total item variance. Considered collectively, these results suggest greater conceptual clarity in the higher order constructs measured by the SCEQ-LD (professional school culture) and the TEBS-LD (self-efficacy beliefs), than for the LDI (leadership density). The results of the multiple factor solutions completed for each of these three measures (reported above) also support the existence of sets of latent constructs subsumed under each higher order construct.

**Intercorrelations Among Factored Dimensions of the Measures**

Intercorrelations (Pearson product moment correlations) among factored dimensions of each of the study measures were computed to examine the direction and strength of relationships among the empirically derived variables. Intercorrelations among the three factored dimensions of the SCEQ-LD, using schools (n=41) as the units of analysis were: CTL/PC, r=.83, p<.001; VL/PC, r=.82, p<.001; VL/CTL, r=.83, p<.001. These results show strong, positive intercorrelations among the three SCEQ factors. Schools in which teachers view one dimension of professional culture as positive are also schools in which the other dimensions of professional culture are viewed as quite positive.

Pearson product moment correlations between factored dimensions of the TEBS-LD using school means (n=41) as the units of analysis were as follows: PL/LOL, r=.76, p<.01;
LM/LOL, r=.59, p<.01; LR/LOL, r=.43, p<.01; LM/PL, r=.84, p<.001; LR/PL, r=.63, p<.01, LR/LM, r=.67, p<.01. These correlations were all positive in direction and ranged from strong to moderately strong in magnitude. These findings show that schools in which teachers believe in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to enhance one dimension of leadership density in their school, also believe in their capabilities to enhance other dimensions of leadership density in their school. The strongest linkages among teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about facilitating leadership density in their school were between opportunities to facilitate the management of leadership (LM) and personal role-taking in leadership activities (PL) (r=.84, p<.001); and between personal role-taking in leadership activities (PL) and facilitating the leadership of learning among teachers in the school (LOL) r=.76, p<.01).

Table 5.11 presents a summary of Pearson product moment correlation coefficients among factored dimensions of the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) using school means (n=41) as the units of analysis. For the table total (n=21 correlations), only 5 were not statistically significant (p>.05). These correlations ranged in direction and magnitude from .67 (ADP/EMP) to -.61 (BS/EMP). Seven of these correlations among the LDI subscales approached or exceeded .50. The direction of the correlations is consistent with the original conceptualization of the LDI, the development of items to tap possible sub constructs, and the empirically factored dimensions. One would expect, for example, a negative relationship between authoritative decision making in schools and teachers' perceptions of personal empowerment to make professional decisions in their classrooms (ADM/EMP, r=-.60, p<.01), teamwork among teachers (ADM/TWK, r=-.17, p>.05), and adaptability relative to accomplishing school goals (ADM/ADP, r=-.48, Pp<.01).
Table 5.11

Summary of Bivariate Correlations Among Factored Subscales of the LDI (n=41 schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TWK</th>
<th>EMP</th>
<th>ADP</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

**p<.01

Bivariate Correlations Between the Independent and Dependent Variables

The original design of the study conceptualized leadership density in schools as the dependent variable and elements of school culture and teacher self-efficacy beliefs as independent variables. Therefore, it was of interest to empirically examine linkages between the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) (as a dependent variable measure), and the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-Leadership Density) and the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs-Scale-Leadership Density Form (TEBS-LD) (as independent variable measures). It should be recognized here that these measures, once factor analyzed, consist of several identifiable sub constructs derived from more holistic measures of the variables. Therefore, linkages between leadership density (LDI), dimensions of professional school culture (SCEQ-LD), and teacher self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to
organize and execute courses of action to facilitate the development of leadership density in their schools are multiple and complex.

Table 5.12 provides a summary of bivariate (Pearson product moment) correlations among factored subscales of the LDI, SCEQ-LD, and TEBS-LD measures. For the total number of intercorrelations between the LDI and SCEQ-LD subscales (n=18 correlations), only three were not statistically significant (p>.05). Interestingly, these three correlations between leadership density and dimensions of professional school culture were for the LDI Bureaucratic Structure (BS) subscale. It should be noted here that schools considered strong in leadership density characteristics are schools that have little bureaucratic structure. Thus, correlations with the LDI “BS” dimension shown in Table 14 are generally in the predicted direction. The set of correlations between the LDI subscales and the SCEQ-LD subscales shown in Table 12 ranged in direction and magnitude from r=.76, p<.01 (EMP/VL) to r=-.40, p<.01 (VL/ADM). Correlations between the LDI Vision and Leadership subscale (VL) and the SCEQ-LD subscales showed the most consistently strong correlations. These correlations were all in the predicted direction, and varied from positive and relatively strong in magnitude (r=.76, p<.01, VL/EMP); (r=.71, p<.01, VL/ADP); (r=.52, p<.01, VL/SV); to negative and rather moderate in magnitude (r=-.40, p<.01, VL/ADM). Considered collectively, the intercorrelations among the LDI and SCEQ-LD factored subscales show that the strength of leadership density in schools is positively, and significantly related to teachers’ perceptions of the strength of multiple dimensions of professional school culture.

Table 5.12 also includes intercorrelations between the leadership density (LDI subscales) and teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action necessary to facilitate the quality of leadership density in their schools.
(TEBS-LD subscales). Of 24 possible intercorrelations between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy beliefs shown in Table 14, only nine (38%) were statistically significant (p<.05). However, several additional correlations (n=7), though not statistically significant, were in the predicted direction. When considering the statistically significant correlations, the strongest relationship between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy beliefs was for the LDI Teamwork and TEBS-LD Personal Leadership subscales (r=.59, p<.01). This correlation shows that schools dense in teamwork among teachers, are schools in which teachers actively participate in personal role-taking related to leadership activities.

Interestingly, the results in Table 5.12 show no statistically significant relationships between three dimensions of leadership density (EMP, BS, ADM) and teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs (TEBS-LD subscales). When considered along with the findings for the correlations between leadership density (LDI) and professional school culture (SCEQ-LD), the collective findings shown in Table 12 rather strongly support the original conceptualization of linkages among the variables framing the study.

Intercorrelations between principals’ ratings of their self-efficacy beliefs pertaining to their capabilities to organize and execute course of action to facilitate the development of leadership density in their schools (AEBS-LD) and subscales of the LDI (administered to teachers) were not statistically significant. These correlations ranged from r=.29 to -.09 (p>.05). These correlations are not shown in Table 5.12.

**Multiple Regression Analyses**

A series of stepwise multiple regression analyses was completed in the study by regressing each factored dimension (subscale) of the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) on factored dimensions (sub scales) of the Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire-
Table 5.12

Summary of the Bivariate Correlations Among Factored Subscales of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and the LDI (n=41 schools).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TWK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCEQ-LD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEBS-LD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOL</td>
<td>.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01

Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD) and the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density Form (TEBS-LD) measures. These analyses were completed to examine the extent to which the combination of professional culture and teacher self-efficacy accounted for variation among schools in leadership density characteristics. Of interest in these analyses, was the unique contribution made by each school culture and teacher self-efficacy variable to explaining variation in leadership density among schools, independent of its relationship to the other school culture and teacher self-efficacy variables. In these regressions, school means were used as the units of analysis since the dependent and independent variables were conceptualized and measured as organizational constructs.
Table 5.13 presents the results of a stepwise multiple regression analysis regressing the LDI Teamwork subscale on three factored dimensions of the SCEQ-LD measure and four factored dimensions of the TEBS-LD measure. The regression model identified two statistically significant (p<.05) predictors of Teamwork among teachers in schools. The most important predictor was the SCEQ-LD factor of Professional Commitment (PC) which accounted for 42% of the variation among schools in Teamwork as an indicator of leadership density (R=.65, F=28.16, p<.001). The Personal Leadership dimension of the TEBS-LD accounted for an additional 2% of the variation in leadership density among schools (Teamwork) (R=.67, F=5.36, p<.026). No other SCEQ-LD or TEBS-LD factors made statistically significant contributions to the regression model.

Table 5.13

Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of the LDI Teamwork Factor on Subscales of the SCEQ-LD and the TEBS-LD Measures (n=40 schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PC b</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PL c</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a School means used as the units of analysis.
b SCEQ-LD Professional Commitment Subscale
c TEBS-LD Personal Leadership Subscale

When the LDI Empowerment (EMP) subscale was regressed on the SCEQ and TEBS-LD sub scales, only one factor was statistically significant in the regression model. The SCEQ-LD Collegial Teaching and Learning (CTL) subscale accounted for 58% of the variation among schools in the teacher empowerment dimension of school leadership density (R=.76, F=53.44, p<.001). When the third LDI factored sub scale (Adaptability) (ADP) was
regressed on the professional school culture and teacher self-efficacy beliefs measures (SCEQ-LD and TEBS-LD), the only statistically significant variable to enter the regression model was the SCEQ-LD Professional Commitment (PC) subscale which accounted for 53% of the total variation among schools in the extent to which schools are adaptable as an element of leadership density (R=.73, F=.45.18, p<.001).

In a fourth stepwise multiple regression analysis, the LDI subscale of Student Volunteerism (SV) was regressed on factored dimensions of the SCEQ-LD and the TEBS-LD measures. The results showed that a single SCEQ-LD independent variable (Professional Commitment) (PC) accounted for 42% of the variation among schools in the extent to which students serve as models in making their knowledge visible and sharing their knowledge with others (teachers and other students), as an important element of facilitating leadership density (R=.65, F=28.46, p<.001).

When the LDI Bureaucratic Structure (BS) subscale was regressed on the SCEQ-LD and TEBS-LD factored subscales, no statistically significant relationships were evident between leadership density, school professional culture and teacher efficacy in the regression model.

Table 5.14 provides a summary of the stepwise regression of the LDI Authoritative Decision Making (ADM) subscale on subscales of the SCEQ-LD and the TEBS-LD. Three independent variables were statistically significant in the regression model. The first variable to enter the model was the SCEQ-LD Vision and leadership (VL) subscale. This professional school culture variable accounted for 16% of the total variation in bureaucratic structure among schools (R=.40, F=.7.51, p<.009). The second independent variable to enter the regression model was the Personal Leadership (PL) dimension of the TEBS-LD measure. This variable accounted for an additional 13% of the variation among schools in leadership
density \( (R=.54, F=7.25, p<.01) \). A third variable from the TEBS-LD measure also entered this regression model (Leadership Resilience) \( (LR) \). The addition of this variable to the model increased the multiple correlation \( (R) \) to .63 \( (F=5.97, p<.019) \). The three-variable regression model accounted for a total of 40\% of the variation among schools in leadership density when considering bureaucratic structure characteristics of these schools.

Table 5.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>VL(^b)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PL(^c)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>LR(^d)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) School means used as the units of analysis.  
\(^b\) SCEQ-LD Vision and Leadership Subscale  
\(^c\) TEBS-LD Personal Leadership Subscale  
\(^d\) TEBS-LD Leadership Resilience Subscale

**Canonical Correlation Analyses**

A series of canonical correlation analyses was completed to explore multivariate linkages between sets of leadership density, professional school culture, and teacher self-efficacy beliefs variables. While not specifically grounded in particular research hypotheses and research questions framing the study, these analyses served to better understand the complexities of relationships among various sub constructs of the study measures. Consistent with the conceptualization of variables in the study, the leadership density variables (LDI factored dimensions) were considered dependent variables and the SCEQ (professional school culture) and TEBS-LD (teacher self-efficacy) variables were considered...
independent variables. In each of these analyses, school means (n=41) were used as the units of analysis.

Table 5.15 is a summary of correlational analysis results between the LDI factored subscales and the factored subscales of the SCEQ-LD. The results show two strong, statistically significant canonical correlations between these two sets of variables. For the first significant canonical relationship (Rc=.83, p<.000), the canonical variate for leadership density is most importantly defined by the loadings (correlations) for the ADP, EMP, and TWK subscales of the LDI (.89, .88, .77 respectively). The most important correlate of the first canonical variate for the SCEQ-LD was the VL (Vision and Leadership) subscale (.99). The remaining two SCEQ-LD subscales are also heavily weighted in defining this variate (PC=.89, CTL=.85). The results in column two of Table 17 show cross-loadings for the LDI and SCEQ-LD subscales. The most heavily weighted leadership density subscales in the first canonical correlation (Rc=.83) are the Empowerment (EMP=.74) and Adaptability (ADP=.74) subscales. The most heavily weighted school culture subscales in this first canonical relationship was Vision and Leadership (VL=.83), followed by Professional Commitment (PC=.74), and Collegial Teaching and Learning (CTL=.71). In summary, the first statistically significant multivariate relationship between the LDI and the SCEQ-LD is rather strong in magnitude (Rc=.83) and can be best understood in terms of leadership density factors pertaining to teacher empowerment and adaptability positively linked to school cultures characterized by strong vision and leadership among organizational members.

Also shown in Table 5.15 are the results for a second canonical correlation pertaining to a multivariate relationship between leadership density in schools, and elements of professional school culture. With covariation among the variables reflected in the first canonical correlation statistically removed, a second, rather strong canonical correlation
among the variables was evident ($R_c = .73$, $p < .002$). The leadership density variate in this relationship was primarily defined by the Student Volunteerism ($SV = -.50$) and Empowerment ($EMP = .37$) subscales. The professional school culture variate was primarily defined by Professional Commitment ($PC = -.43$) and Collegial Teaching and Learning ($CTL = -.35$). The fourth column in the table shows that this second, statistically significant canonical relationship is primarily explained by the contributions of student volunteerism and empowerment (leadership density) and professional commitment and collegial teaching and learning (professional culture). This canonical relationship suggests a second multivariate linkage between school leadership density and professional school culture which is largely explained by positive linkages between teacher and student leadership and strong professional commitment and collegial relations among teachers.

Table 5.15

Canonical Correlations Analysis Between Factored Subscales of the LDI and the SCEQ-LD Measures (n=41 schools).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDI Subscales</th>
<th>$r_w^a$</th>
<th>$r_b^b$</th>
<th>$r_w$</th>
<th>$r_w$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWK</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCEQ-LD Subscales</th>
<th>$r_w^a$</th>
<th>$r_b^b$</th>
<th>$r_w$</th>
<th>$r_w$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Correlation of each measurement subscale with its own canonical variant
$^b$ Correlation of each measurement subscale with the canonical variate of the opposite variable set.

Table 5.16 presents results of a canonical correlation analysis between the elements of leadership density in schools (LDI factored subscales) and teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to facilitate the strength of
leadership density in their schools (factored subscales of the TEBS-LD). This analysis generated one rather strong, statistically significant canonical correlation ($R_c = .79$, $p < .006$).

The primary LDI variables operationalizing the leadership density variate were Teamwork (TWK = .76), Student Volunteerism (SV = .65), and Adaptability (ADP = .55). The primary TEBS-LD variables operationalizing the self-efficacy variate were Personal Learning (PL = .92) and Leadership of Learning (LOL = .90).

The cross-loadings shown in the second column in Table 5.16 show that leadership characteristics of Teamwork (TWK = .60), Student Volunteerism (SV = .51), and Adaptability (ADP = .43) in schools are positively linked to the strength of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about carrying out leadership roles as personal learners and as leaders of learning.

Table 5.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDI Subscales</th>
<th>$r_w^a$</th>
<th>$r_b^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWK</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEBS-LD Subscales</th>
<th>$r_w^a$</th>
<th>$r_b^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOL</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Correlation of each measurement subscale with its own canonical variant

$^b$ Correlation of each measurement subscale with the canonical variate of the opposite variable set.
Table 5.17 shows the results of a canonical analysis between elements of professional school culture (SCEQ-LD) and teacher self-efficacy beliefs (TEBS-LD). One statistically significant canonical correlation was evident in this analysis ($R_c=.70, p<.002$). The primary SCEQ-LD factor operationalizing the school professional culture variate was Professional Commitment ($PC=.90$), with secondary contributions by Collegial Teaching and Learning ($CTL=.58$) and Vision and Leadership ($VL=.50$). The most important teacher self-efficacy dimension defining the self-efficacy variate was Leadership of Learning ($LOL=.94$). The next most important self-efficacy variable was Personal Leadership ($PL=.77$). The cross-loadings reported in Table 19 (second column in the table) show a pattern of contributions to the canonical relationship between school professional culture and teacher self-efficacy beliefs that is similar to the loadings in the first column. This multivariate relationship between professional school culture and teacher self-efficacy beliefs shows that teachers' professional commitment is the most important school culture factor linked to the strength of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to carry out tasks reflecting leadership of learning and personal learning (leadership density).

Table 5.17

Canonical Correlations Analysis Between Factored Subscales of the SCEQ-LD and the TEBS-LD Measures (n=41 schools).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCEQ-LD Subscales</th>
<th>$r_w^a$</th>
<th>$r_b^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There is a statistically significant, positive bivariate relationship between leadership density and elements of professional school culture.

Results pertinent to a test of this hypotheses are included in Table 5.12. Correlations between the LDI factored subscales and factored subscales of the SCEQ are all in the predicted direction, and with only three exceptions, are statistically significant. Considered collectively, these findings provide overwhelming support for the first research hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2

There is a statistically significant, positive bivariate relationship between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy.
Results pertaining to the second research hypothesis are also included in Table 5.12. These correlational results are in the predicted direction, though many are not of sufficient magnitude to attain statistical significance given the sample size on which the analyses are based (n=41 schools). Considered collectively, the results in Table 5.12 provide reasonable support for this hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is a statistically significant, positive bivariate relationship between leadership density and administrator efficacy.

None of the intercorrelations between the measure of administrator self-efficacy beliefs and the measure of leadership density was statistically significant (p<.05). This third research hypothesis was not confirmed.

**Hypothesis 4**

The combination of school culture and teacher self-efficacy and administrator self-efficacy, accounts for significantly more variation in leadership density among schools than any of these variables considered singularly.

This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analyses. The results of these analyses were rather mixed, in that some leadership density factors were predicted by single variables reflecting school culture and self-efficacy, and some were predicted by combinations of these variables. The measure of administrator self-efficacy beliefs was not predictive of leadership density among schools. Supplemental multivariate analyses of these variables (canonical correlations), while not specifically designed as a direct test of this hypothesis as stated, showed that, in a multivariate sense, there are complex relationships
dimensions of leadership density in schools, elements of school professional culture, and teacher self-efficacy beliefs.

Considered collectively, these results of these analyses provide some reasonable support for the fourth hypothesis.

**Summary**

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the quantitative analyses performed for this study. It also relates these analyses to the research hypotheses created for this study. Chapter 6 follows with the results of the qualitative case studies as well as their implications.
CHAPTER 6: QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Overview

Case studies were conducted at four schools for this dissertation. Glenn Miller Elementary was chosen due to its reputation as an effective and progressive school. Faith Hill School, Artie Shaw Elementary, and Skipper Elementary were chosen for case study after screening faculty and administrative responses on quantitative surveys filled out at each site. Principal responses for items measuring their ability to initiate and facilitate empowerment of teachers were used to begin the screening process for selected schools because it is believed that principal willingness to delegate authority, allow risk-taking, and facilitate collaborative planning by teachers is essential to the development of leadership density in a school. After screening principal responses, faculty responses were compared for the same items to determine the degree to which the faculty felt they assumed leadership roles, were allowed to take risks, and the amount of collaborative planning that takes place on their campus.

Interestingly, as the case studies indicate, the item responses did not guarantee that school leadership was divested according to the talents and degrees of commitment of the organizational members. However, the results of the case studies did provide insight into ways that leadership density can be created and facilitated within schools, a subject discussed in detail in the conclusion of this study.

Once schools were selected via this screening process, case studies were conducted in an effort to gain a richer understanding of life at these schools utilizing the qualitative techniques described by Yin (1994). Guiding the case studies were the following research questions:
1. How involved are teachers in decision-making regarding teaching and learning?

2. How does the principal perceive his/her role in terms of providing leadership for the school?

3. Does the principal provide leadership opportunities for teachers?

4. Are teachers working cooperatively and collegially towards school goals?

5. Is small group planning by teams of teachers evident?

6. How willing are teachers to step outside of traditional roles to assume leadership responsibilities?

These formal research questions proved useful to understanding the degree to which leadership density was actualized at a school or to the likelihood that it may eventuate at some later point in time. The research questions were useful in helping to determine within each school selected for case study the degree of: a) Strict decision making structures in place and the extent of their use; b) Teacher autonomy; and c) Reliance upon outside sources for instructional directions. Finally, all the information obtained in the case studies contributed to developing a theory of how leadership density emerges within schools.

**Headings Used Within Case Studies**

The sub-headings listed below were used because of the belief that they serve as a useful framework for organizing data collected at each school site. Each case study follows the same general format for ease of comparison between studies. Following is a list of the headings found in each case study:

- **Context Analysis**
- **School Building and Site**
- **School Demographics**
Life at the School

The Principal

The Staff

Principal Self-Efficacy

Teacher Self-Efficacy

School Culture

Leadership Density at the School

Besides these categories which are common to all case studies, circumstances sometimes warranted additional sections of interest at a particular school site. For example, Skipper Elementary had just experienced a review by the District Assessment Team (DAT). Given the central role the DAT may occupy in leadership taking shape at the school, a decision was made to include it the case study of Skipper Elementary

Case Study 1: Glen Miller Elementary

Context Analysis

Glenn Miller Elementary is located on the outskirts of a large city. It is nestled in the rear of a subdivision, and was originally designed to serve students from the surrounding homes. Houses in the subdivision appear to be built during the 1950's or 1960's and are the same approximate age of the school. Typically, the houses are about 1200 to 1400 square feet in living area with average size lots. Overall, the appearance of the subdivision is starting to show signs of age and is now what would commonly be described as a lower middle-class neighborhood.
The school is located at the end of the subdivision and curiously, the front of the school faces opposite the entrance to the subdivision. Consequently, one sees the rear of the school first, no matter which direction it is approached from. A paved parking lot which provides ample and convenient space for teachers and staff is adjacent to the main road leading into the subdivision.

The school campus has a fence that extends along the rear and side of the school. The play area it encloses is well maintained and provides ample room for the school’s students to enjoy recess and physical education. A circle drive in the front of the school provides limited parking for office personnel and one or two visitors. The grounds at the front of the school are tastefully landscaped and maintained particularly well. Overall, a very favorable impression is gained when first approaching the school.

**School Building and Site**

The school site has ample instructional and recreational space to accommodate the school’s current population of approximately 300 students. The school building’s architecture is typical of schools designed and built during the 1950's and 1960's. A striking feature of the building are silo-shaped, exterior supports for the rafters of the auditorium/cafeteria building. These columns bear some resemblance to the Air Force Academy’s Chapel in Colorado Springs and are arrayed in a manner that suggests motion.

The administrative office is located directly in front of the school. It is small, but neat. A work area for school secretaries is adjoined by offices for the counselor and principal on each side. A larger building to the immediate left of the office complex houses the cafeteria, auditorium, and a space for inside physical activity. The cafeteria and auditorium are separated by a partition which can be moved to provide one large open space. There are
three wings of classes which run transverse to the cafeteria/activity building. Between the first and second wings is the library. The final wing of classes is located to the right of the first two wings and is joined to the buildings by a covered commons area. Another small building located directly beside the cafeteria contains a discipline center that is maintained by the school system. Although this discipline center is located on the school campus, it is not a part of the school itself.

Even though the first impression of the school is very favorable, it is obvious once one moves around the school it is beginning to show its age. Badly peeling paint is on walkways and in some interior areas. Exposed pipes for plumbing and mechanical run throughout the exterior and interior of the school, reflecting add-ons and repairs to original equipment. Hall lights are wall-mounted incandescent fixtures which provide minimal lighting at best. According to the principal, the original roof from 1963 has just been replaced within the past six months. Understandably, leaks and water intrusion were common worries prior to the roof being replaced and in the office computers and electrical equipment had to be covered each night to protect from bat droppings. None of these maintenance issues should be considered normal upkeep for school staff. Maintenance chores that are maintained by the school (upkeep of classes, floors, grounds, etc.) were all performed at acceptable levels. It appears that school system maintenance needs to address the appearance of the overall school site in a timely manner because the cumulative impact of the wear and tear at the facility tends to create a depressing mood that is not in character with the efforts of the faculty and staff at the school.

Classrooms in each hall tend to be rather small (approximately 750 square feet), resulting in tight working conditions for teachers and students alike. Each room has a bank
of windows on one side of the room which allow ample natural lighting. The ceilings in many of the rooms show signs of water damage and the light fixtures are rather unattractive flourescent fixtures which hang suspended about two feet below the ceiling. If funds become available, consideration should be given to installing drop ceilings with recessed lighting to improve the overall appearance, lighting and utility consumption within each room.

**School Demographics**

During the past five years, the school has experienced a steady decline in student population from a high of 330 in 1996–97 to a current enrollment of 287. This drop in enrollment appears to be a function of the desegregation court order which has been responsible for changing population patterns in the city. Glenn Miller Elementary is a school that has seen its borders heavily impacted by the court’s edict and this has apparently contributed to an overall decline in student population over the years.

Even though there has been a 13% decline in student enrollment in the last five years, the faculty has only lost one teacher, with 21 currently assigned to the school. Retention of faculty in the face of declining enrollment has created a very low student-teacher ratio of about 13 to 1. Overall, there are 25 total staff at the school, with the principal, two guidance counselors, librarian, and a Title 1 math instructor, making up the balance.

The faculty is 60% White, 36% African-American, and 4% Hispanic. The faculty has 10 teachers (40%) with more than 20 years experience and 28% (7) with 10 to 20 years of experience. Turnover at the school has been low (approximately 1 or 2 teachers per year on the average) and according to the principal, many of the teachers taught at the school prior to court-ordered busing. These experienced teachers, although possessing competent teaching skills, represented a challenge to the principal when she first assumed the job four
years ago because they were far more likely to believe that their students were not capable of learning because of the difficulties facing them within their homes and communities.

During this same five year time frame, the racial composition of the school has steadily shifted towards a one-race school, with 75% of the student body listed as African-American in 1996–97 and 90% at the beginning of the 2000-01 school year. According to the principal, this percentage is even higher as of January 2001, with an approximate African-American student population of 94%. Approximately 90% of the students at the school are on free or reduced lunch (having risen from 74% in 1996–97). Attendance at the school is above average, consistently measuring 96% over a five year span.

Due to the high percentage of students that are on free and reduced lunch, the school qualifies for Title I assistance. These monies are currently being used to fund a math specialist to assist classroom teachers in the development and implementation of effective mathematical practices. There are two pre-K programs located within the school. The first is an inclusionary program which combines Title I students with Special-Education students in an effort to provide peer role models to both at-risk populations. The second pre-K program brings in students as young as two years old. These students have severe or profound disabilities which limit their behavioral, physical, or cognitive development.

About half of the students that attend the school are bused in with the remainder coming from the surrounding houses of the neighborhood. Of those being bused in, a substantial number come from a nearby subdivision that suffers from heightened crime, drug use, and violence.

Teachers noted that parental participation can often be hard to secure. The teachers felt this was not so much a measure of parental apathy but more of a reflection of the high
percentage of single-parent (almost exclusively mothers) families that are served by the school. In the words of one teacher: “We can’t get them to school because they work all day, go home, and work all night there too.”

**Life at the School**

The combination of demographic factors found within this school’s population are generally associated with inner city schools. The principal noted that they continually fight a stereotype from potential patrons of a school expected to be beset by violence, drugs, and low expectations for students. Such concerns appear to be unfounded. Walking around the school one of the first things that becomes apparent is the manner and decorum of the students. It was obvious there are strong norms and beliefs regarding respect and courtesy held by both faculty and staff. For example, students in the lunchroom were friendly and well-behaved towards each other. Teachers were monitoring student behavior, but the atmosphere was informal and relaxed, and both teachers and students alike were able to enjoy their meal. While at recess, students played in small groups which consistently displayed appropriate behavior.

Classroom observations further reinforced the presence of established norms for proper student behavior as students were generally mindful of maintaining a class atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning. When teachers had to take corrective actions in their classrooms, they were able to do so in politely and respectfully. When corrected, students were non-confrontational and obedient.

All classes at the school are self-contained, that is, each teacher has a groups of students they teach throughout the day. An advantage of this system is the lack of hall traffic between classes. However, a potential disadvantage is the huge increase in planning that
falls upon all teachers, particularly at the higher grades where differentiation of curriculum is becoming more pronounced. The principal noted she was actively considering departmentalizing the 4th and 5th grades but that initial endeavors were not favorably received by the faculty. The faculty’s reticence towards departmentalization appears to be related to their collective resistance to move away from the familiarity of their self-contained classrooms (not exactly the kind of reaction one would expect from a small jazz combo). Although the faculty’s reaction to departmentalization was less than enthusiastic, the principal has not given up on the idea and is proceeding slowly towards bringing the matter up again at a later date.

Students typically arrive at the school about 8:00 a.m. (30 minutes before take-in). All students are provided free breakfast and nearly all students eat their breakfast at school. The few students that do not eat breakfast go to the auditorium where they are monitored until it is time to report to class.

Teachers report to school at 7:45 a.m. and use this unencumbered time for team meetings. Normally teachers meet twice a week, once by subject matter and once with fellow grade-level teachers. According to the teachers, grade-level meetings are used to plan inter-curricula projects, assess and critique each others teaching strategies, discuss students and their needs, prepare for standardized exams, and occasionally, to just vent. Subject meetings are used to assess what is being taught and how it is being taught so that students are able to have smooth transitions from year to year. One teacher noted that conversations about year-end testing occupy a greater portion of subject meetings than grade-level meetings, particularly for those that teach math and language arts. All teachers indicated there is an increasing pressure upon them from the State of Louisiana’s new high-stakes test.
(LEAP 21), and the pressure to up the school performance score is requiring a larger and larger block of their instructional time, activities, and strategies.

The Principal

Before visiting the school, it was first necessary to obtain permission from the central office’s Accountability Department. I was told to expect a principal that was enthusiastic and professional. These descriptors seem to all be accurate as indicated by the following example.

This is currently the principal’s fourth year at the school. She arrived to a faculty that, in her words, was “stuck in their ways” and “saw no need for change.” Historically, the school had once enjoyed a reputation as being one of the best elementary schools in the city. However, as busing emerged and changes in the demographics of the school’s population occurred, the school went into a phase of declining enrollment, teacher morale, school culture, and climate.

Upon the principal’s arrival at the school, it had been classified by the parish as one of the poorest achieving schools in the system. Teachers were convinced that their students were bringing overwhelming disadvantages with them to school which prevented substantial student learning from occurring. Additionally, many of the teachers at the school were trying to use the same instructional methods they had used when the school’s clientele did not have as substantial a percentage of at-risk students.

In order to create a new vision for the school, the principal held a “funeral” upon her arrival. Teachers were told to wear black and to prepare to mourn at the first faculty meeting held under her administration. Naturally, this rather strange request created a sense of
anticipation and tension in the faculty. Although teachers were not sure why they had been requested to wear black, they all obliged the principal.

The faculty meeting where the funeral was held began with teachers brainstorming all the reasons why their children were not learning. Single parents, no parents, crime in their neighborhood, etc., were quickly generated by the teachers. Once a composite list was generated, the teachers were instructed to bring their reasons why students had not been learning up to a coffin where they were buried and mourned for the last time.

The simple act of burying long-held beliefs about limitations of the school's student body had the profound affect of crystallizing for teachers their role and mission. According to the principal, teachers quit moaning about their students' lack of educational preparation and began to emphasize what could be done at the school to improve student learning. Importantly, the principal reassured the teachers that they were not to blame for the problems that students brought to school with them. This recognition by the principal of the obstacles the teachers faced was very helping in beginning to establish a school-wide belief that teachers are responsible for those things they have control over, (e.g., preparation for and implementation of effective teaching and learning opportunities). By focusing teachers on what they could do to affect positive change the principal was able to overcome the defeatist mind-set that had managed to permeate the school's culture before her arrival.

The principal felt very good about the staff as individuals and as a collective unit, although she did identify a couple of teachers she felt could improve. Through frequent walk-through observations she is able to stay abreast of what is happening in each classroom as well as communicate to teachers and students alike her high value for education. A teacher noted that teachers feel very comfortable in working with the principal while two
other teachers added that most of the staff goes to the principal with questions regarding instruction or lesson construction. The principal indicated that she constantly reminds her teachers that she is first and foremost a teacher who happens to be principal. This statement was corroborated by several teachers that repeated the same phrase and gave instances where the principal had come in on their request to perform a lesson.

The principal indicated the school’s staff has a high degree of latitude in decision making at the school. However, a source of frustration this year has been the issuance of top-down mandates (certainly not much small jazz combo leadership here) from the central office regarding curriculum and its implementation. For example, teachers have received mandates this year that are very explicit in their demands for what material to use and when to use them to prepare students for high-stakes testing. The principal viewed these central office mandates as unnecessary examples of micro-management and found them to heighten teacher stress while lowering morale.

Even though the intentions of the mandates are understood, both the principal and the staff have met these mandated instructional requirements with little enthusiasm, feeling that they detract from strategies already proven successful for improving student performance at their school. Instructional strategies such as use of inter-curricular units and emphasis upon concept development are being squeezed out of available instructional time as teachers strive to cover these checklists of skills. Instead of focusing upon concept development and mastery learning, teachers now feel they are required to teach skills in isolation and to test each skill to mastery (as measured by system mandates of up to three retests for each skill).
These school board mandates appear to act more as impediments than helpful aides for teachers to facilitate instruction of students. The principal commented that teachers were informed they must have documentation for these checklists available at all times as they were subject to verification by school board personnel. Although much was made over teacher accountability to the mandates, the principal indicated many teachers were yet to see anyone from the central office regarding the checklists and those few that had been visited indicated a broad variance in the importance of the required activities. This lack of follow-up from the central office regarding the mandates has served to heighten teacher beliefs that the mandates are neither necessary nor useful.

Even with the less than enthusiastic reception of the mandates and the poor follow-up by the school system regarding their implementation, the principal indicated that teachers are still attempting to follow the directives, if only in appearance. She noted that teachers are able to produce documentation for their lessons that indicates they are adhering to the mandates prescribed by the central office but they resent having to do so. These externally generated impositions upon faculty and staff seem to have caused far more problems than they solved. Lack of commitment to the mandates has created a less than enthusiastic response from the faculty and principal alike. Furthermore, the unspoken message of these mandates tells the teachers that their decisions for school improvement were not valued nor adequate. By dropping the mandates into the lap of the school, the school system sent a clear message that teachers are either incompetent or uncaring. Finally, the whole exercise is grounded in, as the principal stated, a “one size fits all” mentality that ignores the individual needs and talents found at each school site as well as ignoring Fullan’s (1993) admonition that you can’t mandate what matters.
If one were looking for a way to squelch the development of leadership density it would be hard to find a more effective means than that employed by the central office. Clear vestiges of an orchestral mentality, where conductors tell musicians what to play and when to play it are present in the central offices well-intentioned but misguided efforts at assuring all students are prepared for high-stakes testing.

Another serious impediment to the school’s efforts to improve teaching and learning also came in the form of another central office mandate. At the beginning of the year all principals were given scripts which address preparation for high-stakes testing. Each principal was then informed they were to read the scripts verbatim to their respective faculties. These exercises have been met with not a small degree of incredulity by the principal and staff alike. The principal mentioned she “makes the best of it” and “I do what I have to do” but clearly there was frustration at what was seen as unnecessary interference by the central office in the school’s efforts to improve learning. “If they would let us do what we feel works and then hold us accountable that would be one thing,” said the principal. “All that’s happening right now is that limitations are being created in the disguise of school improvement.”

Even with the problems that have accompanied the top-down mandates, the principal still tries to be a catalyst for change. “We have been using tests to look at our strengths and weaknesses and we brainstorm often to see what needs to be done. Sometimes these sessions produce ideas that require me to run interference for teachers...to free them up so they can work without interruption.” For example, the principal commented that the teachers are supposed to be following rather tightly scripted curriculum guidelines. According to the principal, these guidelines are often out of alignment with the educational strengths and
weaknesses of children at Glenn Miller Elementary. When teachers feel that their own plans better meet the needs of the children the principal “takes the heat” when central office personnel inquire about teachers following prescribed mandates.

The principal remarked that team meetings are held regularly, both by grade and by team. The main focus of these meetings is ... “to make sure we’re meeting the needs of our students.” These meetings have served an important role in creating teacher awareness of the need for their leadership efforts in the school, according to the principal. However, she was uncertain how the new mandates have affected teacher belief regarding their leadership roles saying: “A year ago I think they would have said their role is central in getting children to where they need to be. But, now I don’t know.”

Even with these reservations, the principal commented she sees many opportunities for teachers to get involved with instructional decisions, noting such things as team meetings, inter-curricular planning, cross team meetings, and the like as examples. One particular benefit observed by the principal in giving teachers opportunity to provide leadership is the sense of faculty cohesion and support it has fostered.

Faculty input was not something the previous principal at the school fostered. According to the principal, she inherited teachers who felt their role was highly dependent upon principal direction. In effect, teachers were taught to ask the principal, “Tell me what you want?” This centrist approach to leadership resulted in low teacher participation in leadership decisions and squelched teacher involvement in problem-solving at Glenn Miller Elementary. Metaphorically, teachers were session musicians. In much the same way that session musicians are hired to play the arrangements they are given, teachers were expected to do what they were told.
Now, the school has more of a collegial atmosphere and consequently teachers are more involved with instructional decisions. The principal feels this has allowed her to move away from a highly centrist role in leadership. Now she feels one of her most important functions is to serve as a source of encouragement and to facilitate the provision of supplies, research, and funds to the teachers. Another benefit of the collegial relationship found at Glenn Miller Elementary has been the creation of a collective sense of excellence which the principal feels permeates the school and the entire faculty. Without high faculty collegiality and cohesion, the principal felt that “We’d just be shutting our doors and each teacher doing their own thing.”

Another benefit of the high level of faculty cohesion found at the school was the manner in which disagreements were handled. When disagreements occur between the principal and staff, the principal indicated she feels comfortable in addressing her concerns to the faculty member(s) involved. “Sometimes we don’t see eye to eye. If it is a policy issue, I try to go look, this is mandated and I want to protect you but policy requires us to do it this way.” This type of approach, where concern for the individual is expressed along with a rationale for the decision seems to work well for the school and has helped to strengthen teacher beliefs that what they say really matters.

The principal (and several teachers) commented that a rather large area of disagreement had come up recently regarding procedures used to allow children to go on field trips. Until recently teachers did not allow students to go on field trips if they did not receive a conduct grade of “B” or “A”. The principal felt strongly this policy should be reviewed, since many of the children had never been on a field trip during their entire time at the school. After much discussion (and no consensus), the principal made an
administrative decision and announced a new field trip attendance policy. She believes that two teachers were opposed to her decision to do this, but they respect the reason why it was done and their support for her was not diminished by the disagreement.

When discussing disagreements, the principal spoke in terms of family, stating that “all families disagree.” Even with the field trip disagreement, which she identified as the strongest difference of opinion so far between the faculty and herself, the principal indicated there has never been an occasion where the professional or collegial relationships has been damaged. In fact, she expressed a strong belief that mutual honor and respect between the faculty and herself would rule out the degeneration of disagreements into petty bickering.

The principal indicated that one of the school’s main strengths is a commonly held belief that all children can learn. She pointed out the school collectively fashioned its own mission statement and it had the commitment and support of the faculty. “There are no barriers, there may be issues” was her comment regarding impediments to learning. She did not mean this in a naive fashion, understanding full well that many of her school’s students come from severely disadvantaged backgrounds. Rather, she was stating that the school can help to overcome these deficits through high levels of commitment and perseverance towards student success.

Reflecting upon the staff’s own beliefs, the principal indicated that prior to her appointment, the more experienced teachers had drifted into a malaise where they felt powerless to combat the impediments to learning that were occurring outside the school. The belief that “we don’t make a difference” was rather systemic upon her arrival and, as stated earlier, was a driving force in the school’s mock funeral for the excuses why the school can not educate those that it serves. Now the principal feels there is a strong commitment across
the faculty that, regardless of experience, what is done at the school can help all the students
to learn.

In general, the principal’s observations and comments were congruent with those of
the faculty. In fact, much of what the principal said about the faculty was virtually repeated
in the faculty’s assessment of the principal. A high degree of collaboration and collegiality
appears to exist between the principal and the staff and much of this can be traced to the
principal’s commitment to providing a quality teaching and learning environment for the
children of the school. Additionally, the principal consistently provides opportunities for
teachers to stay involved with critical decisions regarding teaching and learning. Finally, the
principal values the contributions of the faculty and strives to communicate their worth to
them as evidenced by teacher’s noting their high level of feeling appreciated by the principal.

The Staff

A common theme the staff uses to describe itself is family. Teachers at the school
felt the small size of their faculty was an advantage which allowed them to create bonds and
friendships among themselves which would be impossible in a larger faculty. For example,
one teacher had the tragic experience of a suicide in the family last year, and teachers
remarked how it had become a rallying point of support from the entire faculty.

A strength common to all classrooms observed was the value teachers and students
alike placed upon maintaining an atmosphere conducive to learning. With the exception of
one beginning teacher (a 665 certificate in her 2nd semester), every teacher maintained an
atmosphere which fostered respect for each other and emphasized the importance of the
lesson. This was undoubtedly the most striking positive aspect observed in classroom
observations and seems to be a function of the faculty truly believing the school's mission statement that all children are important and can learn.

Classroom observations revealed three wide-spread circumstances that created obstacles to the instructional effectiveness of the teacher. Part of this variance seemed to be a function of trying to provide accommodations for 504 students. For example, in one 5th grade class, students were taking an exam which was being read aloud by the teacher. However, many students were able to move much faster than the teacher was reading, requiring her to tell several students that "I am not to that page yet". Since it took over 25 minutes to read the test (about 15 items), there was a disproportionate lag time between the questions of some students and their ultimate resolution. And, while it took over 25 minutes to read the test, one student finished the exam in less than 5 minutes.

Another reason for the variance in teacher effectiveness seemed to be the rather overwhelming task of preparing and implementing seven well-designed lessons per day. Reliance upon handouts was frequent in classes observed and students were having mixed bags of success with their assignments. Teachers were aware that students were faltering (on-going monitoring of student progress was generally acceptable) and they would stop to work with students they saw were having trouble. But, these efforts required a great deal of instructional time which prohibited meaningful input and/or discussion with the class at large.

Finally, trying to manage activities that were being filled up with a great deal of one-on-one individual instruction and simultaneously staying upon a posted instructional schedule was very hard. This is not to say that the daily instructional schedule should be viewed as "sacred." But, there was a clear sense of being hurried and rushed on the part of
all observed teachers, with teachers often telling classes they were behind schedule and needed to hurry to complete the assignment so they could move on.

These problems, although substantive, did not preclude learning from taking place in the individual classroom, although its effectiveness was diminished. Each class had a strong culture that helped to buffer the effects of what could have been much worse problems. If the students in these classes would not have been so consistent (along with their teachers) in their efforts to learn, real chaos may have resulted.

Observational evidence of classroom teaching practices at Glenn Miller Elementary resulted in a question emerging from the case studies that was not originally included in the research questions for the dissertation. The question of "What are the attributes of an effective classroom?" was introduced to the case studies as a means to get teachers to reflect upon the adequacy (or lack of it) of their long-term planning. Interestingly, when teachers reflected upon the attributes of an effective classroom they agreed that most of the attributes were highly correlated to meaningful long-term planning while admitting that the majority of their planning was focused on day-to-day issues and activities. The lack of teacher planning for long-term instructional goals is believed to have a major impact on teachers' abilities to realize the attributes of an effective classroom in their own educational settings. Because of the importance of this issue, it will be included in all other case studies conducted for the dissertation and a separate section will be developed at the end of all case studies to address this question.

In a follow-up conversation with the principal about the instructional practices at Glenn Miller Elementary she agreed that teachers effectiveness was lessened by having to plan for seven lesson plans per day. She noted her efforts to move towards
Departmentalization would help alleviate some of the planning overload. Furthermore, she agreed that was the implementation of 504 accommodations may be done in ways that could facilitate long-term planning. Finally, the principal commented that the use of a resource such as Wong's *The First Days of School* (a practical handbook for teachers) as a teaching guide for producing lessons which incorporate meaningful long-term planning might prove beneficial.

When teachers were asked to comment regarding how involved they were in decision-making for teaching and learning they all replied their level of involvement was high. Several teachers noted that the principal was very good about “running up trial balloons” to see what initial response might be to an idea. Teachers indicated they like this, that it made them feel their opinions were worthwhile and valued.

As with the principal, it did not take long before the subject of the system’s mandated checklist came up and it became clear that the faculty and the principal felt the same way about the mandates. Several teachers commented that the check-list was “too much work” and “the time expended does not balance with the results achieved.” And, teachers noted that although the checklist was supposed to be objective it was not. They cited a lack of consistency both in how school board personnel reviewed the lists and the degree of fidelity maintained by those filling out the lists from within the system.

Two teachers noted they had received children this year from other system schools with wide discrepancies in the manner in which the lists were filled out. Additionally, a portfolio is supposed to accompany each student’s checklist as documentation a skill has been mastered. These portfolios also varied widely in their maintenance, leading one teacher to conclude that “a 94% in one school may not be anything like a 94% in another.”
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Apart from the system mandates, teachers were positive and upbeat about their degree of participation in leadership decisions at the school. “We’re involved a lot” and “Even when a decision has been made we can talk to her” were evidence that teachers felt they could provide input to the principal regarding their ideas and concerns about teaching and learning.

Teachers spoke glowingly of the principal and indicated several times that she was a source of inspiration for students and faculty alike.

- She models behavior for us that she wants us to model for the kids;
- She’d live here if they let her (referring to the time spent at the school by the principal);
- She can never retire;
- She’ll come into class and do a demo if we need it—I like that;
- She always reminds us that she is a teacher first; and
- She wants to see us be successful as much as the students.

Remarks such as these were quite common from the teachers in regards to their principal. Furthermore, the teachers were all well aware that the principal spends a great deal of time after hours at the school working with individual students on tutoring or catching up on paperwork. One teacher remarked “She sets the tone that we all strive to follow.”

Teachers echoed the principal’s belief that all students can learn, making this a common theme of their conversations. Many teachers extended learning beyond traditional schooling and commented that they “are concerned about more than just how much the student knows” and “I feel like a mother to them” bringing to mind Huebner’s (1990) description of teaching as a moral activity.
A very important role of the principal, according to the teachers is to buffer them from unnecessary interruptions. Teachers felt the principal was very effective in this role and several remarked they had been in meetings where the principal had skillfully mediated a discussion towards a conclusion. Also, many teachers noted that the principal was constantly on the lookout for worthwhile lessons and that the principal would often search for a worthwhile unit or lesson plan if the teachers requested.

The faculty took great pride in their collegial relationship, referring to themselves over and over as family. “We’re a lucky school” said one teacher with another echoing “Oh, aren’t we.” A teacher with over twenty-five years experience at the school observed that “We’re like family and I know from friends at other schools that is not the way it always is.” Teachers agreed with this assessment and noted that from time to time there had been one or two new hires that had not fit in with the beliefs of the faculty. “They work like family or they leave” remarked one teacher. Another commented that “Where we have seen animosity, they’re gone.”

Teachers noted that they had worked with the principal to develop a mission statement for the school. One teacher noted the statement can be summed up in the statement “Every child can succeed.” This belief was exhibited by one teacher who often went on weekends and nights to visit students, even when the student was not one of hers. She often does this because she has overheard other teachers talking about problems that are occurring with a child. This type of “realistic optimism,” where teachers recognized the need to maintain high levels of commitment, enthusiasm, and perseverance was a common thread in teacher conversations.
When teachers were questioned about disagreements they immediately alluded to the field trip decision. One teacher was blunt: “I believe the decision was wrong, but I can live with it.” Others noted that the principal often makes administrative decisions on policy but tries to leave instructional decisions to the collective wisdom of the faculty. This feeling was reinforced by one faculty member who remarked “She allows us a lot more input than I’ve seen in other places” and that she “…felt important and part of the decision-making process at this school, unlike other places I’ve taught.”

Overall, the faculty exhibited high levels of collegiality and professional norms. There is a cohesiveness to the teachers and this extends to their relationship with the principal also. Teachers emphasized their commitment to their students and were consistent in their belief that they were making a difference in their lives. No animosity was observed either between teacher to teacher or teacher to principal, even when candid areas of disagreement were being discussed.

**Principal Self-Efficacy**

Throughout observations of the principal she consistently demonstrated a high degree of belief in her abilities to help create and facilitate a school environment and culture where all students are valued and can learn as evidenced by her frequent comments on the subject. Furthermore, the principal held a strong belief in her abilities to communicate and model for teachers how important it was for the staff to believe students are valuable and that all can learn.

Self-efficacy has a profound impact upon the amount of energy one is willing to expend on a task and the degree of perseverance one will commit to for the completion of that task (Bandura, 1997). Staying after school to work with students, modeling sound
teaching practices for teachers, working to find lesson plans that are effective, scheduling teacher conferences after normal hours and exhibiting a consistent, and maintaining a positive outlook regarding the job and its responsibilities are all evidences which strongly suggest the principal has high levels of personal self-efficacy for the roles she undertakes in an ongoing effort to improve teaching and learning at the school.

The greatest task facing the principal upon her arrival was the reculturing of the school so that the norms, values, and beliefs were student-centered and inclusive of all students. Given the demographics of the school and the existing beliefs of teachers that the school was in decline, this was no small task. Four years later, the principal still exhibits high levels of enthusiasm for the job and has managed to precipitate a significant shift in faculty values and beliefs. These changes would not be possible without a strongly grounded belief in one's abilities to accomplish these tasks.

Now, as the tasks of leadership shift from those of crises (i.e., the malaise of the faculty) towards those of style and form (i.e., What are effective ways to improve education at the school? How much leadership should teachers assume regarding teaching and learning? What are useful metaphors to govern our ongoing efforts at school improvement?), a very different set of tasks await the principal. There does appear to be a strong belief on her part that teachers are integral parts of the decision-making process for teaching and learning. In this regard, she is mapping on to the small jazz combo metaphor and is expecting teachers to “play their own music” and the need to see all the possible ways of playing it.

Clearly, teachers are open to assuming leadership roles but to what extent they might extend these roles is still unclear, particularly in light of the stifling impact of the system.
dictating how, what, and how much to teach certain skills. To what extent the staff and principal's efforts ongoing efforts to produce a highly collaborative and collegial working environment may depend on one central point—future school scores on the high-stakes exams administered for school accountability.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy**

Like the principal, the teachers have shown a high degree of individual and collective belief in their ability to perform at a high level of expertise regarding the creation and facilitation of an effective teaching and learning environment over the last four years. Evidence of how the faculty currently feels about their abilities in this area was established when teachers were asked to what extent they believed that a school is only as good as its principal. There was agreement that the school had improved since the principal had arrived, but they also pointed out that the faculty has always stuck together and, as one teacher remarked: "We're going to push it as far as we can to make the kids successful."

When asked about the school's environment prior to the principal's arrival, there was general agreement among faculty present at that time that conditions at the school are far better now than they were four years ago. It may be that the beliefs of the teachers were not being actualized four years ago because the prior principal and staff had developed a much more hierarchical relationship where, as stated earlier, the principal fostered a "tell me what you want" approach from the faculty. This type of leadership, where goals are generated externally does not tend to facilitate positive self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). However, when the new principal arrived and actively solicited teacher buy-in and input to the goals for the school, it is quite possible that teacher self-efficacy beliefs for the tasks necessary to create a quality teaching and learning environment were enhanced and subsequently acted
upon. At any rate, the teaching staff currently holds an established system of beliefs that they can provide a quality teaching and learning environment for their school and that all children can learn.

**School Culture**

Students were continually referred to by both the principal and the staff in positive tones and conversations about student achievement centered on what the kids could do rather than what had not been done. Such a positive outlook is indicative of a strong school culture that values and respects students as individuals. Teachers also spent much of their unencumbered free time in conversations about students, even in unstructured moments such as the cafeteria (where, for example a teacher and an ancillary person were discussing strategies for addressing the needs of a student).

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that there are strongly held beliefs at the school regarding student learning and the value of each individual student was the overall classroom atmosphere found at the school. Classroom observations consistently demonstrated student behavior that was respectful of others as well as the importance of an education. Students were polite and well-mannered to each other in the classrooms and this type of behavior was also seen on the playground as well. Such behavior is reflective of well established norms for the importance of the students at Glenn Miller Elementary.

A notable area where a rethinking of norms, values, and beliefs would be helpful is in the delivery of instruction. Although teachers demonstrated high levels of concerns for their students’ learning and well being, classroom instructional practices did not appear to be well suited to facilitating learning for all students, at least at the observed levels of 4th and 5th grades. Classroom observations revealed consistent patterns of pacing within classrooms.
that did not allow for the stronger students' abilities. Typically, much time was devoted to working with students in the middle to lower levels of ability. Greater planning for effective instruction which increases levels of student engagement, addresses differing learning styles, and allows for more effective pacing of the lesson is needed.

An impediment to this type of planning occurring appears to be the multiple preparations that teachers are currently engaged. Limiting teacher preparations would serve multiple purposes. First, teachers would be able to spend more time per preparation in meaningful planning for information rich lessons. Second, teachers would have an easier job of time management during the day. Third, teachers would not need to rely so heavily upon hand-outs and finally, teachers would have greater opportunity to team teach and/or devise lessons which crossed curriculum.

From a cultural standpoint, this may be an area where the principal needs to strive to build a consensus for the need to make changes in the school's methods of instructional delivery. Glenn Miller Elementary teachers know that the principal is dedicated to facilitating an effective teaching and learning environment and they value her experience and expertise. If a clear rationale was created which articulated to teachers the instructional advantages of limiting teacher preparations as well as rethinking how instructional effectiveness could be increased it is believed that the results would be productive.

**Leadership Density**

Given the existence of a strong, supportive school culture, faculty members with high degree of belief in their ability to create and facilitate an effective learning environment, and a principal that shares these beliefs, it is certainly reasonable to suggest that leadership density exists at the school. This is done however with a caveat. Currently the predominant
metaphor which is driving the school appears to be “the faculty and administration as family.” This particular metaphorical conceptualization of leadership suggests that the principal might be expected to act as the parent and the teachers as the children. This suggestion is, in fact, evident in several of the descriptions of how leadership plays out on the campus.

- “The principal sets the tone;”
- “She has a very strong personality;”
- “She’ll let you know what she’s thinking;”
- “WWTPD?” (What would the principal do?); and
- “Hers is the final say . . .She doesn’t do it often but she will tell you how things will be done.”

None of these statements should be taken as negative. Most were made in the midst of glowing praise for the principal. If they were looked at from a small jazz combo perspective, they might be akin to what someone playing with Duke Ellington, Miles Davis, or Dave Brubeck might say if one of these accomplished musicians suggested a different way of playing something. In other words, respect for the ability of the performers would lend tremendous credibility to their suggestions. I’m not sure that the teachers see their relationship with the principal in this light though. Instead, it seems like the teachers believe that a principal sometimes must tell the faculty (in a superior/subordinate fashion) how things should be done.

Glenn Miller Elementary has made substantive progress in the move towards increasing leadership density. Given the fact that only four years ago the school appears to have operated under a leader-centrist framework where teachers were told what to do, there
has been great progress towards creating greater levels of leadership density. It appears that
the school's principal has operated in a manner that would be highly consistent with the
attributes ascribed to a transformational leader (Leithwood, & Jantzi, 1999; Leithwood,
Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999). Her ability to guide constructive change has been central to the
school moving towards greater leadership density. What appears to be needed now for
leadership density to move towards its metaphorical grounding in small jazz combo is a
careful analysis of what metaphors are currently driving efforts for school improvement.

Given Lakoff and Johnson’s (1981) argument that metaphors play a key role in our
cognitive processes, the staff of Glenn Miller Elementary would be well served to evaluate
what metaphors best describe current conditions for how leadership plays out as well as to
investigate what might be the next appropriate metaphor in the development of leadership
density at the school.

It does seem clear that this particular school has many of the components in place to
effectively distribute leadership to those on campus that have the needs, expertise, and
commitment to make decisions which can ultimately improve teaching and learning on
campus. Whether it will ultimately reach a small jazz combo perspective for its leadership
decisions is unknown at this time. What is known is the school system's attempts to mandate
to teachers a top-down, hierarchical, one size fits all instructional model is likely to impede
or obstruct completely any future shifts towards leadership density at the school. And, one
must include the accompanying edict for the principal to read to the teachers from a prepared
script during professional staff development as another obstacle to further development of
leadership density on the campus.
That the four years of Glenn Miller Elementary's faculty and staff diligent efforts to rethink and re-energize teaching and learning can be easily undone by top-down system mandates or over reliance upon high-stakes tests is testimony to the fragility of school cultures that support leadership density. Schools operating in a high leadership density mode are likely outside of the traditional cultural norms for the style and substance of school leadership and therefore more prone to being scrutinized and ridiculed. If, for example, Glenn Miller Elementary actively embraces a small jazz combo metaphor for leadership and experiences a drop in its SPS for the state accountability program, the principal's "failure to maintain administrative control" might be used as a scapegoat. Subsequently, the school may experience pressure from patrons (unlikely) as well as the superintendent (much more likely) to rethink the way the school is operating. The implications of this will be developed in the concluding chapter of this dissertation.

A summary of the major findings for the case study at Glen Miller Elementary is provided in table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1

Summary of the Major Findings for Glen Miller Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
<th>Metaphor for Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>The faculty's view that the principal is &quot;one of them&quot; (family).</td>
<td>Mock Burial, School District's Mandates for School Improvement</td>
<td>big band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study #2: Faith Hill School

Context Analysis

Faith Hill School serves a small, rural community. The community is not incorporated, and is approximately twenty miles from the closest city. The school is located on the single highway which passes directly by the school site. Grades K-8 are housed at the school. To provide a broader contextual basis, the school’s junior high grades (7th and 8th) were selected for this study.

In many ways, the school and the school community are throwbacks to perhaps thirty-five years ago. Families within the school’s attendance zone are almost exclusively white, a fact reflected in the school’s 98% white population. About 50% of the student body is on free or reduced lunch, the lowest percentage for any of the four schools selected for case study.

The community is comprised primarily of blue collar workers, many of whom have family ties to the area that go back many years. Although there is ample land available for new growth, little change in population has occurred over the past twenty years. Essentially the community is a self-sustaining, sub-population within the parish and the parish school system, with few people moving in or out of the area.

School Building and Site

The school is small, housing 325 students in grades K – 8. With main construction taking place in the 1950's, the school is divided into several small building which house the various grades. Kindergarten and lower-grade classes are housed towards the front of the school with the upper elementary and junior high classes located towards the rear. The school’s cafeteria is at the rear of the school.
When driving up to the school, which is about twenty-five yards of the highway, one enters a limestone parking lot which is utilized as a bus drop-off point, parking lot, and commuter drop spot. “Visitor Parking” signs are posted at the front of the parking lot and there is a short walk up a concrete walk to the main office. To the right of the office is a gated, fenced area where faculty and staff park. The fence extends to the rear of the school where 20 acres are fenced in, providing ample space for a recreation area for students as well as physical education classes.

The office is small, but sufficient to house the school’s single secretary, the principal’s office and a guidance counselor. The office has a door which opens into the first complex of rooms and covered walkways connect each set of rooms to the others. Overall, the school is in fairly good repair, particularly given its age. Rooms for kindergarten and lower elementary students are original construction. These areas are due for general renovations, particularly with regards to floors and painting. Also, the restrooms that serve this area of the school could also use renovation and new fixtures. The buildings occupied by the 7th and 8th grades are more recent additions and are in better repair.

**School Demographics**

As previously noted, the school is practically a one-race school (98% white student body). Even though the school is located in one of the fastest growing parishes in Louisiana, its population has remained fairly constant over the past 10 years, with a gain of around 40 students over this period of time. Overall, there are 23 teachers at the school, with the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, and librarian making up the remainder of the faculty. Like the student population, the faculty is also nearly all white, with one African-American teacher at the school.
The 7th and 8th grades are served by eight teachers. Both grades have two sections of each subject and as a result, students are basically scheduled in blocks throughout the day. Upon completion of the 8th grade, students at Faith Hill School are bused approximately 10 miles to a high school in a small, neighboring town.

**Life at the School**

When students arrive at the school in the morning they either proceed to the cafeteria to eat breakfast or they segregate by hall to their classrooms to play and socialize until the bell rings. Play space for grades is segregated into elementary and junior high areas.

The 7th and 8th grade students are essentially blocked into two sections of each class. Given the small class counts, teachers have ample opportunity to become familiar with their students' learning styles, needs, and so forth. Unlike a larger school, where principals typically set a master schedule, teachers at Faith Hill School determined their own class rosters, based primarily upon the staff's individual knowledge of the students and teacher assessment of which students would be best-matched to respective teachers.

Since the school is on a 6 period day, the junior high teachers have 5 classes and one unencumbered period. Currently, teachers do not hold team meetings on a regular scheduled basis, mainly due to the lack of dedicated time for this purpose. However, the teachers noted that they stay in close contact with each other and are familiar with what is going on in each teacher's class.

**The Principal**

The principal of the school is now in his second year at the school. He is in his mid 30's and is enthusiastic and articulate. He noted that the school was not in disarray when he arrived, thereby making his job and any efforts to undertake school improvement less
frantic, and the means to implement improvement efforts less direct. He is quickly establishing a reputation as a competent administrator, receiving praise from the system’s superintendent for his job performance. Prior to becoming the principal at Faith Hill School, he worked for 11 years as a high school teacher within the school system. His first administrative job was as an assistant principalship at a large secondary school. His responsibilities as assistant principal were those often associated with the position (i.e., discipline and student affairs).

The first impression upon meeting the principal was favorable. He was personable, outgoing, dressed professionally, and quick with a smile. This first impression proved to be consistent with his regular demeanor. Students often spoke to him as he moved through the halls and he always responded in kind. It quickly became apparent that the principal’s perspective of his job embraced Sergiovanni’s (2000) call for moral leadership. There was a consistent emphasis upon humanistic values when the principal interacted with students and faculty alike.

In many ways, the principal displays the characteristics of a charismatic leader (i.e., articulate, dynamic, and self-assured). Such attributes might be expected to create a heightened dependency of sorts from those within the organization towards the “gifted leader.” This tendency has already been actively short-circuited by the principal himself. He has purposefully gone about quietly allowing/cajoling teachers into making decisions that heretofore they had no access. For example, prior to his arrival at the school teachers had little to no input into the scheduling of students. Understanding that the teachers were capable of matching faculty members with students needs and abilities, the principal
involved teachers in the scheduling process and eventually gave them plenary power over the master schedule.

By actively encouraging teachers to assume leadership roles they had previously been excluded from, the principal began a systematic process of letting teachers know they were valued and their contributions were vital to the operation of the school. This faith in the teacher’s abilities was accompanied by high expectations. For example, at the end of last year teachers were asked to dissect the diagnostic information that accompanied the IOWA Tests and to come up with instructional strategies which addressed areas of weakness within the school’s profile. According to the principal, he told the teachers, “We’re not looking for blame, we’re looking to improve. You people are the key to improvement occurring.”

Coupling improvement efforts with teacher expertise created a two-fold effect. First, teachers actively assumed a leadership role in deciding how teaching and learning was to occur in the school. Second, these leadership roles could have been mandated by the principal. But, he understood correctly that mandates do not involve teachers in leadership decisions.

By the principal placing trust in the teachers’ abilities to effectively address their students’ needs, the teachers were given a clear signal that decisions would not be made from a centrist, top-down perspective. Furthermore, by staying intimately involved with the ongoing decisions that were made, the principal felt he established a standard of commitment to the task that teachers would recognize and ultimately follow. In essence, the principal was modeling an expected level of performance and was leading by example rather than from position or authority.
Another example of the principal’s efforts to establish high professional norms for the teachers was evidenced in his approach to discipline. At Faith Hill School, all discipline is referred to the principal. Although this may seem that the principal is exhibiting mistrust in the teachers’ abilities to effectively manage their classrooms, this does not appear to be the case. According to the principal, he feels that the small size of the school allows him to handle all disciplinary matters, which in turn frees teachers from having to take time away from classroom instruction to personally handle a disruptive student.

Even though teachers do not handle discipline in their classes, this should not be construed to mean that they are not responsible for maintaining an environment which facilitates student learning. Students that cause minor disruptions are still within the domain of the teacher. However, clear boundaries have been articulated to teachers and students alike regarding what types of behaviors will warrant disciplinary intervention from the principal. For example, a student who is rude and disrespectful will receive an office referral. Or, students who fail to follow teacher directives will be referred to the office.

Without the benefit of seeing teacher/student and principal/student interactions at Faith Hill School, it would be possible to infer that the school is heavily rooted in external and coercive control of student behavior. This, however, is not the case as evidenced by high levels of student enthusiasm in and for their classes as well as healthy rapport between the principal, the faculty, and the students. While students were in classes they demonstrated a relaxed, friendly attitude towards each other as well as their teachers. This pattern of behavior was repeated during class transitions and non-class activities such as lunch and recess. There is ample evidence that Faith Hill School has developed a school culture that values mutual respect between faculty and students and proper student decorum.
Even with the well-established norms for student behavior, the principal is aware that the school’s discipline policy can act like a two-edged sword. For example, if effective instruction is not occurring on a regular basis, then it is likely that some referrals may be a reflection of poor preparation on the teacher’s part rather than a function of willful disobedience. But, given the school’s small size this is not likely to be a chronic problem. The principal correctly noted that he can scan his entire faculty in less time than many principals within the school system could check on one grade level. This fact alone should be sufficient to minimize teacher abuse of their freedom from disciplinary activities.

A systematic means of determining how consistent teachers are in creating and facilitating an effective learning environment will be a priority for next school year, according to the principal. He noted that, “I haven’t been in classes as much this year as I need to be, and that has been mostly by design. I’ve tried to send teachers a clear message that they are valued and trusted. They needed a chance to get to know me, who I am, what I believe. Now we need to move towards balancing the faith held in teachers with the responsibilities that are attached to the faith.”

Continuing with this line of thought, the principal stated that:

Next year we’ll begin to address the relationship of faith and responsibility. That process was started to some extent this year through the constant communications I have had with the junior high teachers regarding LEAP and IOWA tests. These tests have really become a source of stress for teachers, and I have tried to be very supportive because I know how hard each teacher is working here at the school. Teachers have felt threatened by these tests from almost the beginning of school. The fact that they never were far from their minds served to provide motivation for
teaching and learning to occur, although I am very concerned that the teaching and learning that is occurring may not be what students really need to become successful later on in life. My concern is that we might become so focused on scores that we narrow the curriculum to the extent that it becomes virtually meaningless. Also, there is no way we can keep raising our scores. Can’t happen. To use the tests as an incentive is a sure-fire way to induce teacher burnout. We will try to address all these issues beginning next year.

These thoughts demonstrate that the principal is highly aware of and concerned by the threats high-stakes testing poses to staff morale and productivity. The principal clearly perceived that school culture could suffer from excess emphasis upon high-stakes tests and has tried to reassure teachers that they are valued professionals who contribute valued expertise. Certainly his conscious effort to stay outside of his staff’s classrooms for the first year was a calculated risk. However, it appears to be a reasonable one if his assessment regarding the prior administration’s low priority for teacher input into leadership decisions at the school is correct. The principal believes the small size of the school has allowed him the luxury of assessing, albeit at a level lower than he ultimately wishes, the abilities levels of commitment within his faculty. Furthermore, he believes the teachers at Faith Hill School have greatly benefitted from his outward expression of trust and will be more willing to actively investigate ways to improve teaching and learning through the subsequent years as a result.

Although the principal was not familiar with the concept of self-efficacy, he intuitively understands the importance of each teacher believing they can create effective teaching and learning atmospheres. For example, through verbal persuasion the principal has
repeatedly reminded the faculty that they are high-performing, competent professionals. And, when the principal asked teachers to dissect last year’s IOWA and LEAP 21 scores, he effectively empowered teachers to create and successfully complete meaningful enactive mastery experiences which Bandura (1997) indicates is the strongest means of building self-efficacy for a task.

A large amount of time spent in conversation with the principal was aimed towards the future. As the principal’s second year at the school concludes, an emerging list of needs is developing for staff and school improvement to occur. The school is about to rethink and rewrite its mission statement and will use this process to try and crystallize some of the changes in leadership patterns that have been created. The principal is committed to a mission statement that notes the importance of facilitating student learning, yet states that its genesis is primarily a domain of the faculty. “I want them to really believe what they say” the principal noted regarding teacher generation of a new mission statement for the school. “A good mission statement will serve to galvanize our faculty into a mind set that prioritizes student learning as our most important, but not exclusive function as a school.”

Another recognized need is providing teachers with a regular and recurring time for planning, team meetings, and professional staff development (all important to the development of leadership density). To create this planning time, and to offer students a wider choice of classes, an investigation is beginning into the possibility of going to an 8 period day for the junior high. If implemented, teachers would teach six hours and have one of their off hours designated for professional staff development. The principal commented, “I’m not sure how we’ll create more teacher planning yet, but it needs to be done. I like the idea of expanding the curriculum through an 8 period day but I’m not sure we have enough
staff to pull that off. However, there are other options we’ll be looking at to give teachers a professional planning period.”

Statements such as those regarding the need for planning, future plans for school improvement, and evidence of changes currently implemented (e.g., teachers self-scheduling their classes) attest that the principal is open to creating and facilitating a non-centrist form of leadership at the school that has much in common with the small combo jazz metaphor and leadership density. He has actively embraced teacher leadership and demonstrated faith in the faculty’s collective and individual abilities to solve problems. Furthermore, his long-term plans for the school actively embrace teacher participation in leadership decisions.

The Staff

Given the principal’s enthusiasm for the staff at Faith Hill School, I was anticipating an enthusiastic, dedicated group of teachers. This expectation was heightened when the principal informed me the teachers would be willing to meet forty-five minutes before school started to conduct interviews. My initial expectations were correct. All teachers were present and prepared for the interview before the actual meeting time (One teacher came forty-five minutes early in spite of 7 year old triplets). Immediately, a sense of staff enthusiasm and rapport towards the school and between each other was felt.

I asked the teachers if they noticed a difference in their roles in the time since they had worked with their current principal. Comments were quick. “Oh yes!” “Teamwork with staff and students is really emphasized.” “The principal is more like a coach than a principal. He pumps us up. He’s always asking us what we think and including us in decisions.”
Teachers indicated they enjoyed having opportunities to participate in decision making. Particularly, they felt strongly that their ability to make their own schedules had worked both to their and the students’ advantage. “We know which students we can work best with” commented one teacher. “By allowing us to work out our schedules the principal has demonstrated faith in our ability and judgement. And that’s a good feeling.”

A point of disagreement was created when the teachers tried to decide if a school is only as good as the principal. “I don’t think that’s true” said one. “Well, yes it is” said another. “If the principal doesn’t work with you and support you then good things don’t happen.” Another replied, “That’s true, but I kind of took that to mean that the principal forces us to do our jobs. He doesn’t know what we are doing when we close our doors. It’s up to us to do a good job of teaching.”

Upon further probing, it became apparent that the points of view expressed about the role of the principal were not necessarily dichotomous. Those that disagreed with the statement that “a school is only as good as its principal” emphasized their own personal commitment to their jobs. Those that agreed with the statement honed in on the principal’s job capacity to help create positive change. Importantly, no one was thinking of the principal as the sole vehicle through which school improvement is achieved or to whom ineffectiveness should be assigned.

Teachers felt an important role played by the principal is to provide support and motivation for the faculty. “Our principal really sets the tone for our school and that’s infectious” was offered as evidence of the principal’s role. Also, it was mentioned that the principal manages, supervises, and provides help with discipline. When teachers were asked to decide the main role played by the principal, they returned to support. In the context of
this conversation, support meant several things: communicating with parents, obtaining materials for teachers, running interference with parents, working with discipline, and giving suggestions to improve instruction were all mentioned in the context of support. From this perspective it is clear the teachers view the principal as an active partner in the school's efforts to improve instead of seeing him as "the instructional leader," "the orchestrator," or other centrist type descriptions of principal leadership.

Classroom observations of the teachers revealed classroom climates that were supportive of an effective teaching and learning environment. All classrooms observed resonated with cooperative and congenial tones. Students and faculty alike exhibited behavior that was indicative of an overall school culture which valued learning as well as student social development. However, as with Glenn Miller Elementary, observations in classrooms suggested that lessons are being impacted by teacher planning. Specifically, planning for classroom activities which accommodates the varying levels of ability within the classroom and actively engages all students in meaningful activities is needed. This point is further articulated in a special section at the end of all case studies.

An interesting aside was observed about the impact of high-stakes testing on classroom practices. Observations at Faith Hill School were made about one week after the conclusion of the administering of LEAP 21 to the 8th grade students and IOWA tests to the 7th grade. In particular, 8th grade teachers noted that their students were worn out, and that the pressures of high-stakes test preparation had created a need for a time of decompression. One teacher noted that, "They're tired, stressed, and relieved all at the same time. We have consciously taken some time in classes to let them recover. In the next few days, we'll begin to get back into the swing of things." Perhaps the most interesting comment made about
LEAP was, "Now that it is finished and I don’t have to worry about preparing for it I’ll be able to do lessons that both I and the children enjoy."

Using these comments as guides, it appears that high-stakes testing may be stifling highly divergent teaching styles, at least at Faith Hill School. With the onus of high-stakes testing in front of them, teachers indicated they tended to resort to lessons that are straightforward and highly representative of the teacher’s best guess for what the high-stakes test will cover. These high-stakes test appear to inhibit teacher creativity and self-confidence in their ability to design lessons that can simultaneously prepare students for high-stakes testing and be creative.

Oppression of risk-taking during times of crisis is not specific to the teaching profession, nor is it a new phenomenon. American businesses often speak of creating work environments that foster creativity, collaboration, and innovation – until profits start to drop. As soon as that happens, there is often a knee jerk reaction to short-term market conditions. Top-down mandates increase, leadership becomes more centrist, and reforms which are supposedly such a high priority to the organization are quickly disassembled (House, 1998).

High-stakes tests appear to pose the possibility of squelching creativity and innovation in teaching in much the same way that sinking profits cause businesses to rely upon organizational structures already found lacking. Teachers at Faith Hill School, under the stress of accountability, are not taking steps towards doing the types of classroom activities that foster rich and meaningful learning (i.e., activities that create enthusiasm for learning). These types of activities are often open-ended and require students to frame reasons for their actions and rationale for problem-solving. Innovative risk-taking of this sort is not to be expected in an environment that is going to be judged for its effectiveness by an
instrument that is grounded in predetermined pieces of testable knowledge. Thus, teachers at Faith Hill School are approaching preparation for high-stakes tests much differently than the lessons that, "...the children enjoy."

Principal Self-Efficacy

The principal voiced strong belief in his own abilities to contribute to creating and facilitating an effective school. He noted that his efforts up to this point in regards to beginning a journey of school improvement have all been based upon his conviction that what the school has undertaken is worthwhile and achievable. Furthermore, he expressed a very strong belief in the abilities of his staff to accomplish these goals. From his perspective, the teachers are central to the school’s efforts to improve and their beliefs are the key to whether they succeed or not. He explains, “I know this school has good teachers. The key is to utilize their talents so that we get the best product we can.”

I asked the principal if the teachers feel as strongly about their potential as he does. “Probably not,” he said. “They are not used to thinking of themselves as being the true leaders of the school. They still see me as the person responsible for the school. That’s true to a point, but what I want them to internalize is the fact that they are the ones that really make things happen around here. We’re getting there. But there is still a belief that what happens in one classroom isn’t connected to all the others. We’re working on that.”

Commenting on what he believes his most important role is, the principal replied that he was a motivator, facilitator, and to some extent an overseer. He expressed a strong belief that his biggest job was to help teachers realize their potential, and that he would be successful in this endeavor. Conversations with the principal continually looped back to the recurring themes of teacher potential and the ability of teachers to make a difference.
Throughout these conversations, he maintained a strong belief in the abilities of the teachers to create effective teaching and learning environments as well as his ability to facilitate their progress. When weighed against the substantive steps that have already been initiated at the school towards rethinking the role of teachers in creating an effective school, these statements provide supportive evidence that the principal maintains a strong belief system in the ability of all those within the school organization to achieve school goals.

A specific example of the principal's personal beliefs in his ability to work towards creating productive change is his relationship with a teacher at the school. The teacher is the only African-American teacher on staff at Faith Hill School. When the principal first assumed his new job, he found their relationship to be cold and distant. "She didn't trust me," he said. "She wasn't willing to open up until she was sure that I was not a threat to her."

According to the principal, it took all his initial year at the school and much of his second to begin to establish a relationship with the teacher. Through many small, informal conversations and by purposefully working to let the teacher know she was valued and appreciated, the principal was able to break down the barriers between the principal and himself. "It would have been easy to give up and blame her for not opening up to me," he commented. But I could understand and appreciate her concern. A new principal can be a big deal, and she just wasn't sure how it impacted her. She wasn't trying to be difficult, she just wanted to make sure that I wasn't trying to be difficult either. Once it became evident that my intentions were good, she opened up to me and we now share a high degree of respect and trust."
**Teacher Self-Efficacy**

The faculty at Faith Hill School exhibited a high degree of belief in their abilities to facilitate student learning. To a person, teachers were emphatic in focus interview that they make a difference in the lives of their students. Many comments accompanied this announcement. One teacher remarked, “We all have a high degree of commitment to our students.” Another said, “Our job is to help our students. Failure is not an option.”

The small size of the school seemed to strengthen teacher beliefs regarding their ability to facilitate student learning. A teacher noted that, “We get to know these kids really well. As a result, we have a better chance of using their strengths and improving their weaknesses in our classrooms.” The teachers also spoke about their ability to persevere through difficult times in their classrooms. They agreed that the cohesion that existed within the faculty allowed for a sounding board to other teachers when difficulties arose and that teachers were willing to help each other when difficulties arose. One teacher remembered how others had helped grade papers when she had been sick for a few days so she would not be overwhelmed.

The principal’s enthusiasm and commitment to the staff and students at the school seemed to facilitate teacher self-efficacy for the facilitation of student learning. Teachers remarked that the principal had a high degree of faith in their abilities and that his high expectations were motivating. By moving away from a centrist, hierarchical chain of command the principal invited teachers to be active participants in school improvement. When these inactive mastery experiences (Bandura, 1997) were successful teacher self-efficacy was heightened along with levels of commitment and perseverance. Furthermore, by modeling expected behavior and continually supporting and motivating the staff the
principal was enhancing teacher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). By internalizing the setting of goals, the principal increased teacher belief that they would be able to achieve the desired results. Finally, the successful efforts of the teachers led to a positive vicarious experience, the final source of self-efficacy cited by Bandura (1997). Although the principal had never heard of self-efficacy, he instinctively created an environment that is quite congruent with current research on ways to create and facilitate positive self-efficacy beliefs. So far, the results appear encouraging.

**School Culture**

The combination of teacher willingness to assume leadership roles, teacher enthusiasm for teaching, as well as principal support and encouragement would all be expected to lay the foundation for a supportive and professional school culture. This expectation was corroborated on several different levels.

First, students consistently demonstrated respect for peers, teachers, and the importance of learning. Classroom observations revealed established patterns of expectations for students. Students were attentive and respectful in all classes observed. They engaged learning activities at reasonably high levels, and there were consistent demonstrations of high student commitment towards their own learning. Outside the classroom, students were social and respectful. There was no evidence of bullying, intimidation, or harassment between classes, at lunch, or recess. The principal confirmed that these types of incidents are low in frequency with only a handful of such events occurring this year. Overall, the student-to-student environment on the campus was indicative of a school culture that places value and emphasis upon respect for others. And,
the behavior of students in their classrooms provided substantial evidence that students were responsive to the school’s efforts to provide quality learning opportunities.

Second, teachers exhibited a belief in the value of, and their own contribution to, their students’ cognitive and social development. Students were made to feel an integral part of the classroom. They were treated with respect by all teachers during case study observations. From the classroom observations, focus interviews, observation of life on the campus, and the testimony of the principal it was clear that the teachers had a personal commitment to the students that extended beyond the job descriptions of a teacher.

The cultural norms that exist within the junior high faculty at Faith Hill School appear to be positive. Teachers were enthusiastic about sharing ideas and strategies, lending assistance to fellow faculty members, and taking on new roles and responsibilities. Furthermore, this spirit of cooperation and collegiality has helped to create an atmosphere that the teachers describe as practically “bicker free.” The high degree to which these professional norms are upheld is strong evidence of a healthy, supportive culture within the junior high faculty.

Third, the principal consistently demonstrated values and beliefs which were consonant with observations conducted at the school. He was available to students and faculty and mindful of maintaining a positive attitude. He modeled respect to all on campus, and was genuinely concerned with problems of students, faculty, and support personnel. The principal has played a major role in the school’s ongoing quest for school improvement through his personal efforts to create and facilitate a collegial, professional, supportive school culture.
Leadership Density

The principal at Faith Hill School shows many traits of a strong, transformational leader. He commands great respect from the faculty, has formulated a clear action plan for school improvement, understands the value of involving teachers in decision making, and is working to further empower teachers in leadership decisions which involve instruction.

A positive factor in the speed of transformation at Faith Hill School is its small size. The size of the school has allowed for a quick transition to occur between the outgoing principal and the current principal. And, when the current principal took immediate steps to insure that teachers understood they were critical to future school improvement efforts, it took very little time for most teachers to buy in to the changes. That it took so little time is not surprising. Since the school is located in a small, somewhat out of the way community, these somewhat specialized conditions might cause one to expect a high degree of homogeneity in teacher attitudes (either good or bad). This proved to be the case at Faith Hill School. Teacher attitudes towards school change and their role in its actualization were fairly consistent, allowing for a rather rapid introduction of the principal’s agenda for school improvement.

Faith Hill School has, or is in the process of developing many of the attributes which would be expected in a school with high leadership density. The principal employs a non-centrist perspective of leadership with many of his beliefs meshing quite well with the small jazz combo metaphor for school leadership. Also, the principal has placed much emphasis upon developing and nurturing strongly held beliefs that teachers are important and their contributions are important to their students’ cognitive and affective development. These
actions have helped to nurture a strong, supportive, professional school culture as well as strong teacher self-efficacy beliefs for their abilities to facilitate student learning.

It will be of some interest to see how next year unfolds at the school. Specifically, what will the teachers’ response be when a systematic effort is made to gauge the actual progress being made towards the school’s primary goal of facilitating student learning. Will there be an erosion of enthusiasm on the part of teachers as the principal begins to visit their classrooms with increased frequency? It is certainly possible. It appears that the principal has a sufficient grasp on the need to continue to facilitate productive staff morale that he will effectively incorporate classroom visitations as another piece of the school improvement puzzle being solved at the school. If teachers buy in to principals visitations and see them as validating the importance of their roles in facilitating student learning then a significant event will occur. Namely, teachers will begin to rethink traditional beliefs regarding the near sanctity of their rooms and their own personal autonomy within their classrooms and begin to envision their classrooms, metaphorically speaking, as performances to be watched and enjoyed.

If this shift in beliefs occurs, it will be a cornerstone in Faith Hill School’s move towards higher levels of leadership density that are typified by the small jazz combo metaphor. At present both the principal and faculty appear capable and willing to continue to explore ways that leadership can be divested throughout the organization. Of interest will be the extent to which these leadership tendencies hold over time.

A summary of the major findings for the case study at Faith Hill School is provided in table 6.2 below.
Table 6.2

Summary of the Major Findings for Faith Hill School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
<th>Metaphor for Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Transformational and charismatic with vision of teachers assuming leadership roles.</td>
<td>Principal's faith in the faculty.</td>
<td>Newly Appointed Principal (2nd year)</td>
<td>Big band, with elements of small jazz combo possible in short-term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study #3: Artie Shaw Elementary

Context Analysis

Artie Shaw Elementary is the only elementary school (grades K – 5) for a town of approximately 1500 residents. It sits just off of the main highway next to the senior high school. The town itself is nestled beside a river which is quite popular for recreational use. Camps around the river have typically been used as small, weekend type residences. However, the town and surrounding area have experienced a recent influx of wealth as expensive housing developments have cropped up along the river, offering waterfront property and the lull of quiet, country living. This influx of new residents to the area may soon impact the school’s demographics.

At present about 350 of the school’s 471 students is on free or reduced lunch. Additionally, the school has an African-American population of just below 25%. Both of these percentages rank near the top for their respective categories when compared to other schools within the system. Children currently attending the school tend to come from families that have lived in the area for several years to several generations. The principal conservatively estimated that 60% of the children at Artie Shaw Elementary parents attended the same school when they were children.
School Building and Site

The school's location is very attractive. Large, moss-covered oaks ring the campus, providing a true old-south ambience to the grounds. The school is situated on approximately 15 acres of land, all of which is fenced and well maintained.

The school shares a limestone parking lot with the high school. This lot is located directly outside the fenced grounds of the school. Once buses arrive in the morning, the school secures both drive-through gates to eliminate car traffic on the grounds. Parents and visitors park in the adjacent parking lot and enter the grounds through a gate located directly in front of the school office.

The most prominent feature on the campus is the new library, located to the right of the office. The library has room for approximately 60 students and has an ample supply of books for the school's population. Due to a grant, the school has procured high-quality video production equipment which the students use to produce a weekly news program. During construction of the library complex, six classrooms were also added. These classrooms became necessary when the area schools had to absorb middle schools students that were once bused to a co-community middle school. This middle school was closed due to asbestos contamination, requiring both communities to redesign their school facilities and grade clusters to accommodate these students.

Besides the library complex, the school consists of four sets of classroom buildings, a small office complex located in the front and center of the buildings, and a small cafeteria located behind the office. Each wing of classrooms is connected via covered walkways so students can move around campus during inclement weather. Except for the new wing behind the library, all other classes have doors that open to the outside. Each wing houses...
clustered grades of students and the space between each wing serves as a recess area for these respective grades. Adjacent to the office is a temporary building which houses special education classes.

Each wing of the school is in good shape: fresh paint, floors in good repair, and adequate lighting were observed throughout the school site. Also, the school building had recently been renovated with a blue, metal roof, matching the school’s colors and adding a pleasant touch to the school environment.

The grounds of the school were very well maintained, with attractive landscaping decorating the main entrance to the school grounds as well as various areas throughout the site. The grass was freshly cut and the fence surrounding the school was free of weeds. Overall, the school makes a very favorable visual impression and projects a sense of an inviting, open atmosphere to students, faculty, and parents alike.

**School Demographics**

Currently the school has a population of 471 student in grades K– 5. Although there has been a steady increase in school population, it has been smaller than other portions of the school system. This slower rate of growth is primarily due to the area being located in a rural area with the closest city approximately 20 miles away. As stated earlier, there is some building activity in the area due to the town’s proximity to a scenic river and the interstate.

At present the school staff consists of a principal and a principal designee while the faculty is comprised of twenty-four regular education teachers, two special education teachers, two pre-kindergarten teachers, and a speech therapist. Most of the teachers that work at the school also live in or near the community. The school’s physical education
teacher is the only male teacher on campus, causing the principal to remark that she wished she had more males that could serve as positive role models for the students.

Although the school has one of the highest percentages of African-American populations in the parish, the school has no African-American teachers. The principal explained that when teaching openings occur she has looked, with little success, for African-American candidates to fill the positions. Her depiction of the lack of African-American candidates for teaching positions within the school system was confirmed by two sources. First, the Director of Personnel for the school system noted that when the system goes to interview prospective graduates at neighboring colleges there is a paucity of black candidates that decide to interview. Second, the Director of Personnel for the school system stated that the Parish Job Fair has never attracted many African-American candidates either. This was corroborated by the system principal who hosted the job fair last year. He said that out of the 250 job candidates that showed up for last year’s job fair only a handful were African-Americans. There are several factors which contribute to the low level of African-Americans seeking jobs in the system: the parish has a low percentage of African-American population, the hierarchy of system level and school level leadership in the system is almost exclusively white, and the parish still retains vestiges of earlier times when it was considered a local stronghold for the Klan.

Many of the school’s students are from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, a fact reflected in the 74% figure for free and reduced lunch. Due to the high number of students on free or reduced lunch, the school qualifies for Title 1 assistance. Staff at the school commented that the lower SES students have a higher degree of behavioral and academic problems in their classes. According to teachers, many of these lower SES students qualify
for special education services, have low parental involvement and support in their education, have been retained at least once, and comprised the bulk of the students not passing the LEAP test last year. The principal noted they are concerned because of the probability that accountability will increase the chances of failure and retention for a substantial portion of these students. If this occurs, the principal indicated the most likely result would be that these students will give up on school and drop out as soon as they are legally of age to do so.

To address the possibility that most of the potential failures in Artie Shaw Elementary will come from disadvantaged backgrounds, the principal indicated she has worked diligently with the staff to identify at-risk students, ascertain their needs, and formulate plans which address shortcomings and enhance student learning. This strategy is being implemented within regular classes and by regular teachers as much as possible because the staff believes the regular education learning environment is the most conducive to facilitating successful academic outcomes in this at-risk group. According to the principal, students that are identified as potential failures are monitored closely throughout the year and receive extra instruction in areas where academic progress is below average.

Artie Shaw Elementary’s 1999 baseline school performance score (SPS) on the LEAP test was 79.1, giving the school a rating of “academically acceptable.” Last year’s scores showed marginal improvement with an overall SPS of 79.8. The principal indicated that the SPS scores might be close to a ceiling and that future target growth rates may be unattainable. She observed that teachers are already working at maximum capacity and that they have nothing left to give. She also observed that the curriculum was narrowing down each year as the high-stakes tests exert their pressure on what to teach and how to teach it. “Unless we begin at Day 1 teaching the test, I don’t see how we can keep improving
indefinitely. To think that we’ll have twenty straight years of growth is utterly ridiculous.” Attaining and maintaining these scores is creating high stress levels among teachers as they are doubtful that they will be able to meet the growth targets set out in state law. The principal also commented, “Wouldn’t be ironic if we were marked as a ‘school in decline’ yet our scores were higher than most schools in the state?”

Expanding on the problems with the high-stakes accountability program, the principal noted that the LEAP test is supposed to be criterion referenced but the criteria are so all-embracing that they are hard to address. She suggested that the benchmarks which teachers use to prepare for the exam are very broad and sweeping and create high degrees of uncertainty within her faculty about their overall effectiveness in preparing students for the LEAP tests. “It’s very hard to condense a year’s worth of instructions into 35 test items. The fact that the LEAP test does this creates large amounts of fear and anxiety in teachers and students alike.”

**Life at the School**

Observations conducted at the school were specifically conducted with the teachers of 4th and 5th grades. These observations were supplemented with observations of the students at recess, lunch, and in transition between classes. Data collected during these times indicated students were well-versed in routines and procedures regarding expected behavior while on campus. This attention to detail (e.g., how to line up quickly and quietly, how to proceed to lunch, proper decorum at recess, etc.) served a useful function in setting proper guidelines for students both in and out of the classroom. Teacher observations consistently documented established levels of classroom decorum that were conducive to teaching and
learning. Classroom observations indicated that students worked quietly with little prompting from the teacher and that they were quite effective at self-policing themselves.

Outside the classroom, students were also mindful of maintaining proper rules of decorum. In particular, students were quite well behaved while eating lunch in a cafeteria which can only be described as undersized. With a full compliment of students in the cafeteria, there is barely room to walk down the main aisle between tables. In much the same way as stewards work the aisle in an airplane, student workers from the neighboring high school roll a trash cart down the aisle where students placed their trash from their meals. Before leaving the table, students would take all of their uneaten food out of the bowls and rake it onto their tray. Then, they would deposit their fork in a small basket on the end of each table. The tray was then taken by the student to the rear of the cafeteria where they emptied the trash and stacked the tray.

Without the students’ willing cooperation towards compliance with the school’s lunch rules and procedures, and given the lilliputian scale of the cafeteria, lunch may have been more akin to disaster. That was not the case. Watching students happily eat a meal in such cramped conditions while also tending to general table manners was simultaneously a tribute to the children and the staff and was documentation of a diligent effort by both to maintain acceptable levels of behavior.

Transitions between classes were also accomplished with a minimum of disruption. Class schedules were designed with a minimum of movement required. Typically, students only walked a room or two before they reached their next class, eliminating long and possibly disruptive movement between classes. Teachers were waiting at their doors, facilitating a smooth transition.
Recess was taken in groups. That is, the 4th grade had a recess area that was separate from the 5th grade. The groups played in small but adequate areas and each group was monitored by at least two teachers. Once again the manner and decorum of the students indicated their knowledge of and compliance with established procedures and routines.

Observation of classrooms provided corroboration for an emerging trend in the first two case studies which was also documented when data was subsequently collected for the fourth and final case study. Every classroom observation conducted at Artie Shaw Elementary documented teachers that were diligent and professional in their efforts to provide a quality teaching and learning environment. For example, lesson plans were evident, students knew their assignment, teachers were actively implementing the lesson plan, and classroom management was acceptable in all cases. In short, the teachers were working hard at the business of teaching and students were somewhat involved in learning.

The term “somewhat involved in learning” is used because the same phenomenon that had been observed in the earlier case studies emerged at Artie Shaw Elementary as well. Specifically, there was a lack of systematic planning that centered upon criteria for an effective lesson. Metaphorically speaking, small jazz combos have yet to emerge. At present, teachers are spending a great deal of time on day-to-day activities (like a musician might play scales as a daily warm up) with less time spent on activities which would create and facilitate opportunities for students to engage lessons at their own particular levels of skill and expertise. Due to the pervasiveness of this phenomenon in all schools selected for qualitative analysis, a separate section at the end of the case studies will expand on and analyze possible causes for this shortcoming, ways to address the problem, and implications for practice.
The Principal

This is the principal’s second year at the school. Prior to her appointment, she served as the assistant principal for the town’s middle school for several years. Altogether the principal has worked over twenty years in the town’s schools as a teacher, assistant principal, and finally principal.

The initial meeting with the principal set the tone for the entire observation. When we first made contact, she was outside the office answering questions from teachers about the recently completed high-stakes tests. From the conversation, it was apparent the teachers had a great deal of respect and value for the principal’s input. This initial impression was borne out through the principal’s interactions with other staff on campus. Teachers were quick to update the principal on events in their classrooms. In many ways, the principal was treated more like a peer rather than a figure of authority, suggesting that the faculty was not strongly tied to an authoritative and centrist view of their principal.

Stressing the importance of empowering teachers was a high priority for the principal. She noted that her primary roles were to oversee, facilitate, and coordinate the strengths of the faculty and that all of these roles required teacher input if she was to be successful. When asked if she viewed herself as the final authority she said, “I am an equal.” According to the principal, “Teachers at Artie Shaw Elementary are fellow experts in education.” Given this collegial mind set, the principal does not see a need for leadership that is highly bureaucratic. In fact, the principal noted that if she attempted to make leadership decisions that are currently made by teachers she would probably create conditions that would hurt staff morale and be less effective.
Further delineating the school's non-centrist approach to leadership, the principal commented that the statement "A school is only as good as its principal" was incorrect. "No, definitely not. One person does not make or break an organization." According to the principal, teachers in the school are viewed as leaders or future leaders.

Expanding on her view of leadership, the principal commented that each teacher possesses certain qualities of leadership. Therefore, if the collective leadership abilities of the staff are effectively utilized there is more leadership ability available to the school than if leadership decisions were being made by only a few people. Since teachers are viewed as potential sources of leadership, the principal indicated that it is expected of staff at the school that they take leadership responsibilities upon themselves.

By allowing and expecting teachers to assume leadership within Artie Shaw Elementary, the principal demonstrates a strong faith in her teachers' ability and commitment to making sound leadership decisions. Furthermore, the high level of trust in teachers to make responsible and productive decisions places large amounts of responsibility upon the teachers' shoulders. It was no surprise then when the principal remarked that the teachers at the school feel they make a huge difference. "These teachers often work with students that come from homes where education is not really valued. The parents may talk about how important an education is, but they do not spend time with the students actually working to improve their weaknesses. Without the influence of our teachers I fear many of these children would never graduate from high school.”

According to the principal, in her two year tenure there has been consistent movement towards non-centrist leadership. However, the principal felt staff reaction to her leadership would have been much different if it had been measured last year. "When I became principal
I was not as willing to share responsibility as I am now,” she said. “I was walking into a new job with a group of people that I really did not know. I was cautious as to how much authority I relinquished and I was very cautious who I gave it to.”

An area of particular concern for the principal was teacher adherence to policies and requirements for due process of students. The principal explained that it became clear to her upon assuming the job that students, particularly in areas of discipline, had not been given adequate due process. By correctly understanding that lack of due process could open the school and/or its staff into litigation, the principal addressed a shortcoming of pressing importance. Furthermore, by allowing students an opportunity to express themselves the school began to rethink its culture due to the fact that respect, courtesy, and attention to student needs were all being modeled in a consistent fashion by faculty and staff alike.

Besides discipline, another area of concern was record keeping. Teachers were not mindful of the need to keep accurate records, often using white out to mark over grades or not keeping attendance up to date. Viewing these shortcomings as being symptomatic of a broader issue (i.e., the lack of teacher knowledge regarding legal issues), the principal set about to address shortcomings in school procedure which could also serve as effective object lessons to show how teachers can buffer themselves from possible litigation. Besides helping teachers to protect themselves against litigation, the principal’s actions sent a clear message to the teachers that they were valued and worth protecting.

Originally the direct leadership style of the principal towards changing procedures on campus created an atmosphere of apprehension among the teachers. The principal noted that she was requiring some things to be done differently and/or more thoroughly. When this happened, some teachers became a little defensive because they were believed the changes
were directed specifically towards them and were reflective of their being in disfavor with the principal. A few of the more experienced teachers that had been at the school several years even worked in subtle ways to subvert the new policies and procedures.

When the principal realized that there may be a festering resentment towards changes being made, she called a faculty meeting where, in the words of a faculty member, “She laid it on the line.” Teachers described the principal as very passionate about the school’s potential and the need for everyone to stay positive. This faculty meeting appears to have been a pivotal moment in the principal’s tenure at Artie Shaw Elementary. Teachers commented that the faculty meeting provided compelling proof that the principal was highly dedicated to the students and faculty of the school. They also noted that the principal made it clear that professional disagreement was fine, but further actions which attempted to undercut school policy in an unprofessional manner were not going to be tolerated. The staff commented that faculty meeting was important to helping establish strong bonds of commitment and trust between the principal and staff.

The principal’s strong display of loyalty and dedication towards her staff facilitated a sense of team-building and cohesion. Teachers understood that changes were being implemented to bring about improvement in the school’s overall operation and some changes, such as due process, were being made to support instead of criticize the staff. When higher staff cohesiveness developed, the school’s faculty began to rethink and reshape their values and norms in light of the principal’s simultaneous support and expectations. As reculturing occurred, the principal was able to appreciate the faculty’s willingness to become actively engaged in working towards the creation and facilitation of an effective learning environment for the children at the school. Ultimately, this willingness to work, coupled
with the faculty’s demonstration of expertise with various responsibilities delegated by the principal facilitated leadership that moved away from strong hierarchical and centrist tendencies towards leadership density where the faculty is actively engaged in leadership decision making based upon their skills, commitments, and needs.

Having laid the groundwork during the first year, the principal set out this year to actively engage teachers in school leadership. One of the first things that she felt needed to change was the separation of administration from faculty. The principal noted that her first year some teachers never or rarely set foot in her office, primarily because the principal’s office was not viewed as being part of the teacher’s domain in year’s past under different administration. “One teacher never came in here at all last year” noted the principal. When I asked why she said, “I never felt comfortable until now.”

Now, the principal’s office is a hub of activity for the school. Teachers are in and out frequently, making quick contact, dropping notes off, or the like. There is a clear feeling of camaraderie between the faculty and principal. Teachers are now referred to as partners and fellow experts and there is clear evidence that the faculty reciprocates in this view.

When problems arise with staff members, the principal prefers to handle it privately. She noted that “We sit right here (patting the couch) and talk till we get it straight.” According to the principal, she has had very few reasons to do this. Teachers agreed with the principal’s view and consistently pointed out that problems have always been handled in a manner that was professional, caring, and private.

High-stakes testing has played a significant role in impacting the principal’s view of her leadership roles. Due to the increasing stress the faculty finds itself under from high-stakes testing, the principal has assumed a very active role in blocking undue and unnecessary demands upon their time. For example, when informed that the school had been
chosen for a case study, the principal was very quick to protect teachers from unneeded stress as well as from unwarranted attacks. The purpose of the study as well as the requirements of her staff were all covered thoroughly before any commitment to participate was given. “Teachers are burned out” was offered several times as a reminder that no unnecessary intrusions would be brooked.

This supportiveness and protection of the school’s faculty was the source of a large degree of pride and feeling of worth for the staff. It was often expressed that the principal consistently went to great lengths to insulate the teachers from distractions. It appears that high-stakes testing has precipitated a crisis of sorts that caused the faculty and principal to close ranks. A collective sense of all for one and one for all was prevalent and a main function the principal had adapted was to “ride point” for the school. It seems important that this sense of cohesiveness be maintained if leadership continues to evolve towards greater levels of density.

The Staff

Evidence of teachers assuming high degrees of leadership, and metaphorically assuming some of the characteristics of small jazz combos, is the school’s use of embedded professional staff development. Teachers at the school have regularly scheduled (at least one per month) activities that address professional staff development. These activities are self-selected by groups of teachers and are designed to address areas of interest and/or concern. This year a teacher that is on sabbatical has been responsible for assisting in planning and implementing many of the in-services. Topics have varied, ranging from new instructional methods to various ways to implement technology.

Upon entering the school site for observations, two teachers were seen bringing their classes across campus. Students in both classes were well-mannered and attentive, and their
teachers were properly attentive to the transition. In addition, the teachers displayed pleasing dispositions and were helpful in guiding me to the office as well as welcoming me to the campus.

Having just finished high-stakes testing, the staff was almost in a period of “decompression.” A palpable sense of relief could be heard and felt in their conversations, where LEAP was still the topic. All teachers expressed some unease about how the school’s performance score on the state’s accountability model may come out. But, the teachers were convinced they had done a good job of preparing students for the test regardless of the school’s school performance score (SPS). Time and again teachers commented that they had tried to cover all the material they thought would be on the LEAP but they were not sure they had done so. The complaint that the test is too broad, and that teachers were not sure whether their teaching was aligned with the test was endemic. In particular, one teacher had been part of Texas’ high-stakes testing and had commented that the LEAP test was broader, with more material to cover. Even teachers in lower grades were trying to make sure their curriculum was geared towards supporting the 4th grade teachers’ instructional efforts. “We’re taking a team approach on this,” commented one teacher. “We just hope that we’re covering everything we should.”

Clearly high-stakes testing is the vehicle driving curriculum and instruction at Artie Shaw Elementary. Just as clearly, the teachers do not like it. They have reservations that the test is fair, or that one test can be an accurate gauge of what a student knows. Also, they worry about some of the students they fear will not do well on the test even though these students have worked hard all year in preparation for the exams. One teacher asked, “What happens to them?” “How will holding them back help?”
All discussions with teachers regarding LEAP were a repetition of the basic ideas in the two questions that were just posed. By couching the high-stakes test in the context of their students first, and their own personal stake in the outcomes second, it was evident that the school’s culture is one that is centered upon the students.

When asked if they were worried about the personal consequences of a declining SPS the teachers admitted they were. But, they felt that these would be secondary to the impact on the children. And, when asked if the principal should be replaced in failing schools as state law requires the teachers were adamant. “You can’t blame our principal for the school’s scores. She didn’t teach any of these kids.” Said another, “I think that’s ridiculous.” Clearly these answers were given from the perspective of the relationship between faculty and staff on Artie Shaw Elementary campus and are reflective of a strong bond between the principal and her staff. This provides further evidence of a positive school culture, one that values professional collegiality and collaboration.

Teachers commented that this year their input into school decisions is actively sought. Just as the principal described, last year was a time where the principal was much more autocratic and authoritative. Teachers agreed things changed throughout the year towards much greater levels of participatory leadership. As stated earlier, the faculty meeting where the principal challenged everyone to leave behind pettiness and bickering and embrace the school’s goals served as a catalyst for this process.

Now, when teachers speak of the principal’s role they use terms that reflect a close relationship between the staff and the principal. Teachers described the principal’s role as one of guidance, of a sounding board, liaison to the central office, and an organizer. However, teachers still expected the principal to handle some of the traditional roles that
have long been associated with the position: disciplinarian, supervisor, and the ultimate
decision maker.

Classroom observations at Artie Shaw Elementary followed a pattern very similar
to the other two schools where case studies have been completed. High-stakes testing had just been completed a few days prior and students and teachers alike were both on the rebound. Interestingly, the school system made a policy mandate that all students taking the LEAP portion of the state accountability program (4th graders in Artie Shaw Elementary) would take the IOWA test as well.

Both faculty and staff of Artie Shaw Elementary expressed cynicism that the IOWA tests would provide valid results. "The kids just finished one set of tests they knew they had to pass, and now they’re going to take another set they know is not important. I don’t see any way they’ll do their best," observed one teacher.

Most of the faculty echoed similar sentiments to those just expressed. Classrooms observations of 4th grade teachers seemed to lend credence to their concerns In these classes, teachers were working at final preparations for IOWA review and their efforts were not generally greeted by high levels of student interaction. One teacher was consistently cajoling the students to “hang in there” because she knew they were tired. For their part, students were engaging the review materials, but it was clear that they were tiring of the activities and, judging from statements they made in class, were not enthusiastic about another round of testing. “How many days will this test take,” asked one student. Another questioned, “These don’t count, do they?”

Classroom observations within 5th grade classes at Artie Shaw Elementary followed an emerging trend that was first seen at Glenn Miller Elementary and later replicated at Faith
Hill School. As at the other schools, teachers at Artie Shaw Elementary expended high levels of energy within their classrooms. They worked well with students, managed their class climate, and had lesson plans which were used as a template for instructional activities. However, as with the other schools, teachers at Artie Shaw Elementary did not have demonstrative levels of consistent and high student engagement in meaningful learning activities that accommodated varying levels of student skill and expertise.

Typically, classroom activities were teacher centered and teacher directed. As a result, many times the majority of students within the classes were passively engaged while more direct instruction was afforded to one or a few individuals.

A notable exception to this trend was the math class taught by a National Board Certified Teacher. Through the use of manipulatives, and a lesson plan that required students to continually rethink and reuse their previous conclusions, the teacher was able to foster high student engagement in a meaningful learning activity.

Observing teachers in their classrooms revealed a phenomenon which has, to this point in the case studies, been corroborated at all three sites. Specifically, daily planning by teachers seems to be done more on a contingency basis, where focus is on the immediate with little reflection upon the creation and implementation of lessons which foster high student engagement, accommodate various ability levels, utilize individual student interest, and challenge all students.

This lack of planning does not require one to conclude that these teachers are not competent and caring. In classroom observations teachers were consistently demonstrating high levels of caring for student learning, adequate levels of content knowledge, and knowledge of pedagogical techniques, such as small-group instruction. In short, every
teacher that was observed demonstrated ample teaching and interpersonal skills. What was lacking was systematic preparation of lessons which were designed to create the attributes listed above. The largest reason for this omission seems to be time available to teachers for professional planning and self-improvement. A more complete analysis will be formulated after all case studies are completed.

**Principal Self-Efficacy**

Willingness to provide leadership opportunities to teachers, coupled with a high degree of personal and professional commitment to school goals is indicative of the principal’s high self-efficacy for facilitating teacher empowerment. During observations and interviews, the principal consistently referred to how teachers were empowered to make instructional decisions within their own classrooms and noted her strong belief that this was an essential part of creating an effective learning environment within a school.

Besides high self-efficacy for facilitating teacher empowerment, the principal also demonstrated strong beliefs about her ability to shield teachers from unnecessary distractions. By articulating to teachers that their job is first and foremost the creation of quality learning opportunities, and then subsequently shielding teachers from potential distractions, the principal has once again exhibited a strong belief in her ability to facilitate the quality learning opportunities the school is striving for. The high priority placed upon shielding teachers from unnecessary interruptions and intrusions by the principal models behavior that facilitates and heightens levels of performance within the teachers themselves in that they see their principal going to great effort to free up the staff to fulfill their professional requirements and obligations. Such a high degree of confidence in the abilities of the staff,
coupled with expectations for success, serve to boost teacher self-efficacy in their own beliefs to create and facilitate teaching and learning.

Evidence of the principal's high level of commitment to the staff and students at Artie Shaw Elementary was apparent. Teachers remarked that the principal is often at the school after hours and on weekends. Also, the principal has consistently demonstrated her persistence in tasks that she believes are important. For example, teachers noted the principal has worked very hard both years she has been at the school to alleviate teacher stress towards high-stakes tests. Specifically, the principal has made it clear that no teacher should feel personally threatened by the results of high-stakes tests. This willingness to stand by the teachers is interesting, since the school's SPS scores of 79.8, ranks towards the bottom of individual school scores for the parish. Without a high degree of belief in the faculty and their dedication, such a low comparative rating might be expected to cause panic, tension, and finger-pointing. Instead, levels of morale and collegiality at the school remain high.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy**

Perhaps the greatest evidence for teacher self-efficacy towards creating meaningful learning opportunities at the school was their commitment to students taking high-stakes tests. Teacher consistently mentioned how much effort they had placed into addressing high-stakes accountability.

Given the fact that the school's scores rank towards the bottom of individual school scores within the parish, it might be expected that rationales such as poor parental involvement or a greater percentage of low socioeconomic students might be offered as a defense mechanism. This was not the case as teachers willingly acknowledged that many of
the students were facing social and cognitive difficulties. But, instead of offering these problems as excuses, the teachers were recognizing that success for many of these students will depend upon each teacher’s willingness to commit and persevere to helping each child progress.

Teachers consistently vocalized a willingness to take on new roles and to maintain a high level of involvement with leadership decisions at the school, particularly in the area of instructional goals. "It is my choice to meet and exceed our goals," said one teacher. "If I can take on a new role or learn something new to meet these goals then I’m willing to try.” Another teacher stated, “My goal is to make a difference in the lives of my children. What I do is more like a religious mission than a regular job.” These statements are examples of the overall tone of the faculty towards the students at Artie Shaw Elementary and are reflective of a high degree of self-efficacy on the part of faculty members.

Scheduling and participating in self-guided staff development is also evidence of high teacher self-efficacy. As noted earlier, teachers actively solicit topics of interest from among themselves, procure resources to address chosen topics, and set time frames for discussion. Many of these tasks have been handled this year by a teacher that is on sabbatical. This creative use of available talent has allowed teachers to choose from a broader scope of problems. Examples of topics chosen for staff development have this year are integration of technology into the curriculum, appropriate classroom practices which address high-stakes tests, and instructional strategies to improve reading.

Artie Shaw Elementary’s faculty demonstrates high levels of collegiality and cooperation. They perceive their roles as vital and intricate to leadership decisions made at the school and willingly involve themselves in leadership decisions for instruction. In
informal conversations, focus group interviews, and post-observation conversations, teachers demonstrated high levels of self-efficacy by consistently verbalizing a high level of commitment to instructional effectiveness and a willingness to persevere through difficult times.

**School Culture**

The principal and staff (including custodians and cafeteria workers) consistently demonstrated high norms of behavior regarding students and student learning. Conversations with the principal or the staff about the children were based upon student abilities and progress and were indicative of a school culture that values and respects each student. In a similar vein, teachers did not use the disadvantaged circumstances found within some of the student population as excuses for learning not to occur. Classroom observations were consistent with what was stated by the principal and staff. Students were treated with respect and the students reciprocated in kind.

The interactions between students on the campus were also indicative of a school culture that values and models respect towards others. Students were cheerful and respectful towards their peers both in and out of the classroom. While on campus no acts of violence or harassment were observed and in follow-up conversations with the principal and staff it was determined that these types of behavior do not occur often at Artie Shaw Elementary.

The respectful tone demonstrated by teachers and students at the school extended to contact with parents. Parents entering the school ground were greeted by whomever made first contact; principal, teacher, or custodian. From the conversations that ensued, it was apparent that a small-town atmosphere of familiarity and respect still exists between the school and community. This ambience is certainly enhanced by the size of the community.
the school serves. But, the genuine expressions of friendship would not be a given and their presence is evidence of a school culture that values and reaches out to the community as well.

**Leadership Density**

Artie Shaw Elementary is a school that is actively investigating ways to increase the density of their leadership. Teachers at the school engage in small-group planning and are responsible (often with principal support and input) for creating their own professional activities for professional growth. This type of activity suggests a school culture that is open to questioning some entrenched norms such as teacher autonomy and one that is capable of facilitating leadership density. Evidence of this openness is found in teacher attitude towards the high-stakes test. Specifically, teachers have begun to organize themselves into a systems approach to address the problem of high-stakes test. Early grades are recognizing that they contribute in some way to each student's success on LEAP and these grades are pursuing strategies which are believed to be helpful to students facing high-stakes test in the 4th grade.

Teachers at the school do not view the principal as being the endmost link in a hierarchical chain of command. There is a willingness by the principal to embrace the teachers as, she says in her words, “fellow experts.” Teachers expressed agreement that this statement describes how they feel. Such beliefs are metaphorically analogous to small jazz combos where all band members must be able to play well and band members might well be viewed as fellow experts.

The small jazz combo metaphor also runs through the school’s manner of instruction. Teachers describe a curriculum that is open and pliable. Teachers do not try to follow a tightly scripted curriculum that has been designed off site without their input. Instead,
teachers at the school are actively engaged in trying to make meaning out of instructional benchmarks that are supplied by the state in much the same way a small jazz combo might take a musical score and embellish it with their own phrasings and runs.

Leadership opportunities in Artie Shaw Elementary come about by various means. The principal does assign some leadership responsibilities, but the primary means of leadership emerging at the school is through the teachers voluntarily assuming new roles. Instructionally, this is evidenced by teachers working out their own self-improvement staff development time. Teachers commented that they were always looking for new ways to teach, or better instructional methods. As would be expected, technology often came up in these conversations, particularly among the more experienced teachers that are not as thoroughly versed in technological trends as more recent college graduates. Without explicit principal approval for teacher experimentation, there would be little reason to expect such active searches for self-development by teachers or further enhancement of leadership density in the coming years.

Although small group planning is available to the teachers, and the staff does avail itself of the opportunity, there is the ever present need for more staff time for professional development. Teachers at the school are only able to schedule their professional development meetings at most, twice a month. And, when these meetings do occur, they are during the unencumbered time for the teacher. (Unencumbered meaning go to restroom, run off papers, make parental contacts, etc.)

The importance of and opportunity for structured staff development time is critical to significantly increasing leadership density at Artie Shaw Elementary. Lack of planning and preparation time is analogous to a band having little or no practice time. Regardless of
the musical genre, it is very hard to envision how lack of practice could correlate to an improved performance. The school’s culture and the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators appear to be receptive towards greater levels of leadership density. Given the principal’s proclivity towards non-centrist leadership, if teachers were to receive adequate time to plan and make meaningful leadership contributions in areas of instruction small jazz combo leadership may well emerge.

A summary of the major findings for the case study at Artie Shaw Elementary is provided in table 6.3 below.

Table 6.3

Summary of Major Findings for Artie Shaw Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
<th>Metaphor for Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Transformational, with view towards empowering teachers.</td>
<td>Teachers and principal are fellow experts.</td>
<td>Faculty meeting where principal laid it on the line.</td>
<td>Big band. Principal demonstrates enthusiasm for teacher’s assuming leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study #4: Skipper Elementary

**Context Analysis**

Skipper Elementary is located in the center of a small city of about 10,000 people. The school system has experienced rapid growth in recent years, due to the parish’s proximity to a major metropolitan area that has been experiencing white flight. This influx of new citizens into the parish has caused quite a bit of new construction and renovation to take place within the school system in an effort to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population base. Fortunately, the parish has a substantial industrial tax base which provides
a source of revenue for these physical improvements. Newcomers moving into the parish
tend to move into the outlying areas, away from the middle of town where Skipper
Elementary is located. These outlying areas tend to be composed of white families that
reside in middle class to upper-class middle class neighborhoods while the residencies in the
city limits have a higher percentage of disadvantaged and African-American residents.

The boom in construction along the outskirts of the city limits where the school is
located has created an inverse effect within the city. According to the principal of Skipper
Elementary, property values within the city have decreased over the past few years and very
little new construction has taken place. As a result, families that reside in the school’s
attendance zone tend to occupy lower socioeconomic strata than the families of school
children outside the city limits.

Unlike neighboring schools, Skipper Elementary is very close to a 50-50 percentage
in white and black students. Besides a more ethnically diverse population, students at
Skipper Elementary tend to have a much larger proportion of special needs as compared to
the other schools in the school system. Currently the school has 1 paraprofessional for every
2.65 teachers, a proportion that is not approached at any of the outlying schools. Also, the
school is one of the larger elementary schools in the area, currently housing approximately
750 students in grades K-5.

**School Building and Site**

Skipper Elementary occupies the oldest school site in the parish. Built in 1939, it
was originally designed and used as the city’s high school. Considering the age of the
building, it is in reasonable shape but it could benefit from renovations and upgrades,
particularly in mechanical and lighting. The school layout is sprawling and reflects the
adding on of additional classrooms throughout the years to accommodate its students. Currently new classroom construction is underway to add eight more classrooms to the school. With the addition of these rooms, it is possible that the school's population may approach 1,000 students in the next few years.

The school is located directly off of the main highway that runs through the city. It is situated very close to the road, no doubt due to the road being widened from two original lanes to its current four lanes. The school grounds are completely fenced, an obvious necessity given the school's proximity to high levels of vehicular traffic.

The architecture of the school gives away its age. A large, sweeping arch dominates the front of the building and is mindful of an earlier era. As is common with schools built in the 1930's and 40's, each classroom has an entire wall of windows. The building's face is made of stucco and is painted a light tan. The school has one main entrance which is situated below the exterior arch.

Class wings jut off the main building and are interconnected by walkways. Built at various times throughout the years, these interconnecting wings create a small commons/play area that is used for recess and lunch activities. When compared to newer schools, the site is obviously lacking the benefits of more recent construction. The large windows occupying entire sections of many of the rooms are in need of recaulking and general repair. Ceilings within the halls and classrooms have been in place for years and are showing signs of age. The rooms are not adequately insulated and are hard to heat in the winter and hard to cool in the summer. Understandably, maintenance of the building is almost continual. Although the building is old and in need of renovation it is not in general disrepair from neglect. In
fact, in many ways the school possesses an ambience and atmosphere no longer found in the more antiseptic school designs of today.

The administrative offices are located just to the right of the main entrance way. Secretarial work space is located behind a counter that spans the room. This area is an open work space, of ample size, and manned by two secretaries. However, the principal’s office is almost an afterthought, located to the side of the secretarial area in an area that would nearly qualify as closet space.

Adjacent to the school is a large building that was constructed at approximately the same time as Skipper Elementary. At one time this building housed all profound and special needs students. Now, it is used by the Special Education Department for the school system and is home base for the myriad of services provided by special education. The principal noted that Skipper Elementary was actually responsible at one time for the education of all profoundly handicapped students for the school system. Now, the school receives a cluster of severe and profound students as well as severe hearing impaired students from the east side of the parish (where approximately 90% of the population is found). When these students reach thirteen years of age, they are clustered at another site.

The size of the school, its projected growth, and the high percentage of special needs students attending the school has prompted the principal to begin an information campaign with board members and the central office regarding the need for another school in the city limits. According to the principal, he is not very optimistic this will occur, but he feels another school will be essential to maintaining an effective teaching and learning environment at Skipper Elementary.
School Demographics

Currently Skipper Elementary has an enrollment of 720 students in grades K - 5. The school has 53 teachers, a principal, an assistant principal, a librarian, a counselor, and 20 paraprofessional aides.

The past ten years or so have seen a significant change in the racial and socioeconomic composition of the school. In the early 1990's, the school was approximately 80% white. Now, the percentage of African-American students attending the school has increased to nearly 50%. School census figures indicate the school’s enrollment has experienced a steady increase in this period of time with the majority of new students being African-Americans. This general increase of students coupled with a decrease in overall numbers of white children at the school has been responsible for the major shift in demographics occurring over the past decade or so.

At this time about 65% of the student body is on free or reduced lunch and average daily attendance is around 93%. Due to the school’s high percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, the school qualifies for Title 1 assistance. These monies are currently being used to fund a teacher and paraprofessional that administer an early-intervention reading program.

Students that attend the school all live within the city limits. Most bus in, although a few are brought by parents. According to the teachers, many of these students are facing problems such as single parent homes, low parental support and involvement, and close proximity to drugs being sold and used within their neighborhoods. According to teachers, these problems have contributed to a slow but pervasive decline in school climate over the past few years.
Life at the School

Routines and procedures are reflective of Skipper Elementary's large size. For example, teachers on duty do not know the names of all the children they are monitoring and assume more formal monitoring roles than teachers at the three smaller schools where case studies were performed. Furthermore, many more teachers are required to provide adequate supervision of children at lunch or recess. Both of these circumstances contribute to an atmosphere that is not as intimate as that found in the other three schools. Due to the size of the school, there is an understandable need for more emphasis upon routines, with something as mundane as class changes requiring careful thought so that disruptive traffic patterns are not created.

Even with the disadvantages associated with managing a large school, the faculty and staff at the school do a commendable job of overseeing the operation of the school. Students do have established routines and procedures for changing classes, lunch, and recess. These routines are conducive to minimizing the degree of effort required to monitor for acceptable levels of student behavior and help to set an orderly and respectful tone for student behavior.

To create a sense of community as well as minimize unnecessary student movement, students are clustered according to grade. This assists in creating a degree of familiarity between faculty and staff, although not to the extent one might find in smaller schools. Grades 4 and 5, the focus of this case study, are departmentalized. Departmentalizing the grades has helped to reduce teacher planning for multiple preparations and has contributed to faculty members working with a wider percentage of the student body.

The 4th grade at Skipper Elementary has several classes which are significantly smaller in size. These classes are comprised of students that either failed the 4th grade last
year or were held back due to failing the LEAP test. According to the principal, the school system did not elect to provide transition services for students that failed last year's LEAP test. Instead of allowing these students to take on-level classes in areas they passed, the school system elected to place them in homogeneous classrooms. These classrooms are much smaller than regular classes with approximately 10 students in a class. The principal stated students in these classes receive intensive remediation and instruction throughout the year to help them with the recent retaking of the LEAP exam.

Although the parish has a commendable goal of remediation in mind for the students repeating 4th grades, retaining these students even though they may have passed all course work appears ill-advised. Several factors should be considered by the school system before holding back these students in future years. First is the lack of documented positive effects for retention of students. A meta-analysis by Wilson and Ramsay (1999) explored 80 studies and concluded that promoted students consistently perform better than those that are retained. Second, the cost for the system to retain these students is markedly higher than the average cost per student due to the small student/teacher ratios in these classes and the fact that tax dollars are being spent twice to educate these children in the same grade. Finally, according to the Wilson and Ramsay, students that are not retained tend to do better on all kinds of achievement tests in subsequent grades, enjoy better self-esteem and social relations, and have a lower drop-out rate as compared to retained students.

Wilson and Ramsay's work is also supported by Bandura's social cognitive theory which posits that learning is best facilitated by focusing on what a student has learned or achieved instead of what they do not know and then engaging the student in a process of goal setting for subsequent improvement (Bandura, 1997). Furthermore, Tschannen-Moran, Hoy,
& Hoy, (1998) cite information which indicates that students’ beliefs in their ability to achieve a task provide a stronger motivation for completing a task successfully than fear or threat of failure. Taken together, these findings corroborate Wilson and Ramsay’s conclusions and cast considerable question in regards to the cost benefits of retaining these students as well as to what extent these students’ cognitive, social, and emotional growth may actually be stunted.

The school itself provided one more piece of evidence that suggests holding these students back in the 4th grade and not allowing them to take some 5th grade classes in a year of transition was ill-advised. In the words of the principal, “These students gave us hell. They have formed the bulk of the disciplinary problems and, in my opinion, gotten very little out of this school year.”

Besides the smaller remediation classes, classes typically contained about 22 students in both the 4th and 5th grades at Skipper Elementary. Although higher than the pupil/teacher ratios in the remediation classes, the classes are well below the maximum amount of students state law allows per class.

The Principal

The principal is in his fifth year as principal at the school. He has spent his entire career of 22 years in the same school system. Prior to becoming principal of Skipper Elementary, the principal served five years as principal at a local middle school.

The first impression of the principal indicated that he is pleasant and easygoing towards students and staff alike. The principal consistently exhibited an easygoing manner, even in trying times. For example, while interviewing the principal he had to excuse himself
to tend to a student. After leaving, he returned about ten minutes later with a 2nd grader experiencing a rather acute case of separation anxiety.

Living with his recently divorced mother, the boy has been quite reluctant to stay at school when he has been dropped off in the mornings. The problem had been exacerbated this particular day because the boy was dropped off at school by his father after spending the weekend with him. After returning with the young man to the office, the principal acted much like a father, reassuring the youngster and refocusing him on school rather than his parent leaving. After we finished the interview, the principal got the student to walk around with him and "be my helper." After about an hour, the student was better and returned to class.

The first impression of the principal’s easygoing demeanor proved to be accurate. During the entire time observations were conducted at the school, the principal demonstrated a relaxed and open personality. When interacting with faculty, the principal was always pleasant, greeting teachers by name and with a smile. This easy, relaxed communication between the staff and the principal was a well established norm as evidenced by the comfort level of the teachers during these exchanges.

Noting the size of the school, the principal indicated he spends a great deal of time as a manager, making sure teachers have materials they need for day-to-day operations. He also takes the lead in disciplinary problems and acts as a buffer for teachers. For example, one day a teacher was holding a parent conference that had the potential for becoming contentious. According to the teacher, the principal knew this and made a point of stopping by the room at the beginning of the meeting and telling the teacher "Be sure you send for me
if you need me.” The teacher pointed out the principal’s quiet entrance into the room had helped set the tone with the parent and led to a productive meeting.

Although the principal is supportive of teachers, he does not maintain a high degree of involvement with curriculum, delegating most decisions regarding curriculum to the assistant principal. Creating this sort of delineation of duties brings to mind the organization of high schools where there may be an assistant principal of instruction and perhaps another for discipline; all of whom are responsible to the central figurehead (the principal). Given the large size of Skipper Elementary, the high number of special needs students at the school, and the growing percentage of at-risk students attending the school, the principal’s delegation of curriculum oversight to the assistant principal is not a surprise. However, assigning curriculum to the assistant principal has several important implications which are discussed in depth later in this case study.

When a school’s administration organizes itself in the manner described above, it is reasonable to conclude that metaphors which frame the organization will tend to be traditional and have centrist tendencies. This possibility was supported by several teachers describing the principal as being like the captain of a ship. The ship captain metaphor has several implications. First, it suggests that the teachers are dependent upon the principal for directions and orders. Second, if the principal is captain of a ship, then everyone’s well-being is his ultimate responsibility. Third, everyone will be sailing to the same destination and will arrive at the same time. Fourth, what the captain says, goes—unless the ship might be named H.M.S. Bounty.

If the captain metaphor is an adequate description of how leadership plays out at the school, then there is little hope of leadership density gaining so much as a toehold since the
conceptual underpinnings of small jazz combos would be almost perfectly antithetical to a principal as captain.

Further investigation provided some insight into reasons why the faculty felt they were highly involved in leadership decisions regarding instruction yet use such a centrist metaphor to describe the role of the principal. For example, the principal said, “My job is to empower teachers.” And, “I don’t beat them up if they fail.” Or, regarding teachers, “The most important thing you can do is support them and let them take risks.” These statements of principal support for faculty were echoed by teachers at Skipper Elementary. In their view, the principal is very supportive of teachers regarding risk-taking and teachers assuming leadership roles.

What captain allows his crew to take risks with the ship? And, what captain easily abides failures, or empowers the crew? It is safe to say that not many captains have ever asked the crew: “Where should we sail today?” Clearly there is a disconnect of sorts at work in the conflicting language being used to describe who the principal is and what he does.

It appears the apparent contradictions in who the principal is and what he does arise because of the countless roles assumed by the principal. Some of these roles do tend to be centrist and might be accurately described by a centrist metaphor such as the principal/captain example. For example, the principal stated that he is responsible for most discipline at the school. This type of action is fairly congruent with the captain metaphor. By taking control of discipline, the principal insulates teachers from disruptive behaviors that would intrude upon instructional effectiveness. Furthermore, centralizing discipline decisions would be expected to lend consistency to the degree and type of disciplinary action handed out as well. Finally, by one person assuming the central role of disciplinarian, past
problems with a student can be kept in a proper context and reviewed for patterns of behavior, worsening of behavior, etc. If a teacher would be thinking of the principal’s role as the school’s disciplinarian, then the ship captain metaphor seems appropriate.

Another captain-like trait might be the principal’s delegation of curriculum decisions. Leaving the majority of curriculum decisions to the assistant principal is somewhat similar to a ship captain delegating radar duty to appropriate personnel. On the other hand, the principal noted and teachers agreed that he “empowers teachers.” This would be an act which is much more akin to what happens in small jazz combos rather than between captains and their hands. And, to further extend the small jazz combo metaphor, the principal indicates he accepts and encourages risk-taking by teachers.

It is doubtful that teachers were thinking of the contradictions posed by agreeing that they have opportunities to make decisions and are actively encouraged to take risks when they described their principal as the captain of the ship. A more likely explanation is that captains are generally viewed as adept leaders, and teachers that used the captain of the ship metaphor were indicating their belief in the principal’s overall leadership abilities. If, as it appears, this is the case, the positive connotations of the captain of the ship metaphor allude to the many managerial tasks that are primarily within the principal’s realm. Empowering teachers, encouraging risk-taking, and other attributes ascribed to the principal’s leadership can then be seen separately as characterizing leadership that is more analogous to the small jazz combo metaphor and its attendant notion of leadership density.

**The Staff**

Teachers at Skipper Elementary consistently made observations and comments which indicate a rising apprehension about a possible trend of lowered levels of student
preparedness and higher incidents of disruptive behavior. This misgiving was expressed by a majority of teachers interviewed at the school. Commenting about the lack of student preparedness one teacher remarked, “We have lots of single parent moms, and there is little reading done at home.” Another stated, “I expose kids to as many good books as I can.” “Many of my students are not pushed or supported by their parents,” was also voiced. “It’s very hard to teach children during the day that often go home to terrible conditions,” was another teacher’s conclusion.

Alongside the pervasive concern for student preparedness was the belief that student behavior was worsening. Looking for explanations, one teacher remarked, “A lot of them (students) do not have a man in the house, and that is something they really need.” This same teacher noted the problem has become so pervasive that one father has taken the responsibility of spending time with as many students who have no father in the household as he can. “He takes them to get pizza, or he picks them up to spend the weekend over at his house,” she offered. “He has a heart for the at-risk kids in our school. He reaches some, but a lot still wind up in trouble.”

These sentiments were echoed by a female African-American teacher who had been at the school for many years. When asked what her role was she responded that she tries to instill self-esteem, strengthen academics, promote well-rounded students, and combat the effects of low socioeconomic status. According to this teacher, it has become increasingly difficult over the years to meet these goals. “Our values at the school are the same but it is getting harder and harder to achieve our desired goals,” she said.

This teacher felt the largest increase in student behavior problems was occurring within the African-American population and specifically with African-American males.
“Most of the time there’s no father at home. You know you can reach some of these so the problem can be addressed. But too many students come to school now that don’t value education. To me that is a function of the family. Most of the kids who don’t have a father at home have a mom who works all day and they are too busy to help their children with school.”

Besides the lack of parental support, the teacher mentioned another problem that is becoming more pervasive—availability of drugs. “A lot of these kids go home to neighborhoods where they see drugs being used. And the folks using them set a bad example for the kids. The street is pulling mighty hard right now.”

Classroom observations at Skipper Elementary were very similar to observations made during the other three case studies. As at the other schools, teachers were typically the center of the instructional process in the room. They were all working hard, but tending to do deliver instruction in ways where accommodating student abilities, challenging all students with meaningful activities, and structuring lessons for high student engagement could be improved. A separate section at the conclusion of the case studies formulates reasons why this pattern of teaching was pervasive in all case studies conducted for this dissertation as well as recommendations for practice.

**Principal Self-Efficacy**

For leadership density to develop, and for the small jazz combo metaphor to play out, it is important that the principal possess a high level of self-efficacy for creating leadership opportunities for teachers. In one sense, this is happening. Teachers understand that their input is valued and appreciated and would often speak of the principal actively seeking their input on instructional matters. On the other hand, the principal’s near complete delegation
of instruction to the assistant principal may provide a barrier to facilitating higher levels of leadership density on campus and is believed to speak to low principal self-efficacy for facilitating effective instructional leadership decisions by the staff.

Undoubtedly, the size of the school and the high number of special-needs students create a pressing demand for a large portion of the principal's time. Forced to often work in a managerial mode, it may be appropriate for the principal to delegate instruction to the assistant principal. However, whether that delegation needs to be as absolute as the principal indicates is questionable.

By abdicating responsibility for curriculum to the assistant principal, the principal may be sending an unintended message to the faculty about his beliefs. For example, teachers may assume that the principal does not believe that instruction is a critical element of school worthy of his time. Or perhaps, teachers may believe that the principal thinks he is not capable of making competent decisions in areas of teaching and learning. Neither of these possibilities would be expected to facilitate desirable beliefs in teachers about the principal's ability to work effectively with instructional issues.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1996), the actions of the principal at Skipper Elementary are reflective of typical principal behaviors regarding time spent in improving instructional effectiveness. According to the authors, most principals spend less than 10% of their time on matters of instruction. This paucity of interest in what is supposed to be the primary goal of the school suggests that the principal probably does not hold high beliefs in his ability to help facilitate effective instructional change. Furthermore, the laissez faire attitude of the principal regarding instruction indicates that the school's mission and vision lacks clarity.
Placing instructional effectiveness as a high priority would be expected to have a transformative effect upon school culture and teacher beliefs. Transformational leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990) would appear to have productive potential for helping the school move further towards a small jazz combo metaphor for leadership density, particularly since teachers already express strong views about their willingness to get involved.

It is possible, of course, that the assistant principal is more suited to making instructional decisions than the principal. If this is true, then certainly the principal is correct in utilizing her individual abilities in the most effective manner. Indirectly, this view was expressed by the principal when he noted that, “There’s no need for us to be doing the same things.” That may be true enough. But, a low level of involvement in instruction strongly suggests that principal self-efficacy for facilitating its improvement is low.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy**

Over time, teachers at Skipper Elementary have seen what they view as a substantial shift for the worse in their students’ self-discipline, enthusiasm for school, and valuing of education. To address these challenges, the school’s staff will need to possess high levels of self-efficacy for facilitating positive outcomes in all these areas. Without a high level of belief in their collective and individual abilities to affect change, there is little hope that adequate effort expenditure and perseverance for successfully meeting challenges will be evidenced by the staff.

Also, self-efficacy will need to be high among faculty members to address student beliefs in their own individual abilities as well. If students at the school begin to see themselves and their school as marginalized—a place where no one wants to go but some have to—then it is likely that their self-efficacy for productive learning tasks will be weakened.
Teachers must be careful to guard against blaming students and instead adapt and maintain a strong individual and collective sense of self-efficacy which Bandura (1997) indicates acts as a mediator against the negative effects of poverty and other societal disadvantages.

Currently, it appears that teachers are maintaining high levels of self-efficacy both for educating children and for working to overcome conditions such as low parental involvement and neighborhood drug use which are hindering social and affective development of the students. When observing teachers in classes as well as their moment-to-moment activities, there was a sense of enthusiasm exhibited. The atmosphere of the school reflected a sense of optimism and esprit de corp. If teachers possessed little belief in their abilities to positively impact their students, one would expect to see a pervasive atmosphere of low teacher morale, low teacher engagement in instructional activities, high incidences of placing blame, and so forth. That none of these were present indicates self-efficacy for maintaining a productive teaching and learning environment is present at Skipper Elementary.

**School Culture**

Observations of life at Skipper Elementary revealed a school culture that is holding its ground against intruding pressures from outside the school. Rules of procedure are clear and consistently invoked, helping to keep a sense of order throughout the school. Peer respect among students was emphasized in numerous posters placed in strategic areas throughout the school and was reflected in student interactions.

High professional norms for teacher behavior were also present at the school. For example, teachers were at their doors during class changes, pleasant interactions between
students and faculty were common, students were commonly greeted with a smile, and respect towards students were all commonly observed during formal and informal observations.

Classroom observations revealed teachers with strong beliefs in the value of their work towards helping students develop emotionally and cognitively. Teachers made sure that students knew they were valued and respected through ongoing praise and verbal persuasion.

The cultural norms between staff at the school were also positive. Teachers consistently demonstrated respect for each other as peers. Additionally, there was a friendly atmosphere that permeated teacher interactions. It was clear that most of the teachers on staff had known each other for a while and that many close friendships existed between members of the faculty.

Like the teachers, the principal consistently demonstrated high norms of respect and compassion for students. When he passed through the halls, students often greeted him with a smile or a wave and he always reciprocated. As stated earlier, recess often found the principal amongst a group of students engaged in a conversation.

Relationships among the principal and staff were also indicative of a healthy school culture. Teachers appear to genuinely like their principal, and he was almost effusive in praising the staff. There is a comradery among the staff and principal that seems to be strengthened in part by the collective knowledge that their school may not be quite as “advantaged” as other schools in the system (i.e., the school is older, accountability scores are not quite as high, and a greater portion of the population is at risk).
Skipper Elementary exhibited consistently held norms, values, and beliefs regarding the importance of learning and the well-being of their students. In spite of the rather large size of the school, its staff has managed to maintain a feeling of community and enthusiasm for student learning.

**Leadership Density**

Observation of the principal and staff provided support for the principal’s proclivity to giving teachers leadership opportunities. Teachers often commented about the principal allowing them to work. This support of teachers is evidenced by the principal’s reaction to last years school performance profile which was based primarily upon high-stakes tests. Last year Skipper Elementary experienced a precipitous drop in their overall school performance score (SPS) from 86.6 in 1998 to 72.2 in 1999. According to the principal and staff, this decline in the school’s performance profile was very disheartening. Teachers were discouraged and more than a little afraid that they had “dropped the ball.” Making matters worse, when the school was compared to all other schools in the parish, it was the only one to show such a level of decline.

Because the school’s decline in its SPS was unique for the parish schools, its situation was analogous to a damaged bomber that is forced to drop out of formation, losing the protective fire provided by the rest of the squadron. On its own, the only school in the system to sustain such a drop in a school performance score, it received quite a bit of negative press in a local metropolitan newspaper (referred to as “The Morning Aggravate” by the principal). This added attention to the school’s circumstances contributed to the already heightened levels of frustration felt by teachers at the school.
The negative press received by Skipper Elementary presented significant problems with potential for negative and even disastrous consequences for school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy. The school, its principal, and its staff were faced with a significant challenge. By offering unswerving support of the teachers, even with the disappointing school performance score results, the principal struck a clear and resonant chord with the faculty. A scenario where the principal publicly berated the faculty for their failure to meet instructional goals would certainly have been possible and is easily imagined. Such self-serving behavior would be expected in an organization where the collective norms and values are overshadowed by individualism and selfishness. By publicly sticking by the staff, as well as providing daily support and encouragement, the principal demonstrated faith in the faculty's collective and individual leadership ability and teaching expertise.

Such a show of support by the principal towards the staff was important to maintaining some degree of teacher efficacy for bolstering the school's performance score in future years. It also served to abate some of the damage the school's culture incurred by the drop in scores. By “circling the wagons,” the principal made it clear that the faculty's feelings were important and valued. One teacher noted that without the principal’s support, the faculty could easily have disintegrated into factions and cliques, pointing fingers and blaming each other for the school’s drop in performance scores. That this did not occur is evidence of a school culture that correctly looks beyond the overly simplistic bottom line of high-stakes testing as a measure of school performance. Instead of using the test results as a bully pulpit to chide the teachers, the principal looked instead toward the much more complex and meaningful problem of how to keep teachers from becoming discouraged, which would be expected to lower teacher self-efficacy for the task of educating students.
Although this support of the teachers was necessary to protect school culture and facilitate teacher self-efficacy, its necessity may have been precipitated by the principal’s admitted lack of involvement with curriculum decisions in the prior year when the school’s performance score of 86.6 was markedly higher. Even with the size of the school and the myriad of daily demands on the principal’s time, the school’s primary purpose, the delivery of effective instruction, should always be emphasized.

If the size of the school and perhaps the expertise of the assistant principal indicate delegation of curriculum decisions is merited, there still is a pressing need for the principal to have and give timely and systematic feedback on instructional matters. As an analogy, a trumpet player in a small jazz combo may know very little about playing the piano and give broad leeway to how a section of music might be phrased to the pianist. But, in order for the music to remain tight, the trumpet player must know where he will enter, or where he might play counter-phrases to the pianist, etc. With 53 teachers and 20 para-professionals, it is highly unlikely that any one person could operate from a centrist perspective and effectively facilitate instruction. Consequently, there is a need for rethinking leadership roles for the principal, assistant principal, and teachers in regards to improving instructional practices at Skipper Elementary.

The principal pointed out that teachers do try to work collaboratively on grade level at the school. In fact, he felt the teacher’s take pride in their collaborative efforts. This proved to be true as teachers consistently mentioned their willingness to work with colleagues regarding improving instructional effectiveness. But, an appreciable obstruction to teachers systematically collaborating to improve instruction is the lack of planning time allocated to the teachers.
Teachers noted they have thirty-minute off periods due to the school's scheduling of physical education classes. However the actual time is much less. Teachers must wait for the physical education teacher to pick up the students from their class. Then, they must be back at their class prior to the end of the physical education period so the teacher can drop them back off. Somehow in this thirty-minute block of time teachers are supposed to drop off and pick up students, go to the restroom, run copies, hold school building level committee meetings, pupil progression meetings, 504 meetings, I.E.P. meetings, AND plan collaboratively.

The lack of planning time is probably more of a system level problem than a school level problem. The school's resources are determined to a great extent by the support offered by the parish school system. If, for example, the additional staff that was hired to teach the remedial classes had been used to free up teachers for productive staff development time, the school's faculty may have had more opportunity to engage in dialogue regarding ways to facilitate learning and improve delivery of instruction. At the moment, it would probably be more correct to say that the off time teachers have is actually designed to give them a short respite from the instructional day instead of opportunity for systematic self and staff professional development. If the school system wants more from teachers in terms of planning, there will need to be a commitment of resources and personnel to make it happen.

Leadership Density and District Assistance Teams

An expected outcome of leadership density would be that solutions to problems would emerge primarily from inside the organization. This expectation is built upon the belief in the personal expertise and commitment of members within the organization to
achieve organizational goals. Outside assistance with a problem might be actively solicited, but that is different from having external solutions imposed.

The parish school system has formed District Assessment Teams (DATs) in an effort to assist schools in developing effective school improvement plans. This support by the central office has much potential. DATs provide a means of concentrating expertise at a school and could play a vital role in helping to build school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy.

The model for the DATs appears to have some commonalities with the "distinguished educator" the State of Louisiana provides to low-scoring schools in the accountability program. Like the distinguished educator, DATs come in with an air of authority that is directed primarily at evaluating teacher effectiveness in creating an effective teaching and learning environment.

Before entering the school, DATs distribute surveys to parents, faculty, staff, and students regarding their perceptions of the quality of education at a school. Using this information as a guide, the DATs observe every teacher for at least thirty minutes over a two to three day period. After analyzing all data, the DAT presents its findings to the school along with recommendations and commendations.

Findings from a recently completed DAT visitation at Skipper Elementary suggested that the school's faculty was using instructional practices that were primarily teacher-centered. For example, according to faculty surveys, teachers believed they were working in cooperative groups in their classrooms approximately 75% of the time. However, the DAT findings suggested that a more accurate figure was about 25%. Furthermore, the DAT concluded that teachers were working harder than the students, suggesting that low student
engagement in meaningful tasks was a fairly common occurrence. Both of the conclusions of the DAT are in agreement with previously discussed findings from classroom observations conducted for this case study.

With the possible good a DAT can do, a potential cause of concern is the degree to which teachers view the DAT as "their boss." Since the DATs are newly created, it is too early to say what their ultimate contribution to the system's efforts to improve its schools will be. "I want to know how long they'll be around," the principal commented. "I've seen other programs that were supposed to help schools start off offering a lot of help only to disappear a few years later. Our superintendent is very supportive of the DATs. But what if he leaves?"

Questions such as those posed by the principal may point out some assumptions and machinations driving the DAT program. For example, if the program is likely to perish when the superintendent leaves what does that suggest about how much the whole process was valued and internalized by those actually doing the work? Extending that thought, if DAT members do not have high internal motivation or strong belief in their own ability to work effectively with a school towards developing substantive school improvement plans what is the likelihood that meaningful results will be forthcoming? These questions are not within the scope of this study, but answers to them may have profound impact upon future efforts at school improvement for Skipper Elementary. If the DATs are operating as top-down mandates, then there is little likelihood they will have long-term positive impact upon instructional effectiveness at the school. On the other hand, if members of Skipper Elementary's DAT perceive their duties to include self-responsibility for helping to shape
and guide teaching practices, and teachers hold the same beliefs about their roles, then the DAT may provide meaningful support to the school.

If careful attention is not paid to communicating the mission of DATs and making sure that mission is valued by schools then it is quite likely that the sum result will be, in effect, another level of bureaucratization created to mandate teacher behavior and subsequent school outcomes. Ample evidence (e.g., Cuban, 1990; Fullan, 1993; House, 1998; McNeil, 2000) exists that testifies to the futility of utilizing this mind set to bring about substantive school improvement.

**Conclusion**

Skipper Elementary may be on the edge of decline. Specifically, its large student population with their substantial attendant needs may create fissures in the culture of the school as well as the beliefs of its teachers and staff. If the disadvantaged segment of the student body continues to grow (as is likely given the population and demographic trends for the parish) this would be expected to strain self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators alike regarding their ability to affect positive change in student beliefs about the value of school, the danger of drugs, etc. Further exacerbating the potential crisis is the 30% planned increase in the school’s population. Given the body of literature calling for smaller, more manageable schools (e.g., House, 1998; Meier, 1995), the system should pay careful attention to the possible adverse effects of adding another 200 or so students to Skipper Elementary’s student population.

At the moment, the school is working diligently, and with admirable enthusiasm. Teachers are actively engaged in the task of helping the school’s students succeed cognitively and socially. Faculty morale is high and there is no evidence of panic or discontent. Lines
of communication are open between the administration and staff and there is a clear feeling among teachers that their efforts are valued by the principal.

If Skipper Elementary is to be able to take the positive factors found in the school and utilize them to facilitate leadership density it will be necessary for professional planning time for teachers to be incorporated into the school schedule. Thirty minutes a day is an insufficient period of time for meaningful staff development to occur, particularly when this block of time is used for many other purposes.

Lack of dedicated time for professional planning places teachers in highly autonomous worlds trial and error is the most common method of knowledge acquirement. High degrees of personal isolation insure that the same mistakes will be replicated by teachers time and again. Given the current rarity of teachers assuming leadership roles which apply systematic action research, (Little, 2000) there is little likelihood that teachers will stay abreast of current thinking on instructional practices, motivation, self-efficacy, school culture, etc. Even with the availability of adequate time for professional development, it is likely that outside help (the principal for example) will be needed to facilitate meaningful staff development activities (House, 1998). Therefore, alongside providing additional staff development time, Skipper Elementary should consider methods of delivering to teachers research-based topics which could create and facilitate assimilation of the knowledge into the specific contexts within which each teacher functions.

A source of concern for the school is the sixteen point decline in the school’s performance score in Louisiana’s school accountability mode. School patrons are not apt to understand explanations about why the performance score dropped. If the school’s scores for the current year show no improvement, it is likely that the school will once again rank
near the bottom of the parish schools when results are published and patrons may begin to suspect that something is wrong at the school. If this occurs, teacher and faculty defensiveness would be expected to heighten, perhaps creating a bunker mentality where the staff attempts to isolate itself from unwanted criticism from parents and community. And if students begin to suspect they go to a “bad school,” this too will have negative consequences upon Skipper Elementary’s educational efforts.

A large challenge faces Skipper Elementary. Somehow it must accommodate a large and growing student population with increasingly complex needs. Such a task will require a deep personal commitment by teachers and staff alike that the task is doable. A high commitment to this task can not be had unless there is are strongly held beliefs by faculty and staff regarding their individual and collective abilities to successfully educate the students at Skipper Elementary. Fostering and strengthening these beliefs seems to be tightly linked to activities which teachers see as meaningful and helpful to improving instruction both in their classrooms as well as the school as a whole. In short, it seems likely the school will need to actively think of ways to move towards leadership density and its attendant small jazz combo metaphor. Without a purposeful scheme of directly involving teachers in strategies for attaining desired educational outcomes (i.e., creating many small jazz combos within the school, all playing “sweet music), it is likely that teachers at Skipper Elementary will be driven towards higher levels of personal autonomy and self-reliance as the school becomes larger and more bureaucratized. This isolation would be expected to have a deleterious effect upon school culture, teacher self-efficacy, administrator self-efficacy, and ultimately student learning.
Before leadership density can begin to build inertia, it seems likely that the principal at Skipper Elementary will need to work in a transformational manner so that the school will be best positioned to face pending threats. By articulating a clear vision for the school, as well as understandable steps for its attainment the principal can help to transform the school and help it move towards denser levels of leadership.

Given the commitment to student learning demonstrated by teachers and the high respect given to the principal by the staff there is a strong likelihood the school will be able to maintain or improve upon current levels of school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy provided a meaningful process of professional staff development can be implemented at the school level. If this is done, then the school system’s DAT can operate as a facilitator for the school’s self-generated improvement process. On the other hand, if the school does not provide meaningful staff development activities along with adequate time for their study, then teacher autonomy will likely continue to rise as the school population increases.

With high teacher autonomy and little time for collegial and collaborative professional development time, it is unlikely that substantive, positive changes in school culture will be forthcoming. Subsequently, the school system’s DAT would likely come to be viewed as an external source of control and its potential positive influence mediated if not obviated all together due to the lack of an internal drive within the school faculty as a whole to seek out and implement better ways of teaching and learning.

All of these factors point to the critical role that the personal and collective beliefs of a school’s staff play in developing an environment which is conducive to engaging students in meaningful and challenging learning. The staff and faculty at Skipper Elementary
have the potential to move towards a denser form of leadership that is analogous to small jazz combo, but it will require diligent efforts by leadership within the school for this to happen, particularly within the areas of concern addressed above.

A summary of the major findings for the case study at Skipper Elementary is provided in table 6.4 below.

Table 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
<th>Metaphor for Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Managerial, centering on day-to-day issues.</td>
<td>Concern of faculty and staff over changing demographics of school population.</td>
<td>Sixteen point drop in school's performance score.</td>
<td>Principal as captain of the ship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Pertaining to the Research Questions

The following section discusses the results of the research questions item by item. At the conclusion of this section a discussion summarizes the findings for all schools and suggests ways to create and facilitate leadership density in schools.

Research Question 1

How involved are teachers in decision-making regarding teaching and learning?

Teachers at all four school expressed generally strong beliefs that they were involved in decisions regarding teaching and learning at their school. At each site teachers that were interviewed consistently pronounced their willingness to engage this type of leadership decision making. A strong professional commitment to teacher leadership which impacted
the teaching and learning environment was a common theme that emerged at all four schools.

In order for teachers to actualize their professional commitment to creating effective teaching and learning environments, avenues for reflection and collaboration need to be available. To some extent these avenues are available as teachers in all schools hold teacher conferences which deal with instructional issues. However, when the time is built into the instructional day it is often spent dealing with implementation of procedures, routines, and mandates handed down from the system or state level instead of on-site leadership decisions which seek ways to improve teaching and learning.

**Research Question 2**

How does the principal perceive his/her role in terms of providing leadership for the school?

In the first three case studies, there was a great deal of commonality present in the way the principals at each school viewed their role in terms of providing leadership for their school. Each of these principals articulated clear goals and visions for their school and each principal was playing a pivotal part in the implementation of these goals and visions. Furthermore, each of these three principals consistently spoke of their willingness to delegate authority and their high trust in their faculty’s abilities.

The principal at the fourth school also communicated high trust in his faculty’s abilities, but he was not as involved in the instructional process as the other three principals. In fact, he spoke directly about his assistant principal handling nearly all of the instructional issues that arose at the school. It was clear that this principal assumed much more of a managerial role than the other three teachers. As noted in the case studies, part of this may
be due to the larger size of his school and the rather extraordinary ratio of special-needs students present at the school.

**Research Question 3**

Does the principal provide leadership opportunities for teachers?

Once again there were clear similarities between the first three schools in the way the principal provided leadership opportunities for teachers. Principals at these three schools consistently spoke of, and their teachers confirmed, that teachers were expected to be part of the instructional leadership decision process in the school. This was particularly true at Faith Hill School, where the principal had given teachers responsibility for scheduling their own classes.

Teachers at Skipper Elementary were also provided leadership opportunities, but they did not come so much from the principal as from the assistant principal. In essence the principal vested the assistant principal with the responsibility of involving teachers in the instructional process. Skipper Elementary was also working with a District Assessment Team (DAT) that was assuming many of the leadership decision making responsibilities for the school.

**Research Question 4**

Are teachers working cooperatively and collegially towards school goals?

Teachers at all four schools appear to be working cooperatively and collegially towards school goals, with a caveat. None of the schools has an adequate staff development time set aside for teachers to engage in meaningful staff and personal development. This lack of time is acting like a limiting reagent in a chemical reaction. As long as professional
staff development time is limited to its current levels in these four schools there is little likelihood that teachers will be able to fully realize the benefits of cooperating with their colleagues in an effort to better instruction in their schools.

**Research Question 5**

Is small group planning by teams of teachers evident?

All four schools were engaged in systematic small group planning, although the degree and frequency was greatly limited by a lack of time specifically devoted to this end. Some were making rather extraordinary efforts to further enhance their capabilities. For example, Glenn Miller Elementary's staff would sometimes attempt to meet in the morning before school started about once a week. And Artie Shaw Elementary developed an ongoing teacher implemented and self-directed staff development program. However, the caution regarding adequate time for these admirable efforts must again be raised as the team time available for teachers at all four schools is approximately 30 minutes per day. If this time were designated and protected as professional staff development time it would be barely adequate. Factor in all the job-related and personal activities that must take place within this 30 minute time frame and it is evident that there is a pressing need for the availability of additional staff development time to facilitate small group planning by teachers.

**Research Question 6**

How willing are teachers to step outside of traditional roles to assume leadership responsibilities?

Teachers in all four schools were working within structures and relationships that would be considered typical and traditional within schools as they currently exist. For example, teacher involvement in curriculum decision-making was basically limited to
implementation of mandates and directives that were handed down from the system or state. No school had teachers that were actively engaged in team teaching, group critiques of individual small team member's classroom instructional techniques, or investigating the systemic nature of their work roles and responsibilities. These types of non-traditional roles and structures were not observed in operation in any of these schools.

At least two factors are believed to be mediating the lack of teacher assumption of nontraditional leadership responsibilities. The first is the lack of a guiding metaphor for the schools (such as the small jazz combo metaphor) which encourages teachers to rethink their roles and responsibilities in a way that captures many of the possible leadership combinations available. Second, teachers are firmly entrenched within a technician metaphor. That is, teachers are used to being told what to do by textbooks, legislatures, principals, superintendents, etc. To change this, it will also be necessary to get teachers out of the "technician" mode within which they currently operate. (Interestingly, the technician metaphor is, on one level, also appropriate to orchestral musicians as their job is primarily to follow their written musical instructions as closely as possible.)

Findings

There was much commonality in the findings for schools selected for case study in the dissertation. All four schools had healthy school cultures (e.g., appropriate levels of collegiality, professional behavior, respect, etc.) and their teachers held fairly strong beliefs about their abilities to create effective teaching and learning environments. Principals at all four schools were not only liked but genuinely respected by their staffs. In the three smaller schools particularly, all the principals were strong transformational leaders, helping their schools to rethink their goals and the means used to obtain them. At the larger school, the
principal is more disposed to managerial obligations. However, teachers at the school still view him as a transformational leader, giving him credit for helping to establish high standards and an overall goal of instructional excellence at the school.

From the perspective of comparing these schools to others in Louisiana, all four receive acceptable marks, according to the criteria used to establish accountability levels by the State of Louisiana. The schools chosen for case studies are all labeled as "Academically Above Average" in the state’s school accountability program, including Skipper Elementary, which dropped nearly 15 points in its SPS from the 1998 school year to the 1999 school year. Using any criteria set out in Louisiana’s school accountability program, these schools are currently in good favor.

Yet, classroom observations at all schools revealed teaching practices that typically did not foster high student engagement, effectively accommodate various learning styles or ability levels, challenge all students, or serve as motivation for extended learning opportunities. These findings certainly sound ominous. But, they should be read within the context that no classroom observation documented a bad teacher (i.e., one that has inadequate knowledge of subject, little enthusiasm for teaching or students, is disorganized, fails to prepare, etc.).

Why then, the discrepancy between teacher ability and actual classroom practices? There seems to be two powerful mediators acting as disconnects between teacher ability and actual classroom performance—time and the devaluing of teachers. The first is a practical problem. Time for professional planning is either inadequate or not provided for altogether. As a result, teachers tend to spend large amounts of time in the day-to-day details of teaching. This focus on the immediate tends to stymie long-term planning that is geared
towards facilitating effective teaching and learning. By analogy, if someone’s house is burning down they will not have time to sit down and plan their retirement. Without the time to effectively plan and become involved in leadership for instruction, teachers are effectively relegated to fighting the daily fire brought about, ironically, by the teacher’s continued use of centrist teaching methods.

Teachers noted that even with adequate time, a great deal of effort would have to be expended to create lessons which systematically incorporate attributes of an effective lesson into the classroom on a regular basis. When it was suggested in focus interviews that the effort for each individual could be significantly reduced by planning in teams, teachers became much more enthusiastic about the feasibility of planning in this manner. Teachers also commented that high-stakes testing are exerting a larger influence upon course curriculum each year. Teachers are feeling pressure to prepare for the test from practically the first day of school. Often, this myopic view of schooling translates into skill and drill activities (i.e., day-to-day planning instead of long-term) that mimic the style and content of the high-stakes test. Although the teachers felt that students would be better served by long-term planning of information rich lessons, there was a feeling that they would be viewed as directly accountable for student failures in large part because of their emphasis upon learning activities that did not simulate the format of high-stakes tests.

The second major impediment to leadership density in schools is the entrenched pattern of substantive decision making about teaching and learning that, for the most part, fails to seek the input of the teachers. Currently, teachers have many forces at work which tell them what to teach and how it is to be taught. First and foremost, almost all decisions about what should be taught are being made above the school level. This leaves teachers in
an isolated place in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Secondly, the textbooks and curriculum
guides which teachers use also minimize professional judgement of teachers. For example,
many textbooks now come with detailed lesson plans, including ready-made tests. It seems
likely that the typical teacher—far removed from policy decisions and increasingly reliant
upon outside sources for lesson content and assessment—will begin to receive a message that
teachers are not competent to make leadership decisions regarding how teaching and
learning should occur. In essence, teachers may come to believe that their leadership should
only extend to deciding how to implement externally derived policy. Teachers holding this
view will likely believe their ideas about improving curriculum and/or instruction have little
value and will be more likely to operate from an orchestral member perspective.

The Need for Transformational Leadership

Lack of professional development time and the devaluing of the leadership abilities
of teachers are perhaps the two largest impediments to the creation of leadership density in
schools. It seems apparent that to move towards leadership density, schools will first need
strong transformational leadership to begin the reculturing and restructuring process needed
to facilitate high levels of leadership density.

Unlike schools, where teachers are often disconnected from critical decisions, the
business world has recognized for quite some time that removing their working staff from
input in critical decisions tends to impede overall organizational productivity (Senge, 1990).
Consequently, calls for the emergence of Professional Learning Communities, systems
thinking, troubleshooting teams, and the like have emerged from business literature as well
as through success stories of restructured businesses (House, 1998, Senge, 1990). It is
important to note that businesses that have restructured are typically in highly volatile
markets where success depends upon rapid response to market conditions. By recognizing that those doing the day-to-day work for the organization often hold insights unavailable to others, these restructured companies increased the quality of information available for decision making while simultaneously sending a clear message to their working force that they were more than mere technicians. This type of systems thinking has proved very useful to companies such as Toyota, where workers have saved the company millions of dollars by working to help develop an assembly line that can be quickly configured to different types of vehicles (House, 1998).

Why isn’t the same approach valued and sought after for schools? The ongoing give and take within classrooms seems to demand that teachers should be intimately involved in leadership decisions regarding the delivery of effective instruction. But, as noted, to do this requires designated time for professional planning. In the schools surveyed, this time was minimal at best although the smaller schools were able to make more effective use of their planning time than Skipper Elementary. However, simply providing time will not be enough. Teachers need a clear delineation of their mission. What are the goals and outcomes the organization as a whole will strive toward, and what metaphors will guide the process of working towards achieving these goals? What is the role of external mandates? How much influence should they have over on-site decision making?

Questions such as these, where cultural norms are challenged, seem to emanate from a transformational perspective on leadership. Clearly, few if any schools are currently organized to think of themselves as having many small jazz combos performing simultaneously. Before this can occur, a transformation of school culture and teacher beliefs will almost certainly need to occur. This call for transformational leadership is already well
documented in the literature (e.g., Leithwood, & Jantzi, 1990) but it is questionable if the degree and frequency to which transformational leadership is occurring within schools reflects the need for its occurrence.

In the case of the four schools selected for case study, it would be appropriate to view the leadership at the first three schools as transformational. Each of these schools was actively rethinking the roles of teachers, staff, and students. Clear visions for accomplishing school goals were articulated and teachers were involved in defining and refining these goals. Skipper Elementary also showed signs of transformational leadership. But its size, shifting student population, and the stress of lowered high-stakes test scores have created a complex situation making it difficult to create an urgency for actively rethinking “who we are and what we do.”

Even with the highly transformational leadership occurring within the first three schools where case studies were conducted there is no certainty that they will continue to move towards higher levels of leadership density. For one, all three of these principals were dynamic, charismatic individuals. It is certainly possible that their personalities are exerting strong influence or even driving reform efforts at these schools. If these principals leave, there is always the possibility that much of the inertia driving restructuring will leave with them. Skipper Elementary’s principal is more of the traditional, managerial oriented school administrator. Having delegated school curriculum to the assistant principal, he spends a great deal of time managing the day-to-day operations of the school such as discipline (The other three principals also handled discipline. However, their smaller enrollment kept the task from being as burdensome as the principal at Skipper Elementary). Like the principals of the other schools, Skipper Elementary’s principal shares a strong commitment to his
faculty and staff and speaks highly of their collective and individual potential. In all four school sites the principals’ support of their faculty seemed to be a central factor in maintaining positive teacher morale.

Each of these schools exhibited strong to some degree of transformational leadership. In addition, all four schools were observed to have healthy school cultures and high levels of teacher self-efficacy for creating and facilitating effective learning environments. However, none of these schools were observed to have teachers consistently assuming leadership roles that could be considered a viable example of leadership density vis-a-vis the small jazz combo metaphor. The combination of the rigors for preparing for high-stakes testing, inadequate planning time, outdated leadership metaphors, and the limited perception by teachers of their potential in assuming leadership roles have all acted together to form a barrier to transformational leadership facilitating the development leadership density. Accompanying these obstacles is the limited, centrist notion of the principal as leader. In all four schools, much of what teachers were doing was, by their description, something the office wanted. Even with strong, transformational leadership, teachers had not yet moved far beyond familiar roles. Given the findings of these four case studies, a summary is developed below for impediments to high levels of leadership density.

Problem #1: Lack of Daily Planning and Professional Development Time

The need for professional development time was commented upon at all four schools. However, the actual time provided for professional development is inadequate to accommodate meaningful, long-term planning on a regular basis. As a result, teachers tend to spend large amounts of time living in the day-to-day details of teaching. By focusing on short-term planning, teachers tend to create lessons that do not require substantial planning
to implement. Typically, lessons designed with short-term planning are teacher centrist since it is easier to get up in front of a class and transmit information than it is to plan lessons where students actively seek out their own knowledge and conclusions. Ironically, these teacher-centrist classes tend to create learning environments that require the teacher to spend high amounts of energy on classroom management which, in turn, creates a higher demand for short-term planning.

Although focus groups at all schools recognized that long-term planning would be most conducive to building desirable lessons, teachers indicated their planning tended to be more short-term, or day-to-day. In other words, their planning would be typical of what would be seen in a daily lesson plan book. For example, in a math class teacher planning might encompass one or two objectives, page number(s) to be covered, questions to be answered, a list of activities for the day (lecture, practice problems, desk work for example), and perhaps homework. Even when long-term planning is evidenced (such as unit plans for example), it tended to replicate the day-to-day planning in terms of teacher-centrist activities and expectations for student learning.

**Problem #2: Devaluing the Skills of Teaching**

Lack of professional planning time for teachers is a symptom of an external and pervasive threat to high professional norms and for professional expectations within schools. In schools, teachers often operate as technicians, or to return to metaphors of a musical nature, orchestral members. The outcomes of teaching and learning are often determined before the process even begins (e.g., high-stakes test items are determined prior to the first day of instructional time in a school). The linear thinking that predominates such outcome based assumptions does little to emphasize the active, professional role that teachers play in
the teaching and learning process. These assumptions are believed to cause a critical disconnect in teacher self-efficacy, serve as a restrictive force which impedes cultural development in schools and finally, have deleterious impact upon the degree to which leadership density develops within the faculty and staff at a school.

If teachers come to see themselves as technicians/orchestral members, then it is not surprising that their planning would tend to be short-term with little focus on broader issues of teaching and learning. Deeper and richer planning of that nature would be expected to be generated from somewhere else, where the experts (i.e., the engineer in the case of the technician and the composer in the case of the orchestral member) decide proper courses of action. If teachers see themselves in this technical vein (which is certainly understandable) they will wait on their long-term instructions and then attempt to build short-term frameworks to implement them. As noted previously, these short-term frameworks tend to be teacher-centrist.

**Problem #3: Using High-Stakes Tests as the Sole Criterion to Assess Learning**

Several researchers have documented how high-stakes tests narrow curriculum and stifle teacher creativity (e.g., Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Bracey, 1997; Linn, 2000; McNeil, 2000; Rothstein, 1998; Sacks, 1999). This narrowing of curriculum had occurred at all four schools in the case studies. Teachers consistently mentioned that what they taught was determined more and more by external mandates. When teachers spoke of the impact of high-stakes tests upon their classroom environment it was almost always in a negative vein. "I only cover the fun stuff after the test," remarked one teacher. "I've got so much stuff to cover that I am afraid to slow down and get really involved in a lesson," said another. These
types of remarks were quite typical of instructional strategies utilized by teachers facing high-stakes testing as well as the frustrations generated by their use.

Comments such as those just alluded to indicate that teachers feel like they are being left out of the decision making loop for classroom instruction. This lack of confidence in teacher input for instruction appears to cause high levels of frustration and further serves to devalue the role and contributions of teachers.

The teaching profession currently suffers from several competing interests working against each other, resulting in teachers being pulled in contradicting directions. For example, teachers are expected to create effective teaching and learning environments while simultaneously having little input into classroom curriculum. Responsibility for student learning is vested to the teacher, yet policy makers and politicians generally do not recognize that many things teachers can not control occur outside of school, often with deleterious results to student learning. Teachers are asked to deliver scripted outcomes of completed learning objectives while being told to foster autonomous, self-directed thinking. And perhaps the worst contradiction occurs when teachers are expected to act like professionals within job expectations that create technicians.

The devaluing of teachers to where, metaphorically, they operate more like technicians or orchestral members rather than small jazz combo members that are expected to help guide and define the music’s progression may be the single biggest impediment to increasing leadership density within schools.

A summary table for the major findings of the case studies are presented by individual school in the following table.
Table 6.5

Summary of the Major Findings of the Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Principal Leadership</th>
<th>Staff's Involvement In Leadership</th>
<th>Impediments to Leadership Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke Ellington</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>High-stakes tests, district mandates towards them, lack of adequate staff development time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Hill</td>
<td>Transformational, Charismatic</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>High-stakes tests, lack of adequate staff development time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artie Shaw</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>High-stakes tests, lack of adequate staff development time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipper</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>High-stakes tests, lack of adequate staff development time, lack of a transformative vision for empowering teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Chapter 6 presents a summary of the qualitative data analyses conducted for this study. Data from each school was analyzed for the emergence of trends, themes, similarities, and differences. This information was used to address the Research Questions posed in Phase II.

Chapter 7 presents a summary of major findings of the study. Additionally, implications for future research, theory development, and practice are discussed.
CHAPTER 7: MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Context

Throughout the nation, increased attention is being directed to schools and the roles they play in educating children. There seems to be a sense that public schools, in general, are not providing quality teaching and learning opportunities. A driving force behind this pessimistic view of public schools is the use of standardized tests within the context of increased educational accountability (Linn, 2000). The linking of school accountability with standardized testing is spreading rapidly throughout America. Recent calls for a series of federally mandated standardized tests may create a nationwide accountability program that is founded upon results from these tests.

Current calls for school accountability rely upon top-down, bureaucratic policy making. Schools are expected to take their mandated “marching orders” and implement them to produce desired results (i.e., high student test scores on standardized tests). High-stakes school reform of this kind tends to create a crisis mentality, where highly centrist decision making is the norm. In effect, current efforts at school reform are very similar to past, failed efforts (Cuban, 1990, 1992). Specifically, they tend to have heavy reliance upon external mandates and threats of punishment and retribution for those (students, teachers, and schools) that do not meet specified goals. Fullan (1993) notes that external mandates are not optimal for creating long-term, substantive change while House (1998) argues persuasively that current suppositions driving school reform incorrectly paint teachers and students alike as unintelligent and/or lazy.

If the last 50 years of school research have done nothing else, they have documented the tremendous difficulty in restructuring and improving schools. This study proceeds from
the belief that substantive and enduring improvement in schools is realized through the active participation of those within the organization. From this perspective, school improvement is best served through changing internalized goals, values, and norms that permeate the school culture and its members. In essence, without a compelling conviction by members of a school that what is being undertaken in terms of school improvement is both worthwhile and doable, there is little likelihood of systematic school improvement. Improvement must become imbedded in who we are and what we do around here. This study posits an alternative view of school change and improvement that is based upon the utilization of the abilities and commitment of those within the organization to bring about substantive change.

This chapter presents a summary of major findings and implications of the study. Included is a brief overview of the study, along with a summary of findings and conclusions, and finally a detailed discussion. The discussion addresses methodological, theoretical, and practical implications of the findings and provides suggestions for future research.

A New Perspective on School Leadership

A metaphorical model for leadership density (i.e., the small jazz combo) was developed for this study. By basing the study of leadership density upon a metaphor, it was possible to capture the essential elements of leadership density in an elegant and efficient manner. After considering various metaphors reflecting current models of school leadership, a classical orchestra/marching band metaphor was deemed appropriate for understanding existing leader-centrist notions of leadership within schools (Smith & Ellett, 1999, 2000, 2000a).

The classical orchestra/marching band metaphor captures most of the essential assumptions found in school leadership today (Iwanicki, 1999, Brent, 2000). Policy for
schools is decided upon apart from the school itself in much the same way that a composer pens a score apart from the orchestra. Once the policy is finalized, it generally finds its way to the principal of the school who then attempts to see to it that the teachers implement the policy as it was originally intended. By analogy, the principal is acting as the conductor of an orchestra or a band, attempting to ensure that members are playing their parts as envisioned by the policy makers/composers. Extending the analogy further into the classroom, teachers act as conductors of their own small orchestras, and they attempt to get their students to play their parts in the manner described previously by the policy makers, the principal, and the teacher.

School leadership of this type is linear, hierarchical, and assumes a predetermined outcome in much the same way that a classical conductor works with the musicians to complete a musical score. The outcome is the goal (the process of learning is not the primary emphasis), and the outcome has already been determined. Thus, it makes sense under this style of leadership to use high-stakes tests as a single barometer to determine how much learning has occurred since the outcomes are expected to be the same throughout a school system and indeed the entire state.

Several problems present themselves when this metaphorical, classical/marching band style of leadership is applied to schools. First, it is unlikely that external mandates derived from outside sources will produce meaningful change in the way teaching and learning occurs within a school. Given what is now known about the importance of school culture in facilitating the improvement of teaching and learning within schools, it seems much more likely that substantive, meaningful, and long-lasting school improvement will take place from within schools rather than from outside schools (Corbett, Firestone, &
Rossman, 1987; Cuban, 1990; Fullan 1993, 1999, 2000), which is a point in conflict with most current school reform efforts.

Second, current models of school leadership tend to have a devaluative effect upon the importance of teachers in the search for improvement in teaching and learning. Although much has been written about the need for site-based management in schools (e.g., House, 1998; McNeil, 2000), it seems clear that most decisions made on school campuses have to do with how to implement goals and directives already specified for the school by an outside source. By limiting the degree of teacher input into the unique circumstances in the schools in which teachers work, policy makers may have sent a message to teachers that their input is not expected nor warranted when it comes to deciding what students should learn, the best ways to assess the degree that students have learned, and so forth.

Third, it is doubtful that such a complex task as learning can be effectively policed through outside mandates and decision making bodies (Barth, 1986, 1990; Cuban, 1990). The rather unspectacular results of the reform efforts of the past 50 years, and the leadership assumptions inherent within them lend a large amount of anecdotal support for this conclusion. Current learning theory (e.g., social constructivism) suggests rich, robust learning is best facilitated by active student engagement in tasks which require students to:

• Form and refine concepts;
• Engage in critique and collaboration of each other's work;
• Play a role in negotiating learning processes and outcomes; and
• Integrate new information with past learning and experiences as they develop their own knowledge.
If social constructivism is valued as a theory base for teaching and learning in today’s schools, there appears to be a substantial disconnect between the assumptions driving current models of school leadership and the realities of current teaching practices. Teachers, for example, who model centrist notions of leadership in their classrooms are not likely to teach from a social constructivist perspective. Additionally, state mandated testing policies, that are known to drive a mentality among teachers to teach to the test, are at odds with current learning theories such as social constructivism.

Using the disconnect of theory and practice discussed above as a starting point, the study was framed by an effort to reconceptualize school leadership in such a way that: a) the collective and individual talents of teachers (and students) could be best used within a school setting; b) the increasingly difficult job demands being made upon principals as “the leader” could be rethought; and c) positive school change and restructuring within schools could occur as a school reshapes its core norms, values and beliefs. After much thought and consideration, the small jazz combo was determined to be an appropriate metaphor for leadership density in schools since it captured in an elegant and simple manner the attributes believed to be needed to bring about positive and meaningful change in teaching and learning within schools (Smith & Ellett, 2000).

The small jazz combo metaphor was found to be of considerable value for representing a framework to rethink and reconceptualize leadership in schools. The metaphor provides an elegant means for conveying a multitude of conditions believed to be important for effective teaching and learning environments in schools. For example, high levels of cooperation and collaboration, improvisational skills, rapid response to change, adaptability, personal and collective expertise, empathy and patience for others, valuing
creativity, professional reflection, appreciation for individual differences among organizational members and their unique contributions to organizational goals, and performance-based assessments and evaluations, are all closely linked to small jazz combos and schools that are actively seeking to improve teaching and learning. Furthermore, the small jazz combo metaphor also proved quite useful in guiding the qualitative case studies to better understand the meaning of leadership density in the everyday life of the schools selected for case studies.

As previously noted, metaphors are thought to form the conceptual basis for nearly all of our cognitive processes (Lakoff & Johnson, 1981). Given this assumption about the linkage between language conceptions and behavior, the small jazz combo metaphor should prove useful in future efforts at restructuring schools and school leadership by providing a common framework for communicating desired outcomes and attributes of schools high in leadership density.

The study was considered exploratory in nature. There were no known studies of school leadership reconceptualizing leadership using a small jazz combo metaphor. Because of the unique nature of the study, and because of the need to begin establishing a nomological net (Cronbach & Mehl, 1955) for the construct of leadership density in schools, it was of interest to determine the extent to which the creation and facilitation of leadership density in schools might be linked to school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy. Therefore, an important activity of this study was the development of original, psychometrically sound measures of the various variables reflected in the Model for Leadership Density in Schools (Chapter 2; Figure 2).
As developed for this study, the Model of Leadership Density in Schools (MLDS) assumes a triadic and reciprocal relationship between the study variables. This model was developed consistent with Bandura’s (1997) triadic and reciprocal model of human agency (Chapter 2; Figure 1). It is important to note that Bandura’s model reflects three core components: a behavior component (B), an environmental component (E), and a personal component (P). The MLDS assumes that leadership density is a collective behavior (B), mediated in a triadic and reciprocal fashion by elements of professional school culture (E) and teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs (P).

Bandura’s (1997) model for understanding human behavior is not unidirectional. The three core components represent dynamic, ongoing, reciprocal interactions that explain purposeful human behavior. Active cognitive processes are included in the person (P) construct and these processes result in behaviors (B) that act on the environment (E) (human agency). As well, individuals are the recipients of, and are influenced by environmental events and behavioral consequences. Since Bandura’s model is dynamic, causal relations among the P, B, & E variables are reciprocal.

To date, Bandura’s theory of triadic reciprocal causation has largely focused on understanding the role of self and collective efficacy beliefs on human behavior, and the role of the environment and behavior on developing, strengthening, and weakening self-efficacy beliefs. In his theory, self-efficacy is the superordinate theoretical construct reflecting personal (P) variables in the theory. A rich set of studies exists to substantiate Bandura’s theoretical model and the importance of self-efficacy beliefs to human functioning in many contexts. In this study, Bandura’s model of triadic reciprocal causation with its theoretical assumptions about P, B, and E variables was extrapolated to the study of leadership density.
in schools. In the MLDS, B = leadership density (behaviors), P = self-efficacy beliefs, and E = professional organizational culture. In keeping with the assumption of reciprocal causation, causal relations between the B, P, and E components of the MLDS are considered to be bi-directional.

Thus, leadership density (B) in the MLDS model is influenced by, and influences as well, teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs (P) and professional school culture (E). Similarly, the strength of self-efficacy beliefs influences, and is influenced by, changes in professional school culture and leadership density. While this study was primarily concerned with school organizational level variables, these same relationships would be expected to hold at the individual class level between teachers and students. And, collectively, they offer ample evidence that conceptualizing the development of leadership density from a triadic and reciprocal perspective was appropriate to frame the study.

**Overview of the Study**

The initial conceptual development of the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) attempted to capture elements essential to an effective performance by a small jazz combo and place them within a school context. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs-Leadership Scale Density measure (TEBS-LD) was developed to assess the degree to which teachers believed in their abilities to successfully organize and execute tasks necessary for the creation and facilitation of leadership density within a school. In a similar fashion, the Administrator Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density measure (AEBS-LD) was developed to assess the degree to which administrators felt they could facilitate teachers’ assuming leadership roles necessary to enhance leadership density in their schools. The Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire (RSCEQ) was condensed from a 20 item measure (Bobbett, 2001,
Olivier, 2001) to a 15 item measure (SCEQ-LD) for this study. The SCEQ-LD measures actual and preferred perceptions of teachers professional norms, values, and beliefs (professional culture) in their schools.

A set of four research hypotheses derived from components of the Model of Leadership Density in Schools (MLDS) was used to guide the development of the measures and data analyses in this study. Additionally, six research questions were developed to guide qualitative case studies in individual schools in an effort to see how leadership density in schools might play out. Finally, a set of supplemental research questions emerged from the primary data analyses and centered upon: 1) the factor structures of the empirically derived constructs for the various measures developed for the study; 2) the reliability of the quantitative data derived from the study; and 3) the extent to which relationships among the various study variables vary among schools within the sample (as observed in case studies).

The section that follows provides an overview of the study.

The study was completed in two suburban/rural school districts in the State of Louisiana. Both districts had similar population demographics and both districts scored substantially above the state achievement test mean for schools in the first round of the LEAP 21 accountability program. Besides these two school districts, one school was selected from a large, urban school district. This school was selected based upon its reputation for empowerment of its teachers regarding instructional decision making. Data were collected in the spring of 2001 in 41 schools from a sample of 987 teachers and 38 administrators. School performance scores (a numerical score based upon the LEAP 21 criterion-referenced test, the IOWA Test of Basic Skills, and other factors such as drop-out
rate and attendance) were obtained from the State Department of Education for the 2000 school year for the schools where case studies were performed.

A primary focus of the study was the need to develop three original measures. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD), the Administrator Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (AEBS-LD), and the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) were specifically designed for the study. Also, the study was concerned with refining the Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire (RSCEQ), an original measure developed by Cavanagh (1997), and subsequently revised by Bobbett (2001), Ellett (1998), and Olivier (2001). In this study, the RSCEQ was shortened from its original 20 item to a 15 item format (the SCEQ-LD).

The TEBS-LD, AEBS-LD, and the LDI were all developed to measure components of the Leadership Density Model for Schools described in Chapter 2 of this study. The SCEQ-LD was used along with the original measures created for this study in an effort to measure the triadic, reciprocal components found with the Leadership Density Model for Schools. All quantitative measures used in this study were self-report measures (see Chapter 4 and Appendix A for further information). The section that follows presents a summary of the study results as these pertain to the research hypotheses (Quantitative Phase) and the research questions (Qualitative Phase)

Results Pertaining to Tests of the Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There is a statistically significant, positive, bivariate relationship between leadership density and elements of professional school culture.
Overwhelming support was indicated for this hypothesis. Correlations between the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) factored subscales and the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD) were all in the predicted direction, and with only three exceptions, were all statistically significant (p<.05).

**Hypothesis 2**

There is a statistically significant, positive bivariate relationship between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy.

Correlations between leadership density and teacher self-efficacy were in the predicted direction, though many were not of sufficient magnitude, given the rather small sample size (n=41 schools), to attain statistical significance (p<.05). When the results are considered collectively (Table 5.12), they provide reasonable support for the hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is a statistically significant, positive bivariate relationship between leadership density and administrator efficacy.

None of the intercorrelations between the measures of administrator self-efficacy beliefs and the measure of leadership density produced statistically significant results (p>.05). This third research hypothesis was not confirmed.

**Hypothesis 4**

The combination of school culture, teacher self-efficacy, and administrator self-efficacy accounts for significantly more variation in leadership density among schools than any of these variables considered singularly.
This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis. The results were mixed, in that some leadership density factors were predicted by single variables for school culture and self-efficacy, and some were predicted by combinations of these variables.

Canonical correlations were computed to better understand the complex relationships existing among the various sub constructs of the study variables. These results showed rather strong multivariate linkages between leadership density in schools, dimensions of professional school culture, and teacher self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to carry out leadership tasks in their schools. Schools in which leadership density strength was evident in teacher empowerment and adaptability were schools characterized by strong culture fostering vision and leadership among organizational members.

A secondary multivariate linkage between leadership density and school culture was evident as well. Professional commitment and collegial teaching and learning among teachers in these schools (elements of professional school culture) were rather strongly and positively linked to student and teacher participation in leadership tasks.

An additional canonical correlation analysis showed that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to personally learn and to lead the learning of others in their schools (leadership density roles), was positively and strongly associated with leadership density elements of teamwork among teachers and the strength of student volunteerism. Thus, the strength of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to enhance leadership density in their schools goes hand in hand with their perceptions of the strength of leadership density in the school organization.
Results Pertaining to Tests of the Research Questions

Research Question 1

How involved are teachers in decision-making regarding teaching and learning?

Teachers at all four case study schools expressed generally strong beliefs about the importance of their involvement in decisions regarding teaching and learning. A theme evident in all schools was a strong professional commitment to teacher leadership as it pertained to the teaching and learning environment.

Research Question 2

How does the principal perceive his/her role in terms of providing leadership for the school?

In three of the schools the principals demonstrated common themes. They all articulated clear goals and visions for their schools and showed a willingness to delegate authority. Furthermore, each principal was playing a central role in the realization of their school's goals and visions. The fourth principal (Skipper Elementary) also articulated the need for teacher involvement in instructional decision making. However, this principal assumed more of a managerial role and was not as involved in the educational mission of the school, leaving many of the instructional matters at the school to the assistant principal.

Research Question 3

Does the principal provide leadership opportunities for teachers?

In all four schools there was ample evidence that teachers were being afforded leadership opportunities. However, most of the leadership opportunities at Skipper Elementary came from the assistant principal and the District Assessment Team (DAT) that was assigned to the school.
Research Question 4

Are teachers working cooperatively and collegially towards school goals?

Teachers at all four schools were working cooperatively and collegially towards attainment of school goals. However, no school had adequate time for staff development.

Research Question 5

Is small group planning by teams of teachers evident?

All four schools were engaged in some manner of systematic small group planning. But, as noted above, the lack of an adequate block of staff development time limited the effectiveness of team planning.

Research Question 6

How willing are teachers to step outside the traditional roles to assume leadership responsibilities?

Teachers at all four schools demonstrated a willingness to "step outside the box," and think differently. However, at least two factors seem to be impeding this process. First, there was a lack of a guiding metaphor (such as the small jazz combo) to serve as a conceptual basis for rethinking traditional roles and responsibilities. Second, leadership decisions reflecting a thorough knowledge of learning theory, motivation, self-efficacy, etc. were not typically expected from teachers. Rather, teachers tended to function as technicians, working with sets of instructions that were generated off-site.

The results pertinent to the research hypotheses and research questions generated several major findings and conclusions. These are described in the section that follows.
Major Findings and Conclusions

**Major Finding 1**

The quantitative findings, when considered collectively, were rather strongly supportive of relationships predicted among variables in the Model for School Leadership framing the study.

**Conclusions**

Framing school leadership within the metaphorical perspective of a small jazz combo is an efficient way to capture leadership qualities (e.g., high levels of collegiality, collaboration, emphasis upon self-critique and improvement, ability to enhance and innovate) which prove useful in creating and facilitating non-centrist, dense forms of leadership. Additionally, leadership density in schools is reciprocally related to professional organizational culture and teacher self-efficacy beliefs about taking on leadership roles.

**Major Finding 2**

The qualitative case studies did not identify evidence of any school working in a leadership environment consistent with characteristics of a small jazz combo metaphor.

**Conclusions**

This was not an unexpected finding, given the rather unique perspective of leadership that is reflected in the small jazz combo metaphor. Qualitative studies at these four schools did provide evidence that their school leaders (principals) were, to varying degrees, all looking for ways to restructure leadership at their schools so the collective talents of their teachers could be better utilized. In this sense, the qualitative data suggested that leadership density in schools, consonant with the small jazz combo metaphor may be observable and documentable in schools moving away from traditional centrist leadership characteristics.
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These observations support the viability of the leadership density constructs in schools that appear to be moving toward the devolvement of leadership throughout the school.

**Major Finding 3**

Leadership is nested within school culture.

**Conclusions**

Correlations between elements of school culture and leadership density were strong and in the direction predicted by the study hypotheses. Multivariate analyses (multiple regressions and canonical correlations) provided further support for this conclusion. Qualitative case studies corroborated data from the quantitative results. In the case studies, a common thread of high professional norms for teacher leadership was evident at all schools. Although no school could be said to be functioning from a small jazz combo perspective, all were, to some extent, moving toward less traditional (centrist) leadership. These finding support the conclusion that dense (i.e., non-centrist) forms of school leadership are nested within a school culture that values and seeks leadership contributions from its members.

**Major Finding 4**

The qualitative case studies revealed a consistent theme of faculty members’ strong beliefs that they, rather than policy makers, were best suited for charting productive change in their school. Often, these beliefs were at odds with the assumptions driving external mandates designed to force schools to improve. When these conflicts in interest arose, the strongly held values and beliefs of school staff about what the school needed to do to improve won out over external mandates (with the possible exception of the DAT and
This trend was particularly evident with recent accountability (standardized testing and school performance improvement) mandates.

Conclusions

The qualitative case studies revealed a consistent theme of faculty members’ strong beliefs that they were best suited for charting change. Therefore, this study concludes restructuring schools around the collective and individual leadership abilities of the staff is better served by internal, self-directed processes rather than forced, external mandates.

Major Finding 5

Dimensions of elements of professional school culture were more frequently and strongly correlated with leadership density than elements of teachers self-efficacy beliefs.

Conclusions

Leadership density in schools appears to be more imbedded in and fostered by the shared norms, beliefs, and values of teachers that reflect professional school culture than teachers self-efficacy beliefs about their abilities to contribute to school leadership. Linkages between school culture and leadership density in this study are consonant with linkages between culture and school outcomes noted in other, recent studies (Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001; Rugutt, et.al, 1997). In these studies, and in the present study, measures of school culture show stronger criterion-related validity than measures of teacher self-efficacy beliefs using school outcomes (e.g., organizational effectiveness, school performance scores) and leadership density as criterion variables. The findings of this study corroborate findings of these other recent studies and suggest that school culture is more potent in giving rise to leadership density and enhancing school outcomes than teachers’ individual self-efficacy beliefs. It should be noted here that the leadership density construct is rather new and the
self-efficacy measure used in this study asked teachers to report on the strength of their beliefs to carry out tasks that foster leadership density in their schools. As well, it should be noted that recent studies of teachers’ collective self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to enhance student learning (Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001) have shown stronger linkages between these efficacy measures and school organizational effectiveness and productivity than between school culture and these same school outcomes. With greater understanding of the leadership density construct among teachers, measures like the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD) measure may be more sensitive to variation among schools and correlations with the LDI may be stronger than those reported in this study.

**Major Finding 6**

The qualitative phase of the study served to further clarify the construct of leadership density in schools. Furthermore, the qualitative research added meaning to the quantitative findings by collecting and examining data regarding experiences and observations from the everyday life in schools.

**Conclusions**

Further studies of leadership density should continue to employ quantitative and qualitative methods in an effort to understand leadership density in schools, how it develops, how it plays out, impediments to its development, etc. Quantitative data can inform case studies, particularly in situations where a high level of leadership density is indicated by staff responses on quantitative measures. Case studies can be particularly useful for understanding and explaining variance in teacher scores within schools and explaining similarities and contrasts between schools.
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Major Finding 7

The multiple sources of evidence in this study were collected to explore linkages between the small jazz combo metaphor and the leadership density constructs. Items for the LDI were initially developed and endorsed by a small, knowledgeable panel of educators as consonant with characteristics of a small jazz combo. Additionally, the study generated criterion-related validity evidence for the factored subscales of the LDI when they were correlated with measures of self-efficacy and professional organizational culture. Results of the qualitative phase of the study (school case studies) also documented the viability of the small jazz combo metaphor for conceptualizing leadership density in schools.

Conclusions

These findings lead to the conclusion that the small jazz combo metaphor is a viable metaphor for conceptualizing and measuring leadership density in schools.

Major Finding 8

There was little relationship between administrator self-efficacy beliefs and teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to organize and execute tasks related to developing leadership density in their schools.

Conclusions

Given the small number of principal respondents in this study (n=33), further work is necessary to determine the replicability of the data. As such, all conclusions that follow should be viewed as tentative and contingent upon further study. The conclusions are:

- The willingness of teachers to assume leadership roles reflects the internalized beliefs and values of each teacher more so than the principal’s belief in his or her collective ability to create and facilitate leadership density;
• Teachers place little emphasis upon the efforts of the principal to facilitate leadership decision-making since, in teachers views, the principal is rather disconnected from the decision-making process for teaching and learning (acts as a manager or overseer); or

• Teachers view principals as ill-informed about teaching and learning disregard efforts of the principal to facilitate leadership density;

**Discussion**

The results of this study yield a variety of methodological issues and research design concerns that future research studies might address. Basic data collected for the study was generated from teacher self reports on surveys. Self reporting always carries the possibility of data contamination through halo effects, social desirability of responses and so forth.

A particular methodological issue in this study was the discrepancy between the rather high correlations between leadership density, school culture, and teacher self-efficacy in the quantitative phase of the study and the lack of evidence of the existence of high levels of leadership density in the schools selected for case studies. Concurrent with this issue, are the rather high item mean scores observed for the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI), School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD), and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density (TEBS-LD). Given the rather high means on these self-report measures, it might be expected that rather high levels of leadership density would be observed in the schools selected for the case studies, particularly since these schools were selected based upon items which were believed to be the most important to create and facilitate leadership density in schools.
The lack of case study evidence to corroborate the quantitative findings suggests several possibilities. As mentioned previously, halo effects are always a possible consideration in artificially elevating scores on self-report measures like the LDI, SCEQ-LD, and the TEBS-LD. Additionally, discrepancies between the qualitative and quantitative findings pertinent to leadership density in Schools may be explained due to rather high ceiling scores on the various self-report measures used. As well, and particularly with the LDI as a newly constructed measure, teachers may not have fully understood leadership density as a basis for assessing it in their schools, or as a basis for reporting on their self-efficacy beliefs.

Replications and extensions of this study might need to rethink the measures used in this study terms of the understandability of item content, and may also need to lengthen the measures to better differentiate levels of the variables measured among schools. With self-report measures that ask teachers and administrators to describe their personal characteristics (e.g., self-efficacy beliefs) and key school features (i.e., professional culture and leadership features), there may also be a tendency for respondents to provide fake good responses. Thus, future research using the measures developed for this study might profit from including sets of items that assess the social desirability of responses. Triangulation of multiple data sources (e.g., faculty, administrators, students, and parents) might also prove useful in future studies to provide a richer picture of the nature of leadership density in schools.

When the results of this study are considered collectively, the measures used in this study can be used in future research with considerable confidence. Some of the measures were adapted from existing measures with the rest developed specifically for this study. The results suggest that some of the measures need additional refinement by examining factor
structure and enhancing the reliability of data collection. In particular, the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) needs additional study since it is a new measure of a new theoretical construct of leadership in schools. Given the exploratory nature of this study, and the newness of the leadership density concept to school practitioners, the need to further refine the LDI is not surprising. Particularly noted in this study were marginal reliabilities of data collected for two of the six factored LDI scales.

The Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Leadership Density measure (TEBS-LD) and the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD) both produced rather strong results in the predicted direction. Future studies with these measures are of interest to see if similar results with other samples of teachers attain. If future studies replicate the structure of these measures, greater theoretical clarity and support would be offered for conceptions of self-efficacy for teacher participation in the creation, development, and facilitation of leadership density, as well as elements of professional school culture that enhance such participation.

Since leadership density in schools appears to a rare phenomenon, future case studies should employ careful sampling strategies which heighten the probability of finding a school(s) where high levels of leadership density are present. To this end, schools that serve predominantly affluent populations (and are therefore less likely to have their teaching strategies influenced by high-stakes testing) may be appropriate places to search for leadership density. Private schools may also be an appropriate place to sample since they typically serve more affluent populations and in most states their students do not take the high-stakes tests administered to students in public schools. However, this is not to say that poor schools can not be characterized as dense in leadership. Given the theoretical model
guiding this study, poor schools, as well as more affluent schools, can develop strong professional cultures and self-efficacy beliefs that strengthen leadership density, and attendant school effectiveness.

Another possibility in studying leadership density in schools may be to identify a school(s) that is(are) actively seeking to restructure leadership and is(are) willing to take the small jazz combo metaphor and internalize it within their school settings. If a school used the small jazz combo metaphor as a basis for a school improvement plan, longitudinal quantitative and qualitative data could be collected to study leadership density as it unfolds in schools. These kinds of studies could be quite useful in broadening our understanding of whether, and in what ways, the small jazz combo metaphor and attendant leadership density can shape structures and roles in schools. Time series designs in which leadership density (and perhaps professional school culture and self-efficacy beliefs as well) are measured over time might proved particularly interesting in this regard.

Another sampling strategy in future research might be to examine extreme variations in within school correlations among a set of study variables, and to use these extreme correlations as a means of identifying schools for case studies. Qualitative questions with this methodology would, in part, attempt to understand why correlations among variables are weak or strong, or positive or negative in some schools and not in others. This procedure has been completed with success in one other known study (Claudet, 1993) and has been suggested by syntheses of large-scale research studies in schools as a potentially enlightening methodology, and as important for extending theory development in schools as well (Ellett, Logan, Claudet, Loup, Johnson, & Chauvin, 1997).
Implications for Theory and Research

This results of this study have implications for theory development, refinement, and subsequent research in a number of areas. In particular, the results of this study have implications for theory refinement and further research in:

- The area of professional elements of school culture;
- Self-efficacy theory for developing leadership density in schools as well as the general theory of self-efficacy;
- Teacher and administrator preparation and certification programs;
- School accountability models;
- Future efforts at school reform;
- Evolution of leadership in schools; and
- Implications for what leadership density may mean at the class, school, local, state, and national levels.

Implications for Further Studies of School Culture and Self-Efficacy

Results of this study indicate that the norms, values, and beliefs held by members of a school are powerful contributors in the creation and facilitation of leadership density. For example, 83% of the bivariate correlations between the Professional Elements of School Culture-Leadership Density measure (SCEQ-LD) and the Leadership Density Inventory were positive in direction and statistically significant (p<.05). Furthermore, the three non-significant correlations were obtained with the subscale Bureaucratic Structure (BS) of the LDI (an expected result).

Future research might attempt to further refine the subscales of school culture and seek to provide a greater understanding of how these subscales are theoretically related to the
self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators as regards to leadership density. Also, future research might seek to clarify which subscales exert the most influence over the professional norms, values, and beliefs within a school, how these elements of culture can be positively changed, and to what degree the subscales are generic or contextually sensitive.

Although not as strong as the correlations between the School Culture Elements-Leadership Density measure (SCEQ-LD) and the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI), the correlations between the Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs-Leadership Density measure (TEBS-LD) and the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI results generally followed predicted patterns. For example, the TEBS-LD subconstruct Leadership of Learning (LOL) and the LDI subconstruct Teamwork (TWK) demonstrated rather strong, positive relationships. On the other hand, no subscales of the TEBS-LD had a significant correlation ($p<.05$) with the LDI subscales for Empowerment (EMP), even though intuitively it seems there should be a significant correlation.

The correlations between the subscales of the LDI and TEBS-LD were either strongly significant at the $p<.01$ level or, they were not significant at all. This indicates that theoretical linkages existing between teacher self-efficacy and leadership density may be nested almost entirely within the variables where the significant correlations exist. Future research should attempt to clarify the relations between subscales of the TEBS-LD and LDI measurements, the strength of these relationships, as well as their replicability and contextual sensitivity.

When subscales of the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI) were regressed against subscales of the School Culture Elements Questionnaire-Leadership Density (SCEQ-LD), there was only one SCEQ-LD subscale which was a statistically significant ($p<.001$)
predictor for Teamwork (TWK). Furthermore, only one factor, Collegial Teaching and Learning (CTL) was statistically significant (p<.001) when the LDI subscale of Empowerment (EMP) was regressed on the SCEQ-LD.

While the regression analyses were useful in answering questions about self-efficacy beliefs and professional school culture factors predicting variation in leadership density factors among schools, the canonical correlation analyses provided a more complete, simultaneous picture of the complexities that exist among leadership density, professional school culture, and teacher self-efficacy beliefs about their development of leadership density in their schools. The results of these multivariate analyses showed that linkages between professional school culture and leadership density in schools are positive in direction, rather strong in magnitude. The primary linkage between these variables shows that the strength of shared vision and leadership among organizational members (an element of professional school culture) goes hand in hand with leadership density characteristics of teacher empowerment and adaptability of members of the culture and leadership density and school culture was further documented in this study by rather strong, positive (secondary) linkages between student and teacher leadership in schools and the strength of teachers’ professional commitments and collegial relationships pertaining to the enhancement of teaching and learning in schools. Thus, linkages between school culture and leadership density in schools are multi-faceted and complex. The results of this study suggest that, from the practice and school improvement perspective, strengthening different elements of professional school culture (e.g., teacher empowerment vs collegial teaching and learning) may well lead to the development of different kinds of leadership density in schools. If replicated in future
research studies, the findings reported in this study will need to be accommodated in the more formal development of any theory of leadership density in schools.

The canonical correlation findings that showed positive and rather strong linkages between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to enhance the development of leadership density in their schools and levels of leadership density also have implications for future research and theory development. From the social cognitive theory perspective of the importance of human agency (self-efficacy beliefs) to human functioning (Bandura, 1997), the results of this study make sense. Consistent with self-efficacy theory, if teacher self-efficacy beliefs about their capabilities to enhance leadership density in their schools is strong, then leadership density in schools (an efficacy expectation) should also be strong. Alternatively, as a more formal theory of leadership density in schools evolves, it will need to accommodate the multivariate findings from this study that show teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about their personal learning, and leading the learning of others, go hand in hand with leadership density characteristics of teamwork among organizational members, and empowerment to carry out leadership roles in schools. From the practice perspective, the results of this study suggest that strengthening teamwork among teachers in schools and empowering teachers to carry out individual and group leadership roles, may well depend upon providing opportunities to strengthen their self-efficacy beliefs that they have the capability to continuously learn and to lead the learning of others.

Current self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977) can be used as a framework for structuring such opportunities through in-service education, by teachers mentoring and modeling leadership practices for each other, encouraging positive task persuasion and social interactions among teachers, and infusing professional enthusiasm within the school.
environment. All of these elements of developing organizations and individuals within organizations are consistent with sources of strengthening self-efficacy beliefs described in current self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997).

Implications for Teacher and Administrator Preparation and Certification Programs

Given the results of the case studies, teacher and administrator preparation programs will need to be revamped in order to produce personnel that understand, and are capable of creating and facilitating a small jazz combo working environment that reflects cultural norms for teachers assuming new leadership roles. Teachers need a greater understanding of the core theoretical constructs which lay the foundation for the creation of leadership density (e.g., social cognitive theory, reculturing for meaningful change, learning theory, motivation theory). An understanding of how these important elements of an effective teaching learning environment are related would create a substantive step in “thickening” the leadership density within a school.

Effective implementation of the above mentioned foundations of leadership density teacher will require preparation programs that stress the practical advantages of producing a small jazz combo learning environment. If teachers can see there are practical advantages to leadership density, they will begin to value and believe in the viability of the metaphor, thereby capturing essential elements of the leadership density construct through a metaphor that can be easily understood and communicated. Likewise, administrator training programs need to take steps to help principals understand their role from a decentralized perspective and how they can facilitate heightened levels of leadership density within schools.
Implications for School Accountability Models and Future Efforts at School Reform

The theory of leadership density predicts that teachers in schools working towards higher levels of leadership density would hold high beliefs in their individual and collective abilities to chart paths for productive change. This was borne out in the case studies, as a compelling and recurring theme offered by teachers was their strong belief that, if left to their own means, they could devise a school improvement plan that was more relevant to their students' needs than the State of Louisiana's model for school accountability. Additionally, both quantitative and qualitative data confirmed that elements of school culture (such as professional commitment for example) are integral to developing high levels of leadership density in schools.

Taken as a whole, the results of this study suggest that school reform and accountability models should consider the individual and collective talents of each school's faculty and staff. Additionally, outcomes for each school might not be based on the same single criterion (i.e., high standardized test scores), but might reflect several areas within schools known to facilitate a positive teaching and learning environment (e.g., high student morale, classrooms that create learning activities which are rich and robust, etc.). To this end, it seems that assimilation of the small jazz combo for leadership into school accountability models would mean that educational processes would be valued over high-stakes end products. And, that before substantive change can occur, the norms values and beliefs which precipitate that change must become internalized by members of the organization. Thus, introduction of leader density via inclusion of the small jazz combo metaphor in school accountability models would recognize that school improvement is, for
the most part, an internal process, highly dependent upon the skills and level of commitment of those within the organization, and that is not easily manipulated by external mandates.

The small jazz combo metaphor would also have implications for school reform attempts on the national level. If federal policy makers recognized the value of fostering leadership density in schools the means of education (resources and processes which make up the educational process) might take precedence over the ends of educations (typically reliance upon one end-of-year test score). Such a shift in policy focus would be expected to create new priorities at the federal level. For example, policy makers might note that poverty levels and poor performance on standardized tests are highly correlated to each other and begin to work on lowering America’s levels of child poverty, currently the highest in the world among developed nations (Payne & Biddle, 1999).

**Implications for Evolution of Leadership In Schools**

Many studies have been done which document leadership in general is a complex construct (see Yukl, 1998; Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996 for examples). This study has produced evidence that the specific construct of leadership density in schools is also complex. A strength of leadership density is its conceptual richness. It is theoretically grounded by its linkages to school culture and the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and administrators. These variables seem to be necessary, but perhaps insufficient conditions to give a robust explanation of leadership density in schools.

Although it is not currently known what other variables might enhance leadership density, it is clear that any comprehensive theory of leadership density should explain some of the other things known about schools [e.g., substantive change in schools is slow and requires changing norms, values, and beliefs (Hargreaves, 1995)]. Since leadership density
represents a substantive change in how leadership can play out in a school, it is expected that its creation and development will develop slowly over time. Besides explaining the change process, a well-developed theory of leadership density should have congruence with sound pedagogical and cognitive theory. For example, if leadership density extends to the classroom level, it should agree with and be able to provide rationale for effective teaching practices and the process of learning. Such a theory is not yet realized, although it is believed that potential exists for its development.

A comprehensive theory of leadership density will have implications for the future of school leaders and school leadership. By rethinking roles and structures that teachers and administrators traditionally follow in schools to reflect the small jazz combo metaphor, schools undertaking a journey towards higher levels of leadership density will go through an evolutive process. Perhaps a comprehensive theory of leadership density will be able to map this process and provide phases through which schools might move as they transition towards a small jazz combo for leadership. If this is the case, then a comprehensive theory of leadership density could play an integral role in future efforts to redefine schools, school structures, and the roles of school employees which are responsible for creating effective teaching and learning environments.

Implications for Future Practice

The original conceptualization of this study, when considered in view of the results of the study as noted have a variety of implications for future practices in schools. For example, this study examined school effectiveness using a variety of indices (i.e., elements of school culture, teacher and administrative self-efficacy) besides the typical variable of student achievement. By broadening the context within which school effectiveness is
conceptualized, it is possible to begin to understand linkages between student achievement and various organizational and cultural variables. It is from this broadened perspective of school effectiveness that the following recommendations for practice are offered.

**Recommendation 1**

Work towards structuring school staffs so that teachers work in groups which are analogous to small jazz combos.

**Rationale**

Involving teachers in leadership decisions is one definite area where smaller group size is of benefit. Principals should give careful consideration to planning schedules so that teachers can work in small teams with an eye towards creating many small jazz combos throughout the school.

**Recommendation 2**

Provide adequate planning time for professional development.

**Rationale**

All case studies conducted for this study documented faculty that were willing to become actively involved in leadership decisions. However, actively involving teachers in leadership decisions is very difficult to do without adequate staff development time to create goals, define problems and seek solutions to them, etc. This staff development time is essential to teachers defining issues and collaboratively working towards their resolutions.

**Recommendation 3**

Rethink the roles of teachers.

**Rationale**

Focus group interviews revealed a consistent theme at each school where case studies were conducted. Specifically, there was no general consensus for what makes teaching a
profession. This lack of consensus appears to be created, at least in part, by teaching environments where the roles of teachers are primarily determined through external mandates, making them the conduit through which policy is transmitted. If schools want teachers involved in roles pertaining to greater leadership density in schools, then it seems critical that teachers be viewed as more than technicians or orchestral members. A clear delineation of the leadership roles and responsibilities beyond those described by teachers as orchestra members or technicians would be useful in increasing levels of leadership density in schools.

**Recommendation 4**

Make quality professional development activities available for all teachers and administrators.

**Rationale**

Leadership density is believed to be useful for describing attributes of an effective classroom (e.g., high levels of student engagement, stimulating tasks, opportunity for students to demonstrate knowledge, high levels of collaboration, etc.). However, classroom observations conducted during case studies revealed a consistent trend of classrooms with low levels of student engagement, and consequently many other important attributes of effective classrooms. This suggests that there is a need among teachers and administrators for in-service activities which bring greater awareness for techniques which place theory into practice. Such activities would facilitate a greater understanding of various means for creating effective teaching and learning environments, healthy school cultures, high staff efficacy, etc.
Recommendation 5

Improve the professional stature of practitioners in the field.

Rationale

Leadership density, as represented by the small jazz combo metaphor, indicates that effective teachers should be akin to good jazz musicians. That is, they should be able to place theory into practice in ways that an untrained person would not be able. In focus group interviews, when teachers were asked why teaching was a profession, the answers tended to center on “love for kids,” “we go the extra mile,” or something similar. No teacher effectively articulated a set of skills and how they placed those skills into practice in a manner which would be consistent the small jazz combo metaphor for leadership density. There appears to be a belief (even among teachers) that teachers possess few job-specific skills as compared to engineers or accountants. Ensuring that graduates of teacher certification programs: a) have a firm grounding in theories appropriate to effective instruction; and b) these theories can be placed into practice in ways that can not be done by untrained people would help to facilitate leadership density in schools.

Recommendation 6

Rethink metaphors used to understand leadership in schools.

Rationale

Qualitative studies revealed faculties willing to work towards higher levels of leadership density. For example, teachers talked of their willingness to become involved in leadership decisions and principals noted their efforts to divest leadership to their faculty. However, the metaphorical models which framed these efforts were not appropriate to creating high levels of leadership density in any of these schools. It seems that schools are
currently bound by input/output thinking. This linear view of learning is framed by a number of metaphors: “school as factory,” or “school as an orchestra” are examples. Unfortunately, much of what we now know about learning (e.g., the emerging body of literature on social constructivism) is not well represented by the way schools are currently designed to function. If we are to move towards learning environments where high levels of leadership density extend into the classroom it will be necessary to rethink the framework of, and ultimately the metaphors used, within schools.

Prologue

Over a decade ago, Immegart (1988) noted the need for studies which moved away from looking at the leader and moved towards the development of leadership theories. This study is an attempt to heed Immegart’s call. Future research on leadership density should take into consideration the metaphors constraining the school as an organization. Data collected for this study indicate that, within the schools studied, cultural norms for centrist leadership still exist (albeit not at a marching band/Sousa level). For example, there was a general theme or trend in teacher interviews for the principal to be seen as having the final word, even when he/she had little input or even understanding of a problem. This type of hierarchical thinking is deeply embedded within schools, a vestige of the factory/reductionist model which framed leadership for schools over the past century or so and continues to frame today’s school leadership.

To change the way schools operate, it will be necessary to rethink and revisit cultural norms. From a theoretical perspective, this suggest that the metaphors which frame these cultural norms will need to be examined. These metaphors may be so deeply imbedded within the school culture that the staff and administration take them for granted. Thus, they...
may not be evident to them. However, if cultural norms are to change, and non-centrist leadership is to emerge, an examination of “the metaphors we live by” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1981) is needed. Therefore, future research should consider involving schools in a self-examination of their guiding metaphors as an initial phase of study and as a means of beginning the process of creating higher levels of leadership density.

Since this study is exploratory, further research is also needed to determine the replicability of the data. Through the use of broader and more extensive sampling, future studies can begin to investigate the various contexts in schools within which leadership density may play out.

This study’s primary focus was the degree to which teachers assume leadership roles based upon their collective and individual talents, needs, and commitments. However, given that leadership density is viewed as an organizational construct that extends into the classroom, future studies might include more detailed analyses of classroom models of teaching and learning as a means of furthering development of the theory of leadership density.

Summary

Chapter 7 presented a summary of major findings from the results of the study as well as implications for theory, future research, and practice. The study was designed in response to the lack of literature on leadership in schools (and organizations in general) for ways to extend leadership beyond commonly held leader centrist notions. This study is exploratory, and represents the first step in a new and emerging line of inquiry that reconceptualizes leadership as an organizational construct instead of an attribute of authority or position. At the core of this line of inquiry is the concept of leadership density in schools reflected in a new metaphor for school leadership...the small jazz combo.
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APPENDIX A:

INSTRUMENT SET USED FOR DATA COLLECTION, ITEM LOCATION INDICES, ONE FACTOR PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS SOLUTIONS, HIGHEST AND LOWEST RATED ITEMS FOR FACTORED SUBSCALES, AND ITEM MEANS FOR FACTORED SUBSCALES OF THE SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, AND LDI
FACULTY SURVEY

Demographics

1. Gender
   Male
   Female

2. Ethnicity:
   Asian
   Black
   Hispanic
   White
   Other

3. Type of teaching situation in which you are currently working:
   __Self-contained regular education classroom
   __Departmentalized regular education classroom
   __Special education classroom
   __Administrator (complete questions 7.8.9.10 in this section only)
   __Other: _____

4. Content area in which you primarily teach? (mark only one)
   __elementary education (all areas)
   __science
   __special education
   __art/music
   __reading
   __physical education
   __mathematics
   __other: _____
   __social studies

5. Which grade do you primarily teach? (mark only one)
   __K  __4  __7  __10
   __1  __5  __8  __11
   __2  __6  __9  __12
   __3

6. In your classroom, the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch is:

7. Total number of years as a professional educator (including this year) is:

8. Total number of years working at your current school (including this year) is:

9. Your first or native language is
   __English
   __Spanish
   __Other (please specify): _____

10. Highest Degree Completed:
    __Bachelor
    __Master
    __Master + 30 (specialist)
    __Doctorate (PhD or EdD)
RSCEO-LD

Definition

This teacher survey asks you to make a series of judgements about your experiences as a teaching professional. Teacher is defined as any full or part time faculty member having direct contact with students on a daily basis.

Directions

This questionnaire contains a number of statements about things which occur in some schools. After reading each of the statements carefully, you are asked to judge each response according to two criteria: (1) how you and your school actually are and (2) how you would prefer that you or your school would be. You are to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements by darkening the appropriate circle. The "actual scale" applies to how "YOU AND/OR YOUR SCHOOL ACTUALLY ARE" and the "prefer scale" applies to how "YOU WOULD PREFER TO BE OR WOULD PREFER YOU SCHOOL TO BE LIKE."

Rating Scale: 

__ Strongly Disagree (SD)
__ Disagree
__ Agree
__ Strongly Agree

STATEMENTS:

Teachers value and believe it is important to . . .

1. help each other when problems arise . . .
2. improve their understanding of student learning by sharing classroom experiences with each other . . .
3. give priority to helping their students develop higher order thinking skills . . .
4. incorporate the findings of educational research into their own teaching and learning practices . . .
5. openly share problems with each other . . .
6. help all students learn . . .
7. professionally share and learn from one another . . .
8. commit to professional growth to improve teaching and learning . . .
9. work cooperatively with other teachers and administrators to develop new school programs and policies . . .
10. encourage other teachers to use professional judgement when making decisions . . .
11. adequately plan teaching and learning activities to accommodate individual differences in learning among students . . .
12. provide suggestions to colleagues about ways in which to improve teaching and learning in their classroom . . .
13. spend time in professional reflection about their work . . .
14. spend productive time with other teachers informally discussing ways to improve the school . . .
15. spend productive time with the principal informally discussing ways to improve the school . . .
TEBS-LD

Definition

This teacher survey asks you to make a series of judgments about your experiences as a teaching professional. Teacher is defined as any full or part-time faculty member having direct contact with students on a daily basis.

Instructions

This questionnaire contains a number of statements about things which occur in some schools. Rate the following items in terms of the strength of your beliefs in your capabilities to attain the outcomes.

Rating Scale:  __Strongly Disagree (SD)
               __Disagree
               __Agree
               __Strongly Agree

STATEMENTS:

My beliefs in my capabilities to . . .

1. successfully work with other teachers in small groups to accomplish school goals are . . .
2. persevere through difficult times at my school are . . .
3. create an effective learning environment where commitment and perseverance are modeled to all students are . . .
4. take a stand for something I believe in, even when it is unpopular are . . .
5. positively impact every student’s learning in my classes are . . .
6. lead myself through positive self-reflection and critique in order to make changes which improve my teaching strategies are . . .
7. overcome academic deficiencies of students in my classes are . . .
8. create with other teachers a teaching and learning environment that is more than the sum of its parts are . . .
9. make leadership decisions in areas of teaching and learning are . . .
10. enhance student learning by having students work together in small cooperative groups to accomplish school goals are . . .
11. work together with others on difficult tasks are . . .
12. set and realize meaningful personal goals are . . .
13. model qualities essential to the enhancement of teaching and learning are . . .
14. overcome negative community influences upon students are . . .
15. effectively motivate students are . . .
16. maintain high productivity in the classroom while also assuming leadership responsibility for the school are . . .
17. change my teaching techniques to meet individual student needs are . . .
18. successfully structure the efforts of others towards desirable outcomes are . . .
19. test different options when making decisions are . . .
20. choose successful courses of action in complex and uncertain environments are . . .
21. work through others are . . .
22. coordinate, manage, and monitor collective leadership efforts are . . .
23. maintain my composure in highly stressful circumstances are . . .
24. use decision-making skills effectively are . . .
25. remain task-oriented during times of difficulty are . . .
LDI

Definition

This teacher survey asks you to make a series of judgements about your experiences as a teaching professional. Teacher is defined as any full or part time faculty member having direct contact with students on a daily basis.

Instructions

This questionnaire contains a number of statements about things which occur in some schools. Given the following definition of leadership density, take the individual items in this survey and after reading each of the statements carefully, you are asked to judge how you and/or your school actually are. You are to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by darkening the appropriate circle.

Leadership Density Definition

Leadership is defined as purposeful role taking on the part of organizational members, either individually or collectively, that moves the organization towards accomplishment of stated goals. The greater the collective and individual role taking in leadership activities by organizational members, the greater the leadership density.

Rating Scale:  ___Strongly Disagree (SD) ___Disagree ___Agree ___Strongly Agree

STATEMENTS:

In this school . . .

1. teachers typically work in small groups to accomplish school objectives . . .
2. the principal has the final say on all important decisions . . .
3. the principal willingly allows and encourages teachers to assume leadership roles . . .
4. my job is primarily to teach students . . .
5. policy is set by the principal . . .
6. students voluntarily assume leadership roles when opportunities arise . . .
7. teachers regularly use small group, cooperative learning in their classrooms . . .
8. the principal divests leadership to only a few, trusted teachers . . .
9. teachers are told what to teach . . .
10. teachers team teach or implement cross curricular activities . . .
11. teachers work together to help students, even when the help is not directly related to the subject(s) taught by teachers . . .
12. to accomplish school objectives, the principal typically works with teachers in small groups instead of with the entire faculty as one large group . . .
13. teachers in the same subject are expected to teach at the same pace . . .
14. teachers recognize the contributions of other teachers to the overall accomplishment of school goals . . .
15. a tight chain of command is followed . . .
16. the principal encourages experimentation and innovation in regards to teaching and learning activities . . .

(measure continues)
In this school...

18. opportunities for teachers to plan in small groups are built into the schedule...
19. students regularly engage in mastery demonstrations of acquired knowledge...
20. teachers regularly share effective instructional strategies...
21. teachers regularly serve as mentors to other teachers...
22. diverse solutions to problems are actively solicited by the principal...
23. teachers willingly take on leadership roles as they arise...
24. teachers readily embrace new ideas and change that increases student learning...
25. teachers often try to turn dilemmas into opportunities to accomplish school goals...
26. active experimentation is encouraged in the pursuit of school goals...
27. teachers are told how to teach...
28. the principal trusts only a few teachers to perform important tasks...
29. mistakes in pursuit of school goals are tolerated...
30. students readily volunteer their experience and knowledge with the class...
31. teachers encourage students to share their knowledge with other students in the class...
32. students volunteer to help each other...
**Definition**

This administrator survey asks you to make a series of judgements about your experiences as an administrator of a school.

**Directions**

This questionnaire contains a number of statements about things which occur in some schools. Rate the following items in terms of the strength of your beliefs in your capabilities to attain the outcomes. You are to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by darkening the appropriate circle.

**Scale:**
- Very Weak Beliefs In My Capabilities (VW)
- Weak Beliefs In My Capabilities (W)
- Strong Beliefs In My Capabilities (S)
- Very Strong Beliefs In My Capabilities (VS)

**STATEMENTS**

**My beliefs in my capabilities to . . .**

1. work through others are . . .
2. coordinate, manage, and monitor collective leadership efforts of teams of teachers are . . .
3. maintain my composure in highly stressful circumstances are . . .
4. use decision-making skills effectively are . . .
5. remain task-oriented during difficult times are . . .
6. facilitate organizational outcomes through the efforts of others within the school are . . .
7. create an atmosphere that is tolerant of well-intentioned mistakes are . . .
8. turn a dilemma into an opportunity for accomplishment of school goals are . . .
9. provide meaningful leadership opportunities for teachers are . . .
10. allow teachers to make leadership decisions based upon their abilities, needs, and commitment are . . .
11. trust teachers to make leadership decisions without my direct, personal supervision are . . .
12. actively support risk-taking by teachers are . . .
13. model leadership that expects others to make meaningful contributions to school goals are . . .
14. help teachers create self-managed groups which are responsible for meeting school goals are . . .
15. respect and appreciate diverse solutions presented by teachers are . . .
16. communicate to staff the importance of their assumption of leadership roles are . . .
17. provide adequate time for teachers to undertake leadership roles are . . .
18. buffer teachers from being overwhelmed with unimportant paperwork or assignments are . . .
19. facilitate high degrees of teacher interaction in the attainment of school goals are . . .
20. embrace productive change are . . .
21. facilitate a school culture that views school goals as fluid and dynamic rather than static and unchanging are . . .
22. facilitate a school culture in which learning is viewed as a process rather than accomplishing a predetermined outcomes are . . .
23. facilitate a school culture where teachers take ownership of and value their leadership roles are . . .
24. facilitate peer mentoring among teachers are . . .
Table A.1

Item Location Index for Factored Subscales of the SCEQ-LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCEQ-LD Subscale</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment (5)(^a)</td>
<td>3, 4, 6, 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Teaching and Learning (4)</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Leadership (5)</td>
<td>9, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of items on subscale
Table A.2

Item Location Index for Factored Subscales of the TEBS-LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEBS-LD Subscale</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of Learning (6)a</td>
<td>5,7,10,14,15,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership (8)</td>
<td>1,3,6,8,9,11,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Management (4)</td>
<td>19,20,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Resilience (4)</td>
<td>4,23,24,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Item Total (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNumber of items on subscale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDI Subscale</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork (8)a</td>
<td>7,11,12,13,18,19,20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (5)</td>
<td>3,8,17,22,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (5)</td>
<td>9,23,24,25,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Collaboration (4)</td>
<td>6,30,31,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Command (4)</td>
<td>2,4,5,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Decision Making (3)</td>
<td>10,14,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Item Total (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of Items on Subscale
Table A.4

Item/Factor Loadings (Correlations) for a One-Factor Principal Components Solution of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and LDI for the Total Sample (n=987).

### SCEQ-LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Communalitv</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen Value 7.36

Total Variance Explained 49.1

### TEBS-LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Communalitv</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### TEBS-LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eigen Value** 10.22

**Total Variance Explained** 40.90

### LDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen Value 7.93

Total Variance Explained 23.30

---
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Table A.5

Highest (H) and Lowest (L) Rated Items for Means and Standard Deviations for Each Factored Subscale of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and LDI Measures for the Total Sample of Teachers (n=987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCEQ-LD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>help all students learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>incorporate the findings of educational research into their teaching and learning practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>work cooperatively with other teachers and administrators to develop new school programs and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>spend productive time with other teachers informally discussing ways to improve the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>help each other when problems arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>openly share problems with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEBS-LD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My beliefs in my capabilities to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOL</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>positively impact every student’s learning in my class are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>overcome negative community influences upon students are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>successfully work with other teachers in small groups to accomplish school goals are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>make leadership decisions in areas of teaching and learning are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>test different options when making decisions are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>coordinate, manage, and monitor collective leadership efforts are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers work together to help students, even when the help is not directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to the subject(s) taught by teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To accomplish school objectives, the principal typically works with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in small groups instead of with the entire faculty as one large group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal willingly allows and encourages teachers to assume leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal divests leadership to only a few, trusted teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers willingly take on leadership roles as they arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have opportunities to make decisions about how they learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers encourage students to share their knowledge with other students in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students voluntarily assume leadership roles when opportunities arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal has the final say on all important decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tight chain of command is followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are told what to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are told how to teach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table A.6

Item Means for Factored Subscales of the SCEQ-LD, TEBS-LD, and LDI for the Total Sample (n=987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCEQ-LD Subscales</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a 4 6 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.22 2.95 3.40 3.26 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.47 3.29 3.27 3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3.10 3.00 2.90 3.00 2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEBS-LD Subscales</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 7 10 14 15 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.43 3.13 3.30 3.05 3.35 3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.56 3.53 3.35 3.33 3.32 3.43 3.39 3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3.20 3.08 3.09 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3.24 3.14 3.29 3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDI Subscales</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 11 12 13 18 19 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.18 2.95 3.20 2.58 2.97 2.98 3.16 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.30 2.67 3.27 2.92 2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Item numbers for the components of each factor.
APPENDIX B:

SMALL JAZZ COMBO METAPHOR CHARACTERISTICS
FRAMING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LDI
AND RESULTING ITEMS
Items from the Leadership Density Instrument (LDI)

Small Jazz Combo Feature: Size of Group

School Organizational Corollary: Principals, teachers and/or students working together cooperatively in small groups towards the achievement of school goals.

Items:

In this school...

1. teachers typically work in small groups to accomplish school objectives.

2. teachers regularly use small group, cooperative learning in their classrooms.

3. to accomplish school objectives, the principal typically works with teachers in small groups instead of with the entire faculty as one large group.

4. opportunities for teachers to plan in small groups are built into the schedule.

Small Jazz Combo Feature: Each member of the combo takes ownership of the music.

School Organizational Corollary: Teachers and students voluntarily assume active roles of leadership when opportunities arise.

Items:

In this school...

1. the principal willingly allows and encourages teachers to assume leadership roles.

2. students voluntarily assume leadership roles when opportunities arise.

3. teachers willingly take on leadership roles as they arise.

4. students volunteer to help each other.

5. students readily volunteer their experience and knowledge with the class.

(continues next page)
Small Jazz Combo Feature: Improvisation and Ability to Play Solo or With Others

School Organizational Corollary: Teachers and students view learning as an open process that builds on interest and abilities.

Items:

In this school...

1. the principal encourages experimentation and innovation in regards to teaching and learning activities.
2. diverse solutions to problems are actively solicited by the principal.
3. active experimentation is encouraged in the pursuit of school goals.
4. teachers readily embrace new ideas and change that increase student learning.
5. teachers often try to turn dilemmas into opportunities to accomplish school goals.
6. mistakes in pursuit of school goals are tolerated.
7. students regularly engage in master demonstrations of acquired knowledge.

Small Jazz Combo Feature: No defacto leader for the music.

School Organizational Corollary: Tight, structured chain of commands and hierarchies are not the norm (when there is no crisis).

Items:

In this school...

1. the principal has the final say on all important decisions.
2. my job is primarily to teach students.
3. policy is set by the principal.

(continues next page)
4. teachers are told what to teach.

5. teachers are told how to teach.

6. teachers in the same subject area are expected to teach at the same pace.

7. a tight chain of command is followed.

8. the principal trusts only a few teachers to perform important tasks.

9. the principal divests leadership to only a few, trusted teachers.

Small Jazz Combo Feature: High levels of collaboration.

School Organizational Corollary: High levels of collaboration exist among staff and students.

Items:

In this school...

1. students have opportunities to make decisions about how they learn.

2. teachers team teach or implement cross curricular activities.

3. teachers work together to help students, even when the help is not directly related to the subject(s) taught by teachers.

4. teachers recognize the contributions of other teachers to the overall accomplishment of school goals.

5. teachers regularly share effective instructional strategies.

6. teachers regularly serve as mentors to other teachers.

7. teachers encourage students to share their knowledge with other students in the class.
CONCEPTUAL DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP DENSITY
AND TASK INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTENT VERIFICATION OF THE
LEADERSHIP DENSITY INVENTORY (LDI)
Conceptual Definition of Leadership Density: Leadership is the purposeful role taking of organizational members, either collectively or individually, with the intent of moving the organization towards the accomplishment of goals. The greater the collective and individual role taking in leadership activities by organizational members, the greater the leadership density. Thus, from this perspective, leadership density is an organizational construct and is a direct function of the talents, needs, and levels of commitment exhibited by those within the organization.

Directions for Task Instructions for Content Verification of the Leadership Density Inventory (LDI): As a means of verifying the content of the LDI, a group of people knowledgeable of the leadership density construct were chosen. This group consisted of four professors of education (all professors are or were tenured in the College of Education at Louisiana State University) and two doctoral students that were nearing completion of their dissertations from the College of Education at Louisiana State University. Individual group members read each item and ranked each item dichotomously as to whether or not it was harmonious with the conceptual definition of leadership density. After each individual group member completed their ratings, all results were compiled. All items on the pilot version of the LDI received either unanimous or near unanimous ratings of acceptability and were therefore included in the study.
APPENDIX D:

PROTOCOL FOR CASE STUDIES
Protocol for Case Studies:

1. Introduction to principal and staff
   a. Purpose of study
   b. Why school was selected

2. Context Analysis
   a. Overall impression of school
   b. Classroom observations
   c. Observations of how leadership in school (e.g., Who assumes it? How is it manifested? How flexible is it?)
   d. Focused observations
   e. Student achievement and school performance scores (S.P.S.)

3. Focus Interviews (principals and teachers were asked the same questions... when teachers answered principal questions they would respond how they believed the principal would respond and vice versa)
   1. What things are valued by the school as a whole?
   2. What is the school’s vision/mission?
   3. A school is only as good as its principal—Yes or no?
   4. What is your leadership role on this campus? What is the leadership role of other teachers? The principal?
   5. As a whole group, what is the staff’s leadership role?
   6. When disagreement occurs on the staff (either between teachers or teachers and the principal) how is it typically resolved?
   7. How comfortable are you with experimentation and acceptance of new roles?
   8. How comfortable do you believe the staff as a whole is with experimentation and acceptance of new roles?
   9. What creates an effective teaching and learning environment for a school?

4. Order of case studies
   a. Context Analysis
   b. School Building and Site
   c. School Demographics
   d. Life at the School
   e. The Principal
   f. The Staff
   g. Principal Self-Efficacy
   h. Teacher Self-Efficacy
   i. School Culture
   j. Leadership Density at the School
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