Leadership in Effective Middle Schools: A Shared or Solitary Activity.

Robin Frances garrett Jarvis
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/6681

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700  800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
LEADERSHIP IN EFFECTIVE MIDDLE SCHOOLS:
A SHARED OR SOLITARY ACTIVITY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Counseling

by

Robin Frances Garrett Jarvis
B. S., Louisiana State University, 1984
M. Ed., Louisiana State University, 1987
May 1998

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Keith, Kristin, and Garrett for the love and encouragement they have shown throughout this process.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many close friends, family members, and colleagues have been supportive during the completion of this work. Without their encouragement, it would not have been possible. Thanks, first of all, to my committee members, who provided guidance and support throughout my program. To Dr. Charles Teddlie, my major professor, who became my friend, colleague, and guide through this process, and who provided encouragement even when things may have seemed impossible. To Dr. Diane Taylor, who provided support and assistance in the development of this study. To Dr. Terry Buchanan, who has been a colleague for many years, and whose support and encouragement at the end of this journey will never be forgotten.

Thanks also go to my family without whom none of this would have been possible. I want to thank my children, Kristin and Garrett, for their understanding when mom was not always able to be there. Also, to my husband, Keith, whose patience and willingness to step in for me, made it possible for me to complete this work. To my mother and father, Harold and Betty Garrett, thanks for teaching me to believe I could do whatever I set out to do. Your encouragement throughout my life has been a constant source of strength.

And finally, thanks to my friends, Sharon, Jennie, Debbie, Betty, and Lysah, for the friendship and encouragement they provided. This would not have been possible without the support group that they became, providing encouragement or humor, whatever was needed at the time.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................ iv

LIST OF TABLES .......................................................... x

LIST OF FIGURES. .......................................................... xii

ABSTRACT ...................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION ........................................... 1

The Issue of Leadership in Middle Schools ................................................. 3
Purposes of the Study .................................................................................. 5
Importance of the Study .............................................................................. 5
Research Questions .................................................................................... 6
  Question I ........................................................................................... 6
  Question II .......................................................................................... 7
  Question III .......................................................................................... 7
  Question IV .......................................................................................... 7
Definitions ................................................................................................... 8
  School Effectiveness ............................................................................ 8
  Effective Schools .................................................................................. 8
  Ineffective Schools .............................................................................. 8
  Typical Schools .................................................................................... 9
Middle Schools .......................................................................................... 9
Certified Faculty Members ......................................................................... 9
Shared Leadership ..................................................................................... 10
Network Analysis ....................................................................................... 10
Centrality .................................................................................................. 11
Network Cohesiveness ............................................................................... 11
Outlier Study .............................................................................................. 11
Limitations of the Study ........................................................................... 12
Summary ..................................................................................................... 13

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE ................................... 15

Review of Literature on Middle Level Education ..................................... 15
  The Goals of Middle Level Education ..................................................... 15
  Evidence Related to the Success and Failure of Middle Level Education .................................................................................. 18
Current Issues in Middle School Education .............................................. 22
Review Of School Effectiveness Research ................................................. 24
  Early School Effectiveness Research: Educational Production Function Studies and Effective Schools Studies ................................................. 24

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Criticisms of the Early School Effectiveness Research ........................................ 30
The Second Wave of School Effectiveness Research ........................................... 35
  Context Studies Regarding SES of Students ...................................................... 36
  Context Studies Regarding School Community Type ........................................ 39
  Context Studies Regarding Grade Level Configuration .................................... 41
School Effectiveness Research and Instructional Leadership ................................ 45
  General Theories of Educational Leadership ..................................................... 45
  Applications to School Effectiveness Research ................................................ 49
  Functions of Instructional Leadership ................................................................ 52
  Leadership as a Shared Conceptualization ....................................................... 54
Models of School Effectiveness and Organizational Coupling .............................. 58
  The Five-Factor Model ...................................................................................... 58
  Loose and Tight Coupling in Organizational Theory ......................................... 60
  Contingency Approaches .................................................................................. 62
  Three Contemporary Models of School Effectiveness ........................................ 63
Social Network Analysis and School Effectiveness Research .............................. 68

Summary .............................................................................................................. 71

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY ................................................................. 73
  Introduction ........................................................................................................ 73
  Methodology for Phase I .................................................................................. 76
    Phase I Sample Selection (Figure 3.1, IA) ....................................................... 76
    Instrument Development ................................................................................ 77
    Administration of the Modified SOIL (MSOIL) Survey (Figure 3.1, IB) ....... 78
    Analysis of the Pilot Study Data .................................................................... 79
    Results of the Pilot Study (Figure 3.1, IC) ....................................................... 80
    Construct Validity ............................................................................................ 80
    Survey Revision ............................................................................................... 82
  Methodology for Phase II .................................................................................. 87
  Research Questions .......................................................................................... 87
    Question 1 ....................................................................................................... 87
    Selection of the Sample (Figure 3.1, IIA) ......................................................... 87
  Regression Analyses for Phase II .................................................................... 89
    Generation of SIPSCORES, the criterion variable ........................................ 90
    Socioeconomic Status Classifications ............................................................ 92
    School Community Type Classifications ....................................................... 93
    Percent of Students Receiving Special Education Services .......................... 94
    Percent of Students Identified as Gifted and Talented .................................. 94
    Percent of Limited English Proficiency Students ......................................... 95
  Results from Phase II Regression Analyses .................................................... 95
    Bivariate Correlations of Predictor and Criterion Variables ....................... 95

vi
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1
Mean Scores for Theoretical Construct Dimensions by Role Category ...................... 81

Table 3.2
Factor Structure for the Modified SOIL Survey ............................................................ 83

Table 3.3
Factor Structure for Phase II Faculty Involvement Survey ............................................ 85

Table 3.4
Sample Schools Response Summary ............................................................................... 88

Table 3.5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Model 1, Academic Year 1994-95 .......................................................... 96

Table 3.6
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Model 2, Academic Year 1995-96 .......................................................... 96

Table 3.7
Model 1. Criterion Variable 95Z ..................................................................................... 97

Table 3.8
Model 1. Criterion Variable 96Z ..................................................................................... 97

Table 3.9
Phase II Sample ............................................................................................................. 98

Table 3.10
Sample Schools by Leadership Pattern and SES ........................................................... 102

Table 4.1
Response Patterns by Effectiveness Group (Pilot Study) ............................................... 112

Table 4.2
Response Patterns by Effectiveness Group ..................................................................... 116

Table 4.3
Response Pattern by School for Effective Schools Group ............................................. 121
Table 4.4
Sample Schools by Leadership Pattern and SES

Table 4.5
Sample Schools by Leadership Pattern and Organizational Structure

Table 4.6
Number of Effective Schools by Community Type

Table 4.7
Sample Schools by Leadership Pattern and Community Type

Table 5.1
Effective Schools by Leadership Pattern and SES

Table 5.2
Phase III School Context Variables

Table 5.3
Comparison of Schools on Dimensions of Contrast

Table 5.4
School Classifications within Centrality-Cohesiveness Model
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1
Flowchart of Research Methodology .................................................................75

Figure 5.1
Sociogram for Allen Junior High .................................................................143

Figure 5.2
Sociogram for Carson Middle School ..................................................154

Figure 5.3
Sociogram for Sewell Middle School ...........................................166

Figure 5.4
Sociogram for Poplar Grove Middle School ..................................177
ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and examine patterns of leadership within effective middle schools. A three phase research methodology including both quantitative and qualitative techniques was utilized. Phase I of the study involved the development of the Faculty Involvement Survey.

Phase II was conducted with a sample of 46 differentially effective 6th - 8th grade middle schools in Louisiana. Data collection for this phase consisted of the administration of the Faculty Involvement Survey which was aimed at determining the instructional leadership structure of the school. Four leadership patterns ranging from principal only to overall faculty involvement were identified.

Based upon the results of these surveys, a smaller sample of four effective middle schools across the state were selected that were representative of the leadership structures of the schools in the Phase II sample. Phase III of the data collection included the development of case studies of the leadership structures and behaviors in the four selected effective middle schools. These case studies were developed through on-site visits to the schools which included observations, interviews, and Social Network Analysis.

The findings of this study indicate differences in the leadership patterns in low-SES and mid-SES middle schools. Instructional leadership in effective mid-SES middle schools was found to be more likely to be shared by faculty members rather than to be the solitary activity of the principal as was more common in low-SES schools of the same type. These results confirm results of earlier studies in effective elementary schools which indicate variation in the roles of the principals in these schools based upon the SES of the school.
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In addition, the results of this study indicate that teacher leadership activities continue to primarily involve those activities traditionally regarded as instructional in nature, while administrative members of the school team have maintained authority over those areas involving the daily management of the school. Additionally, the results from the Social Network Analyses indicate that communication networks of schools in which shared leadership is practiced are less cohesive and less centralized than has traditionally been expected in effective schools.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Leadership is critical for all types of organizations. We identify leaders in our businesses, our schools, our churches, and even in our families. These persons may have been given formal authority through a particular title that denotes their leadership in the organization, or they may have gained their position of leadership informally by assuming responsibility for the workings of the group. Regardless of how they have gained this position, they are frequently seen as being the solitary leader of the organization. They are looked to for guidance and vision, and are respected for the position they hold.

Leaders are important for three basic reasons (Bennis, 1989). First, they assume responsibility for the effectiveness of the organization. The quality of the leader is seen as essential to the success of the organization. Secondly, leaders are needed as anchors for their organizations during periods of change. They provide stability, guidance, and vision during periods of uncertainty and upheaval. Third, leaders are needed in schools to alleviate the public’s concerns regarding the perceived crisis in public education that has been prevalent since the 1960's.

Over its 30 year history, school effectiveness research has clearly established the importance of instructional leadership on improving student achievement in schools (e.g., Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Heck, 1992; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1988, 1989; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1985,1993; Weber, 1971). The majority of this research, and the school improvement programs based on it, has stressed the importance of the principal as the instructional leader. Ron Edmonds (1979), one of the most well-known proponents of effective schools research, stressed the
importance of leadership in his five factor model. With this model he sought to provide a framework to explain the effectiveness of inner-city schools in educating the urban poor. The first of the five factors that Edmonds refers to as the “most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools” is strong administrative leadership (p. 22).

Throughout the literature, this strong administrative leadership is viewed as the role of the principal in leading the instructional component of the school organization. Other school effectiveness models have been developed that provide varying numbers of correlates of school effectiveness. Most of these include at least one factor relating to the strong instructional leadership of the principal. These models present the principal as the primary instructional leader (Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989).

With the growth of a contextually sensitive knowledge base within the area of school effectiveness research, this conceptualization of the principal as the instructional leader is changing. Studies involving schools of varying socioeconomic status (SES) levels have clearly indicated that principals in effective schools in these differing contexts deviate from each other on their level of task orientation and control over instructional matters (e.g., Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Hebert, 1992; Reynolds & Teddlie, 1995; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Research has also shown that due to the management problems or other constraints faced by urban schools, strong instructional leadership is more necessary for these schools to achieve effectiveness than it is for their rural and suburban counterparts (e.g., Hannaway & Talbert, 1991; Purkey & Rutter, 1987; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Witte & Walsh, 1990).
One major weakness of much of this research is that it has been conducted primarily in elementary schools (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984; Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1984; Good & Brophy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; U. S. General Accounting Office, 1989). This limitation has had substantial impact on the generalizability of these findings to secondary schools (Cuban, 1984). However, for the most part, this drawback has been ignored by practitioners in their attempt to overcome the educational crisis that has existed in this country since the 1960's (Firestone, 1991).

Structural and cultural differences between elementary and secondary schools include, at the secondary level, the departmentalization of subject areas, the presence of multiple instructional leaders, and the variation in certification and specialization of teachers (e.g., Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1989; Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Teddlie, 1994). Middle schools face even more distinct difficulties with their focus on the development of young adolescents, the difficulty in locating faculty members properly trained to teach this clientele, and the variety of goals and emphases at this level.

The Issue of Leadership in Middle Schools

While school effectiveness research within the context of elementary schools has continued to point to the importance of the principal as the primary instructional leader in the organization, studies at the secondary level have begun to indicate clear variations from this conceptualization. These studies indicate that principals in effective secondary schools spend less time on instructional matters than do principals in effective elementary schools (Heck, 1992; Martin & Willower, 1981; Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991). Furthermore, the ability of secondary school principals to function as the instructional
leader in their school may be further constrained by organizational variables including departmentalization and staff size (e.g., Firestone & Herriott, 1982, Virgilio, et al., 1991). This research indicates that secondary school principals may tend to delegate leadership activities to other members of the school faculty due to the organizational complexity of these schools.

This proposition is supported by research at the middle school level that indicates that leadership in these schools is a shared responsibility (Miller, 1988; Sithole, 1995; Spirito, 1991) including many actors: principals, assistant principals, department heads, team leaders, and teachers. Furthermore, the role of instructional leader often appears to be left to grade level teams while the principal maintains a more managerial role. Based upon these findings, it is apparent that the widely accepted conceptualization of the principal as the strong, primary instructional leader is not applicable to middle schools. Therefore, studies of leadership at the middle school level are required in order to better understand alternative methods of governance for those schools.

The premise of this study was that while principals at the middle school level may play a less active role in direct instructional leadership, this role is shared by other members of the school organization in a concerted effort to attain the school's goals. This occurs through the distribution of leadership roles among these members through either formally or informally defined structures within the organization. The intent of this study was to determine whether patterns could be identified with regard to the distribution of this leadership amongst the members of the faculty in effective middle schools.
Purposes of the Study

The primary goal of this study was to identify and examine patterns of shared leadership within effective middle schools. Within this primary goal, there were four secondary purposes:

- to identify patterns of shared leadership in effective middle schools based upon perceptions of the faculties of these schools;
- to identify communication networks of these effective middle school faculties through the use of Social Network Analysis;
- to compare the perceived leadership structures of the schools with the communication networks within the schools;
- to provide in-depth case study analysis of the internal processes associated with shared leadership in effective middle schools.

Importance of the Study

The importance of this study was twofold. As indicated above, most of the research on school effectiveness has been conducted in urban elementary schools. These studies have failed to provide insight into the unique contexts of middle and high schools, yet their findings have been applied to schools at all levels in a variety of school improvement initiatives. As a result, this study, first of all, provides information about the sources of instructional leadership specifically within effective middle schools, and adds to the knowledge base of school effectiveness research.

Secondly, the findings of this study are also useful to practitioners by indicating what leadership sources appear to be working in effective middle schools. Studies of
middle grade students have reported that the number of students who fail in school grows exponentially between the fourth and eighth or ninth grades. Most of the students who fail at this level either drop out or struggle in remedial programs throughout high school (Hechinger, 1993). Despite this, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development in its 1989 report Turning Points stated “Middle grade schools - junior high, intermediate, and middle schools - are potentially society’s most powerful force to recapture millions of youth adrift, and help every young person thrive during early adolescence” (p.8).

The current study’s findings regarding effective middle schools provide insight for practitioners about how the leadership in these schools has been structured to successfully meet the needs of the young adolescents whom they serve. These findings also provide guidance on how less effective middle schools can be improved.

Research Questions

The overall goal of this study was to identify and examine the patterns of shared leadership within effective middle schools. Within this goal, four secondary purposes were identified. In order to provide continuity within the study, the following research questions were designed to correspond to these purposes.

Question I

What patterns of instructional leadership can be identified in effective middle schools based on perceptions of the faculties?

A. Which members of the faculties are included as sources of instructional leadership?

B. Does the sharing of instructional leadership extend beyond the administrative
levels of the school to include teachers and other members of the faculty?

Question II

What communication patterns exist in effective middle schools?

A. What positions within the social networks are held by those members who have been identified as instructional leaders in the school?

B. What types of networks are prevalent in effective middle schools in which a variety of leadership sources are identified? Hierarchical structures? Dense, flat webs?

Question III

How do the communication networks of effective middle schools correspond to the perceived sources of instructional leadership in these schools?

A. To what degree do the ranked individuals within the communication networks correspond to those individuals perceived by the faculty to be sources of instructional leadership?

B. How does the centrality of the principal as measured through Social Network Analysis correspond to the faculty perceptions of him/her as a source of instructional leadership within the school?

Question IV

How do the internal processes of effective middle schools facilitate or hinder the functioning of these multiple leadership sources?
A. What types of linkage mechanisms are utilized in effective middle schools to increase the cohesiveness of their faculties?

B. How do these multiple leadership sources function to achieve the instructional goals of the school on a day to day basis?

Definitions

**School Effectiveness**

For the purposes of this study, effectiveness was defined in terms of the academic achievement of students. This is appropriate due the study's focus on instructional leadership, which has been shown to have an indirect effect on student achievement (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Dwyer, 1984; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Heck, 1992; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Heck & Marcoulides, 1990; Scheerens & Creemers, 1989, 1994). Schools included in the study were divided into three categories - effective, ineffective, and typical - based on their effectiveness status over a two year period as determined through the use of regression analyses. These categories were utilized in order to maintain consistency with earlier research in this field.

**Effective Schools.** Effective schools were identified as those middle schools that performed higher than their predicted score on standardized achievement tests for both the 1994/95 and 1995/96 school years.

**Ineffective Schools.** Ineffective schools were identified as those middle schools that performed lower than their predicted score on standardized achievement tests for both the 1994/95 and 1995/96 school years.
**Typical Schools.** Typical schools were identified as those schools that were inconsistent in their performance on standardized achievement tests for the 1994/95 and 1995/96 school years. These schools scored above their predicted score for one of the years in question and below their predicted score for the other year.

**Middle Schools**

In light of the relatively small number of these schools in Louisiana, middle schools included all schools in the state serving only 6th through 8th grade students. Students in these schools generally ranged in age from 11 to 14 years old. Due to the changes that have occurred over the years at this level, some of these schools are identified as junior highs rather than middle schools. However, both groups were included in the study as long as they served only 6th - 8th graders, since the goal of this study was to provide insight into the effective education of young adolescents in a setting developed especially for them.

**Certified Faculty Members**

For the purposes of survey administration for this study, only those individuals holding positions requiring Louisiana teacher certification were included. These positions include the principal, assistant principals, librarians, guidance counselors, and classroom teachers. Throughout Chapter Three, these individuals are referred to as certified faculty members. It should be noted, however, that during the case study phase of the research, informal conversations were often conducted with non-certified staff members at the schools.
**Shared Leadership**

Sergiovanni (1991) defines shared leadership or “leadership density” as “... the extent to which leadership roles are shared and leadership itself is broadly based and exercised” within an organization (p. 136). This definition presents a need to identify those members of the organization who are involved in leadership functions, as well as the types of activities in which they participate.

For the purposes of this study, this was done through the use of the Faculty Involvement Survey. This instrument assesses, through faculty perceptions, the participation of faculty members in leadership roles within the school.

**Network Analysis**

Network analysis is the methodology used to explore the relationships between the members of a group. It provides for the identification of the individual links from one person to another that when viewed as a whole constitute a network of relationships within the group. Network analysis provides the opportunity to explore both the formal and informal structures of the group. The formal structure of a group includes those roles and functions that are explicitly stated through the formal organization in job descriptions, contracts, and organizational charts. The informal structure consists of the culture created by the members of the group through their personal interactions and relationships. Through network analysis, these structures can be compared and contrasted in order to identify the similarities, differences, or relationships between them.
Centrality

Centrality explains the status or popularity of a particular person in the group.

Two types of centrality measures were utilized for this study: centrality and group centralization. Centrality indicates to what extent a particular individual's position is central within the network as measured by the number of connections faculty members indicate they have with that person.

Group centralization indicates the degree to which one person in the group is more likely to be central to the network. The likelihood of one individual being more central and the others being around the edges of the network is determined by the size of the centralization measure.

Network Cohesiveness

Network cohesiveness refers to the degree to which the members of the entire network are connected to each other. For this study, it will be determined through the use of a network density measure. This measure compares the proportion of connections actually made by the faculty members to the total connections possible in the network.

Outlier Study

According to Stringfield (1994), outliers are those cases in a research study that do not follow the predicted patterns. They are unusual events or situations that vary from what is normally expected. Within the field of school effectiveness research, the study of outliers is common due to the interest in identifying the reasons why some schools may be more or less effective with the same type of student population. In order to study such phenomena, it is necessary to identify schools that perform above what is expected.
(positive outliers), those that perform below what is predicted (negative outliers), or those that perform within the expected range (typical cases).

The current study utilized a sampling scheme in Phase II that included positive outliers, typical schools, and negative outliers to allow for comparisons between the three groups. This method is recommended by Stringfield (1994) to allow the researcher to discriminate at three distinct points along the school effectiveness continuum.

However, due to the exploratory nature of the study, sampling for Phase III was limited to positive outliers only in order to provide indepth knowledge of the phenomena surrounding their success. This strategy allowed me to direct my attention at this point in the study to the phenomenon of greatest interest, shared leadership in effective middle schools.

Limitations of the Study

The first two phases of this study were designed to compare leadership patterns across schools of all three effectiveness groups. However, due to the exploratory nature of this study, the focus of the final phase of data collection was on positive outliers only. This approach limited the researcher's ability to make comparisons between effective middle schools and their ineffective or typical counterparts.

A second limitation of this study, closely related to the first, pertains to the utilization of only middle schools in the sample. This limited sample precludes comparisons between these schools and elementary or high schools within the confines of the present study. It also limits the generalizability of the findings to schools of other grade level configurations.
However, considering the limited knowledge base within school effectiveness regarding middle level education, it was appropriate to utilize such an approach in order to provide a foundation for research in this area. With the provision of this foundation, future research will be able to make appropriate comparisons utilizing sampling techniques that will allow for the inclusion of broader samples.

Summary

The following chapters explain the details of this proposal. Chapter Two provides a review of literature pertinent to the study. This contains an introduction to middle level education including successes and failures within the movement and current issues in this area. A historical perspective of school effectiveness research is provided that leads into a review of pertinent literature in the areas of instructional leadership and models of school effectiveness. The final section of Chapter Two consists of a review of literature relating to the use of Social Network Analysis in educational research especially in the area of school effectiveness.

Chapter Three delineates the research design and methodology. The design for this study includes a three phase research sequence that includes both qualitative and quantitative data. The research design is described pictorially in Figure 3.1 through a flowchart design. This flowchart breaks down each phase of the study into three parts. In addition, the results involving the development of the Faculty Involvement Survey in Phase I, the pilot study, are included in this chapter.

Chapter Four provides a description of the results of the frequency distributions for Phases I and II of the study. These results include the quantitative analysis of the
responses to the Faculty Involvement Survey utilized in the study to identify primary leadership patterns for each of the effectiveness groups, and for each of the schools in the effective group.

Chapter Five details the qualitative results of the study through the use of four case studies. These case studies tell the story of four effective middle schools included in the study who varied as to their primary leadership patterns as well as their organizational structures, SES, and community types. This chapter provides in-depth descriptions of each of the schools individually as well as comparisons of them based upon themes that resulted through the qualitative analyses.

Chapter Six summarizes the study by reconsidering each of the research questions and the extent to which it has been answered through the results of this study. Ideas are expressed here about future research in this area, and how the research presented herein might shape these studies. In addition, other observations noted during the study are presented as they pertain to the fields of school leadership and effectiveness.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of literature includes summarizations of the research in three major areas pertinent to this study: middle level education, school effectiveness, and the use of network analysis. The chapter begins with a review of the literature related to the introduction of middle level education, its successes and failures, and current issues in this area. The second major section presents a historical perspective on school effectiveness research, and then proceeds to address research in this area relating specifically to instructional leadership and models of school effectiveness. The final section of the literature review addresses the use of network analysis, or sociometry, in the study of school effectiveness.

Literature relevant to this study was identified through a variety of research strategies such as computer and manual searches of numerous sources, including journals containing information pertinent to the research area, and bibliographies of selected texts, papers, articles, and studies. Computer searches were conducted of Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Dissertation Abstracts International in order to identify applicable papers, articles, studies and dissertations. Examples of journals frequently cited include Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Educational Administration Quarterly, and School Effectiveness and School Improvement.

Review of Literature on Middle Level Education

The Goals of Middle Level Education

Goals in middle level education have changed little since the invention of the junior high school in the first decade of the 20th century. This first conceptualization of middle
level education grew out of calls for a response to the special educational needs of adolescents. These included endorsements from the Committee of Ten and the Committee for the Reorganization of Secondary Education for plans calling for six years of elementary education and six years of secondary education, and the Committee on the Economy of Time recommending a separate junior level of secondary education (e.g., Cuban, 1992; George, Stevenson, Thomason, & Beane, 1992; Hechinger, 1993).

The goals of these early reformers included alleviating what they considered to be the inefficiencies of elementary schools, and reducing the large number of out-of-school and out-of-work 12- and 13-year olds (Cuban, 1992). They also intended to meet the needs of the industrial businesses for semi-skilled workers. Proponents of these plans emphasized the need to help students prepare for the world of work by providing opportunities for them to explore a variety of interest areas in order to make choices about their future vocation (Cuban, 1992; McKay, 1995). They also recommended that junior high schools provide for the gradual introduction of departmentalized instruction, offer some electives and prevocational courses, and stress the importance of developing personal responsibility (Hechinger, 1993; McKay, 1995).

In 1920, Leonard Koos, who chronicled the junior high school movement, summarized educators' reasons for choosing this innovation as:

1) realizing a democratic school system through
   a) retention of pupils,
   b) economy of time,
   c) recognition of individual differences,
   d) exploration for guidance, and
   e) vocational education;
2) recognizing the nature of the child;
3) providing the conditions for better teaching;
4) securing superb scholarship; and
5) improving the disciplinary situation and socializing opportunities.
(As cited in Cuban, 1992, p. 236)

While the emphasis for most of these reformers was on providing educational opportunities that would be more responsive to the needs of early adolescents, these schools quickly became more and more like miniature high schools (Cuban, 1992; George, et al., 1992; McKay, 1995).

With the 1960's came a new wave of reform involving middle level education. Reformers during this period stressed the need to change junior high schools to middle schools which would be sensitive to the needs of early adolescents. The mission of these schools was supposedly to provide special places for 10 to 14 year olds where their varied developmental needs could be met (Cuban, 1992). However, the change to middle schools was endorsed by many school boards for reasons other than a concern for the special needs of young adolescents (George, et al., 1992). These included attempts to racially desegregate school systems, to reduce overcrowding in elementary schools and increase enrollment in near empty high school buildings, to provide more specialization in grade 5 and/or 6, and to jump on the bandwagon of educational reform (e.g., Cuban, 1992; George, et al., 1992; Romano & Georgiady, 1994). This phase of the middle level reform effort quickly became just a name change on the sign outside most junior high schools.

More recent calls for the reform of middle level education have swayed little from the goals of the early reformers, and express many of the same concerns about the future
of young adolescents. Proponents of this latest reform effort cite the increasing risks presented by adolescent sexual promiscuity, alcohol and drug abuse, poor school performance and social alienation as indicative of the need to reform middle level education (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989). Once again, these reformers, including the Middle School Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, seek to refocus education at this level to be responsive to the developmental needs of young adolescents (George, et al., 1992).

Evidence Related to the Success and Failure of Middle Level Education

The repeated reform efforts in middle level education have met with little success. Studies conducted between 1930 and 1960 revealed that the fundamental reform intended by the creation of junior high schools did not occur (Cuban, 1992). These studies revealed that departmentalization had remained, the availability of electives was limited, little integration of subject matter existed, block scheduling was virtually nonexistent, and ability grouping had increased. While junior high schools had succeeded in reducing the number of dropouts in the later elementary years, they had failed at almost all of their other goals.

More recent research indicates the continued failure of the reform of middle level education. Evidence of this failure came in a study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1987 noting “The most alarming dimension of sixth grade curriculum is the low incidence of efforts to correlate and integrate subjects” (Lounsbury & Johnston, 1988, p. 26). These middle schools provided their students with little support in making coherent academic sense of their days.
Further evidence followed from a study of 2400 schools by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools (Epstein, 1990). This study showed that around two-thirds of the schools had an advisory or homeroom period, but that the school day was still generally organized around six 50 minute periods. Teachers continued to be organized into departments based upon their subject matter specialization, and most students did not receive instruction from teams of teachers. In fact, only about 10% of the schools utilized interdisciplinary teams, provided common planning time for team members of at least two hours per week, and actually used more than a small fraction of that planning time to coordinate activities that would strengthen the effects of the team approach to instruction.

While these studies indicated the failure of middle level schools to respond to repeated reform attempts, there were also promising results in some middle schools that had changed to meet the special needs of their young adolescent clientele. Lipsitz’s study of four effective middle schools (1984) showed that all of these schools placed a heavy emphasis on the enhancement of the personal growth and development of their students, even though they were quite diverse. These successful schools shared certain characteristics, beliefs, and practices related to three areas (Martin, 1993). In the area of school climate, they provided a warm productive atmosphere as a result of several factors. These included a physical setting that encouraged student contributions to their school, a sense of community, established support groups for students, subgroupings of students through team and house structures, the use of reward systems and recognition, high
expectations for teachers and students, and a universal appreciation for the uniqueness of young adolescents.

Similarities in school organization were clearly based on similar philosophies gleaned from a well articulated understanding of the developmental needs of young adolescents. These common philosophies resulted in the utilization of team or house structures that grouped faculty and students into smaller subunits, the reduction of departmentalization, and the establishment of interdisciplinary teams. They also provided for guaranteed common planning time for team members, and flexibility in scheduling that allowed for the modification of the regular schedule for special events or activities.

A third area of commonality for these successful middle schools was curriculum and instruction. Administrators and teachers in these schools clung to neither the concept that schools must be strict and orderly to stress academic achievement, nor to the idea that they must be warm and caring to attend to students’ emotional and social needs. They instead developed curricular and instructional policies that promoted academic success and attended to the physical, emotional, social, and intellectual needs of their young adolescent clients.

Additional research on effective middle level schools has been limited. With respect to instructional leadership, research findings have shown differences in the implementation of leadership behaviors by principals in high and low achieving schools as perceived by the teachers in these schools (Spirito, 1991). Principals in high-achieving schools were perceived by their teachers to implement leadership behaviors more frequently than were their counterparts in low-achieving schools. The focus of leadership
behaviors for principals in high-achieving middle schools centers around meeting the individual needs of both students and teachers, on creating and maintaining a warm, caring, and supportive environment, and on doing those things necessary for success (Shaw, 1991).

Furthermore, based upon his study of principals' instructional leadership behaviors and practices in urban middle schools, Sithole (1995) reached five major conclusions about instructional leadership:

• it is reinforced by a shared vision,
• it is planned and distinguished by knowledgeable actions,
• it is situational and purposeful,
• it is student centered, and
• it is a shared responsibility.

This sharing of the instructional leadership responsibility includes principals, other administrators, and teachers.

Additional research that supports this conceptualization of shared leadership in middle schools indicates that middle school principals serve more as managers than as instructional leaders (Miller, 1988). Instructional leadership is instead provided by grade level teams in which teachers develop interdependent relationships through cooperative planning.

Research on middle level education clearly indicates that attempts to reform education at this level have been limited in their success. However, evidence exists that, in those schools where reform has occurred, successes are resulting. These schools are
meeting the unique needs of their young adolescent clientele through a variety of methods including interdisciplinary team teaching, the use of team and house structures, and the reduction of departmentalization. Attempts must be made to determine methods for diffusing these innovations and thus improving the future for all young adolescents.

**Current Issues in Middle School Education**

According to the report by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989), middle schools may be the last chance we have to reach these young adolescents before they become to far adrift from mainstream society to be recaptured. In order to accomplish this task, the report makes eight recommendations for the improvement of middle level education. These recommendations are:

- *Create small communities for learning*....
- *Teach a core academic program*....
- *Ensure success for all students*....
- *Empower teachers and administrators to make decisions about the experiences of middle grade students*....
- *Staff middle grade schools with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents*....
- *Improve academic performance through fostering the health and fitness*....
- *Reengage families in the education of young adolescents*....
- *Connect schools with communities*.... (Carnegie Council, 1989, p. 9-10)

These recommendations closely mirror the suggestions of earlier proponents of reform. However, an increasingly dreary portrait of the future of young adolescents is apparent in this latest reform attempt. Statistics cited in *Turning Points* (Carnegie Council, 1989) indicate that 7 million, or one in four, young adolescents are at extremely high risk for self-destructive activities and school failure, and another 7 million are at moderate risk for such activities.
High school completion rates indicate that schools are clearly losing a substantial portion of our population. For those between the ages of 18 and 19, the completion rate has decreased from 73.3% in 1970 to 71.6% in 1989 (ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, 1991). More notably, this 1989 figure is down from the recent high completion rate of 74.6% in 1986. Statistics indicate that in Louisiana, the situation is considerably worse with the cohort rate of ninth grade completers decreasing from 66.5% in 1973 to 56.1% in 1993 (Fossey, 1996).

The picture is even more bleak for members of minority groups. Between 1987 and 1989, approximately 8% of Hispanic students and 7% of African American students dropped out of school each year. These rates are nearly twice as high as the rate for whites which was estimated at 4% per year during this time period.

Recent figures indicate that 10% of all 15- to 19-year old females become pregnant each year (Kids having kids, 1996). Of the 52%, or half a million, of them who actually give birth, 80% will end up in poverty and dependent on welfare. Many of them will remain dependent on welfare for the majority of their child's highly important early developmental years. The costs of teen pregnancy to society can be measured not only in terms of costs to taxpayers, estimated at $6.9 billion per year, but also in terms of the social costs including the need for increased health care and foster care, and in terms of unmeasured costs such as lost productivity and wasted resources.

It is apparent from these statistics that improvements must be made in secondary education to recapture these at-risk students. Middle schools appear to be the place to begin with such efforts since these problems often have their inception during this young
adolescent period. Efforts need to be made to identify the organizational structure and
culture that exists in effective middle schools that increases their ability to reach such
students, and to diffuse these characteristics to other middle schools in order to increase
their chances for success with these students.

Review Of School Effectiveness Research

Early School Effectiveness Research: Educational Production Function Studies and
Effective Schools Studies

School effectiveness research as a field of study originated in reaction to Coleman, et al.'s (1966) and Jencks, et al.'s (1972) findings that school based variables have little impact on student achievement. These studies provided a rather pessimistic view of the possible influence of school based factors, and instead attributed the majority of between school variance in student achievement to school input factors including student socioeconomic status and ability (Creemers, 1994).

Several problems with these large-scale cross-sectional surveys have been noted (e.g., Cohen, 1983; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston. 1979, Stringfield, 1994). These include:

- the use of general ability measures of attainment,
- the under specification of the school effects model, and
- failure to account for within school differences.

These original studies (e.g., Coleman, 1966) used measures of attainment (e.g., verbal ability) that showed little relationship to what schools actually strive to teach. Later
research indicated that the use of general ability measures rather than subject specific tests resulted in an underestimation of school effects (Madaus, Airasian, & Kelleghan, 1980).

Educational production function studies also focused on a very narrow range of school variables including, for the most part, easily measurable resources such as physical facilities, student-teacher ratios, school size, average per pupil expenditure, and number of library books owned. This meant that other school features including cultural norms and values, instructional practices, classroom management, and school organization were completely ignored (Cohen, 1983; Murnane, 1983; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979). Such an omission could doubtless result in rather misleading conclusions (Rutter et al., 1979).

These early input-output studies also overlooked the fact that the majority of achievement differences occur within schools rather than between schools. According to Cohen (1983), within school differences account for between 70 and 90% of the variation in student achievement. This criticism of the early studies has led to better specified multi-level models in more recent research.

Regardless of these and other weaknesses, the conclusions drawn from these findings were taken by many educational researchers and policymakers as proof for the proposition that "schools do not make a difference" (Creemers, 1994). In reaction to these conclusions, early school effectiveness researchers conducted studies directed at locating schools that were making a difference in student achievement. These researchers shared three central assumptions:
1) schools can be identified that are unusually effective in teaching poor and minority children basic skills as measured by standardized tests;
2) these successful schools exhibit characteristics that are correlated with their success and that lie well within the domain of educators to manipulate;
3) that the characteristics of a successful school provide a basis for improving schools not deemed successful. (Bickel, 1983, p.3)

Researchers conducting these studies referred to their work as “effective schools research” (e.g., De Bevoise, 1984; Dwyer, 1984; Edmonds, 1979; Gersten, Carnine & Green, 1982). The definition of effectiveness utilized by many of these researchers as the focus of their research relied on the guiding principle of equity as its mainstay. For these researchers, an effective school was one that was able to teach poor children at least as well as it taught middle class children, bringing them to the same level of mastery of basic skills that was acceptable as a minimum for middle class children (Edmonds, 1979).

The most prominent of these advocates of effective schools, Ron Edmonds, conducted a reanalysis of the Equal Educational Opportunity Survey data (Edmonds & Frederickson, 1978). The central thesis of this reanalysis was that all children are educable, and that school characteristics and activities are critical in determining the quality of education received by students.

This reanalysis indicated that while some schools were consistently effective in teaching subgroups of their student population that were homogeneous in race and socioeconomic status, these same schools were not always consistently effective in educating children of more heterogeneous groupings (Edmonds & Frederickson, 1978). Also, schools that were found to be instructionally effective with poor and black children were found to be indistinguishable from their less effective counterparts on student
background variables such as parent's educational level, parental occupations, percentage of white students, mean family size, and percentage of intact families. Based upon these findings, Edmonds (1979) concluded that "the large differences in performance between the effective and ineffective schools could not therefore be attributed to differences in the social class and family background of pupils enrolled in the schools" (p. 21).

Another early contributor to the field of school effectiveness research was Weber (1971) who studied four instructionally effective inner-city schools in an attempt to provide an undeniable alternative to the findings of Coleman, et al. (1966). All four schools included in the study had exhibited clearly successful reading achievement for poor children, and were examined to determine the common characteristics they possessed that contributed to that success. Weber (1971) concluded that the four schools shared the following characteristics: strong leadership by the principal; high expectations for all students; an orderly, relatively quiet, and pleasant atmosphere; and a strong emphasis on student acquisition of basic reading skills reinforced by frequent evaluation of student progress.

Brookover and Lezotte's study of eight Michigan schools (1977) included six improving schools and two classified as declining. The results of this study indicated that improving schools differ from declining schools on a number of important variables. These variables include the emphasis the staff places on basic reading and math skills accomplishment, the expectations that staff hold for student achievement, the time devoted to direct reading instruction, and the principal's role as the instructional leader in
the school. Staffs of the improving schools were found to show greater commitment and emphasis to all of these areas than were the staffs of the declining schools.

Rutter, et al. (1979) conducted one of the few mainstream school effectiveness studies involving secondary schools, and utilized a longitudinal research design following a group of students from primary school to secondary school. This study investigated between school differences in student achievement and behavior, as well as the ways in which schools influence their students' progress. The focus here was on the social organization of the schools involved and the learning climates they provided to their students rather than on material or monetary resources.

The results of this study indicated that there were clearly differences in the achievement and behavior outcomes for secondary school students in inner London. These differences could not be accounted for using between school differences in student background variables, school physical factors, or administrative or organizational features, but "were systematically related to their characteristics as social institutions" (Rutter, et al., 1979, p. 178). These characteristics included the degree of academic emphasis, teaching methods used, the presence and use of reward structures, good conditions for pupils, and the extent to which children were able to take responsibility for their own learning and behavior. Based upon these results, Rutter et al. (1979) concluded that "to an appreciable extent children's behaviour and attitudes are shaped and influenced by their experiences at school and, in particular, by the qualities of the school as a social institution" (p. 179). He referred to these factors as the "school ethos".
These early studies showed that the influence of school based variables was undeniable, and all of them reached similar conclusions about the characteristics of these effective schools (Creemers, 1994). The most widely known list of these characteristics was developed by Ron Edmonds (1979). Based upon his review of numerous early studies of school effectiveness, Edmonds identified what he deemed the "most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools":

(a) They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together;
(b) Schools that are instructionally effective for poor children have a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum, but efficacious levels of achievement;
(c) The school's atmosphere is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand;
(d) Effective schools get that way partly by making it clear that pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities;
(e) When necessary, school energy and resources can be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives; and
(f) There must be some means by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored. (Edmonds, 1979, p. 22)

Cohen (1983) notes that there are at least two shortcomings of such summaries. First, the "laundry lists of variables" they present fail to provide adequate information on how the characteristics are interrelated and on how they work. Secondly, they fail to provide a complete picture of current research since they do not include knowledge gained from studies of "instructional practices, classroom management and organization, teacher and school change, staff development, and school organization and climate" (p. 18). They are instead limited to the findings and conclusions of studies comparing more and less effective schools. Other critics noted methodological flaws in the effective schools.
Despite these criticisms, the findings from effective schools research were widely utilized by practitioners and policymakers in school improvement initiatives. According to the U. S. General Accounting Office (1989) report, by 1988, 41% of the nation's school districts had "effective schools" programs. Only one-fifth of these programs were estimated to be in schools that served clientele where over 40% of the students received free- or reduced-price lunches. Thus, the effective schools model was being implemented in many schools that did not fit the profile of the schools in which the original research was done (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). This effective schools emphasis was also evident at the federal level in the elementary and secondary school improvement amendments of 1988 in which Chapter I requirements were modified to allow schools with 75% or more of their students achieving at extremely low levels to stop targeting funds for specific students and develop schoolwide programs as an alternative (Firestone, 1991).

**Criticisms of the Early School Effectiveness Research**

While improvement initiatives based on early school effectiveness research have been widely embraced by practitioners and policymakers, this research has been criticized in numerous reviews by researchers. Criticisms of this research include:

- the tendency to produce "recipes" for school improvement,
- the selection and size of the samples studied,
- the aggregation of achievement data to the school level in regression analyses utilized to identify effective schools,
• the subjectivity of the criteria for determining school success, and
• the overgeneralization of findings to schools of varying contexts.

The tendency of these early studies to produce narrow, simplistic recipes for school improvement has been highly criticized (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984; Purkey & Smith, 1983; U. S. General Accounting Office, 1989). While the research findings have consistently differentiated effective schools from ineffective ones, there have been differences between the various researchers as to the salient characteristics to which between school achievement differences can be attributed (e.g., D'Amico, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Therefore, there is not a single recipe or blueprint for school improvement.

A second area of criticism has been the selection and size of the samples studied (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983). The samples for most early studies of school effects were narrow and relatively small, with sample sizes ranging from two to 12 schools. With these small sample sizes, the possibility of incorrect identification of outlier schools was increased. As noted by Purkey and Smith (1983), "the strength of the outlier approach depends on the quality of the measures used to partial out the effects of social class and home background" (p. 431). The limited size of the samples utilized in these studies increased the possibility that the characteristics or correlates that appeared to differentiate between effective and ineffective schools were actually only chance events.

Additionally, achievement data were aggregated to the school level for these regression analyses, which may have masked the differential effects of schools on specific subgroups of students, and failed to account for within school differences in achievement.
Considering this weakness, such studies may fail to provide information to practitioners on how to make schools more effective for all of the subgroups of children within the same school (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

It has also been noted that outlier studies may make inappropriate comparisons between unusually effective and ineffective schools, while failing to make any comparisons with typical schools (Klitgaard & Hall, 1974). More appropriate comparisons might be made between effective and typical schools, since the differences between these groups of schools may be very unlike the differences between ineffective schools and effective schools. As noted by Purkey and Smith (1983), "unless schools are capable of making quantum leaps in effectiveness, it will probably not greatly profit a very poor school to compare itself with an exceptionally fine school" (p. 432).

The criteria utilized in these early school effectiveness studies for determining school success have also been highly criticized for their generally subjective nature. This subjectivity could result in a school identified as "unusually effective" for predominantly low income and minority students having considerably lower achievement than a middle class white suburban school (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

A further criticism of early school effectiveness research has related to the limited concept of effectiveness utilized in many of the studies (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984; Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1984; Good & Brophy, 1986; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983). Definitions of effectiveness have been closely related to achievement test scores in lower level reading and math skills, and have thus failed to consider many skills and attitudes that are a major part of what goes on in schools, especially at the secondary level (e.g., Farrar,
Neufeld, & Miles, 1984). Many of these skills and attitudes have been excluded due to the
difficulty in measuring them, and to the fact that they are beyond the scope of paper and
class tests (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984).

The importance of these other outcomes of schooling to both educators and
parents is evident in the work of A Place Called School (Goodlad, 1984). In his study of
38 schools in 13 communities, Goodlad found that while there was an assumption during
the 1970's that parents wanted a more limited kind of schooling for their children, the
evidence from his study indicated that both parents and educators have broad expectations
for schools. In this study, parents, teachers, and students were asked about the
importance of four broad areas of school goals: academic goals, vocational goals,
social/civic goals, and personal goals.

In general, parents responded that all four of these goal areas were very important.
The one exception to this was in the area of vocational goals for elementary parents which
ranked slightly below the other three goal areas. When parents and teachers were asked
to select one most preferred goal for their schools, approximately one-half of the parents
and almost one-half of the teachers chose the academic goal category. The other half of
both groups spread their choice evenly across the other three areas. When students were
asked to select the most preferred area of school goals, their preferences were evenly
spread across all four categories. These results clearly indicate that parents, teachers, and
students in this study do not hold a "back to basics" attitude about schools, but are instead
concerned about schools preparing students in a broad range of skills (Goodlad, 1984).
Criticisms of early school effectiveness research have also focused on the fact that the majority of this research has been limited to urban elementary schools, and yet practitioners and policymakers persist in generalizing the findings of these studies to other contexts (e.g., Cuban, 1983, 1984; Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1984; Good & Brophy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; U. S. General Accounting Office, 1989). Difficulties have been noted in generalizing these findings to schools of differing community contexts and grade level configurations.

Some researchers have proposed that suburban and rural schools differ from urban schools on a number of important characteristics that may have implications for the application of effective school findings in these settings (e.g., Hannaway & Talbert, 1991; Purkey & Rutter, 1987; Witte & Walsh, 1990). In the area of labor differences, Hannaway and Talbert (1991) indicate that “some schools may have an advantage developing a productive school working environment as a consequence of the quality of staff they are able to attract and retain” (p. 9). Organizational differences relating to the impact of external constituencies and the size of school districts are also recognized as variables that may differ between urban, suburban, and rural schools (e.g., Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Hannaway, 1990).

The problem of applying findings from studies done primarily in elementary schools has also been discussed in several critiques (e.g., Cuban, 1983,1984; Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991). Secondary schools differ from elementary schools in several important areas, including the following:
1) there is a shift in emphasis from child-centered to knowledge-centered curriculum;
2) the content of course materials is more sophisticated;
3) teachers can be different from one another in terms of their teacher preparation programs and certificates;
4) students are adolescents, making the clientele quite different from elementary school students;
5) there are multiple academic leaders (principals, assistant principal(s), department chairs) at the secondary level, as opposed to a single academic leader (the principal) at the elementary level. (Teddlie, 1994, p. 99)

These numerous criticisms have resulted in a second wave of school effectiveness research that has sought to provide a response to these critics by studying school effectiveness across a variety of contexts.

The Second Wave of School Effectiveness Research

In response to criticisms of the first wave of research, the focus of school effectiveness research shifted from equity to efficiency (Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989). The question to be addressed became "How can we produce better schools for any and all students?" rather than "How can we produce better schools for the disadvantaged?" (Teddlie, 1994, p. 87). As a result, the second phase of research has been characterized by studies of school effects across a variety of contexts (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). These contexts have included the socioeconomic status (SES) of the student population, the grade level configuration of the school, the community type of the school, the size of the school or district, the school governance sector (either public or private), the subject matter context of the school, and the administrative context of the school. These studies may be referred to as “contextually sensitive” studies of school effectiveness. Findings from these “contextually sensitive” studies are of particular
importance for policymakers and practitioners seeking to implement effective schools programs.

Most studies during this phase have focused on context factors related to student SES, school grade level configuration, and/or community type of the school (Teddlie, 1994). Since these areas make up the bulk of context specific school effectiveness research, each of these areas will be discussed in the following separate sections.

**Context Studies Regarding SES of Students.** There have been two comprehensive studies of the impact of SES as a context variable conducted in the United States. Hallinger and Murphy's (1986) study of eight effective elementary schools utilized a positive outlier case study approach. The second major study was conducted by Teddlie, Stringfield, and their colleagues (1985, 1988, 1989), and originally included 76 schools across three effectiveness categories (more effective, typical, and less effective) and two student body SES levels (middle and low). For later phases of this study, the sample was reduced to eight matched pairs of schools that were representative of the original sample (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1988; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

Data from these studies and others indicate that certain characteristics of effective schools exist regardless of the SES of the school's students. These include: clear academic mission and focus, orderly environment, high academic engaged time-on-task, and frequent monitoring of student progress (Teddlie, 1994; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). However, middle and low SES schools have also been found to differ on several characteristics.
The first of these is the area of expectations for student achievement. In mid-SES schools, both high present and high future educational expectations are promoted by the school staff, while in low-SES schools high expectations for present educational achievement are emphasized to the exclusion of future expectations (Teddle, 1994; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). The source of expectations for low- and mid-SES schools has also been found to differ. In low-SES schools, the school itself is the source of expectations, and the expectations tended to be more moderate, possibly accounting for the difference in present and future expectations in these schools. In mid-SES schools, the parents and the school serve as joint sources of expectations resulting in very high expectations for students in these schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986).

These differences in expectations also appear to impact other areas of school effectiveness characteristics for these schools. Curricular offerings in effective low-SES schools tend to focus on basic skills, while in effective mid-SES schools curricular offerings are frequently expanded to include more higher order skills (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie, 1994; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). The presence and significance of external reward structures also varies for these two groups of schools. While effective low-SES schools place great emphasis on providing rewards for their students’ achievements often in the form of frequent school honors assemblies and other recognition, effective mid-SES schools tend to downplay such activities, instead expecting that rewards for such achievement will come from the students’ homes (Teddle, 1994; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).
This difference highlights the variation in school/home linkages between low- and mid-SES schools. These linkages tend to be weak in effective low-SES schools, where principals often attempt to buffer the school from negative community influences by creating boundaries between the school and community. On the other hand, home/school linkages in mid-SES schools are strong with principals and teachers encouraging parent and community involvement in the school (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie, 1994; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

Principal leadership styles and teacher characteristics also differ in these two groups of schools. Principals express varying degrees of control over staff selection with those in effective mid-SES schools having less input on hiring, but greater availability of experienced teachers to consider for openings. In contrast, principals in effective low-SES schools perceive greater control over hiring practices, but lesser availability of experienced teachers (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). As a result of this, effective mid-SES schools typically have a larger number of more experienced teachers, while effective low-SES schools have a majority of less experienced teachers (Teddlie, 1994).

In the area of leadership styles, principals in effective low-SES schools maintain greater control over instruction and a higher task orientation (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). These leaders tend to be interested in making changes in their schools and therefore serve as change initiators (Teddlie, 1994). As a result of this focus, these administrators make more frequent observations in classrooms, and are often involved in providing assistance to teachers (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Principals in effective mid-SES schools serve their schools more as good managers, who maintain low to moderate control of
instruction, and are more moderate in their task orientation (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie, 1994). Behaviors exhibited by these principals include less frequent observations in classrooms, less frequent assistance to teachers, and more of a managerial role with regard to academic programs, thus allowing for greater teacher autonomy and leadership (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Several of the results from these studies have been replicated by Hebert (1994) and research done in a recent international study of school effectiveness (Reynolds & Teddlie, 1995).

**Context Studies Regarding School Community Type.** Studies involving schools from a variety of community types were especially limited during the first phase of school effectiveness research, due to the focus on finding effective urban schools. These early studies were primarily studies of urban schools, and were most often limited to elementary schools due to the focus on basic skills (Teddlie, 1994; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989).

Two interesting differences between rural and urban schools have been noted in the few studies that have been done comparing these two contexts (e.g., Hannaway & Talbert, 1991; Purkey & Rutter, 1987; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Witte & Walsh, 1990). First, educational resources are scarcer for schools in rural districts than for those in urban ones. Secondly, rural schools generally have smaller faculties and serve fewer students, who are more culturally homogeneous, which may lead to greater faculty cohesiveness (Teddlie, 1994). However, it should be noted that effective urban schools also tend to more ethnically homogeneous than their ineffective urban counterparts (Lomotey & Swanson, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1985).
In addition, Lomotey and Swanson (1989) found in their comparison of urban and rural schools that effective urban schools are in some ways more like rural schools than like their typical urban counterparts. This includes the tendency for faculties of effective urban schools to work toward developing a nurturing climate that is both challenging and compassionate. In addition, these schools strive to implement disciplinary procedures that are orderly and provide preplanned routines. In addition, effective urban schools also tend to focus on a back to basics approach that limits their course offerings as compared to typical urban schools, but in some ways mirrors the limitations often imposed on rural schools due to their small size.

In their case studies of two rural, two suburban, and two urban schools, Teddlie and Stringfield (1993) also found these pairs of schools to differ in four other areas:

- community and district office support,
- leadership,
- faculty and instructional organization,
- curriculum and professional development.

The findings of these researchers clearly indicate that urban and rural schools have more difficulty attaining success in these areas due to their contextual constraints. These difficulties are most notable for urban schools.

One clear example of these differences involves community and district office resources. Urban schools may have access to adequate resources, but frequently possess an inefficient system for acquiring these resources. Rural schools typically have an overall lack of adequate resources, frequently due to a lack of funding in the school district. In
contrast, suburban schools generally possess both adequate resources and an appropriate delivery system enabling them to provide their students with more suitable educational programs. In addition, while suburban and rural schools are characterized by intermediate to strong community and parental involvement, urban schools must frequently buffer themselves from communities whose negative influences might adversely affect the school’s operation and goal attainment.

Freeman (1997) has demonstrated that schools located in city/urban fringe areas are more likely to experience "naturally occurring school improvement" than are those in metropolitan or rural districts. Freeman speculated that this was due to greater human and other resources in these schools.

These findings tend to support the results of three studies done utilizing the 1984 High School and Beyond database (Hannaway & Talbert, 1991; Purkey & Rutter, 1987; Witte & Walsh, 1990). Teachers in urban schools were found by these researchers to believe that they and their students faced more difficult tasks and had less positive environments than did their counterparts in suburban schools (Purkey & Rutter, 1987; Witte & Walsh, 1990). Based upon their findings, research in all three of these studies concluded that “there are two very separate educational worlds - one in the city and one in the suburbs” (Witte & Walsh, 1990, p. 192).

**Context Studies Regarding Grade Level Configuration.** There are significant differences between elementary and secondary schools on a number of important dimensions. First, in secondary schools, there is a shift from the child-centeredness of
elementary schools to an increased emphasis on the curriculum (e.g., Firestone & Herriot, 1982; Teddlie, 1994).

Secondly, teachers differ greatly from one another in their areas of specialization and certification (Teddlie, 1994). In middle schools, teachers may have been trained for either elementary or secondary education, but may lack the specialized training in adolescent development that is necessary to successfully meet the needs of the young adolescents whom they serve (McKay, 1995). Departmentalization and staff size at this level can also limit the principal’s influence on their faculty members (e.g., Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1989; Firestone & Herriott, 1982).

Secondary schools also work with an adolescent clientele that is quite different from the student body in elementary schools. In middle schools, the students are just beginning to reach puberty and to seek their own identity and independence. In effect, the middle school years represent a “turning point” in the lives of our youth (e.g., Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989).

Despite these differences, there continues to be limited research regarding the variation between schools of different grade level configurations (Levine and Lezotte, 1990) in part due to methodological difficulties with concurrent studies of elementary and secondary schools (Teddlie, 1994). These difficulties include the inability of low inference measures of teacher effectiveness, such as time-on-task measures, to successfully differentiate among levels of school effectiveness at the secondary level (Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991). However, the limited research in this area has indicated differences
with regards to curriculum emphases, goal consensus, and leadership structures and behaviors.

With regard to curriculum emphases, unusually effective secondary schools have been described as offering a curriculum that is enriched and highly relevant to student needs (Firestone & Wilson, 1989; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). Levine and Eubanks (1989) also note that it is characteristic for effective secondary schools to provide ‘alternative types of learning arrangements and experiences’. These findings differ greatly from the basic skills orientation of effective elementary schools.

In the area of goal consensus, research has concluded that this correlate is problematic for secondary schools (e.g., Farrar, Neufeld, & Miles, 1984; Virgilio, 1987). Teachers at the secondary level show significantly less agreement on instructional goals than do teachers at the elementary level possibly due to their specialization in particular subject matter areas (e.g., Firestone & Herriott, 1982). In Lipsitz’s study of four successful middle schools (1984), she found that the four schools had distinctly different missions, none of which focused on a basic skills orientation. Based upon these findings, it is apparent that goals in secondary schools are not limited to the provision of instruction on basic skills for only the urban poor, but instead struggle with a wide array of important goals for a diverse clientele (Firestone & Herriott, 1982).

Clear differences in leadership as a school effectiveness characteristic have been identified in research involving grade level configuration as a context variable (e.g., Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Heck, 1992; Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991). This research has shown that in secondary schools there is greater participation by the faculty in
several areas, including influence over classroom management (Firestone & Herriott, 1982).

Principal influence at the secondary level is decreased due to several structural characteristics of the schools including departmentalization, subject matter specialization of teachers, and staff size. These structural characteristics, first of all, make it difficult for principals to exert expert power when they may have little knowledge in some of the subject matter areas. They also make it necessary to delegate communication with teachers to others including assistant principals and department chairs (Firestone & Herriott, 1982).

These findings are consist with the conclusions of Heck (1992), which indicated that principals in effective secondary schools devote substantially less time to instructional leadership activities than do their counterparts in effective elementary schools. Findings from Virgilio, Teddlie, and Oescher (1991) further indicate that secondary school principals do not have the time or expertise required to be the strong instructional leader suggested by Edmonds (1979).

Over its 30 year history, school effectiveness research has made a transition from a search for effective schools for the urban poor to a search for effective schools for any and all students. This transition was brought on by the myriad criticisms of the early studies of school effects. While these criticisms resulted in a change of focus for researchers, it was met with little interest by practitioners and policymakers, who have often clung to the lists of school effectiveness correlates generated by the earlier effective schools research as a panacea for all of the problems that plague public education. As noted by Cuban (1993),
If ever a continental divide existed between researchers on the one side and policymakers and practitioners on the other, it is most clearly revealed over effective schools research. As researchers turned up their collective noses at this body of research, those who worked daily in improving schools embraced the findings with a relish bordering on passion in their efforts to create programs in urban and non-urban schools, districts, and states. (p. ix)

Researchers have widened their search for effective schools to include schools from a variety of contexts. They have sought to discover the differences between effective schools of varying contextual conditions in order to provide greater insight for the improvement of all schools. Within this search, it has become apparent that schools of differing contexts vary with respect to those characteristics that have become known as correlates of school effectiveness including the emphasis on basic skills, instructional leadership, high expectations for students, and goal consensus. Research that has uncovered the differences in instructional leadership in these diverse contexts is of particular interest for the purposes of this study.

School Effectiveness Research and Instructional Leadership

General Theories of Educational Leadership. Models of leadership have typically fallen into three general types: trait theory, situational theory, and contingency theory. Within these three general types, several models of leadership have been developed that guide research in the area of educational leadership.

Trait theory, frequently referred to as the great man theory of leadership, was the dominant model for this area of research until the 1950s (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). This approach attempted to identify specific physical or psychological traits that explained the behavior or actions of leaders. Through early reviews of this research (e.g., Gibb, 1954;
Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948), it became apparent that the results of these studies were confusing and inconsequential. Traits identified as significant in one study were found to be unimportant in other studies. Regardless of these criticisms, trait studies have persisted, and have more recently focused on managers and administrators (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

Situational theory developed, in large part, as a reaction to the lack of success that had become evident in studies utilizing the trait approach. This approach attempted to isolate unique characteristics in individual settings that led to the leader's success. Variables in four areas were hypothesized to be relevant to leader behavior and success: structural properties of the organization, organizational climate or culture, role characteristics, and subordinate characteristics (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1977, 1982) situational leadership theory attempted to provide leaders with an understanding of the relationships that exist between effective leadership styles and maturity levels of followers. Within this theory, leadership style refers to one of four leader behavior patterns. These patterns are based on two dimensions of leader behavior: task behavior and relationship behavior. The only situational variable utilized in this model is subordinate maturity level which is defined as “the capacity to set high but attainable goals, the willingness and ability to take responsibility, and the experience of an individual or a group” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 151). In this model, effectiveness is attained through the matching of leader behavior with the level of maturity of the subordinates in the situation. It is hypothesized by Hersey and Blanchard that as the followers reach higher levels of maturity, less task orientation is
required of the leader. In addition, when subordinates reach the highest level of maturity, leadership emerges from the group itself.

The contingency approach represents an integration of the two earlier approaches. This approach seeks to identify the conditions or contextual variables that regulate the relationship between leader characteristics and performance. Three models have been developed within this approach (Hoy & Miskel, 1991): House’s path-goal theory (e.g., House & Baetz, 1979), Fiedler’s (1967) contingency model, and the cognitive resource theory (Feidler & Garcia, 1987).

House’s (e.g., House & Baetz, 1979) path-goal theory seeks to explain how leaders control the perceptions of their followers as to their work goals, personal goals, and available paths to goal attainment. Variables important in this model include four types of leadership (directive, achievement-oriented, supportive, and participative) and two kinds of situational factors (personal characteristics of followers and environmental pressures and demands). In this model, effectiveness of the leader is determined by the degree to which his/her behavior improves subordinate job satisfaction, increases leader acceptance, and promotes follower motivation.

Fiedler’s (1967) contingency model views both the satisfaction of the leader’s personal needs and the accomplishment of organizational goals as important to the leadership situation. In this model, leadership behavior and leadership style are clearly different. Leadership behavior refers to the specific activities of a leader in guiding and organizing the work of the followers. Leadership style is defined as the leader’s personal need structure that motivates his/her behavior in various situations with others. Three
major variables are utilized to determine situational control: position power, or the power conferred to the leader by the formal organization; task structure, or the degree to which task goals, methods, and performance standards are clearly defined; and leader-member relations, or the extent of the group members' acceptance of and respect for the leader. Effectiveness in this model is determined by the group's degree of task accomplishment.

The cognitive resource theory (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987) was developed in response to criticisms of Fiedler's earlier contingency model regarding its failure to explain the hidden processes that result in effective performance by the group. In this theory, cognitive resources are considered to be "the intellectual abilities, technical competence, and job-relevant knowledge acquired through formal training or experience in the organization" (Hoy & Miskel, 1991, p. 282). The theory proposes that the cognitive resources of the leader are the primary source of the methods and tactics utilized by the group in its accomplishment of its primary task. It is hypothesized that more effective leaders have better ideas and plans, and thus, increase the capacity of their subordinate group to accomplish their primary task.

Although research has been conducted in all three of the general types of leadership theories, most of the predominant models involve a contingency approach (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). The contingency approach to leadership in school effectiveness research has many advocates (e.g., Creemers, 1994; Scheerens, 1990; Scheerens & Creemers, 1989; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). This approach to leadership has begun to dominate the area of school effectiveness research with the growth of contextually sensitive studies.
Applications to School Effectiveness Research. It is clear that leadership within schools has an undeniable impact on student outcomes. This connection has been verified through research findings in various fields of study including effective schools, school improvement, staff development, program innovations, and change studies (Murphy, 1990). These studies have gradually led to a greater understanding of the role of instructional leadership within school effectiveness.

Numerous early studies of instructional leadership focused on personal characteristics of certain principals that made them more effective than others in leading their schools (De Bevoise, 1984). Characteristics of strong, effective principals identified in these studies included an ability to set clear goals and use them as a source of continual motivation, high self confidence and openness, an ability to handle ambiguity, an inclination to test limits, an awareness of the dynamics of power, an analytical mind, and a take charge mentality (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Huff, Lake, & Schaalman, 1982).

Three weaknesses were identified in this early research on characteristics of effective principals (De Bevoise, 1984). First, measuring these behaviors and characteristics, and correlating them with the expected outcomes are difficult tasks. Secondly, none of these studies compared effective principals with their ineffective counterparts. There were also no studies of ineffective principals that could be used as a comparison for these studies of effective ones. Thirdly, these lists of preferable characteristics fail to consider context or situational factors. Based upon these weaknesses, De Bevoise (1984) stated “Rather than seeking a prescription for principal
behavior, research needs to clarify how different styles and personalities interact with specific contexts to produce either desirable or undesirable consequences.” (p. 89)

More recent research by Kirby, Paradise, and King (1992) investigated the characteristics of extraordinary leaders in education through two separate studies. The first study involved the responses of 103 practicing educators to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire with regard to their own immediate supervisors. This instrument measures transformational and transactional leadership characteristics. The second study involved the identification and description of an extraordinary leader in education by a group of 58 graduate students. Based upon the results of these two studies, Kirby et al. (1992) concluded that extraordinary or transformational leaders in education are characterized as positive in their outlook, concerned about others, knowledgeable through personal experience, committed to the organization, and able to inspire others. Overall, these leaders were considered to be challengers of the status quo who were not reckless in their actions, but who carefully considered their chances for success.

Recent studies involving the use of context variables in research on school effects have clearly indicated differences between schools of varying contexts with regard to instructional leadership. These differences have been noted within research regarding at least three context areas including: student SES, school community type, and grade level configuration.

As noted earlier, differences in leadership style have been identified in effective schools of varying SES levels (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).
Principals in low- and mid-SES schools differ distinctively in their involvement in instructional matters. In low-SES schools, principals tend to be active in more bureaucratic activities that are easily observable such as more frequent classroom observations, more frequent direct assistance to teachers, and greater involvement in initiating new academic programs. Principals in mid-SES schools tend to serve their schools more as good managers who take a more moderate approach to instruction by observing less in classrooms, and maintaining a more managerial role in academic programs.

Clear differences have also been noted with regard to instructional leadership in studies utilizing urbanicity as a context variable. Teddlie and Stringfield's case studies (1993) of two rural, two suburban, and two urban schools provide insight into these differences. Based upon their findings, these researchers concluded that urban elementary schools for which discipline is frequently a problem require strong instructional leaders who are actively involved in disciplinary matters. These leaders have moderate ties to the central or district office, and foster greater participation by faculty members in various leadership roles.

Furthermore, it should be noted that although effective urban schools must function under the same bureaucratic structure as their less effective counterparts, the faculties in these schools find ways to make meaningful changes in order to meet the students' needs (Lomotey & Swanson, 1989). Lomotey (1990) indicates that principals in effective urban schools share three distinct characteristics. They are committed to the
education of minority children, have an understanding of the children and communities they serve, and are confident in the ability of all minority children to learn.

In contrast, a more managerial leadership style may frequently be appropriate in suburban schools where disciplinary problems may vary based upon the community, faculty, and principal characteristics. These schools also foster more moderate involvement of faculty in leadership activities, while maintaining moderate ties to the district office (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

Principals in rural schools often successfully utilize a more personal style of leadership that lies somewhere between the manager's role and the initiator's role. Less faculty participation in leadership is seen in these schools in part due to the typically smaller school size. Community stability in rural schools also helps to diminish the disciplinary problems that must be addressed. Leaders in these schools generally maintain close ties to the central office often due to the small size of the school district and its community (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

**Functions of Instructional Leadership.** With the growth of school effectiveness research, studies of principal effectiveness have increasingly focused on the instructional leadership functions of the principal. Instructional leadership has been broadly defined as encompassing "those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning" (De Bevoise, 1984, p. 87). These actions include but are not limited to articulating the instructional goals of the school, selecting instructional personnel, evaluating teachers, and communicating high expectations (Selim, 1985). These activities have been identified as indirect determinants of student achievement.

Research on effective principals and successful schools has identified particular functions that must be carried out in order for schools to be successful (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Dwyer, 1984; Heck, 1992; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Heck & Marcoulides, 1990). These findings have been summarized into four areas of principal leadership (Bossert, et al., 1982):

- goals and production emphasis,
- power and decision making,
- organization or coordination,
- human relations.

The goals and production emphasis area focuses on the tendency of principals in high-achieving schools to emphasize achievement. Power and decision making involves the apparent power held by effective principals in contrast to their ineffective counterparts. They are especially powerful in curriculum and instruction areas where they tend to be more active in decision making.

The third area is that of organization or coordination in which principals and other administrators in effective schools are noted for devoting more of their time to the coordination and control of instruction. These administrators tend to be more skillful at the tasks involved in such activities. The final area involves human relations in which successful principals are known for their ability to handle the varied personalities and
needs of teachers which enables them to be more capable of helping teachers achieve their own goals.

Findings from the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study indicate clear differences in the perceptions and behaviors of principals in more and less effective elementary schools. Principals in this study were asked to respond to questions regarding five areas: school mission, classroom instruction, hiring, basic skills, and children’s family background (Wimpelberg, 1993). Principals in more effective schools focused more clearly on children, were more personally knowledgeable about classroom instruction, were more initiatory in their hiring practices, saw basic reading and math skills as important tools for higher order learning, and saw children’s background differences as a challenge rather than as an insurmountable obstacle.

This draws a sharp contrast with the principals in less effective schools who tended to assign blame for the ineffectiveness of their schools wherever they could. These principals distanced themselves from instructional matters, especially classrooms, felt constrained in their hiring practices by district procedures, and saw the students’ family backgrounds as having a dominant and insurmountable effect upon the abilities of their students. They had conceivably lost sight of the importance of children in their mission, focusing instead on the importance of a myriad of social services they provided on behalf of parents, and relegating reading and math to ‘the most important among equally important’ kinds of learning (Wimpelberg, 1993, p. 167).

Leadership as a Shared Conceptualization. For the most part, this research has been tied to the conceptualization that the principal is the sole source of leadership
(W pimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989). Principals were seen as the catalysts for change in schools, and were therefore thought to be key figures in the successful implementation of school improvement strategies based on school effectiveness research (Hallinger, 1992). However, a reconceptualization of the principal's role is occurring that more accurately reflects research involving a variety of school contexts, and the current movement toward shared leadership. According to Rosenholtz (1985), "there is strong evidence that performance of schools is linked to the participation of their staffs in making decisions about matters that relate to teaching." (p. 354).

This reconceptualization is supported by early research on effective instructional leadership. Gersten and Carnine (1981) provided a conceptualization of six administrative and supervisory support functions that do not necessarily need to be carried out by the principal, but that are crucial for instructional improvement and success. This concept implies the usefulness of a team approach to leadership. It is recognized by these researchers that the degree of implementation of a team approach will vary greatly based upon the principal's leadership style.

Research on effective federally funded compensatory education programs, such as Follow Through, indicate that these programs have been successful in some urban districts without the support of building level principals (Kennedy, 1978; Good & Grouws, 1979). This research shows that, in these cases, instructional leadership was provided to teachers by supervisors and staff consultants rather than by principals (Good & Grouws, 1979).

Based upon these findings, Gersten, Carnine, and Green (1982) concluded "that effective educational programs in inner-city schools can succeed if (a) teachers are
provided with specific, concrete training; (b) the educational model succeeds with
difficult-to-teach students; and (c) there is a system for monitoring student and teacher
performance” (p. 128). These researchers specify that regardless of the instructional
leadership of the principal, these three factors are crucial for the success of such programs.

Research involving grade level as a context variable also indicates the usefulness of
a shared image of leadership. Secondary schools differ from elementary schools on a
number of factors including leadership structures. While the conception of leadership as
the solitary role of the principal has dominated the effective schools research in elementary
schools, it is undeniable that secondary schools have multiple academic leaders including
the principal, assistant principals, department heads, and team leaders (Teddlie, 1994).
Furthermore, middle school principalships are frequently viewed as a proving ground for
those seeking to move on to the more lucrative high school principalship. The bulk of
school effectiveness research and school improvement initiatives have ignored these
contextual differences, and have applied the findings from elementary schools to
secondary settings disregarding these important organizational and cultural differences.

Additional studies have considered the unique application of these functions based
upon the variety of school grade level configurations in which they are utilized. Studies of
the generalizability of Bossert, et al.’s instructional leadership model (1982) have
examined the differences in instructional leadership in ineffective and effective schools at
both the elementary and secondary level (Heck, 1992; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides,
1990; Heck & Marcoulides, 1990). These studies have found that principals in effective
elementary schools are more involved, and devote more time to instructional leadership
activities than do their counterparts in effective secondary schools, or in ineffective schools at either level (Heck, 1992). The greatest differences in implementation of leadership functions were found to be between principals in effective elementary schools and those in ineffective secondary schools.

Findings from this study are consistent with those of Virgilio, Teddlie, and Oescher (1991) that show that principals in secondary schools do not designate as much time to instructional leadership tasks as do their elementary counterparts, regardless of the effectiveness status of their school. These results are further supported by findings that indicate that secondary principals spend only 17% of their time, and 8% of the actual tasks they work on dealing with academic matters (Martin & Willower, 1981). Furthermore, Virgilio, et al.'s findings (1991) indicate that due to the diverse backgrounds of the teachers and the organizational structure of the schools, principals in secondary schools are unable, due to their limited training, and the competing demands on their time, to be strong instructional leaders.

These findings are reinforced by Firestone and Herriott (1982) who also indicate that staff size constrains principal's influence over teachers since communication with teachers is frequently delegated to others. Other constraining influences at the secondary level include departmentalization and subject matter specialization of teachers. This research also indicates that greater faculty participation in decision making may be a characteristic of effective secondary schools.

These findings have led some researchers to call for more extensive studies of the leadership structures and activities in secondary schools. Future studies of instructional
leadership should consider roles played by other members of the school faculty including what has been referred to as "substitutes for leadership", exceptions to the usual role of assistant principals, and participatory decision making by teachers (Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989). This concept of leadership by persons other than the principal challenges the traditional definition of instructional leadership within school effectiveness research. Also of importance for future research interests is the idea of the sharing of leadership within secondary schools especially. Research in this area should consider how leadership is shared as well as the implications this sharing of leadership has for the effectiveness of the school (e.g., Teddlie, 1994; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989).

**Models of School Effectiveness and Organizational Coupling**

The *Five-Factor Model*. Despite the increased interest in school effectiveness research, the field has continued to suffer from the lack of a strong theoretical base from which to work (Creemers & Scheerens, 1989; Stringfield, 1994, Slater & Teddlie, 1992). However, several models for school effectiveness have been proposed. The first, and still the most widely known and utilized model, is the five-factor model which proposes that the five school characteristics that have been repeatedly mentioned in the literature work together to promote school effectiveness in the form of high student achievement. These five factors are:

- strong educational leadership;
- high expectations of student achievement;
- an emphasis on basic skills;
- a safe and orderly climate;
- frequent evaluation of pupils’ progress (Creemers, 1994, p. 12).
This five factor model has been criticized for numerous weaknesses in addition to the methodological problems of the research base from which it was developed. Two of the most critical weaknesses with this model are its failure to consider process and context with regard to school effectiveness. As noted earlier, neither this model nor others like it can simply be adopted by a school in order to improve its effectiveness. Consideration must be given to the specific context of the school and its community in any attempt at improvement.

It has also been noted that "the causal status of the '5-factor model' is correlational" (Creemers, 1994, p. 12; Scheerens & Creemers, 1989, p. 692). By this, one should understand that although the five factors are frequently acknowledged as being causes of high student achievement, there is actually no methodological basis for this claim. Numerous other problems stem from this fact.

First, Scheerens and Creemers (1989) state that "there is a hint of tautology in the emphasis on basic skills as a determinant of outcomes, and also exclusively measuring basic skills as the dependent variable" (p. 12). This redundancy fails to allow for the inclusion of outcomes in the affective domain, and misses the importance of goal consensus as the truly important factor in this model. These researchers recommend that the 'emphasis on basic skills' should be utilized as a control variable rather than as a causal variable.

In addition, these researchers question whether the five factors are really independent variables, and recommend that correlations between them be studied. This
concern relates to a third question raised by Scheerens and Creemers (1989) regarding the locus of the factors. Difficulty exists in determining whether these factors should be more appropriately seen as all being aspects of school leadership or of school climate. Difficulty is also recognized in the fact that some of the factors may be defined at the school level, while others may be more appropriately defined at the classroom or teacher level. The five-factor model fails to recognize these various levels of school effects.

Finally, it is questionable whether the factors are causes or actually effects of high student achievement. It must be recognized that satisfying feedback from student achievement may result in higher expectations in the future. This indicates the need for a more reciprocal model of school effects.

**Loose and Tight Coupling in Organizational Theory.** The five-factor model, as well as much of the early school effectiveness research, tends to view schools more as classical bureaucracies that are hierarchically structured, and sensitive to rational control (Purkey & Smith, 1982). This view assumes that schools are characterized by four organizational properties: "the existence of a self-correcting rational system among highly interdependent people, consensus on goals, coordination by the dissemination of information, and predictability of problems and of responses to those problems" (Weick, 1982). However, research on schools as loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976) indicates that schools are not characterized by these properties, and that certain characteristics of schools may mitigate against top-down change (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Schools as loosely coupled organizations are instead proposed to possess weak linkages between administrative levels and autonomous classrooms (Purkey & Smith,
1983; Weick, 1976). This structural looseness is even more noticeable at the secondary school level where departmentalization and larger school size distance administrators from the instructional level of the school to an even greater degree (Firestone & Herriott, 1982). Such a view mitigates against the centrality of leadership which is so deeply ingrained in the literature on school effectiveness (Firestone, 1985).

It has been suggested, however, that schools are neither tightly coupled nor loosely coupled organizations, but that they are both (Firestone, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1984). This interpretation proposes that coupling in schools should be considered with regard to the pattern of coupling, and the fit of the coupling mechanism. Pattern of coupling refers to the presence of tight coupling in some parts of the system, such as around organizational goals, and loose coupling with regard to other parts, such as autonomy in the classroom. Fit of the coupling mechanism refers to the use of a variety of coupling mechanisms, such as bureaucratic or cultural linkages, as is appropriate to the particular situation.

This explanation is supported by Peters and Waterman's work with Fortune 500 corporations (1982) which indicates that tight coupling may best be conveyed through a strong culture that promotes shared values and goals. These tight cultural couplings may, in turn, allow other couplings to be loosened based upon the context of the organization.

Research by Hallinger and Murphy (1986) and Teddlie and Stringfield (1985, 1993) further support this conceptualization within the realm of differentially effective schools. These researchers indicate that effective schools in low-SES settings may be tightly coupled organizationally while those in mid-SES settings may possess
organizational attributes indicative of both tight and loose coupling. As Murphy (1992) notes:

One of the most powerful and enduring lessons from all the research on effective schools is that the better schools are more tightly linked - structurally, symbolically, and culturally - than the less effective ones. They operate more as an organic whole and less as a loose collection of disparate subsystems. There is a great deal of consistency within and across the major components of the organization, especially those of the production function - the teaching - learning process. (p. 96)

Contingency Approaches. More recent models (Creemers & Scheerens, 1989, 1994; Slater & Teddlie, 1992; Stringfield, 1994) have recognized these difficulties with the five-factor model, and have included components that account for them. Both the Scheerens and Creemers model (1989, 1994) and the Slater and Teddlie model (1992) include three levels of school effects including a school level, a classroom, or teacher, level, and an individual student level. The Stringfield model (1994) adds to these three levels what he refers to as a four-plus level that includes groups beyond the school itself such as the community, the school district, and the state and federal governments. These external entities are seen as important to the effectiveness of the school in their ability to impact the level of effective teaching delivered to students through a variety of mechanisms such as societal needs and pressures, government regulations, and legal mandates.

The four-plus level of this model, the student background component and school effects level of the Creemers and Scheerens model (1989, 1994), and the student readiness level of the Slater and Teddlie model (1992) provide an emphasis on the importance of the contextual conditions of the school. As noted earlier, the importance of the impact of
contextual or environmental conditions on school functioning is best explained through contingency theory (Mintzberg, 1979; Thompson, 1967).

Two aspects of contingency theory are especially relevant to the area of school effectiveness research (Scheerens, 1989). This research is generally identified with a rather narrow definition of effectiveness relating to productivity. However, other effectiveness criteria such as adaptability, resource acquisition, and cohesion and morale among an organization's members have been identified. Various contextual or contingency factors including environmental uncertainty, or age of the organization, can result in a shifting focus between these various criteria, or organizational emphases.

Furthermore, the presence of external incentives are important for maintaining an achievement oriented school policy. While it is of utmost importance for a school to focus its efforts on achievement in order to be successful, it is most beneficial when external stakeholders, such as state and district education agencies, parents, and community members, also emphasize achievement.

Findings from studies of low- and mid-SES schools bear out the impact of this aspect of contingency theory on school effectiveness (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993, 1989, 1988, 1985). The mid-SES schools in this longitudinal study were found to have greater support from parents on achievement oriented goals, and as a result, higher expectations were emphasized for these students than for the students in low-SES schools where the school itself was the primary source of educational expectations.

**Three Contemporary Models of School Effectiveness.** The three models discussed here (Creemers & Scheerens, 1989; Slater & Teddlie, 1992; Stringfield, 1994) further
propose that activities at the higher levels, or those further removed from instruction, should provide conditions that facilitate the activities at the lower levels increasing student achievement (Creemers, 1994; Creemers & Scheerens, 1989; Scheerens, 1990). According to Creemers and Reezigt (1996), while the school level factors included in these models were selected because of their empirical support, a more important concern was “their presumed influence on classroom processes” (p. 202).

All of these models suggest that the starting point for inquiries as to school effectiveness should be the individual student level. However, the Creemers and Scheerens model (1989, 1994) and the Stringfield model continue to maintain a more top-down approach to school effectiveness. This top-down orientation is most apparent in Stringfield’s discussion of schools as high reliability organizations (HROs). In this discussion, it is noted that schools now exist in which the majority of students succeed, and very few students fail (Stringfield, 1994; Stringfield & Slavin, 1992). These highly effective schools are believed to possess certain characteristics that can be shared by all schools. In order for schools to become highly effective, Stringfield states that they must become HROs (LaPorte & Consolini, 1991), and maintain their development by becoming Centers of Academic Synergy (CAS).

LaPorte and Consolini (1991) indicate that HROs possess several unifying characteristics that Stringfield (1994) suggests positive outlier schools and programs also possess. These characteristics are: clear assignment of tasks, multiple checks on work, high levels of training, and equal voice by all staff members in critical decisions. Stringfield (1994) states further that “the underlying shared characteristic between the
HROs and those unusually effective schools was a profound belief shared by the working professionals in the schools that *even one system failure is unacceptable*” (p. 179).

It is suggested that conditions exist in Levels three and four-plus of Stringfield’s model that will facilitate the movement of schools toward becoming HROs. Targeted staff development, careful selection and supervision of personnel, and changes in the hierarchical structures of schools can assist in increasing the reliability of schools. Special programs, state and national policies and funding are believed by Stringfield to be necessary to develop and maintain HRO schools. Based upon the research on schools as loosely coupled organizations discussed earlier, and upon research indicating that top-down change in education has not be successful (Purkey & Smith, 1983), care must be taken in presenting any model that relies upon such conditions for educational reform.

In contrast to this, the Slater and Teddlie model, the Typology of School Effectiveness and Leadership, provides greater recognition of both the contextual factors that impact schools and the process schools go through as they become more or less effective over time. This process orientation clearly indicates that schools do not remain static in their effectiveness, but that they instead move through the various stages of effectiveness depending upon their ability to deal with changes in their contextual conditions. The inability of an effective school to adapt to a shift in the demographic characteristics of its student population, a change in leadership that impacts the vision of the school, or the loss of good teachers over a period of time may lead this school to the process of becoming ineffective. Likewise, this typology recognizes that schools may also improve over time as their contexts improve through new leadership, more experienced
teachers, or a renewed commitment to an academic emphasis that may lead them toward increased effectiveness. In this way, schools and their members respond either positively or negatively to the ever changing context of their environment.

The Typology of School Effectiveness and Leadership (Slater & Teddlie, 1992) also provides a greater recognition of both structural and cultural characteristics of schools through its administrative appropriateness element. Administrative appropriateness is defined within the contexts of both organizational structure and culture. An organization’s structure consists of the network of social interactions that occur between its members, while an organization’s culture consists of the shared orientations and beliefs of its members.

Both structure and culture are emphasized as important for organizational effectiveness. However, according to this model, it may be necessary for an administrator to choose to emphasize one more than the other depending upon teacher preparedness. In cases where teachers are poorly prepared, administrators may need to emphasize structural components of the organization. In cases where teachers are better prepared, the administrator may be able to de-emphasize structural components in favor of culture building.

This concept of differential emphasis of organizational structure and culture is supported by Firestone and Wilson’s work on bureaucratic and cultural linkages (1989). This work proposes that principals influence the instructional work in their schools through both bureaucratic and cultural linkages. Bureaucratic linkages include more formal, enduring arrangements including roles, rules, procedures, and authority
relationships that are more structural in their nature. Cultural linkages include those aspects of a school's culture that affect the way teachers and students think about their work. These linkages include the stories, icons, and rituals of an organization that constitute the shared ethos of its members. Cultural linkages can be influenced by the principal's symbolic activity.

One example of the differential application of these linkages is in the differences in principal leadership characteristics in low- and mid-SES schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). The emphasis on organizational structure, or bureaucratic linkages, in low-SES schools may be necessitated by the tendency of these schools to employ larger numbers of inexperienced teachers who would presumably be less prepared to handle the children that they face. In contrast, mid-SES schools are able to recruit and employ larger numbers of experienced teachers providing a higher level of teacher preparedness in these schools. This allows the principals in these schools to place greater emphasis on the organizational culture, and to utilize cultural linkages, in their attempts to influence student achievement. Through the stories, icons, and rituals of the school, these principals maintained an emphasis on student achievement.

While school effectiveness research has moved from a focus on effective schooling for the urban poor to a focus on effective schooling for all children, theory development has been slow. Recently, models of school effectiveness have been developed. However, weaknesses still exist in these models. With the wealth of findings now available as a foundation on which to build, greater attention should be given to the formation of a theoretical base for school effectiveness research in the future.
Social Network Analysis and School Effectiveness Research

Social Network Analysis as a field of study had its origins in the 1930's with J. L. Moreno's (1934) development of the first basic sociometric methodology, and generated considerable empirical work for over a decade (e.g., Festinger, 1949; Forsyth & Katz, 1946; Katz, 1947; Luce & Perry, 1949, Moreno, 1946; Moreno & Jennings, 1938; Northway, 1940). This work included the development of sociomatrices (numeric indices) and sociograms (two dimensional drawings of relationships among social units) through the use of simple sociometric questions such as asking faculty members to identify the three teachers they talked to most in the past month.

Many of the basic sociometric concepts including cliques, centrality, density, and isolates were identified by the mid-1950's (e.g., Lindzey & Borgatta, 1954). By 1959, A. R. Radcliffe-Browne, an anthropologist, noted the need to develop a separate theoretical and methodological area for the exploration of social structures. Although this field lay relatively dormant for around 20 years, it reemerged in the 1970's with the development of computer based analysis techniques (e.g., Breiger, 1991; Freeman, 1988; Freeman, Roeder, & Mulholland, 1980), and has been utilized extensively for studies in areas such as inter-organizational relationships, social support networks, and political networks (e.g., Barrera, Sandler, & Ramsay, 1981; Bolland & Wilson, 1994; Mardon, 1996; Mizruchi & Potts, 1996, Vaux, 1988).

Network analysis has more recently been identified as a useful methodology for the study of the relationships that exist between school faculty members within the framework of school effectiveness research (Durland, 1996). It is helpful in exploring both the formal
and informal structures of an organization as well as their similarities, differences, and relationships. According to Durland (1996), this application of the methodology is supported by two propositions drawn from the aggregate findings of school effectiveness and school improvement research.

1. Schooling is a complex interactive social process which is, conceptually, a structural model of interactions between and within components and not an additive model of specific components. This is the core even though schooling is comprised of individual components such as resources, teachers, students, activities, and outcomes and is influenced by contextual variables and situations.

2. Many of the characteristics of the components associated with effective schools describe relationships or the results of relationships associated with communication structures. Identified in this study were those characteristics associated with the principal's leadership status within the faculty and faculty cohesiveness. These characteristics were defined as the structural indicators of a communication network. (p. 12)

Investigations exploring the social structures of school faculties utilizing network analysis have been limited. However, those studies that have been conducted support the usefulness of this methodology for studying these relationships. Slater's (1991) study of effective, higher performing schools found that the structural patterns of these schools are characterized more by dense, flat webs than by hierarchical structures, and that the faculties of these schools tend to discuss instructional matters more frequently than friendship oriented matters. In a related study, support was found for the relationship between the principal's role and school performance (Friedkin & Slater, 1994). Studies by Teddlie and Kochan (1991) and Kelly and Duran (1985) further support the use of network analysis in the study of school faculties.

Findings from Durland's (1996) study of differentially effective elementary schools indicate that clear differences exist between effective and ineffective schools with respect
to the centrality of their principals and the cohesiveness of their faculties. Statistical data from this study indicate that principals in effective schools had higher “centrality” scores than did their counterparts in ineffective schools. Furthermore, these results show that higher network density was more characteristic of effective schools than of ineffective schools. Analyses involving the development of sociograms further indicated that greater “webbing” within the networks was more consistent with effective schools, while the networks of ineffective schools appeared to be more “stringy” (Durland, 1996).

The majority of these studies utilize the prevailing view within school effectiveness research of the principal as the major source of leadership. Although it is recognized that other persons may provide leadership within schools, most studies continue to perceive the principal “as the most critical leadership determinant of effectiveness” (Levine & Lezotte, 1990, p. 16). As noted by Durland (1996), while these other school leaders may hold positions of leadership within the network as determined by their connections to the group, they should also be connected to the principal. Within the network, the principal should be connected to other school leaders, both formal and informal, who are connected to the teachers within the school.

This proposition supports the concept that secondary school principals may tend to delegate communication with teachers to assistant principals, department heads, team leaders, and others (Firestone & Herriott, 1982), thus increasing the sharing of leadership in these contexts. This sharing of leadership should be identifiable through the structural patterns such as webbing that are observed through network analysis. The use of network
This chapter has provided a review of literature in the areas of middle level education, school effectiveness research, and social network analysis to support the proposed study's effort to investigate patterns of instructional leadership in effective middle schools. This review has also included literature relating to these areas that is pertinent to instructional leadership and school effectiveness models.

The review of literature began with an introduction to the middle school movement that addressed this effort both historically and in light of its successes and failures as a school reform initiative. It was noted in this section that although middle schools appear to be the last chance for many students, educators continue to be unable to fully implement this initiative.

The review of school effectiveness research provided an historical perspective of the field that led the reader through the transition from the early focus on equity to the more recent focus on efficiency. This transition has led to research that recognizes and attempts to study the impact of context on schools. This new wave of contextually sensitive studies has provided insight beyond the urban elementary schools of the early studies, and has open doorways to the study of effectiveness in a variety of contexts including the middle school.

Research on instructional leadership especially within the area of school effectiveness has delineated this lack of fit even more clearly. While this strain of research
has maintained a focus on the principal as the primary source of instructional leadership, it has become evident through research in other areas that this may not be the case for secondary schools in general, and middle schools in particular. This research instead presents the perspective that leadership at these levels may be more of a shared phenomenon in which various members of the school community contribute to the leadership of the school. This review of literature provides a supporting foundation for the proposed study of shared leadership within effective middle schools.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and examine patterns of shared leadership within effective middle schools. Within this primary purpose, there were four secondary objectives:

- to identify patterns of shared leadership in effective middle schools based upon perceptions of the faculties of these schools;
- to identify communication networks of these effective middle school faculties through the use of Social Network Analysis;
- to compare the perceived leadership structures of the schools with the communication networks within the schools;
- to provide in-depth case study analysis of the internal processes associated with shared leadership in effective middle schools.

Through the methodology outlined in this chapter, the purpose of the study was to delineate specific patterns of shared leadership in effective middle schools, and to verify these patterns through more in-depth study of a sample of these schools. As noted in Chapter One, this is an area in which little research has been conducted to date. Due to this lack of prior research and to the exploratory nature of the current study, a mixed methodology utilizing both quantitative and qualitative techniques was employed.

Denzin (1978) notes the importance of utilizing mixed methodologies, or triangulation. He states:
no single method ever adequately solves the problem of rival causal factors. Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observations must be employed. This is termed triangulation. I now offer as a final methodological rule the principle that multiple methods should be used in every investigation. (p. 28)

Patton (1990) identifies four basic types of triangulation. These include data triangulation in which a variety of data sources are utilized; investigator triangulation in which multiple researchers are employed; theory triangulation which uses a variety of perspectives or theories to interpret a set of data; and methodological triangulation in which multiple methods are used to study a problem. In the present study, both methodological and data triangulation were utilized.

This study employed three phases of data collection. The first phase consisted of the development of an instrument for measuring faculty perceptions of their involvement in leadership activities. The second phase involved the administration of this survey to participating middle schools and its analysis through quantitative techniques. The third phase employed both quantitative and qualitative methods by using both Social Network Analysis and case studies to further investigate the leadership patterns identified through Phase II. Through the three phases of the study, multiple data sources including surveys, interviews, and observations were utilized thus constituting data triangulation.

Due to the progressive nature of the study, the overview of the methodology provided in this chapter is divided into sections based upon the three phases of the study. These sections include descriptions of the research questions, sampling procedures, data collection and data analysis procedures for each phase. Figure 3.1 provides an overview of the research design for this study.
Figure 3.1
Flowchart of Research Methodology
Methodology for Phase I

Phase I Sample Selection (Figure 3.1, IA)

The sample of eight schools utilized for the pilot study were located in a Louisiana school district that was not being considered for participation in the study due to unusual contextual circumstances in the district. At the time of the pilot study, this district was involved in the implementation of a court approved plan for desegregation which led to the transfer of numerous teachers and administrators in the school system. The district's middle schools were also participating in an extensive effective schools program and school reform plan involving the establishment of school improvement teams.

Furthermore, in earlier regression analyses involving this district, it had been determined that only two of the 17 middle schools in this district were effective schools based upon their SEIs for the school years 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 (Freeman, 1997; Freeman & Teddlie, 1996). The two schools identified as effective were involved in dedicated magnet programs that prohibited them from being considered typical middle schools for the state.

The eight schools included in the pilot study included two schools that were determined to be effective based upon regression analyses for the 1994-95 school year, and six schools that were shown to be ineffective in the same analyses. These classifications were in keeping with the effectiveness status identified for each of these schools in the analyses for the 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 school years (Freeman, 1997; Freeman & Teddlie, 1996).
In order to be considered an effective school in these analyses, the school had to have positive residual scores for all three school years. Those schools with negative residual scores for all three years were identified as ineffective.

**Instrument Development**

For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to develop a survey to assess the perceptions of certified faculty members as to the involvement of faculty in leadership activities. The purpose of this survey was to identify patterns of shared leadership in the sample schools. During the literature search, a copy of the *Sources of Instructional Leadership (SOIL) Survey* (Selim, 1989) was located and modified for this purpose. The original survey included 31 items dealing with the management of instructional resources. A copy of this survey is available upon request. Reliability coefficients for the original survey were .93, .96, .96, .93, and .89 for principal, vice principal, department head, specialist, and teacher role scales respectively.

It was modified for the purposes of this study to include 36 total items and a modified role or position scale.

1) Fourteen of the original items were eliminated during survey development due to concerns of experts in the field that these items maintained a focus on the principal's role as instructional leader and might preclude responses indicating the involvement of other members of the faculty in these activities. These eliminated items included "Evaluates teachers" and "Helps teachers to develop appropriate instructional materials that are not commercially available".
2) Seventeen items from the original survey were included in the modified version. Nine of these items were reworded to reflect current thought on shared leadership in educational organizations. These include minor revisions such as changing "Helps teachers to relate the school’s instructional goals to their curriculum units" to "Helps relate the school’s instructional goals to curriculum units" as well as more specific changes including revising "Selects instructional personnel" to read "Interviews and recommends the hiring or placement of instructional personnel".

3) Sixteen additional items were added to the survey based upon Heck’s (1990) Predictive Model of Principal Instructional Leadership. These include "Communicates the school’s instructional goals to teachers and students" and "Recognizes and rewards student accomplishments". According to Heck (1990), all of the subscales on the final version of the instrument had internal consistency coefficients that ranged from .7 to over .9.

4) Three other items were added based upon current research in the areas of educational leadership and middle school reform. These were "Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the instructional goals of the school", "Provides expertise on instructional matters", and "Provides expertise on curriculum issues".

5) The role scale choices were revised to include both department head and team leader due to the diverse organizational structures of middle schools today.

Administration of the Modified SOIL (MSOIL) Survey (Figure 3.1, IB)

The modified survey (See Appendix A) was then piloted in the eight middle schools described in the sampling section above. First, permission was obtained from the
superintendent of this school district, and each principal was then contacted to discuss the pilot study. After these initial contacts were made, a packet including administration instructions and a copy of the survey for each certified faculty member were delivered to the school. These surveys were placed in the teachers' mailboxes to be completed and returned to the school office within three to four days.

Return rates for the first distribution of the surveys were low in several of the schools, so a second distribution of the surveys was done. For the second distribution, the researcher remained at the school for the morning so that faculty members could return the surveys directly. Due to conditions within the district, several teachers had expressed apprehension at returning the surveys to the office where they might be read over by the principal. In addition, there was concern on the part of some teachers that indicating the involvement of faculty members other than the principal in leadership activities would be misconstrued to mean that they did not see their administrator as the instructional leader in the school. The total number of respondents for the Phase I data collection was 169.

Analysis of the Pilot Study Data

Two types of analysis were used with the data from the pilot study. These included a factor analysis, and calculation of frequencies for the response patterns by item. The factor analysis was computed to provide information as to the usefulness of the survey. The frequency data was utilized to make comparisons between the effective and ineffective groups in the pilot study, and to determine what response patterns might be prevalent in the Phase II data. The results of the frequency distributions are included in Chapter 4, while the results of the factor analysis are discussed here.
Results of the Pilot Study (Figure 3.1, IC)

Construct Validity. Construct validity demonstrates the extent to which an instrument or test can be shown to measure a certain theoretical construct about the nature of human behavior (Borg & Gall, 1989). In order to determine the existence of such constructs, researchers frequently utilize factor analytic techniques (Anastasi, 1982; Crocker & Algina, 1986). The major purpose of factor analysis is to obtain a set of easily understandable factors that communicate the most important information contained in the original set of variables (Afifi & Clark, 1984). This reduction in the number of necessary variables simplifies the description of the data.

The first step in factor analysis is the initial factor extraction. After a set of initial factors is obtained, the factors are then rotated to improve the interpretation and to provide the best possible fit of items to factors. In orthogonal rotation, it is assumed that the factors are not correlated. Types of orthogonal rotation include varimax, quartimax, and equimax approaches. These provide different combinations of the items in order to determine appropriate groupings for each factor (De Villis, 1991). In this study, a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation was used. This is a standard technique utilized in construct validation studies (e.g., Teddlie, Virgilio, & Oescher, 1990).

The purpose of the factor analysis in this study was to determine the construct validity of the instrument in terms of its ability to determine different patterns of shared instructional leadership. The consideration here was not whether the behaviors were
related to one another, but instead whether there were patterns of shared leadership as indicated by responses to the survey.

Based upon this premise, it was assumed that the theoretical groupings of governance, school climate, and instructional organization were appropriate for the purposes of this factor analysis. These groupings had been previously developed in school effectiveness research (Heck, 1990; Selim, 1989); therefore, it was not necessary to develop such groupings in this study. The items included in each of these groupings is shown in Appendix B.

Using these three theoretical construct leadership dimensions, mean scores were calculated for each of the role scale choices which led to 18 mean scores. Table 3.1 indicates the mean scores for each dimension by role category.

Table 3.1
Mean Scores for Theorectical Construct Dimensions by Role Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
<th>Ancillary Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Governance Score</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean School Climate Score</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Instructional Organization Score</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The mean governance score is based on 6 items. The mean school climate score is based on 10 items. The mean instructional organization score is based on 20 items. The range for these mean scores is 0-2.
These mean scores are the average rating for the participation of each instructional leader for each of the three major components. A low mean score indicates less frequent involvement of the members of that role category in the activities that comprised that dimension, while a high mean score indicates greater involvement of the role category members in the activities that were included in the dimension.

These mean scores were then utilized in the factor analysis to ascertain the capacity of the instrument to determine different patterns of shared instructional leadership. Eighteen item groups were factor analyzed. The three factor solution shown in Table 3.2 was judged to be the best based on the SAS default option, which requires an Eigenvalue of 1.0 for a factor to stay in the analysis.

This solution indicates three distinct patterns of involvement in shared leadership as indicated by responses to the survey. These include a department head/team leader/special education/Title I teacher pattern in Factor 1, a principal/assistant principal pattern in Factor 2, and a classroom teacher pattern in Factor 3. These results indicate that the faculty respondents in the pilot study perceived differing patterns of involvement for the various role choices included on the survey.

Survey Revision

Revisions to the Modified SOIL Survey were done based upon both the results of the factor analysis, and input from participants at the schools included in the pilot study. Based upon these results, the survey was revised to include only five role scale choices by combining the department heads and team leaders into one category. It was decided that in most schools either department heads or team leaders are utilized depending on the
organizational structure of the school. The decision was made that information about the
organizational structure of the school could be gathered from the principal, so that the
researcher would know whether faculty members were referring to department heads or
team leaders when marking this category on the survey.

Table 3.2
Factor Structure for the Modified SOIL Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM GROUP</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Governance</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - Governance</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head - Governance</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader - Governance</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - Governance</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - School Climate</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head - School Climate</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader - School Climate</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - School Climate</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - Instr'l Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Each item group consisted of the mean scores for a particular theoretical construct
dimension.
It was further decided that the principal and assistant principal should remain as separate response categories so that it could be determined if certain duties were being handled exclusively by the assistant principal in some schools. It was believed that such a finding might indicate the relinquishment of some of the primary leadership role by the principal. Due to the nature of the study, it was believed that it would be important to determine, if this occurred, whether it was more prominent in effective or ineffective schools.

Furthermore, the role scale choice of special education/Title I was retained, but was renamed ancillary in order to include all types of professional ancillary personnel in the schools. This was done due to a concern on the part of some of the respondents that the survey did not provide for the inclusion of such faculty members as librarians and guidance counselors who in some schools may be very instrumental in some of the duties included on the survey.

A factor analysis was done for the Phase II study data following the same format utilized in the pilot study. This analysis produced a 5-factor solution shown in Table 3.3 that indicates a distinct factor for each role scale choice. These results indicate that the survey respondents in Phase II perceived different patterns of involvement for the groups identified by each role scale choice on the leadership activities included on the instrument.

The reader may wonder why these results differ from the clustering of role scale choices on three factors in the initial factor analysis of the pilot data (see Table 3.2). This
Table 3.3
Factor Structure for Phase II Faculty Involvement Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Group</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Gov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - Gov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head/Team Ldr. - Gov.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - Gov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - Gov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head/Team Ldr. - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Instr'l Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't Principal - Instr'l Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep't Head/Team Ldr. - Instr'l Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary - Instr'l Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher - Instr'l Org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference may have resulted due to the difference of sample size, and to the inclusion of a larger number of effective schools in the study data. While the pilot study consisted of a sample of two effective schools and six ineffective schools, the sample for Phase II included 21 effective schools, 12 ineffective schools, and 13 typical schools. The results of the Phase II factor analysis verify the inclusion of all five role scale choices.

Additional input from participants at the school sites was obtained during the site visits which were conducted to collect completed questionnaires. These respondents expressed concern that their indication of involvement in leadership tasks such as those included on the survey might indicate that their principal was not doing his or her job adequately. These participants did not seem to see their participation in leadership as a positive aspect of the school.

Some of these perceptions may have been due to unique circumstances that existed in this school district due to its involvement in a consent decree related to a long-running desegregation lawsuit. This consent decree had resulted in the redrawing of attendance zones which was going to mandate the transfer of numerous faculty members throughout the district at the end of the school year. Transfer decisions were being made by building level administrators in cooperation with system level administrators. As a result, some teachers expressed fear of responding to the survey in a way that might upset their administrator, and result in their being selected for a transfer.

Although there were extenuating circumstances in the pilot study district, the concerns expressed by these participants were valid, and were believed to be potentially problematic for the study. As a result, the survey was further revised to remove any direct
mention of leadership or administration, and the directions were rewritten to indicate that these were typical duties of professional members of the faculty in most schools. A copy of the revised survey, the Faculty Involvement Survey (FIS), is included in Appendix C.

Methodology for Phase II

Research Questions

There were four major research questions as identified in Chapter 1 that were addressed through the final two phases of this study. The research questions investigated by the second phase of data collection were:

Question 1. What patterns of instructional leadership can be identified in effective middle schools based on perceptions of the faculties?

A. Which members of these faculties are included as sources of instructional leadership?

B. Does the sharing of instructional leadership extend beyond the administrative levels of the school to include teachers and other members of the faculty?

Selection of the Sample (Figure 3.1, JIA)

This study was conducted in the state of Louisiana. There are 64 public parish and 2 public city school systems with a total of 1,556 public schools (Louisiana Department of Education, 1995) in the state. The population for this phase of the study included the 109 6th - 8th grade middle or junior high schools which constitute 7% of the public schools in the state. This population includes only those public schools whose grade level configuration includes only 6th through 8th grades. Seventeen schools from the district in
which the FIS had been piloted were eliminated due to the district’s participation in the pilot study. This resulted in 92 schools in the sample to be contacted for participation in Phase II of the study. Table 3.4 provides an overview of the responses of these schools.

Table 3.4
Sample Schools Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>109 Total Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters were sent to the superintendents in each of the 33 school districts that included middle schools requesting their permission to contact the principals of these schools to participate in the study (see Appendix D). A follow up phone call was made to each superintendent to answer any questions about the study, and to gain permission to contact the principals in that district. Superintendents in 28 school districts approached agreed to have all of their middle schools contacted for participation in the study. One superintendent asked that one of the three middle schools in his district not be requested to participate due to a recent change in leadership at the school. A second superintendent indicated that two of the 11 middle schools in his district were already participating in another study, and should not be contacted. These responses resulted in a sample of 80 schools that were contacted for participation in the study.

After permission was granted by the superintendent, letters were sent to each of the 80 principals involved requesting their cooperation in the data collection process (see
Appendix E). Stamped, self addressed school information cards were included with these letters to be returned to the researcher indicating a willingness to participate in the study. These cards asked for the name of the school, its district name, the length of tenure of the principal, the number of certified faculty members, and whether the school used a departmental or team structure. After two weeks, follow up phone calls were made to those principals who had not yet responded. A total of 55 of the 80 principals contacted agreed to participate in Phase II of the study.

**Regression Analyses for Phase II**

The sample of schools participating in the study was classified into three groups based upon their effectiveness status over a two year period. Regression analyses (ordinary least squares or OLS) were used to generate School Effectiveness Indicators (SEIs) that indicated the effectiveness status of each of the middle schools. Although some problems have been identified with the stability over time of effectiveness estimates as determined through the regression model used to determine SEIs based on residual scores, this method continues to be the most widely used technique in the U.S. and the U.K. (Fitz-Gibbon, 1997; Mandeville & Anderson, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rowan et al., 1983; Teddlie and Reynolds, in press). In order to alleviate these problems, some researchers have recommended the use of more advanced multilevel models as a more precise technique for the generation of SEIs. However, research has shown that the traditional regression analyses and these multilevel models result in similar statistics (e.g.,

---

1These regression analyses were generated by Professor Eugene Kennedy as part of the Louisiana School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP) (School Assessment and Improvement Services, 1997).
Kennedy et al., 1993; Fitz-Gibbon, 1997). As a result, regression analyses were utilized to determine the SEIs of the sample of schools in this study.

In the regression analyses used for this study, the criterion variable (SIPSCORES) was regressed onto five hard-to-control predictor variables (SES, community type, % of students receiving special education, % of students identified as gifted and/or talented and % of limited english proficiency students). These analyses resulted in an output file that included a residual score (school effectiveness indicator or SEI) for each middle school in the state. These positive or negative residual scores indicate how well other schools serving similar students in similar contexts performed. For the purposes of this study, the sample schools were classified into three groups (effective, typical, ineffective) based upon these analyses.

**Generation of SIPSCORES, the criterion variable.** Data used for the criterion variable (composite student achievement scores) were obtained from the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE). These data included results from both criterion-referenced and norm-referenced standardized tests utilized as part of the state's pupil accountability program. The CRTs incorporate student scores for the language arts and mathematics parts of the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) tests administered to all seventh graders in Louisiana public middle schools during the two years designated. The NRTs include student scores on the total battery of the California Achievement Tests administered to all sixth graders during the same school years.

For the purposes of the regression analyses, these scores were converted to a composite score known as a SIPSCORE (Brooks & Oescher, 1992; Crone, Franklin,
Caldas, Ducote, & Killebrew, 1992). The use of such a composite score as the criterion variable is recommended in the literature in order to increase the consistency and reliability of school effectiveness classifications (Crone, Lang, Teddlie, & Franklin, 1995; Purkey & Smith, 1983). The SIPSCORE utilized in this study was first developed as part of the Louisiana School Incentive Program (SIP) by staff members at the LDE, Bureau of School Accountability (Crone, et al., 1992).

As indicated in Freeman (1997), the process of converting the NRT and CRT scores to SIPSCORES involved a five step procedure as follows:

1. Convert student raw scores on CRT mathematics and language arts for 7th grade LEAP tests, and NRT total battery raw scores on 6th grade CAT tests into student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level using the SAS statistical package (SAS Institute, 1985).

2. Convert student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level into student \( z \) scores for each subject area and grade level, using the state means and standard deviations. Combining NRTs and CRTs is appropriate for this calculation since the \( z \) score is a standardized score (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988).

3. Convert student \( z \) scores for each subject area and grade level into mean student \( z \) scores for each subject area and grade level by summing the student scaled scores for each subject area and grade level of each test, and then dividing by the total number of students in the school who participated in that test.

4. Calculate school level \( z \) scores for each subject area and grade level.
5. Convert school level z scores to SIPSCORES by dividing the school level z scores at each subject area and grade level by the number of subject areas and grade levels in the school.

The result of this five step procedure was a list including each middle school in Louisiana and its SIPSCORE for two consecutive years. These SIPSCORES were then utilized as the dependent or criterion variable in the two regression models (1994-95, 1995-96).

**Socioeconomic Status Classifications.** The predictor variable, SES, was determined based upon the percentage of students in the school receiving free lunch services, since data about family income and parents' educational background are not normally collected by the LDE. Data indicating the number of students participating in the school's free lunch program are maintained by the schools, and are reported to the LDE. Since requirements for participation in this program are related to family income, student enrollment in the program serves as the best available proxy for SES.

The percentage of students participating in the free lunch program in a school is computed in Louisiana by dividing the number of students enrolled in the program by the total number of students attending the school (Crone, et al., 1992). Those students eligible for reduced price lunch were not included in these calculations, since it has been determined that the percentage of students participating in the free lunch program alone is a better indicator of student achievement (Crone, et al., 1992).

Data to be used in these calculations were obtained from the LDE Student Information System (SIS). The LDE requires local education agencies (LEAs) to enter a
code into each student's enrollment record on the SIS database that indicates whether the student is eligible to receive either free or reduced price lunches.

A SAS database was created including the percentage of free lunch students at each of the 6th - 8th grade middle schools in Louisiana. This database was then used as one of the predictor variables for the regression analyses.

**School Community Type Classifications.** The second predictor variable, community type, was also obtained from the LDE. Community type identifications are based on locale codes assigned by the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census based upon school addresses. This data describes a school based upon its location relative to populous areas, and includes seven community types: large city, mid-size city, urban fringe of a large city, urban fringe of a mid-size city, large town, small town, and rural. Descriptions of these community types are as follows:

- **Large city:** A central city with a population greater than or equal to 250,000.
- **Mid-size City:** A central city having a population less than 250,000.
- **Urban Fringe of a Large City:** Any incorporated place or non-place territory defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
- **Urban Fringe of a Mid-size City:** Any incorporated place or non-place territory defined as urban by the Census Bureau.
- **Large Town:** An incorporated place with a population of 25,000 or more.
- **Small Town:** An incorporated place with population between 2,500 and 25,000.
- **Rural:** Any incorporated place or non place territory designated as rural by the Census Bureau.
A SAS data file was developed including the community type of each middle school in the state which was used as a predictor variable in the regression procedure.

**Percent of Students Receiving Special Education Services.** The data for this predictor variable was provided by the LDE. This information was taken from the LDE's LANSER system, which is utilized for reporting students who are receiving special education services. Local education agencies (LEAs) are required, for the purposes of the state's minimum foundation program (MFP), to record a code indicating the primary exceptionality of each student receiving special education services. Based upon these codes, the LDE provided a data file including the percentage of students in each middle school in the state receiving special education services to be used as a predictor variable in the regression procedure. This percentage did not include those students identified as gifted and talented, which are also reported on the LANSER system.

**Percent of Students Identified as Gifted and Talented.** In the state of Louisiana, students identified as gifted and talented are also classified as special education. Therefore, for this predictor variable, the LDE separated those students reported under these categories at each school from the rest of the students receiving special education services. The number of students identified as gifted and talented was then divided by the total enrollment of the school to determine the percentage of gifted and talented students in the school. This information was also provided by the LDE as a data file which was then used as a predictor variable for the regression procedure.
Percent of Limited English Proficiency Students. It is a requirement of the LEAP that teachers code students' individual test booklets to indicate whether the student is considered to be limited in his or her English proficiency. As a result, this information was collected by school from the test data files. The total number of limited English proficient students was then divided by the school's total enrollment in order to calculate the percent of limited English proficient students in the school. A data file was developed with these percentages for each middle school in the state that was used as a predictor variable in the regression procedure.

Results from Phase II Regression Analyses

Bivariate Correlations of Predictor and Criterion Variables. Results from the Phase II regression analyses used to classify the sample schools into groups based upon effectiveness status were analyzed using both bivariate correlation and multiple regression. Tables 3.5 and 3.6 show the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations for both models.

Through the bivariate correlations, four of the five predictor variables (SES, %GIFTED, COMTYPE, %SPEC ED) were found to be significantly related to the criterion variable (school level composite z score) for each successive regression model. In Model 1 for Academic Year 1994-95, SES 95 (r = -.30), %GIFTED (r = .48), COMTYPE (r = .29), and %SPEC ED (r = -.37) were significantly related to achievement (95Z) at p < .0001. All were related in the predicted direction. The predictor variable, %LEP (r = .06), was not significantly related to achievement at in Model 1.
Table 3.5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Model 1, Academic Year 1994-95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 95Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SES 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % GIFTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COMTYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % SPEC ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. % LEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 231; *p < .05, **p < .01, **p < .001

Table 3.6
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Model 1, Academic Year 1995-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 96Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SES96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % GIFTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COMTYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % SPEC ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. % LEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 219; *p < .01; **p < .001

For Academic Year 1995-96, Model 2 indicates that SES96 (r = -.68), %GIFTED (r = .5), COMTYPE (r = .29), and %SPEC ED (r = -.4), were significantly related to achievement (96Z) at p < .0001. All were related in the predicted direction. In Model 2, %LEP (r = -.05) was not significantly related to achievement (96Z).
Results from Multiple Regression Models. Two separate multiple regression models were used to regress the z scores for each of the two years on the linear combination of SES, %GIFTED, COMTYPE, %SPEC ED, and %LEP for the two like years. Tables 3.7 and 3.8 show the results of the equation for the two models.

In Model 1, the linear equation of SES, %GIFTED, COMTYPE, %SPEC ED, and %LEP accounted for 67% of the variance in the criterion variable 95Z [F(6,225) = 79.77, p < .0001, adjusted R² = .67]. For Model 2, the equation including the same predictor variables accounted for 60% of the variance in the criterion variable 96Z [F(5,214) = 67.50, p < .0001, adjusted R² = .60].

### Table 3.7
**Model 1. Criterion Variable 95Z**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1354101.06</td>
<td>225683.51</td>
<td>79.77</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>636562.16</td>
<td>2829.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1990663.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.8
**Model 2. Criterion Variable 96Z**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1226249.07</td>
<td>245249.81</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>777553.64</td>
<td>3633.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2003802.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification of Schools by Effectiveness Status. The effective schools group included 21 schools that had positive residual scores for both the 1994-95 and the 1995-
96 school years. The ineffective schools group included 12 schools with negative residual scores for both years. The typical schools groups included 13 schools with a positive score for one year and a negative score for the other. Table 3.9 illustrates the sample for Phase II of the data collection process.

Table 3.9
Phase II Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55 Total Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Effective Group</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Ineffective Group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Typical Group</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Failed to Return Surveys</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration of the FIS (Figure 1, IIB)

Once these principals agreed to participate, packets were mailed to each of the 55 schools containing a letter explaining the study and providing instructions for administering the survey to their faculty members. The packet also included enough surveys for the number of faculty members at the school. The survey was administered to the faculty of each of the participating schools by the principal, or their designee, during a faculty meeting. Each of the professional faculty members in these schools was asked to complete a survey providing their perceptions of the persons involved in leading or contributing to leadership in 36 identified instructional leadership functions. Surveys were returned by 46 of the 55 schools that agreed to participate. Follow up phone calls were made to the nine schools who did not return the surveys, but these requests went unanswered. The final sample of schools for Phase II included 21 schools in the effective group, 13 in the typical group, and 12 in the ineffective group.
Analysis of the FIS (Figure 3.1, IIC)

The responses to the surveys were analyzed using frequency distributions. These distributions were first calculated by effectiveness group. The most frequently occurring response pattern on each item was then identified for each of the effectiveness groups. Based upon these analyses, patterns of leadership were identified for each group.

After the predominant leadership pattern for each effectiveness group was identified, individual frequency distributions were then calculated for each of the schools in the effective group. These were then analyzed to determine the most frequently occurring response pattern for each item. These analyses were used to determine the predominant leadership pattern for the school.

In the analyses to determine the most frequently occurring response pattern for each item, the following rules were used:

- Responses were grouped to include both responses of 1 or 2 as involvement in the activity defined by the item. This meant that for these analyses the response pattern of 22222, or shared involvement by all parties, included any response that indicated involvement of all of the role scale choices at either the 1 or 2 level.

- Response patterns had to account for 25% or more of the total responses in order to be considered the most frequently occurring pattern.

As a result of these analyses, three distinct patterns of leadership emerged as predominant in the effective middle schools. In addition, two schools exhibited patterns that were unique to the particular school, and four schools exhibited no predominant response pattern. These patterns are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.
Methodology for Phase III

Research Questions

The research questions to be addressed in Phase III of the study are:

**Question II.** What communication patterns exist in effective middle schools?

A. What positions within the network are held by those members identified as instructional leaders in the school?

B. What types of networks are prevalent in effective middle level schools in which a variety of leadership sources are identified? Hierarchical structures? Dense, flat webs?

**Question III.** How do the communication networks of effective middle schools correspond to the perceived sources of instructional leadership in these schools?

A. To what degree do the ranked individuals within the communication networks correspond to those individuals perceived by the faculty to be sources of instructional leadership?

B. How does the centrality of the principal as measured through Social Network Analysis correspond to the faculty perceptions of him/her as a source of instructional leadership within the school?

**Question IV.** How do the internal processes of effective middle schools facilitate or hinder the functioning of these multiple leadership sources?

A. What types of linkage mechanisms are utilized in effective middle schools to increase the cohesiveness of their faculties?

B. How do these multiple leadership sources function to achieve the
instructional goals of the school on a day to day basis?

**Selection of the Phase III Sample (Figure 3.1, IIIA)**

The sample for Phase III of the study were based upon the analysis of the responses to the EIS utilized in Phase II. In these analyses, the frequency of the primary response patterns was determined for each of the 21 effective schools. A pattern was considered to be the primary pattern for the school if it accounted for the largest percentage of responses (25% or more) on a majority of the survey items for that school.

These analyses resulted in the identification of the same primary leadership patterns as found in Phase I of the study (see Chapter 4). These patterns were:

- principal involvement only (Type I),
- principal/assistant principal involvement (Type II),
- overall faculty involvement (Type III),
- principal/assistant principal/teacher involvement (Type IV), and
- miscellaneous or no distinct pattern (Type V).

The number of schools in the each of the primary categories is shown by SES in Table 3.10. One of the mid-SES schools included in Type V had leadership patterns of principal/assistant principal/auxiliary/and teacher, while one had a pattern including teachers only. One mid-SES school and the three low-SES schools in Type V had no distinct leadership pattern.

After these analyses were completed, stratified purposeful sampling was utilized to select four schools representative of the results of the sample of effective schools for Phase II. Schools were selected that most strongly represented each of the identified
leadership patterns in order to allow more in-depth study of these patterns in effective middle schools. These schools were selected to provide representation of the leadership patterns that involved sharing of some administrative duties. As a result, none of the Type I schools were included in the case study portion of the study. Schools were also selected to represent the total sample on SES as well as leadership pattern.

The schools selected for the Phase III case studies were:

- a mid-SES Type II school located in the southeastern part of the state;
- a mid-SES Type III school located in the school district in the southwestern part of the state;
- a low-SES school located in the same school district as the mid-SES Type III school above to allow for comparisons within a school district; and
- a mid-SES school located in the Northwestern part of the state that displayed a principal/assistant principal/teacher pattern that was unique to it.

Although the low-SES school included in this sample was one for which no clear pattern emerged, I felt that it was important to visit two schools in one school district in order to allow for the examination of district level context factors that may impact the leadership within individual schools. The mid-SES school with the unique leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10
Sample Schools By Leadership Pattern and SES
pattern was included in the Phase III sample to provide representation to the three schools in which these unique patterns existed.

**Data Collection for Phase III (Figure 3.1, IIIB)**

The development of case studies for each of the four schools was utilized as the research methodology for Phase III. According to Yin (1989), "As a research endeavor, the case study contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena" (p. 14). As such, the case studies included in this study contribute to our understanding of the leadership phenomenon in effective middle schools.

Data collection for the case studies was done over a two day period at each of the four schools. Data collection for the case studies included observations, interviews, and Social Network Analysis at each school site. Social Network Analysis for each of the schools involved the administration of a sociometric survey discussed in detail below.

Interviews were conducted with the principal, assistant principal, two department heads or team leaders, and six other classroom teachers. Other informal conversations were conducted with members of the faculty and staff during the two day visit. Copies of the protocols used in these interviews are included in Appendix F.

Observations of the school were conducted in the office area and throughout other areas of the school. The purpose of these observations was to gather information as to how the faculty interacted with each other and with the administration of the school. These observations were utilized to add descriptions of the school's everyday functioning to the case studies.
Administration of the Sociometric Survey. Sociometric surveys were utilized for the Social Network Analysis portion of Phase III of the study (see Appendix G). The survey used in this study had been previously utilized in the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993) and by Durland (1996) in her dissertation research. Two questions were included in this survey.

The first question asked respondents to identify all faculty members with whom they have discussed academic matters in the past week, and then to rank the three persons they have communicated with the most about such matters in the past week. The second question asked respondents to identify those faculty members with whom they would like to serve on a school improvement committee, and then to rank their top three choices for this committee. These data were compared to the Phase II results as well as to the other case study data to provide further confirmation of these results.

Each certified faculty member received a letter explaining the study, instructions for completing the survey, and a copy of the survey. These packets were individually addressed to allow for privacy and the pre-coding of all surveys. Pre-coding of the surveys was done to ensure anonymity of the respondents. Faculty members marked their responses directly on the survey.

Data Analysis for Phase III (Figure 3.1, IIIC)

Analysis of the data sources for Phase III of this study required a two-fold process. First, the sociometric surveys were analyzed using the three step process described here. Then, the interview responses and observation field notes were analyzed through Lincoln and Guba's (1985) constant comparative method. The data from these sources were
unitized and categorized through this process, and thus the themes emerging from this data were narrowed to form distinct categories of information that were then used in the case study development. This technique allowed for the reduction of the extensive data collected at each school site into manageable units that provide the in-depth content necessary for the case study development.

Analysis of the Sociometric Surveys. Analysis of the sociometric surveys proceeded through three steps.

1. Data Input and Processing: Data processing for the network analysis included a four step process (Durland, 1996). The first step involved entering the data into WordPerfect files. Respondents were assigned code numbers during the administration of these surveys which were used in place of names during the data input and processing procedure. The network was defined as all teachers included on the faculty roster whether they were absent or failed to return the survey. Input of the sociometric survey data consisted of the construction of a square matrix for each school listing each individual’s code number across the top and down the left side of the matrix. Each respondent’s choices were then entered across the row corresponding to their assigned code number. These choices were written in the matrix square corresponding to the chosen individual’s column.

After the data input was complete, the data sets were imported into UCINETX (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 1992a; 1992b) for calculation of the network measures. The third step of this process was to construct data files for SPSS, and the fourth step
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involved exporting the original matrix data sets into Krackplot 3.0 (Krackhardt, Blythe, & McGrath, 1994, 1995) in order to construct the sociograms.

Sociograms were constructed through a three step process using Krackplot 3.0 (Krackhardt, Blythe, & McGrath, 1994, 1995). First, the graph of each network was imported into Krackplot in a random pattern. Second, using Quick Multidimensional Scaling, the random pattern was then laid out. This provided a crude picture of the graph layout using a two-dimensional solution based on the shortest path distances between all teacher pairs. Finally, the graph was laid out using a simulated annealing routine that “(a) maximized nodes (teachers) forming clusters determined by connections to other nodes (teachers), (b) separate isolates from the group, and (c) minimize edge (line) length” (Durland, 1996, p. 77).

2. Calculation of Centrality Measures: Two centrality measures were calculated based upon the network analysis data: principal centrality and group centralization.

The individual centrality of the principal can be calculated using three measures: Freeman’s normalized indegree, Freeman’s Betweenness, and Freeman’s Closeness. Each of these measures assumes a specific structural relationship between the various members of the network (Freeman, 1979).

For the purposes of this study, Freeman’s normalized indegree was used to measure principal centrality. This indice measures the number of times the individual, in this case the principal, was chosen by others. It seeks to answer the question of whether principals are directly and actively connected to each of the members of their faculties. As
a measure of network activity, it is equal to the number of other members directly linked to this individual.

Group Centralization measures were also calculated for each school network. Measures used for this calculation were degree centralization and betweenness centralization which were calculated as a function of the individual centrality measures. These measures provided information as to the likelihood of one individual being more central within the network. The larger the numeric value of this measure, the greater the probability that one person is central to the network while the others are positioned around the edges of it.

3. Calculation of Cohesiveness Measure: Cohesiveness for each network were calculated using an overall measure of group density. This measure demonstrated the degree to which all of the members of the network were connected to each other. Group density provided an indication of the overall connectedness of the network within which the principal is located. It is expressed as the proportion of all of the possible connections that are actually present in the network.

Case Study Development. Field notes and interview responses collected during the two day site visits were analyzed using Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) constant comparative method which supports the identification of themes that emerge from the data. The responses to the interview questions were combined across principal, assistant principal, department head/team leader, and teachers to provide a description of the school. The data gathered through the interviews and observations focused on the attitudes and behaviors of the participants, and were utilized to provide insight into the
internal processes of effective middle schools that facilitate or hinder the functioning of multiple leadership sources.

In addition to the interview and observation data collected during the two day site visits, the results of the Social Network Analysis were also utilized in the case studies to further explain the social climate of the schools. The communication networks uncovered in each of the schools played a prominent role in the leadership patterns that were identified.

Cross case analysis between the four schools was also conducted to determine patterns that existed in the data across cases. This analysis was done using the emergent themes identified for each of the four schools during the initial case study development. This cross case analysis allowed for the discussion of similarities and differences between the four schools which may account for the variations in them with regard to leadership.

Summary

This chapter provides an outline of the methods that were followed in this study to identify and explore the patterns of shared leadership in effective middle schools in the state of Louisiana. An overview of this methodology is provided in Figure 3.1. The study utilized a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies and data sources in order to provide a greater understanding of the internal processes that impact the sharing of leadership within these schools.

The methodology employed here also provides for the triangulation of both methodologies and data sources. As noted by Patton (1990), triangulation helps to solve the problem of relying too heavily on a single data source or method. For the purposes of
this study, triangulation provided a method for verifying through a number of data
sources the presence or absence of certain factors within the individual schools that appear
to have influenced the sharing of leadership in these settings.

The three phase methodology developed for this study allowed for a pilot study in
which primary leadership patterns that might be expected in middle schools were
identified. These leadership patterns were then confirmed through the phase II study
which included a sample of 46 differentially effective middle schools in Louisiana. From
this sample of 46 schools, four effective middle schools that exhibited differential shared
leadership patterns were then selected for case study analyses. These case study analyses,
included in Chapter 5, provide a more in-depth look at the patterns of shared leadership
identified in the study, and the contexts in which they occur.
CHAPTER FOUR: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Introduction

The primary focus of this study was to identify and examine patterns of shared leadership within effective middle schools. Since this was an exploratory study, however, it was necessary to consider the patterns of leadership within all middle schools, regardless of their effectiveness status. As a result, Phase I of the data collection focused on the development and pilot testing of the FIS with a group of eight schools. The results of the factor analyses on this instrument were reported in Chapter 3, while the results of the frequency distributions for each of the identified leadership patterns will be discussed here.

In addition, Phase II of this study focused first on the leadership patterns identified for groups of schools based on their effectiveness status. After this was done, the primary leadership patterns for the sample of effective schools were examined for each school individually.

The research questions to be addressed in Phase II of the study were:

Question 1. What patterns of instructional leadership can be identified in effective middle schools based on perceptions of the faculties?

A. Which members of these faculties are included as sources of instructional leadership?

B. Does the sharing of instructional leadership extend beyond the administrative levels of the school to include teachers and other members of the faculty?
The Use of Frequency Distributions

Due to the nature of the survey utilized in this study, frequency distributions were utilized to analyze the response patterns of the study participants in order to identify the primary patterns of leadership within each effectiveness group, and then, within each effective school. The use of frequency distributions to summarize the data collected through the Faculty Involvement Survey allowed the researcher to determine the number of respondents who marked a particular pattern of responses on each item of the survey. In this way, I was able to determine what percentage of responses each pattern accounted for, and to thus make determinations as to which response pattern was the primary pattern for each item. In addition, this method was used to determine the primary pattern for each school type and for each of the effective schools individually.

The use of descriptive statistics, such as frequency distributions, was deemed appropriate due to the nature of the study. According to Borg and Gall (1989), "descriptive studies are primarily concerned with finding out 'what is' (p. 331)". The exploratory nature of this study fits with this definition of a descriptive study, thereby making the use of descriptive statistics appropriate.

Results from Phase I Pilot Study

Phase I Frequency Data

Frequency data were calculated by item for each of the effectiveness levels (effective and ineffective). These data were then further analyzed to determine if a particular response pattern occurred more frequently than others. A response pattern was
determined to be the primary response pattern for an item if it accounted for the largest percentage of responses on that item.

Based upon the analysis of the frequency of response patterns, both the effective and the ineffective group indicated that most of the items included on the survey were handled by the principal and assistant principal (Type II), including 27 items and 24 items respectively. The second most frequent response pattern for both groups indicated the involvement of the principal, assistant principal, and classroom teachers which included eight items for the effective group and seven items for the ineffective group. Table 4.1 provides an overview of the most frequent response patterns by school type. Although Type I, principal only is included in this table, it was not identified as a primary response pattern in the analyses until Phase II. However, in order to maintain consistency throughout the presentation of the results, all leadership patterns are included in each table.

Table 4.1
*Response Patterns by Effectiveness Group (Pilot Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEMS BY RESPONSE PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Type I = Principal Only, Type II = Principal/Assistant Principal, Type III = All Groups, Type IV = Principal/Assistant Principal/Teacher, and Type V = Miscellaneous or No Distinct Pattern

Of particular interest, the ineffective group indicated the involvement of all members of the faculty on three items. Two of these items were developing instructional goals for the school, and evaluating and selecting instructional materials. The effective
group indicated the involvement of only the principal and assistant principal on both of these items. For the third item that the ineffective group indicated the involvement of all groups, helping relate the school’s instructional goals to curriculum units, the effective group indicated the involvement of the principal, assistant principal and classroom teachers but excluded the involvement of department heads, team leaders, and special education/Title I personnel.

In addition, the ineffective group indicated the involvement of the principal, assistant principal, department heads, and classroom teachers in coordinating the instructional program across grade levels while the effective group maintained that this was handled primarily by the principal and assistant principal. Each group indicated no particular pattern for one item. For the effective group this item was providing expertise on instructional matters which according to the ineffective group was done by the principal and assistant principal. Providing help to teachers when their teaching methods are not successful was the item for which there was no clear leadership pattern among the ineffective group. However, this was handled by the principal and the assistant principal according to the effective group. In addition, neither group indicated principal leadership only as the primary leadership pattern for any of the items on the survey.

Based upon the results of the pilot study, it was expected that the predominant pattern of leadership for all three types of schools in Phase II would be principal/assistant principal involvement. There was expected to be some tendency for teachers to be perceived by the faculty members as being more involved in certain activities. These
activities were expected to primarily involve school climate and instructional organization tasks.

Results from Phase II Study

Based on the results from Phase I, several rules for the identification of primary leadership patterns were established. These rules served to guide the process of identifying the primary leadership pattern for each effectiveness group and for each of the effective schools. The rules for these analyses were:

- Responses were grouped to include both responses of 1 or 2 as involvement in the activity defined by the item. This meant that for these analyses the response pattern of 22222, or shared involvement by all parties, included any response that indicated involvement of all of the role scale choices at either the 1 or 2 level.
- Response patterns had to account for 25% or more of the total responses in order to be considered the most frequently occurring pattern.

Using these rules, three primary patterns of shared leadership were identified in the pilot study conducted in Phase I. These patterns were utilized in the analyses for Phase II, and provided a good fit for these analyses. However, in addition to these three patterns of shared leadership, a fourth pattern of leadership in which no sharing occurred, and the principal was perceived as the solitary instructional leader, was added based upon the Phase II results. In both the Phase I and II analyses, some schools showed no distinct pattern and therefore were placed in a separate category (Type V). The patterns of leadership identified through the Phase I and II analyses were:

- principal involvement only (Type I),
leadership patterns by effectiveness group

the effectiveness status of the 46 schools in the sample was determined based upon regression analyses. these analyses generated school effectiveness indices (SEIs) for each of the schools indicating how well the students performed on achievement measures as compared to students in schools with similar contexts. the schools were classified based upon their SEIs for two consecutive years, 1994-95 and 1995-96.

three effectiveness classifications were utilized for the study. schools were included in the effective group if they had a positive residual score for each of the two years. those schools in the ineffective group had a negative residual score for each of the two years, while the typical group exhibited inconsistency in their academic performance with a positive residual score one year, and a negative one the other. the final sample for the study included 21 effective schools, 12 ineffective schools, and 13 typical schools.

analyses for the first part of phase II were done by effectiveness group. table 4.2 provides an overview of the most frequent response patterns by school type. a Type I pattern indicates that the principal is perceive by the professional faculty within the school as the solitary instructional leader. this pattern further indicates no sharing of leadership. Types II, III, and IV all indicate some variation of shared leadership. a Type II pattern indicates the perception by the faculty that the principal and assistant principal are the
persons primarily responsible for leadership within the school. A Type III pattern indicates that leadership within the school is perceived as being a shared task including all members of the professional faculty. In the one school in which a Type IV pattern was identified, the principal, assistant principal, and teachers were perceived as being instructional leaders, while the auxiliary teachers and department heads or team leaders were not seen as being involved in these tasks.

Table 4.2
Response Patterns by Effectiveness Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEMS BY RESPONSE PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Type I = Principal Only, Type II = Principal/Assistant Principal, Type III = All Groups, Type IV = Principal/Assistant Principal/Teacher, and Type V = Miscellaneous or No Distinct Pattern

These analyses indicate several similarities between the three types of schools. For all three groups, items for which no distinct pattern could be identified constituted the largest group. Items for which all three groups indicated no distinct pattern were:

- Organizes staff development programs that are related to the school's instructional goals,
- Emphasizes the use of test results and other assessments for program improvement,
- Provides expertise on instructional matters,
• Establishes a school policy on promotion,
• Provides expertise on curriculum issues,
• Makes critical decisions about the instructional program of the school, and
• Schedules assemblies that have an instructional purpose.

This may, in part, be due to the fact that some of these activities are frequently handled at the district level, including the organization of staff development programs and the establishment of a promotion policy. In addition, school assemblies are rather limited, and frequently focus around awards or athletics. This finding is substantially different from the pilot study in which this pattern type accounted for only one item for the effective group, and 2 items for the ineffective group.

It should be noted that the five items for which the effective group exhibited a pattern identified as miscellaneous, the pattern identified was teacher only. The items for which this pattern was primary were:
• Develops a clear discipline code,
• Helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units,
• Evaluates and selects instructional materials,
• Coordinates the instructional program across grade levels, and
• Ensures systematic monitoring of student progress.

Both the ineffective and inconsistent groups identified no distinct pattern of leadership for the last three of these items.

All three effectiveness groups identified the interviewing and hiring of instructional personnel as something the principal did alone. This is interesting considering the
emphasis in the area of site-based decision-making on allowing teachers to participate in this area of governance. Responses from the effective school group indicated that the principal acted alone in providing the necessary support personnel to assist teachers, assigning teachers to specific classes or teams, and securing additional resources and funds for instructional purposes. Faculty members in the ineffective and inconsistent school groups indicated that the first two of these items were done by the principal and assistant principal together, while no distinct pattern of leadership was indicated for the third item by these two groups.

Both principal and assistant principal leadership was indicated by all three groups on the following items.

- Develops the school’s master schedule
- Protects the faculty from undue pressure
- Encourages teachers to observe in each other’s classes
- Works to keep faculty morale high
- Clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional position
- Makes regular classroom visits
- Gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching

These items basically cover areas which have been traditionally addressed by those in administrative positions. The designation of these items as primarily being handled by the administrative personnel in the school indicates that while principals have begun to share some of these duties with their assistant principals, they have yet to spread these types of responsibilities to instructional personnel.
For the ineffective school group, the largest number of items (11) were perceived as being addressed by all members of the faculty. The effective school group identified seven items with this pattern, while the typical group identified six. The three groups agreed on the following areas as fitting into this leadership pattern:

- Involves parents in the school program,
- Develops instructional goals for the school,
- Communicates high expectations for all students,
- Recognizes and rewards academic accomplishments of students, and
- Works to improve the instructional program of the school.

Faculty perceptions of overall involvement in these activities indicates that teachers and administrators continue to perceive teachers and other instructional personnel as primarily involved in instructional tasks related to students and parents.

In addition to these items, the effective and ineffective school groups also identified communicating to parents the importance of learning, and establishing a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code as activities accomplished through shared leadership. The typical group also identified the provision of help to teachers whose teaching methods are not successful as a shared task.

While these results indicate few differences globally in the presence of shared leadership within middle schools, they do indicate some differences on individual items. In addition, it should be noted that, in effective schools, principals do tend to be perceived as providing solitary leadership on a larger number of tasks. Also, in these effective schools, principal and assistant principal leadership as a team appears to be important. These
findings indicate that while principals may not serve as solitary leaders in these settings, certain aspects of leadership remain an administrative duty.

**Leadership Patterns for Effective Schools**

Analyses for the effective schools was also done individually following the criteria for the identification of the primary leadership pattern for each item on the *Faculty Involvement Survey*. Patterns for these analyses were consistent with the findings of both Phase I and the analyses by effectiveness group in Phase II. The response patterns by school are included in Table 4.3.

Patterns II, III, and IV all indicate some degree of shared leadership within the school. While pattern II indicates only sharing within the administrative levels, patterns III and IV exhibit sharing across administrative and instructional levels. All of the effective schools, excluding School No. 2, included items for which these were the primary patterns of leadership. This indicates that although the sharing of leadership may not have been the primary pattern for the school, sharing did occur at each of these schools for some of the activities.

It should be noted that in most of the effective schools the items on which shared leadership was perceived as more prominent were areas which have traditionally been instructional in nature. These include communicating the importance of learning to parents, involving parents in the school program, communicating the instructional goals for the school, and providing expertise on curriculum and instructional matters. Items which continue to be classified as Type I, or principal only, activities include interviewing and hiring instructional personnel, assigning teachers to classes or teams,
Table 4.3
Response Pattern by School for Effective Schools Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEMS BY RESPONSE PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
making regular classroom visits, and protecting the faculty from undue pressure. While there are exceptions to these classifications as detailed in Chapter 5, for the most part, these traditional boundaries do continue to exist.

In order to provide greater insight into the contextual factors that might encourage certain patterns of leadership, the schools in the effective group were classified using three matrices:

- primary leadership pattern by SES,
- primary leadership pattern by organizational structure, and
- primary leadership pattern by community type.

These classifications yield some interesting results as to the prevalence of shared leadership in schools of varying contexts.

As indicated in Table 4.4, shared leadership was identified more frequently in schools serving mid-SES student populations. Ten of the 14 mid-SES schools in the sample exhibited either a Type II, III, or IV leadership pattern, while only one of the seven low-SES schools indicated such.

Chi-square analyses were calculated on the frequency table for leadership pattern by SES, and a significant difference in the frequency of leadership patterns by school type was detected ($\chi^2 = 8.52, \text{df} = 4, p < .10$). This indicates that the sharing of leadership is more prevalent in mid-SES schools, although even in these schools, the phenomenon appears to primarily involve the principal and assistant principal.
Table 4.4
Sample Schools By Leadership Pattern and SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(21.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.0%)</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Column percentages are in boldface. Row percentages are in italics.

In addition, this finding confirms earlier school effectiveness research (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971) that principals in low-SES effective schools serve as the primary instructional leader. This finding is also supported by earlier research findings that indicate that principals in low- and mid-SES schools differ from one another in a number of significant characteristics (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Most importantly for this study, principals in effective low-SES schools have been shown to maintain greater control over instruction and to exhibit a higher task orientation than do their counterparts in effective mid-SES schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986).

In contrast, principals in effective mid-SES schools serve more as good managers who maintain low or moderate control over instruction (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie, 1994). These principals, therefore, provide more opportunities for teacher leadership and allow greater teacher autonomy, especially with regard to academic programs (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).
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Table 4.5 provides a breakdown of the 21 effective schools by organizational structure. Nine of these schools utilized a traditional departmentalized approach, seven were involved in organizational structures involving teaming, and five of them utilized a structure that combined the two concepts.

Table 4.5
Sample Schools By Leadership Pattern and Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmentalized</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>9 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(44.4%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Concept</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td>(20.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Column percentages are in boldface. Row percentages are in italics.

In most of these cases, the principal indicated that the school was in a transition from a departmentalized approach to a team approach, and that as a result, some grades were departmentalized while others were using teams. In some cases, however, the school had chosen to use a team approach with the 6th and 7th graders, and then transition the 8th graders into a departmentalized program apparently to prepare them for high school.

The results of this analysis indicate that schools which utilize a team approach to instruction tend to be more varied in the leadership pattern that they identify as primary,
while schools maintaining a departmentalized approach tend to provide leadership from the administrative levels. These results appear to indicate that as schools move toward a team approach, as recommended in middle school reform literature (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Lipsitz, 1984; Martin, 1993), leadership becomes more diffuse across the school's professional faculty members.

For the third set of analyses, the schools were divided into two groups based upon their community type classifications for the regression analyses. The community type classifications for these analyses and the number of school included in each of these groups is included in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6
Number of Effective Schools by Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Large City</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mid-size City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urban Fringe of a Large City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Urban Fringe of a Mid-size City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Large Town</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small Town</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These seven community types were collapsed into two types: suburban and rural. Since none of the effective schools were located in large cities, it was not believed to be necessary to include an urban designation. As a result, the suburban group included those schools identified as being located in a mid-size city, in the urban fringe of a large city, or
in the urban fringe of a mid-size city. This group included a total of 15 schools. The rural group included six schools classified for the regression analyses as either small town or rural.

After these classifications were identified, the schools were then placed in a 2X5 matrix based on their perceived leadership pattern and community type. This matrix is shown in Table 4.7. While nine of the 15 suburban schools indicated that the primary leadership pattern in the school was either Type II, III, or IV, only one of the six rural schools indicated one of these shared leadership patterns. In addition, in the one rural school for which a shared leadership pattern was primary, this pattern was one that included only the principal and assistant principal. This indicates that, in this school, leadership was still primarily the domain of the administrative appointees.

Table 4.7
Sample Schools By Leadership Pattern and Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>15 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (14.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Column percentages are in boldface. Row percentages are in italics.

Based upon these analyses, shared leadership appears to be more prominent in schools in suburban areas. However, it should be noted that the most prominent pattern even among these schools involves only the principal and assistant principal. In addition,
the sample of rural schools was very small, making it difficult to draw conclusions from this data.

Reliability

Determining the reliability of the five role scale choices of the FIS was an important step in the validation of the instrument. Several authors (e.g., Borg & Gall, 1989; Huck & Cormier, 1996) agree that Cronbach’s alpha is the best method for assessing the internal consistency of instruments with multiple response choices. This measure assesses the internal consistency of an instrument on the degree to which the same characteristic is being measured.

For this study, it was important to determine the internal consistency of each of the three theoretical constructs of the survey. As a result, internal-consistency estimates of reliability (coefficient alpha) for the total scale were calculated for each of these constructs: governance, school climate, and instructional organization. This was done by calculating mean scores for each item on the survey. From these scores, mean scores for each of the theoretical constructs were calculated (see item groupings in Appendix B), resulting in three scores for each respondent. These scores were then utilized in the calculations of Cronbach’s alpha to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. The obtained coefficient for these constructs on the total instrument were .94, .93, and .91, respectively.

Summary

Based upon the quantitative analyses of the data collected through the Faculty Involvement Survey, there appear to be only minor differences in the presence of shared
leadership in effective, ineffective, and typical schools when considered as a group. Some
differences do exist between these groups of schools on individual items. However, the
same patterns of leadership were identified in all three types of schools.

Analyses of the individual schools within the effective group indicate that shared
leadership is more likely to occur in mid-SES schools. This finding indicates that the
traditional school effectiveness correlate identifying the principal as the primary
instructional leader (Edmonds, 1979) may not hold true for mid-SES middle schools. As a
result, it is important to reconsider this conceptualization of leadership as it applies to such
schools.

The findings also tend to indicate that leadership in middle schools continues to
primarily remain a function of those individuals in administrative positions. While some
involvement of teachers in leadership activities was indicated in the study, this
responsibility still primarily involved activities in the instructional area. Based upon the
results of this study, most of the leadership tasks that have traditionally been considered as
governance activities continue to be handled by either the principal, assistant principal, or
a combination of the two.
CHAPTER FIVE: QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Introduction

The quantitative results detailed in Chapter 4 identified the leadership patterns for a sample of 21 effective middle schools in the state of Louisiana. Phase III of the study involved the selection of four of these schools for more in-depth study. In order to select the schools for the qualitative phase of the research project, purposeful sampling techniques (Patton, 1990) were utilized. Details regarding this sampling are provided in Chapter 3 and later in this chapter.

While Chapter 4 provided the quantitative results for each of the effectiveness groups (effective, typical, and ineffective), and for each of the individual 21 effective schools in the study, Chapter 5 provides a more detailed look at four of these effective schools. The qualitative results seek to provide greater understanding of the unique contexts of these schools that have created their variations in leadership pattern. Although the quantitative and qualitative results are discussed in separate chapters, they should be considered as complementary to each other in providing a complete portrait of leadership in these effective middle schools.

Case Study as a Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative case studies attempt to describe a particular person, organization, or phenomenon in detail providing both context and history. They can be particularly helpful if a researcher needs to understand a certain group of people, a specific problem, or an unusual situation in greater detail (Patton, 1990). According to Stake (1981), good case
studies can "provide more valid portrayals, better bases for personal understanding of what is going on, and solid grounds for considering action (p. 32)."

Such case studies involve the researcher in making a detailed examination of a single subject or entity. These methods require the collection of large quantities of data that will provide an in-depth understanding of the unit being studied, and generally encompass a variety of qualitative, and sometimes quantitative, data collection methods (Borg & Gall, 1989). By utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, the researcher is better able to confirm the findings of the study.

**Methods for Qualitative Sampling.**

Although quantitative research designs require large, randomly selected samples for study, qualitative research relies heavily on purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling allows for the selection of particular cases that are considered to be information-rich in order to allow for the in-depth study of their contexts. Patton (1990) defines information-rich cases as "those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling (p. 169)."

Patton identified 16 types of purposeful sampling that allow the researcher to meet the specific needs of the study. For the purposes of this study, the most appropriate strategy was stratified purposeful sampling. This strategy allows the researcher to select cases that best illustrate the characteristics of the various subgroups that are of particular interest for the study.

For the purposes of the present study, this strategy enabled the selection of four schools that were representative of the total sample of effective schools on the variables of
leadership pattern and SES. Four predominant types of leadership patterns were identified for the 21 effective schools as indicated in Chapter 4. In addition, another leadership pattern (Type V) was added to allow for two schools that had unique leadership patterns that were not shared by any of the other schools, and four schools that exhibited no primary pattern. The breakdown of the effective schools by leadership pattern and SES is shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Effective Schools by Leadership Pattern and SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Type I = Principal only, Type II = Principal/Assistant Principal, Type III = All groups, Type IV = Principal/Assistant Principal/Teacher, Type V = No Distinct Pattern/Miscellaneous

Type I schools were eliminated from selection for Phase III since the stated purpose of the study was to identify and explore patterns of shared leadership in effective middle schools. Since the faculties of these schools had identified the leadership in their schools as coming primarily from the principal alone, they were not considered as appropriate cases for further in-depth study.

As a result, a sample of 17 schools was left from which the four case study schools were selected. In order to get adequate representation of the remaining patterns identified in Phase II, one mid-SES school from each type was selected. This selection allowed for the in-depth study of one school from each of the two more prominent patterns, Type II and Type III, and the one school that displayed a Type IV pattern which had also been identified in the Phase I sample. Although this school exhibited a leadership pattern that
was unusual to it, as did two of the Type V schools, it was believed to be important to further investigate this school since this pattern had appeared throughout the various phases of the study.

Mid-SES schools were focused on for this phase of the data collection because of the small number of low-SES schools available in the sample. In addition, the mid-SES sample of schools exhibited shared leadership to a greater extent than did the low-SES sample. Ten of the 11 mid-SES schools for which a primary leadership pattern could be identified exhibited a Type II, III, or IV pattern indicating some level of shared leadership. In contrast, only one of the four low-SES schools for which a primary leadership pattern was identified exhibited a Type II, III, or IV pattern. This finding is in keeping with research on lower SES effective elementary schools which shows that these schools have a more authoritarian leadership pattern (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993).

The fourth school selected for case study analysis was chosen based upon its location within the same school district as the Type III mid-SES school selected for Phase III. Although this school exhibited no distinct leadership pattern, it was included to allow for comparisons to be made within a school district. In addition, Phase II data analyses were not finalized at the time the Phase III schools were selected. As a result, the data for the low-SES Type III school was unavailable at the time these decisions were made. The sample of schools for the Phase III case studies included:

- a mid-SES Type II school located in the southeastern part of the state;
- a mid-SES Type III school located in a school district in the southwestern part of the state;
• a low-SES school located in the same school district as the mid-SES Type III school above to allow for comparisons within a school district; and

• a mid-SES school located in the Northwestern part of the state that displayed a principal/assistant principal/teacher pattern (Type IV) that was unique to it.

The four schools included in Phase III of the study represent three distinct regions of the state (the Southeast, the Northeast, and the Northwest areas) and therefore, provide a good geographical cross-section of the state. In addition, the schools include two located in mid-size cities, and two located in the urban fringe, or suburban areas surrounding such cities. These selections are representative of the community types in which those schools that exhibited shared leadership were located.

Considering the research in the area of middle school reform, an effort was also made to include schools that represented both the middle school reform practices and more traditional practices. As a result, two of the schools selected for Phase III data collection used a team structure for instruction, while the other two used a more departmentalized structure with one of them moving toward a team concept. Table 5.2 provides a more detailed picture of these context variables in each of the Phase III schools.

All school and personnel names utilized throughout these case studies and the analyses that follow are pseudonyms. Pseudonyms were used to guarantee anonymity of all participants. The guarantee of anonymity enabled the collection of the maximum amount of candid information from school personnel during the site visits.
Table 5.2
Phase III School Context Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Total Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Leadership Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Junior High School</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Urban Fringe of a Mid-size City</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>Departmentalized by subject area</td>
<td>Type II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Middle School</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid-size City</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Team structure</td>
<td>Type IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewell Middle School</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid-size City</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>Team structure</td>
<td>Type III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Grove Middle School</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Urban Fringe of a Mid-size City</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Departmentalized by grade level</td>
<td>No pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All names throughout these analyses are assigned pseudonyms.

Data Collection for Phase III

Data collection for this phase of the research project included two day site visits to each of the four schools selected for case study analysis. During the two day visits, general observations were made of the school including the climate, disciplinary procedures, student and teacher attitudes, and interactions between all school community members. In addition, interviews (see Appendix F) were conducted with the principal, assistant principal, and a sample of department heads or team leaders and teachers. Informal interviews were also conducted with teachers in areas such as the teachers' lounge and the cafeteria. These interviews provided greater detail as to the teachers' opinions of the school's operations.
Sociometric surveys (see Appendix G) were also administered to the faculty of each school for use in the case studies. These surveys were mailed to the principal of the school prior to the site visit, and were collected at the school site during the visit. This procedure allowed the faculty members two or three days to complete the surveys prior to their collection.

The sociometric surveys consisted of two questions. The first question asked the respondents to identify all faculty members with whom they had discussed academic matters with in the previous week. They then had to rank the three persons they had communicated with the most about such matters in that week. The second question asked respondents to identify the faculty members with whom they would like to serve on a school improvement committee, and then to rank their top three choices on this item as well.

The results of these surveys were analyzed through techniques of Social Network Analysis to determine the levels of principal centrality and faculty cohesiveness (Durland, 1996; Freeman, 1979). Discussions of these measures are provided in each case study with the results for each individual school.

In order to help the reader better understand these analyses, it is important to define some of the terminology used in the discussion of the sociometric analyses. Principal centrality was measured using Freeman's normalized indegree indice which indicates the degree to which the principals are directly and actively connected to each of the members of their faculties. Faculty cohesiveness was calculated using an overall measure of group density. This measure provides evidence of the overall connectedness
of the network, and is expressed as the proportion of all of the possible connections that are actually present in the network. Isolates represent those individuals in the network who do not communicate with others in the network.

A comparison and discussion across the four schools is provided in the cross-site analysis in this chapter. The dimensions of contrast for the cross-site analysis include: communication, shared leadership, inter-staff relations, parental involvement, and collegiality. (Table 5.3 in the last section of this chapter contrasts the four schools on these dimensions.)

By making comparisons of the frequency data from the Faculty Involvement Survey completed in Phase II, the interview and observation notes, and the results of the Social Network Analysis, case studies for the four schools were developed. There are four sections to each case study: background information, organizational structure, communication network, and leadership.

These case studies follow a format that seeks to first introduce the reader to the school and its context by providing background information about the school. After this groundwork is laid, the case studies discuss the organizational structure of the school providing examples of how this structure operates on a daily basis, and in some cases, how the school developed this structure. The sociograms and a discussion of the communication network of the school then provide the reader with details about both the formal and informal communication methods within the school. Finally, the leadership pattern as revealed in Phase II is discussed including interview and observation data that expands upon and develops these patterns further.
Results

Allen Junior High School

**Background Information.** Allen Junior High School is located in a small suburban school district adjacent to a large urban school system that has been embroiled in a desegregation lawsuit for the past 40 years. As a result of the court-ordered desegregation that was implemented 15 years prior to this study, many families have moved out of the urban district to the suburban district in which Allen lies to avoid forced busing. As a result, the school district has experienced a growth in student enrollment that has forced the addition of new buildings in an attempt to keep up with the growing population. Allen Junior High is one of the new schools in the district that has resulted because of this growth.

The building was converted in 1995, two years prior to my visit, from an elementary school to a junior high to relieve the overcrowding at another junior high school located about five miles down the road. The main school buildings were built in 1975, and were renovated in 1995 when the school was converted to a junior high school. They include three classroom buildings and a cafeteria. One teacher related during an informal interview that when the present faculty first visited the school prior to the renovations, the school was in very poor shape, and that a lot of work had been done to prepare it for the junior high school students. She was also quick to point out that the principal had supervised the renovations very closely to insure that they were done properly to provide a first rate facility. In addition to the renovations, a gymnasium and band building were added in 1995.
Allen Junior High serves a majority white student population with the principal estimating that only three percent of the students are African American. For the purposes of this study, the school was classified as mid-SES with 31 percent of the students receiving free or reduced price lunches. The school district is located in a rural area with little industry. As a result, the tax base is limited although taxpayers in the area have been willing in recent years to approve tax propositions to support the area schools.

Due to the limited tax base and rapid growth that has been experienced by the school district, resources at the school are limited. The principal mentioned during my interview with him that the school has been wired for the internet through the Title II Science and Math Program, and that the teachers have participated in a six hour internet training program on Saturday. However, teachers subsequently revealed that there are no computers available in the school for student use.

A computer is available in the library that is used by the librarian for circulation, but students are not able to use it. At the time of my visit, all of the academic teachers in the school were involved in writing LA Learn grants to get one computer for each of their classrooms. The grant amount was only $1000 per teacher. The teachers I spoke to who were involved in this program seemed resentful of having to go to such lengths to get what they saw as necessary teaching tools. According to one teacher, "We're a new school, so we're last on the list to get anything . . . Why don't they just come out here? I'll show them, no computers! Do you see any computers?"

Both the teachers and administrators at Allen indicated that this lack of technological resources was a result of the school district's lack of funding. However, it is
interesting to note that each student in the school, as well as in all of the other schools in the district, had been given a complete set of textbooks to keep at home for the entire year. Sets of textbooks were also kept in each of the classrooms for use at school. Considering the cost of textbooks, this policy may be limiting the funds the district has available for other endeavors.

It should be noted that the textbook policy has eliminated the need for students to carry textbooks back and forth to school and home. It has also made it unnecessary for the students to be assigned lockers since they are able to carry their notebooks and pencils in their book sacks. This particular school, due to having previously been an elementary school, did not have lockers. However, when I inquired about this, I was informed of the textbook policy and was told that lockers are not used at any of the junior highs in the district.

The school is very clean and well kept, and the faculty and staff seem to take great pride in the facility. While bulletin boards around the school provide highlights of upcoming activities, little evidence of student work is seen anywhere in the school. In all three classroom buildings, signs are displayed that state simply "Stay to your right and keep moving". Both the principal and assistant principal are visible in the hallways during class changes to reduce student behavioral problems during these times, and overall the students were well-behaved and polite. Little interaction was observed between these administrators and the students except what was necessary to insure appropriate behavior during class changes.
Since the school has three separate buildings, the administration has been able to organize the classes such that each grade level of students has its own building, and thus there is little crossover from one building to the other by students. The front building houses the office, library, and sixth grade classes. The principal related that it was very important to keep the sixth graders in their own area, because they have more problems if they have to move from one area of the school facility to another. The middle building houses seventh grade classes, and the rear building is used for the eighth graders.

The importance of not having students cross from one area to the next has been so highly emphasized that when it becomes necessary for a teacher to teach a class at differing grade levels, such as a teacher who teaches both seventh and eighth grade science, she is given a classroom in each building so that the students remain in their own building. When I asked one of the teachers about the separation of the students into buildings by grade level, she indicated that it was a much better arrangement than at her previous school where the students had to move throughout the buildings to get to their classes. However, she did indicate that it was difficult for her to have to move for one period each day to teach a class at a different grade level, and that she felt somewhat uncomfortable about having to teach that period in someone else's classroom while they had their planning period. As a result of this arrangement, she noted that the classroom that she taught in for that period had no displays of the content she was teaching, and thus did not really serve to enhance her instruction.

Organizational Structure. While the physical plant at Allen provides a unique opportunity to implement middle school reform concepts such as teaming or house
structures that have been shown to improve outcomes at the middle school level (Lipsitz, 1984; Martin, 1993), no attempt has yet been made to initiate these types of reforms. Although the students are assigned to buildings by grade level, the school maintains a departmentalized structure that is organized by subject area.

This arrangement means that while the teachers are housed with others who teach the same grade level, for planning purposes, they are expected to work in subject area departments with people who may be housed two buildings away. When asked about the reasoning behind this arrangement, the principal explained that utilizing subject area departments made it "easier for the administration to work on curriculum matters".

Departmental meetings are held once each grading period for the purpose of planning curriculum in each of the subjects taught in the school. These meetings are held on days set aside by the school district for staff development so that the students are dismissed early. Teachers are not provided time for planning with others at their own grade level, nor is common planning time provided for those teachers who might teach the same subject area or grade level although this is another strategy that is present in numerous effective schools at the middle level (Lipsitz, 1984, Martin, 1993). In effect, Allen Junior High has retained the qualities of a miniature high school that have been highly criticized by those in the area of middle school research (Cuban, 1992; George, et al., 1992; McKay, 1995).

**Communication Network at Allen Junior High.** The Social Network Analysis for Allen Junior indicates that the school is high in principal centrality and low in faculty cohesiveness when compared to the mean score on these variables for the four school
sample. The network for the school, shown in Figure 5.1, has eight isolates or members who are not connected to the network. It includes only one component, indicating that, for those members who are included, there are no breaks in the network. This finding indicates that if one member of the faculty at Allen were told a piece of information, it would eventually be spread to all other members of the faculty included in this communication network.

It should be noted, however, that although the principal had a high centrality rating as compared to the mean for the schools in the sample, he is not ranked in either the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd positions in the network, indicating that he is not highly central in the network for his own school. He is also not linked to the persons who are ranked 1st, 2nd, and 3rd by the other members of the network. This is not a surprising finding considering that formal communication from the principal was limited according to observations at the school site.

Indicative of this, the principal made little effort to meet with his faculty on a regular basis other than what was required by the school system for staff development. He also did not have any formal method for communicating with the teachers or department heads on a regular basis. Based upon observations at the school site, and interviews with various members of the faculty, it was ascertained that most information from the administration came through word of mouth through the grapevine which according to the Social Network Analysis appears to have been very well developed.
Figure 5.1
Sociogram for Allen Junior High
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Leadership at Allen Junior High. Mr. Breaux had been the principal at Allen Junior High since it opened in the Fall of 1995. Prior to becoming the principal here, he served for several years as the assistant principal at another junior high school in the same district. The assistant principal, Mr. Gordon, stated that 13 of the 28 present faculty members came to Allen with Mr. Breaux from his previous school, where they had worked with him for 12 years. One of these teachers stated during an interview, "The principal at our previous school was very controlling, it was her way only. Most of us really wanted out, and were glad to leave. This is a much better atmosphere. The teachers are respected and valued." Another teacher with 28 years in the school system remarked "This is the first time in 28 years that I have felt respected and like my opinions were valued." She further commented, "The teachers would have followed Mr. Breaux anywhere to get out of there. He could have been Hannibal and we would have followed him."

While these remarks showed a true dedication to Mr. Breaux by these teachers, it is interesting to note that based on the results of the Faculty Involvement Survey and the interview data, there was little evidence of faculty involvement in decision making in this school. Responses to the Faculty Involvement Survey revealed a Type II leadership pattern indicating that the principal and assistant principal were perceived as being the individuals primarily involved in the largest number of the activities included on the questionnaire.

The majority of activities the principal and assistant principal were perceived as being responsible for were in the area of instructional organization, and included:
• Communicates the instructional goals for the school,
• Clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional position,
• Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the school's instructional goals,
• Allocates materials needed to accomplish instructional goals,
• Sees to it that the necessary support personnel (aides, Ch.1 teachers, etc.) are available to assist teachers in accomplishing instructional goals,
• Makes regular classroom visits,
• Establishes a school policy on promotion, and
• Gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching.

In addition, the principal and assistant principal were seen as primarily responsible for one item in the school climate area, "Encourages teachers to observe in each other's classes", and two items in the governance area, "Makes critical decisions about the instructional program of the school" and "Protects faculty from undue pressure".

The faculty did, however, indicate involvement of the entire faculty on 5 items, 4 of which fell in the school climate area. These were:
• Develops instructional goals for the school,
• Communicates high expectations for all students,
• Encourages discussion of instructional issues, and
• Establishes a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code.

The fifth item for which shared leadership was indicated was "Involves parents in the school program" in the governance area.
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Overall, the survey results were confirmed in the case study phase of the research project. In fact, several of the interviews, including the assistant principal's indicated that decision making in the school may be even more principal centered than the survey responses indicated. Comments that support this conclusion include the assistant principal's response to a question about a formal plan to include faculty members in leadership in which he stated that decision making in the school is "somewhat more centralized" here than in his previous school, and that "Mr. Breaux wants decisions to come through him."

This opinion was confirmed by teachers who indicated that while their opinions are asked on most things, the principal has the final say. However, they did indicate that the principal listened to what they had to say and made his decisions considering their input to the degree that this was possible. Two teachers indicated that the faculty had been given more input into decision making in the first year the school was open, but that hassles from parents and pressure from the school board had forced the principal to take greater control. One teacher stated, "We're not given as many choices this year as last year, the principal controls things more now. Of course, he's hearing it from the school board."

Another teacher compared Mr. Breaux to the benevolent father, "He listens to your opinion, says no if he has to, and explains why."

All the faculty members interviewed were aware of the school's involvement in an Effective Schools Program that is mandated by the school system. This program requires each school to develop a school improvement plan to meet district set objectives. According to both the principal and teachers, teacher input is required in the development
of this plan. At Allen, the plan focused on parent communication/involvement, school wide discipline, and participation in a professional growth program using Harry Wong's videotape series on effective teaching.

Included in the plan were the start up of a Parent/Teacher Organization that I was told by the assistant principal never got off the ground. One teacher indicated that the school staff was planning to try again next year to get the PTO started. Mr. Gordon also indicated that although the school improvement plan attempted to improve communication with parents, no attempt was being made to involve them in decision making.

The school wide discipline component of the plan included the provision of individual and small group counseling sessions for those students needing such assistance, the development of teacher management plans, and the scheduling of small group assemblies by the administrators for the purpose of reminding students of the school's rules and regulations. In addition, after school and Saturday detention are also being instituted. No indication was given by any of the persons interviewed as to how these activities were impacting student behavior. However, no disciplinary problems were observed while I was on the campus.

The study of Harry Wong's program involved a three year plan that had begun the year of my site visit. The principal indicated that the faculty was involved this year in viewing the videotapes in the series, that next year the practices included in the tapes would be implemented, and in the third year, the results of the program would be evaluated. This seemed to me to be an unusual plan for implementing such a program since most staff development series such as this one recommend the on-going
implementation and evaluation of the strategies as they are introduced with a summative evaluation at the end of the implementation period.

No indication was given by the principal or any other faculty members as to how much input was given by the central office staff in the development of this plan, nor was any data discussed that supported the development of the plan. However, considerable concern was expressed about accomplishing the goals of the plan, since additional school system funding was tied to its accomplishment. The principal also stated that while he doesn’t dictate what the school improvement plan should involve, he does try to make sure that it includes something that the entire faculty can do together.

Overall, Allen Junior High appeared to have maintained a top down leadership structure with increased faculty involvement primarily in those areas impacting school climate. While the school was indicated through the regression analyses to be an effective school, it maintained a departmentalized structure, much like that of a high school, which has been highly criticized by those in the area of middle school reform (Cuban, 1992; Epstein, 1990; George, et al., 1992; Lounsbury & Johnston, 1988; McKay, 1995). It is interesting to note that apparently the oppressive school climate in which many of the teachers in this school had previously worked has led them to the conclusion that what they have here at Allen is much better. While this school may not have achieved the epitome of shared leadership proclaimed by researchers, what they presently have is more than they were ever led to expect. As a result, the teachers at Allen are content with the situation as it presently stands, and appear to have little interest in changing the status quo they have established here.
Carson Middle School

Background Information. Carson Middle School is located in a mid-size city in the northwestern corner of Louisiana. The district in which it is located serves not only natives to the area, but also a large population of military dependents from an Air Force base located in the parish. In addition, the neighboring parish has been involved in a desegregation lawsuit that has resulted in many families moving to outlying areas including the parish in which Carson Middle School is located.

The school is housed in a large building that encompasses all of the facilities including the P.E. and band areas. As the principal, Mr. Barry explained, the building was built in 1981 with the intent that it would someday be used as a high school facility. As a result, most rooms have signs over the door indicating Sewing Room, Cooking Lab, Business Education, etc., and the teachers have taped paper signs to the transom glass with their names and subject areas on them. It should be noted, however, that home economics and some basic business courses are offered in the school, although not in all of the rooms labeled as such.

Upon entering the building, we were struck by the large size of the commons area located just inside the front hallway. The area is very large, and includes about 20 concrete benches on which the students gather in the morning before school, and after lunch for a period of about 10-15 minutes before returning to class. The cafeteria and office are located to the right of the commons area and front hallway, and both have windows across the front allowing close supervision of these areas. To the left of the commons area are two hallways, each with classrooms on one side and the library, teacher
work room, and library in the center. This area houses the sixth and seventh grade classes, while the eighth grade is located behind this area in a second classroom area.

Overall, the building is very modern in appearance, and has been well-maintained. There is some evidence of roof leaks, with ceiling tiles in several areas appearing to have some water damage, but overall the building is clean and attractive.

Carson Middle School serves approximately 550 students with less than 30% of those students being African American. Mr. Barry indicated that the student body includes students from a wide variety of socioeconomic levels ranging from upper middle income to lower income. For the purposes of this study, the school was considered to be mid-SES with approximately 40% of the students receiving free or reduced price meals.

Few displays are seen around the school, although the eighth grade wing appears to be the exception to this. The eighth grade teachers have adopted a team orientation in which the students are split into six teams which are block scheduled every other day. They are referred to as Krewes, and have names such as etouffee, boudin, and gumbo. This seems a little unusual, considering that the school is located in the northern part of the state where there has historically been little cajun influence. In the area where the eighth grade classes are held, large banners are displayed noting each of these krewes, and cheering them on to better performance.

In the two hallways housing the sixth and seventh grade classes, some teachers have displays outside there classrooms indicating students who are high achievers in their classes. Few other bulletin boards or displays are seen in the school, although there are some motivational posters located in various areas.
It was very obvious that the school provided a safe and orderly climate after observing student behavior in the commons area. In the morning and at lunchtime, the students came into this area, and dropped off their booksacks, jackets, and other materials, and then proceeded to the cafeteria for breakfast or lunch. There appeared to be no concern about theft of materials left in this area during this time, and the students and teachers seemed comfortable with this procedure.

Procedures in the cafeteria at lunchtime were rather regimented. Students were brought into the cafeteria by the teacher they had the period just prior to lunch, and were seated together at a table. They then got up to be served one table at a time, and then returned to their original seats by class. The cafeteria was monitored by teachers according to the duty schedule, and separate tables were provided at which faculty and staff could eat.

In general, Carson Middle School was a pleasant and friendly campus in which both staff and students appeared to feel comfortable and safe. Both the administrative and instructional staffs were friendly and cooperative, and both seemed interested in assisting in any way they could with the study.

Organizational Structure. A team approach is utilized at Carson Middle School to organize the staff and students. The teachers are divided into teams by grade level, and in some cases, especially at the sixth grade level, these teams consist of only two teachers who teach a common group of students. Although common planning time is not built into the schedule for these teachers to meet with their team members for planning, biweekly team meetings are held on Mondays after school. The faculty stays after school every
Monday for either a faculty meeting or team meeting. This time is outside the regular workday, and teachers are not compensated financially for the extra time they work for these meetings.

Although Mr. Barry stated that there are no formal leaders of these teams, various teachers pitch in and take leadership roles on the teams. Notes are taken at the team meetings which are turned in to the office. This allows the administrators to review the discussion and concerns of the teams and act on them where possible.

Teachers who were interviewed about this organizational structure seemed pleased with it and indicated that it met the needs of the students. Several did note, however, that the various subject area groups still met together regularly to coordinate the curriculum across the grade levels.

Communication Network at Carson Middle School. The Social Network Analysis for Carson indicates that the school is high in both principal centrality and faculty cohesiveness when compared to the mean scores for this sample of schools on these variables. The network for the school, shown in Figure 5.2, contained no isolates, or persons not linked to anyone. In addition, the network included only one component indicating that there was no break in the communication network of the school, such that all persons in the school would eventually be told any information.

Not only did the principal rank high in centrality based on the mean score for the sample of schools, he was also ranked number two in the network for his school. In addition, he was linked to both the person ranked 1st and the person ranked 3rd in the network. This finding indicates that he was fairly central to the communication network.
of the school. The standardized procedures for disseminating information that were observed in the school during the two day visit substantiated this finding.

The principal utilized a weekly newsletter, "From the Front", to maintain communication with the faculty and staff. This newsletter provided information to these persons as to activities for the week as well as space for feedback to the principal about needs and recommendations. In addition, weekly faculty meetings were held to brief teachers on important activities, and biweekly team meetings were held with the requirement that the team complete a report to the administration as to items discussed in the meeting. This allowed the administrators to review these reports, and address any concerns the staff might have.

In addition to these formal methods of communication, the principal was also highly visible on the campus, talking and visiting with faculty, staff, and students, and maintained an open door policy that was commented on by several of the teachers and the assistant principal. It is clear based upon the observations and interviews at the school, and the evidence found in the Social Network Analysis for this school, that communication was a strong point, both formally and informally, in this school.

Leadership at Carson Middle School. Mr. Barry was appointed as acting principal at Carson Middle School only four months prior to my visit there. He had previously served as assistant principal at the school for six and a half years, and had been asked to
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take over as principal for the remainder of the school year when his predecessor was promoted to the Director of Technology for the school district. Mr. Barry even commented during the interview that his position was temporary, and that he had just that morning received the announcement for the position for the following school year. When asked if he intended to apply, he responded that he did, but did not seem to feel certain that he would be selected. It should be noted that Mr. Barry was appointed to the permanent principalship at Carson Middle School during the summer following my visit.

In addition to Mr. Barry's short tenure as principal, the school also had a new assistant principal, Mrs. McCormick, who had previously served as the school's guidance counselor for five years, and as a math teacher at the school for two years prior to that. To fill the guidance counselor position that had been left vacant by this move, the former band director for three years, Mrs. Brunson, had returned from a sabbatical leave to assume the position. Although the school was in a transitional period with these administrative changes, it was evident that the appointment decisions made by the district's superintendent and school board had enabled the school to maintain considerable continuity.

The administrative transition in which the school found itself also appeared to be impacting the faculty's perception of leadership involvement in the school. Responses to the Faculty Involvement Survey revealed a Type IV leadership pattern in which the principal, assistant principal, and teachers were perceived as being the primary persons involved in a majority of the 36 leadership activities included on the survey. It is interesting to note that Carson Middle School was the only effective school in the study in
which this pattern was identified. It is possible that this pattern may have been a result of the transition of some of the auxiliary staff (e.g., guidance counselor, band director) to administrative positions leaving these key auxiliary positions vacant at the time the surveys were completed by the faculty.

A Type IV leadership pattern was identified for activities in all three areas of the questionnaire: governance, school climate, and instructional organization. These activities included:

- Interviews and recommends the hiring of instructional personnel for the school,
- Makes critical decisions about the instructional program of the school,
- Involves parents in the school program,
- Develops instructional goals for the school,
- Communicates to parents the importance of learning,
- Schedules assemblies that have an instructional purpose,
- Encourages discussion of instructional issues,
- Establishes a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code,
- Develops a clear discipline code,
- Recognizes and rewards academic accomplishments of students
- Works to keep faculty morale high,
- Communicates the instructional goals for the school,
- Helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units,
- Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the school's instructional goals,
• Evaluates and selects instructional materials,
• Ensures systematic monitoring of student progress,
• Coordinates the instructional program across subject areas, and
• Works to improve the instructional program of the school.

It should be noted that there were six activities that the principal and assistant principal were perceived by the faculty as being primarily responsible for. These activities were: assigning teachers to specific classes or teams, and protecting faculty from undue pressure, both in the governance area; clarifying the instructional responsibilities of each professional position, organizing staff development programs that are related to the school’s instructional goals, making regular classroom visits, and giving teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching, all in the instructional organization area.

The survey results indicating involvement of both teachers and administrators were confirmed in the case study phase of the study with most interview respondents recounting numerous opportunities to provide input into the daily functioning of the school. All of the faculty members interviewed commented on the weekly staff newsletter put out by Mr. Barry. They believed that it provided them with information about what was going on in the school on a weekly basis, as well as providing them an opportunity to make any suggestions or comments they would like.

Mr. Barry explained that he had started the newsletter at the beginning of the school year when he was still serving as the assistant principal, and had added a section for faculty and staff comments and suggestions when he took over as principal. During the interview, he removed from his desk a stack of these comment cards from the week's
newsletter. The comments ranged from ideas about instructional issues to custodial needs in individual classrooms or areas of the building. He commented that he did his best to respond to every one of them, and to make sure the faculty knew that he was working on their ideas.

In addition to the faculty input and weekly activities sections of the newsletter, there was also a weekly quote from some other source, usually dealing with positive discipline or school effectiveness. One such quote was "Teaching is not an end in itself, it is a means of inviting the realization of human potential." These quotes served as motivational reminders that it was going to take everyone working together to attain success for the students at Carson Middle School.

Additional evidence of faculty input included a faculty/staff retreat that had been held the summer before the school year that I visited. Although attendance was not required, I was told that most of the teachers attended, and all of the teachers I spoke with who had attended found it beneficial and helpful to getting the school year off to a good start. The retreat provided the faculty time to plan as subject area departments as well as to spend some time relaxing together and getting to know each other personally.

A seventh grade science teacher told me that the retreat gave the science teachers a chance to get together and decide what would be taught at each grade level. She was very pleased that although Biology was normally taught at the eighth grade level, the science teachers were given the authority by the administration to move this content area to seventh grade in order to better accommodate a district mandate that sex education be
taught in seventh grade. The science teachers believed that this would provide better
continuity of instruction and presented their case to the administrative team who agreed.

Another example of the teachers' ability to impact the organizational structure in
the school came from an eighth grade teacher who had been at the school since its
inception. She shared with me that Mr. Barry was her third principal at the school, and
that all three had been very open to faculty input. She further stated that the eighth grade
teaching team had begun to read and hear about teaming and block scheduling over the
last couple of years, and had decided together to approach the administration about trying
such a format. The administration agreed to the change, and the Krewe concept that was
in place during my visit was an outgrowth of their efforts. All of the eighth grade teachers
believed that this arrangement gave them an enhanced opportunity to plan appropriate
lessons, and to meet the needs of their students. There was some discussion among both
the teachers and the administrators about extending this concept down to the sixth and
seventh graders in the near future.

The eighth grade teachers had also had the opportunity this year to participate in
interviewing two new teachers who were joining their team. They were excited about
being able to share in this selection process, and in being able to ensure that the new team
member would fit well with what they had already established. Being involved in the
interview process allowed these teachers to determine in advance how the various
applicants would adjust to their established program, and to have input into which
applicant would best meet the needs of the team.
Although the survey results indicated that the principal and assistant principal were primarily responsible for assigning teachers to particular classes or teams, it was interesting to note that the teachers felt free to let their personal wishes be known in this process. One math teacher shared that she had been teaching reading for several years, and had begun to feel burned out. She had gone to the administration at the end of the previous school year and requested that she be able to change subject area for the next year. As a result, she was moved to teach math, and commented that although it was a lot of work to start all over with a new subject, she really felt like it had re-energized her teaching. She stated that although the principal had changed this year, she would still feel free to make such a request of the new administration.

Overall, Carson Middle School seemed to have maintained, even through this transitional period in its leadership, a structure and climate that promoted the involvement of most of its faculty members in areas impacting governance, school climate, and instructional organization. The school had begun to make the transition to a team approach, a transition that was being led by the teachers themselves, and for which they felt great ownership. The new administration had tried to maintain some continuity in the everyday functioning of the school, and also to open up the lines of communication with the faculty to an even greater extent. It appears that the lack of involvement of auxiliary teachers in leadership activities may have in some ways been a function of the leadership transition.
Sewell Middle School

Background. Sewell Middle School is located in the suburban area adjacent to a mid-size city in southwestern Louisiana. Less than 30 percent of the 770 students at Sewell receive free or reduced price lunches, and, according to the principal, Mr. Thomas, only about two percent of the students are African American.

At the time of my visit, the school was in the midst of a building project that would add six classrooms, and provide better science lab teaching stations. Mr. Thomas explained that the parish was divided into ten bonding districts rather than being a single bonding district. This format allowed the residents in each of the bonding districts the ability to vote on taxes that impacted the growth and upkeep of the school facilities in their immediate area.

While he noted that this made it easier to get taxes for schools in some areas of the parish, his being one of them, it also made it more difficult for schools in the main part of the city to raise such funds. He also discussed openly the fact that there was a move in the area to consolidate to a single bonding district in order to be better able to provide for all the schools in the system. While he believed that this might work out better for the district as a whole, he was also very concerned that the citizens in the area would be less likely to vote for taxes.

The physical plant of Sewell Middle School consisted of a sprawling two story building. The main classroom portion of the building was U-shaped with a courtyard including a pond and botanical garden in the center. Mr. Thomas explained that this area was used by the science classes for projects, and included several picnic tables for this
purpose. During my visit, the courtyard was not in use, and the gates to it were locked.

Extending out from this U-shaped portion of the building were the gymnasium, cafeteria, and music wings of the building.

Sewell was strikingly different from the other three schools visited right from the main entrance, which was filled with bulletin boards and wall hangings celebrating the accomplishments of the school and its students. Bulletin boards in the main hallway expressed thanks to the school's adopters, noted monthly activities, and displayed awards and honors earned by individual students and clubs.

Hanging from the ceiling just inside the entrance to the building were seven fabric banners, each displaying a different cartoon character ranging from the Tasmanian Devil to Tweety Bird. Although nothing was said about these during any of the interviews I conducted, observations around the school made it obvious that these were the mascots for the nine teams into which the faculty and students are divided. Throughout the building, sections of the hallways were painted in different colors and decorated with signs indicating each team's area, such as "Now entering Woodstock's Nest". In each of the team areas, large displays celebrated the accomplishments of the students on these teams including math fair winners, honor rolls, Mardi Gras Float winners, Honor Band and Chorus members, Student of the Year, and many others.

Other displays around the school included trophy cases with choir and band trophies, academic and sports trophies displayed on the tops of the shelves in the library, and motivational sayings and posters throughout the school. Motivational sayings included "Your Future Starts Now" and "School could give you a hang-up" which
included a picture of a high school diploma hanging on the wall. In addition, the following Martin Buher quote was found displayed in one of the eighth grade team areas.

Every person born into this world represents something new, something that never existed before, something original and unique. It is the duty of the person . . . to know . . . that there has never been anyone like him/her in the world, for if there had been someone like him/her, there would have been no need to be. Every single person is a new thing in the world.

Students at Sewell were well-behaved and polite during my visit. They appeared to be respectful of the adults in the school, and that respect seemed to be returned by the administration and faculty's treatment of the students. This was most obvious in observing the cafeteria routine. Frequently, lunchtime routines in schools are very regimented and disciplined as was the case in the three other case study schools.

However, at Sewell, the students were dropped off at the door of the cafeteria by the teachers from their previous class period. They were then free to enter the cafeteria, select which of two serving lines to go through based on their food choice that day, and then were allowed to sit wherever they chose.

While several teachers did remain in the cafeteria during the lunch period, most of them went to the teachers' lounge or their classrooms for lunch. The students were supervised during this time by the assistant principal and two teachers' aides. After finishing lunch, the students were free to go to an outside area just off the cafeteria, and visit with friends. They were also able to get soft drinks from a machine just outside the cafeteria.

During this time, the students visited with each other, the assistant principal, and the other adults in the area. They were very friendly and polite, and the entire lunch
period appeared to be very low-key and relaxed. In general, the climate of Sewell was warm and friendly with faculty, staff, and student members of the school community conversing freely.

Organizational Structure. Two years prior to my visit, during the summer after his first year as principal at Sewell, Mr. Thomas worked with the faculty to institute the team concept that was utilized in the school. He remarked during the interview that although he had read information about the team concept in middle school reform literature earlier, he had chosen to wait until after his first year as principal to institute it so that he would know the faculty better. He felt that this had enabled him to divide the faculty into teams that would function easily, and in the best interest of the students.

The faculty and students were divided into seven teams, with 2 teams at each grade level, and one special education team. The teachers on each team instructed a common group of students who were assigned to their team for the year. Each teacher on the team taught a different core subject area, but the teachers planned together to correlate instruction in the various subjects.

In order to provide common planning for the teachers on each team, the students on the teams were all scheduled for their elective course at the same time. The teachers were required to meet weekly for team planning time, but it was obvious during my visit that these teachers worked together very closely. Teams of teachers were observed during every class period in the teachers' lounge, guidance office, or classrooms, planning units and discussing individual students and their needs.
Mr. Sonnier, the assistant principal, remarked that some teams worked together better or had better attitudes toward their students than others did. He noted that he and Mr. Thomas were trying to decide whether some of the faculty teams should be reworked for the next school year to alleviate some of these problems. There was a great deal of concern on the part of the administrators about breaking up a good team to help a team that was struggling, thus ending up with two mediocre teams. While both felt that this might be better for the largest number of students in the long run, they were also concerned about the adverse effect it might have on the teachers on each team. Mr. Sonnier noted that they were holding off on making any decisions about this until they saw what changes would occur on the teams as the result of attrition at the end of the year.

The team concept at Sewell had been taken farther than any other school visited during this study, and included fundraising and staff development opportunities. One teacher shared with me that her team was sponsoring a dance for their students that would raise money for the teachers on the team to purchase instructional materials, and to participate in inservice opportunities. She stated that the teachers basically were in control of everything for their team, and that team spirit was a high priority in the school. Rather than having a school t-shirt and spirit days, the faculty at Sewell encouraged spirit through team t-shirts that were worn every Friday.

Communication Network at Sewell. The Social Network Analysis for Sewell indicated that compared to the mean scores for principal centrality and faculty cohesiveness for the other schools in the sample, this school ranked low in both areas. The network for the school, shown in Figure 5.3, includes eight isolates who were not
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named by anyone else in the school as someone they had talked to about instructional
matters in the previous week. In addition, there were five network components, indicating
five breaks in the network of the school. This finding indicates that the faculty of the
school was divided into groups for communication purposes rather than having one
complete network through which all information could travel to all persons in the school.

It should also be noted that although the school was low in terms of principal
centrality when compared to the mean score for the group of schools on this variable, the
principal was ranked first in the network. Based upon the sociogram in Figure 5.2, he
appears to be connected to some of the members of the group who are well-connected in
the network. This finding is interesting based upon the theory of decentralized leadership
espoused at Sewell.

The principal had elected to form teams of teachers and students, and for the
primary instructional work of the school to be done within these teams. Therefore, it
follows that the teachers would be highly connected to the other members of their team,
rather than to the entire faculty network. The principal, on the other hand, might instead
be linked only to prominent people in the network, who provided the connection between
he and the rest of the faculty. Although this fails to confirm with the traditional
conception of the principal as a central figure in the school, it would be in keeping with the
current thought of middle school reform. Decentralized team leadership may take us
"beyond" highly cohesive staffs with a strong central leader.

Leadership at Sewell. Mr. Thomas, the principal, and Mr. Sonnier, the assistant
principal, were both in their third years in their respective positions at Sewell. Mr.
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Thomas had previously served as the assistant principal at the area high school, and Mr. Sonnier had been a teacher at the same school. Mr. Sonnier shared with me that everyone in the school district had expected Mr. Thomas to become the next principal at this high school, but that when the principal there retired, someone else was appointed from outside the school, and Mr. Thomas had been asked to take the principalship at Sewell.

While one might expect that Mr. Thomas would feel somewhat let down by this turn of events, it appeared during my visit that just the opposite was the case. Mr. Thomas seemed to take his duties at the school very seriously, and took great pride in the changes he had been able to make there with the assistance of the faculty.

Based upon the results of the Faculty Involvement Survey, the faculty perceived that leadership in the school was shared by all parties on a majority of the items on the questionnaire. This perception of shared leadership was especially prominent in the area of governance, where it was identified as the primary pattern in four of the six items, including:

- develops the school's master schedule,
- makes critical decisions about the instructional program of the school,
- involves parents in the school program, and
- protects faculty from undue pressure.

In the area of school climate, shared leadership was the primary pattern for only three items. These items were:

- develops instructional goals for the school,
- encourages discussion of instructional issues, and
works to keep faculty morale high.

In the area of instructional organization, shared leadership was the primary pattern for the following activities:

- communicates the instructional goals for the school,
- helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units,
- clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional position,
- organizes staff development programs that are related to the school's instructional goals,
- provides expertise on instructional matters,
- coordinates the instructional program across grade levels
- gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching, and
- provides expertise on curriculum issues.

Observations and interviews at Sewell confirmed the faculty's belief in a shared leadership system within the school. Teachers were observed during every period planning and conferencing with one another, especially with the other members of their teaching team. In addition, teachers shared with me that they have complete control of any curricular issues, and plan interdisciplinary units within their teams.

While class schedules are done by the administration, teachers at Sewell stated that they still have the freedom to change these as it meets their teams' needs. The only restriction to this was that any changes made cannot alter the students' elective period times, since these are taught by faculty members outside their team who must also teach students on other teams. This flexibility in scheduling allows the teams to rearrange,
lengthen, or shorten various periods in order to meet the special needs of their team. These changes in scheduling usually result due to special units that they are teaching. It should be noted that all of these revisions to the schedule are planned in advance, and that the teachers cannot ask for an extra five or ten minutes to finish an activity on the spur of the moment.

All of the teachers interviewed indicated that the administrators maintain an open door policy with both teachers and students in the school. Observations in the school made it clear that this was definitely the case. While teachers and students were seen frequently in the office area talking with one of the administrators, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Sonnier were just as often seen outside the office in other areas of the school engaged in conversation with teachers, students, and parents.

While the administration used the informal techniques discussed to gain faculty input, Mr. Thomas indicated that a formal plan for faculty involvement in leadership had been developed and would be implemented the following school year. This plan called for the establishment of a School Improvement Council with a membership including representation from various stakeholders in the school. The team membership was to include 10 teachers, one from each team and three from auxiliary or elective areas, who would serve as voting members. In addition, the principal, administrative, staff, and parent representatives were to serve as non-voting members of the council.

The responsibilities of the council included providing a needs assessment, establishing annual priorities, and developing a plan for Sewell Middle School that would include:
• student academic achievement,
• faculty professional growth,
• implementation of successful teaching, learning, and assessment practices in the classroom,
• involvement of Sewell Middle School in the community,
• enhancement of academic support provided to Sewell Middle,
• improvement of the climate of learning at Sewell Middle, and
• enhancement of the instructional facilities and equipment.

In addition, the council was to be responsible for involving the entire faculty in the decision-making process through the use of sub-committees that would conduct research, collect data, address concerns and provided recommendations for improvement to the council.

Mr. Thomas remarked that he had waited three years to implement such a plan because he felt the faculty needed time to assimilate some of the other changes he had made before they would be ready for a formal plan for shared leadership. He also noted that he had waited until after his first full year as principal before suggesting the transition to a team structure. After his second full year as principal, Mr. Thomas had worked with the PTO and faculty to establish a very active parent volunteer group in the school. It appeared to be his philosophy that change would take time, and that it was best to give the faculty time to adjust to each new idea before introducing something else into the school. His philosophy seemed to have paid off as the teachers and students appeared to truly live the ideals of middle school reform.
Poplar Grove Middle School

Background Information. Poplar Grove Middle School is located in the same school district in southwestern Louisiana as Sewell Middle School. However, Poplar Grove is located in the main metropolitan area of the parish, while Sewell lies in the suburban area bordering the city. As a result, the demographics of the student population at Poplar Grove are substantially different from that of Sewell.

The street on which Poplar Grove is located is filled with two story homes, and appears to be an upper middle class neighborhood. The area around the school is clean and attractive, and large oak trees line the boulevard in front of the school. The appearance of the neighborhood is misleading, however, when it comes to the student population served by Poplar Grove Middle.

The school serves a low SES population with 53% of its students receiving free lunch. The principal estimated that 80% of the students are African American. The school is one of only three middle schools in the district receiving Title I funding.

The buildings that house Poplar Grove Middle School include a two story building which includes the office, cafeteria, library, gymnasium, and eighth grade classrooms downstairs, and the seventh grade classrooms upstairs. Behind the main two story building is a one story building that houses the sixth grade classrooms, and a band building that includes choir and band practice rooms as well as the teachers' lounge.

The downstairs area in the main building, as well as the sixth grade wing, were bright and cheerful. A large amount of student artwork and other projects were displayed in the eighth grade hall, while teacher-made inspirational signs hung in the sixth grade hall.
These displays included sayings such as, "Poplar Grove Middle School - Stretch to your Limit!" and "What I do today is very important because I am treading a day in my life".

In contrast, the upstairs hallway that houses the seventh grade classrooms had no student work displays, and the only displays found anywhere in the hallway were located at the entrance to the classroom of a veteran teacher of 24 years. The quotes outside her door included "I'm impossible to please (but keep trying)", and "You have the right to Remain Silent. Please Consider It." In addition, the following quote from Erma Bombeck that hung on her door stood in stark contrast to the Martin Buher quote displayed in one of the eighth grade team areas at Sewell.

Learning is hard work. Some days you could die from the boredom and sleep from the repetition, but it's necessary. Teachers are not there to entertain you. School isn't television. It's one of the most elite factories in the world, one that tests your skills and challenges your talents. It touches all of your senses, leaving you with an idea of how much you don't know and how much you have to learn. In the process, you carve out for yourself a place on this planet.

Both the principal and assistant principal were observed in the hallways frequently both during class changes and during class periods. They both remarked during their interviews on the importance of this monitoring. The students were well-behaved, and moved easily from class to class. However, there was no bell indicating the end of the class change period, making it difficult to insure that these times were minimized, and instructional time was maximized.

A lunch detention was used to deter inappropriate behavior, but it was held in the cafeteria, and was supervised by the teacher on duty in the cafeteria for lunch. Since only one teacher was on duty each day in the cafeteria, several teachers and the assistant
principal remarked that it was difficult for the duty teacher to properly supervise both those students eating lunch and those in detention.

In addition to the lunch detention, the assistant principal informed me that several teachers conducted their own after school detentions, but that they were on their own in operating these programs. This may have contributed to the comments by a number of teachers indicating that the administration was getting lax in the area of discipline, and that they were having to handle more and more of it themselves.

Those students who were not in detention during recess were allowed to go outside in front of the main building to a shady area with a few benches. There were not nearly enough benches to accommodate the large number of students outside at this time, and many students sat on the covered walkway running the length of the school.

While the assistant principal was open and friendly, the principal appeared to be a bit more guarded in his remarks. The teachers were generally willing to talk with me, but some were rather reserved in their comments. The school appeared to be one in which resistance to change may have been creating friction and division among the faculty.

**Organizational Structure.** The faculty at Poplar Grove Middle School utilizes a team approach in the instructional organization of their program. At the sixth grade level, the team approach is more evident with two distinct teams of both teachers and students. At the seventh and eighth grade levels, the teachers are teamed within the grade level, but may teach a mix of students.

The school continues to maintain a nine period day which allows each teacher two planning periods each day. During one of these planning periods, all of the teachers in a
particular team are off at the same time, and are supposed to use this time as their team planning time. However, during my visit, I was told that they did not have team meetings on some days of the week to allow the teachers extra individual planning time. I was also told that team meetings were held in the conference room, which was locked. When the assistant principal opened it for me to use with one of the teachers, it looked like it was a storage area.

In visiting in the classrooms as I conducted my interviews, there appeared to be little sign of any coordination of instruction. In addition, some teachers commented that the nine period day made it difficult to conduct indepth or discovery oriented lessons. Poplar Grove Middle was the only school visited during this study that utilized a nine period day, but the assistant principal noted that this schedule allowed students to take two enrichment courses which encouraged planning across subject areas.

Each team had a leader appointed by the administration, but notes or minutes of their meetings were not kept for the administration to review periodically. Although the administration had initiated these cooperative planning teams, both the principal and assistant principal seemed to take a hands-off approach to their implementation. Neither were aware that team meetings were not held every day, and they were not involved in meetings, nor did they provide any feedback to the teachers regarding their planning efforts.

Communication Network At Poplar Grove Middle School. The Social Network Analysis for Poplar Grove indicated that in comparison to the mean score for the four schools on principal centrality, this school ranked low. In contrast, Poplar Grove ranked
high on faculty cohesiveness when compared to the mean score for the sample of schools on this variable. This indicates that although the principal was not highly central to the network, the faculty itself created a cohesive network amongst themselves.

The network for the school, shown in Figure 5.4, indicates 11 isolates, or persons who were unnamed in the responses. In addition, this diagram includes only one component indicating that the network that does exist is complete without any breaks. Thus, anyone included in the network should be able to find out information through it fairly readily.

In addition, the principal is one of the 11 isolates on the faculty indicating that he was not named by any of the respondents to the survey as someone with whom they had discussed instructional issues in the previous week. This is indicative of the observation during the case study visit that he appeared to be involved with only certain members of the faculty with whom he worked on special projects such as the Effective Schools Program. In addition, this finding is consistent with several of the faculty members having limited awareness of certain activities or programs in the school. The principal at Poplar Grove appears to have withdrawn from a large number of his faculty members, choosing instead to work with only a small group.

Leadership at Poplar Grove Middle School. Mr. Ward, the principal at Poplar Grove, was in his third year as principal there at the time of my visit. He was a quiet, reserved man who had previously been a middle school teacher. During his interview, he shared with me that he preferred to hire elementary certified teachers because they had a better understanding of middle school students. This is interesting to note since the
Indegree Centrality
Top Three Ranks

School: SSQ1
Type: LH
Principal: 40
Rank 1: 27, 39
Rank 2: 1
Rank 3: 11, 12, 28, 32, 36, 38

Figure 5.4
Sociogram for Poplar Grove Middle School
assistant principal, Mr. Mason, was a former high school physics and chemistry teacher who had also been at the school for three years.

The results of the Faculty Involvement Survey indicated that the faculty's perception of leadership in the school was somewhat uncertain especially in the area of instructional organization. In this area, the faculty failed to indicate a predominant pattern for 12 of the 20 activities. This confusion was substantiated based upon the differing perceptions of the principal and assistant principal in this area. While the principal was in tune with the ideas of the middle school reform movement, and had worked to establish the team concept and planning time, the assistant principal clung to the high school format of a 9 period day.

In the area of school climate, the faculty perceived a Type III sharing of leadership on 5 of the 10 activities including:

- develops instructional goals for the school,
- communicates to parents the importance of learning,
- communicates high expectations for all students,
- encourages discussion of instructional issues,
- establishes a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code, and
- recognizes and rewards academic accomplishments of students.

They indicated no particular pattern for only four of the items in this area.

In the area of governance, the principal and assistant principal (Type II) were viewed as the most prominent leadership forces with 3 of the 6 items being done primarily by them.
• Develops the school's master schedule,
• Assigns teachers to specific classes or teams, and
• Protects faculty from undue pressure.

In addition, the principal was identified as the primary leader (Type I) in interviewing and recommending the hiring of instructional personnel for the school.

Information gathered during the case study visit supported the faculty's mixed perception of leadership in the school. This support was evident from the start of my visit with the principal and assistant principal interviews, and was confirmed with each teacher interview.

The principal was very proud of the school's first year of participation in a Quality Schools Project sponsored by the Louisiana Department of Education. The project required the development of a school improvement plan with faculty input. He was very pleased that this would be the first year that the faculty would get to rate how things were going. He stated that a group of teachers served on the Quality Schools Committee, and that they get input from other teachers, parents, and students. These teachers are provided release time by the school district to attend meetings, and all of their expenses are paid for these meetings.

Mr. Ward also stated that he felt that some teachers liked this opportunity for input, but that others weren't responding at all. In Mr. Ward's opinion, these teachers were not interested in participating in discussions regarding the leadership of the school. He stated that they were not willing to serve on committees or to participate in additional activities that might require extral time and planning.
When the assistant principal was interviewed, Mr. Mason indicated that he had no direct knowledge of any school improvement or restructuring program involving the faculty in which the school was participating. He stated that while he knew some of the faculty was participating in such a program and that he gave input sometimes, he was not directly involved in this program and really had no information about it. In discussing faculty involvement in leadership, Mr. Mason primarily discussed teacher involvement in awards day programs and fundraisers. He also stated that faculty meetings were held every Tuesday to allow the administration to disseminate information to the faculty, a very top-down strategy.

Through the teacher interviews, the inconsistencies evident in the administrator interviews became even more evident. Only three teachers mentioned the Quality Schools Project, and only two of these teachers appeared to have any involvement in the process. One mentioned that the project required the faculty to learn to do things by consensus not by majority, while the other discussed the meetings the group participated in monthly and the training provided by the Louisiana Department of Education. One of these teachers also explained that the committee for this project was supposed to include parents and students, but that it got to be "too much" for them. This teacher indicated that the parents were not really interested in taking on these types of responsibilities or in participating in making these decisions.

The third teacher mentioned that the teachers had been asked to fill out a questionnaire for the project, and that they been asked for some input. A fourth teacher mentioned that a group of teachers were involved with some project with the state
department, and went to the LDE offices for training. She appeared to have little additional knowledge about the program.

All of the teachers I talked with, both in formal interviews and informally, mentioned their involvement in the SACS accreditation the school had gone through the previous year. Additional discussions of involvement in planning related primarily to activities such as fundraisers, team planning, and extracurricular activities.

Two teachers also indicated that the administration relied on certain teachers for input while excluding others. One of these teachers went so far as to say that teachers who expressed opinions that differed from the administration were discouraged from participating. She believed that this had become "an ego thing" for the administrators, and that if teachers made suggestions, they were seen as not supporting the administration. She felt that any attempts to involve the teachers in decision making or leadership were not done with consistency.

The other teachers indicated that they had good relationships with the administrators, and that the principal maintained an open door policy that allowed them to express their opinion. These teachers and the assistant principal also mentioned that the Mr. Ward had instituted a suggestion box to allow parents, teachers, and students to make suggestions. They indicated that they had seen evidence in the past three years of some of these suggestions being put into practice. This apparently included the common planning time which had been implemented, but for which little follow-through was evident.

Most of the teachers also spoke highly of the common planning time, although there was little evidence of it during my visit. They indicated that it allowed them to
support each other on disciplinary issues, and to coordinate planning efforts. One teacher also noted that it allowed for more decisions to be made at grade level, although they still had to be approved by the administration. In general, the teachers and administrators at Poplar Grove Middle indicated that teachers had a fair amount of input into general decisions regarding day-to-day routines. However, faculty input on school policy was limited, and few leadership roles existed for teachers.

The results of the Faculty Involvement Survey and the case study data indicate that there were probably divisions among the faculty and administration at Poplar Grove Middle. These divisions may have created difficulties for the administration in creating a climate for properly implementing some of the restructuring activities he was attempting, such as the Quality Schools Project and the team concept.

It should be noted that those teachers with negative perceptions were all from the seventh grade team. Several of the teachers on this team indicated that they felt left out and uninvolved, and there was little evidence on their hallway of involvement or interest in the total school program.

Analyses Involving Multiple Schools

Cross-District Analyses

As noted earlier, Sewell and Poplar Grove were located in the same district. However, their stories were very different, partially due to the division of the district into two rather distinct areas. The first area, in which Poplar Grove is located, is the major city for the district. As in most areas, the downtown section of this city has become urbanized and has gradually become a majority black area. The second section of the school district
is located across a river in what was once a rural area. Over the years, this area has experienced tremendous growth resulting from the expansion of industry in the area, and the flight of whites out of the urban center. This division has created two schools with very different student populations, with Poplar Grove serving a predominantly black, low-income population, and Sewell serving a more affluent, majority white student body.

In addition, the separate taxing authorities within the district, as described by the principal at Sewell, have created further discrepancies between the two schools by creating an inequitable allocation of resources for the schools. While Poplar Grove struggled to maintain what little they had, Sewell enjoyed the luxury of building additions and renovations that would substantially improve their facilities and capacity for instructional effectiveness.

While on the surface, these factors might not appear to play a major role in the leadership within these schools, when we delve deeper, it is obvious that this is not true. Due to the location and student population at Poplar Grove, it is more difficult for the principal in this school to recruit and retain qualified faculty members. Therefore, the principal in this school appeared to have little choice about the teachers he hired, making it very difficult to make any radical changes within the culture of the school itself.

Sewell, on the other hand, was probably seen by those within the district as a very desirable place to work, making it much easier for the principal there to hire qualified staff. The principal probably had the ability to choose between a number of qualified persons to select individuals who would fit the vision and mission of the school. This is not a luxury
many principals in urban areas have, because they must frequently take whomever can be found to fill the classrooms (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, & Olsen, 1991).

The differences between these schools are detailed further in the cross-site analyses, and while some of these differences were due to variations in school context, some of them were due to failure of the principal at Poplar Grove to take a more active role as a change agent within his school. He appeared to have surrounded himself with a very small group of dedicated faculty members who were willing to be involved in the projects he was implementing. As for the other staff members, he had basically disregarded them, apparently awaiting either their departure through natural attrition, or their conversion to his point of view. Neither of these will occur without some pressure from the top, which was not happening at the time of the site visit.

Cross-Site Analyses

Based on the data collected during the site visits for the case studies, the four schools were compared on the following dimensions of contrast: communication, shared leadership, inter-staff relations, parental involvement, and collegiality. These themes were selected for the cross-site analyses based upon the degree of differentiation of the schools on each of them. Data collected during Phases II and III of the study provided the information on which the ratings for each of these dimensions was based. Table 5.3 shows each school’s rating on these dimensions.

In the area of communication, the presence or absence of methods of formal communication were first considered. In addition, each school was rated based upon the informal communication that existed at the school, and the results of the Social Network
Analyses. For this dimension, Carson was rated high due to the clear efforts the principal made at communicating on a regular basis with his faculty. These included a weekly newsletter, regular faculty meetings, and a communication system with the academic teams. In addition, the sociogram data indicated that the faculty of this school was highly cohesive, and the principal had high centrality in comparison to the other schools.

Sewell and Allen were both rated medium in this area with informal communication networks that appeared to meet many of the needs of the school. However, both schools failed to have clear, concise plans for the dissemination of information other than the district mandated staff development days. The sociometric data for Sewell indicated that the school's network was both low in principal centrality and faculty cohesiveness. The network data for Allen indicated that the school's network exhibited high principal centrality and low faculty cohesiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Contrast</th>
<th>Allen</th>
<th>Carson</th>
<th>Sewell</th>
<th>Poplar Grove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Leadership</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-staff Relations</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Level of emphasis: ○ = low, • = medium, • = high
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Poplar Grove had no evidence of regular formal communication, which was evident in the lack of knowledge of several faculty members about key projects mentioned by the principal. The assistant principal and principal's lack of awareness that the teachers did not hold team meetings daily was also problematic. In addition, the analysis of the sociogram leads me to believe that the principal failed to play an integral part in communication in the school. Although delegation of authority is important, it is also integral that the principal maintain an awareness of how this authority is being used.

Ratings on shared leadership were derived through comparisons between the results of the Faculty Involvement Survey and observations made during the site visit. Based upon these sources, Sewell was rated high in this area, since the faculty perception of shared leadership was supported by data collected during the site visit. The faculty of this school was actively involved in making daily decisions that impacted the lives of children, and the policies of their school. These included decisions regarding the use of block scheduling as needed for their team's activities, or the use of money raised through team fundraisers to provide for materials and inservice opportunities for the group's teachers.

Allen and Carson received ratings indicating that they were rated medium in this area. Carson received this rating because the recent administrative changes in the school appear to have negatively impacted the involvement of the faculty on decision making. Allen received this rating due to the faculty perception that only the principal and assistant principal were involved in leadership activities at the school. This perception was substantiated during the site visit. While these two schools do exhibit shared leadership, it
does not extend throughout all levels of the faculty, and thus cannot be considered a strong dimension for these schools.

In the case of Poplar Grove, a low rating was given on this dimension since no clear leadership pattern could be identified through the analyses of the Faculty Involvement Survey. Additionally, the lack of direction in the school was apparent during the site visits, and a clear division in the faculty was also apparent. The principal's focus on the Effective Schools Program sponsored by the LDE coupled with the faculty's lack of information about it was a clear indication of the lack of direction provided by the administration of the school. In addition, the attitudes of some teachers in the school that the administrators only wanted to hear from certain individuals and that it was best for others to remain silent further indicated underlying problems in the school.

Carson and Sewell were both high in the area of inter-staff relations. Both faculties exhibited an unusually high degree of interaction. Based upon the Social Network Analyses, the faculty at Carson also exhibited a high degree of cohesiveness within the communication network. While the analyses at Sewell indicated a low level of faculty cohesiveness, the faculty was highly interactive during planning periods with other members of their team. It is possible that the overall low faculty cohesiveness may be due to the division of the faculty into teams, which resulted in less communication with faculty members outside their designated unit.

Allen and Poplar Grove both received ratings in this area of medium. While Poplar Grove's sociometric analyses indicated high faculty cohesiveness, this was not apparent in the site visits. The faculty members in this school were rarely seen interacting, and openly
complained about one another. While it was apparent based upon the scheduling of daily team planning times that there was some emphasis on inter-staff relations, relations outside these teams and with other members of the faculty generally were not very positive. In addition, few observations were made of faculty members discussing any instructional issues.

In the case of Allen, the school's sociometric analyses indicated a low mean score for faculty cohesiveness. However, the faculty did interact positively with each other during the site visit, and were helpful and interested in each other. Therefore, the school was given a rating of medium, since the observed interactions indicated that the staff did have some positive interpersonal communication.

In the area of parental involvement, Sewell was high due to a concerted effort on the part of the principal and his faculty to welcome parents into the school and make them an integral part of the community. This initiative was fairly new to the school, having been implemented for only one year, and yet it appeared to be highly successful based on the amount of activity involving parents in the school on a daily basis. In fact, it was sometimes difficult to tell parents and teachers apart in many cases.

Carson was rated medium in this area. While there was evidence that the principal and the faculty attempted to involve parents through booster clubs and parent workshops, there was little evidence of parental involvement in the daily functioning of the school. Parents were not observed in the school at all during the site visit, and it did not appear that they were highly involved in a regular volunteer program.
The administrations at both Allen and Poplar Grove indicated that their attempts to involve parents had been unsuccessful, leading to a rating of low on this dimension. These schools failed to exhibit initiative in this area, instead indicating that methods to involve parents had been tried, but had failed, and apparently would not be tried again for at least this school year.

On the dimension of collegiality, both Carson and Sewell were high in contrast to the other schools. The faculty at Sewell was probably the highest of all of the schools on this dimension due to the constant interaction of the faculty. The team members at this school spent almost all of their shared planning time together, discussing student needs and planning for future team activities and units. The faculty at Carson, while not as involved as those at Sewell, were still committed to the students within their team, and to providing the best possible education for them. Discussions in the faculty lounge primarily centered around instructional matters, while personal matters were less noticeable.

In contrast, the faculty at Poplar Grove were rarely seen discussing instructional matters during the site visit, and more frequently complained about the students, the school, and the administration when they would talk to me. As a result, Poplar Grove was rated low on this dimension. Allen fell in the middle of these two ends with a rating of medium. The faculty in this school were observed discussing student needs, inservice opportunities, and grants they were writing. While they were not pleased with having to write these grants, they had formed an after school group to support one another in doing so. This spoke highly for the school on this dimension.
Social Network Analysis

In addition to the comparisons that can be made between the schools on the dimensions of contrast, the schools can also be compared based upon their categorizations within the Centrality-Cohesiveness Model (Durland, 1996). This model ranks the schools as either high or low on each of these dimensions based upon their placement around the mean score for the sample of schools. The placement of the schools on the Centrality-Cohesiveness Model is shown in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4
School Classifications within Centrality-Cohesiveness Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRALITY</th>
<th>COHESIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poplar Grove Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewell Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 According to Durland (1996), the categorizations for the Centrality-Cohesiveness Model are:
HH - High Principal Centrality and High Faculty Cohesiveness
HL - High Principal Centrality and Low Faculty Cohesiveness
LH - Low Principal Centrality and High Faculty Cohesiveness
LL - Low Principal Centrality and Low Faculty Cohesiveness
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Principal centrality was calculated using Freeman's normalized indegree measure (Freeman, 1979) which calculates the number of times the individual, in this case the principal, was chosen by others. The measure is an attempt to answer the question of whether or not the principal is directly and actively connected to each of the members of their faculties.

The mean score for the four schools on this measure was 15.28. Both Carson and Allen were above the mean on this measure with mean scores of 26.42 and 16.67 respectively, indicating high principal centrality as compared to the group. Low principal centrality was noted for Poplar Grove and Sewell with mean scores of 9.33 and 8.69 respectively, both below the mean for the sample.

For the measure of cohesiveness, a density score was calculated for each school. The measure indicates to what extent the entire network is connected to each other. Therefore, it is a measure of the connectedness of the group within which the principal is positioned. Density is measured as the proportion of possible connections ($l$) that are actually present. It was calculated using the formula:

$$\text{density} = \frac{l}{n(n-1)/2}$$

The mean score for the four schools on faculty cohesiveness was .21. Based upon this mean score, Carson and Poplar Grove ranked above the mean on this measure with mean scores of .26 and .30 respectively. Allen and Sewell were below this mean score with means of .17 and .09 respectively, indicating low faculty cohesiveness based on the model.
These measures indicate that the schools differ in communication network measures. These differences are in keeping with the findings of the case study and Faculty Involvement Survey data. This data indicates that each school had a distinctive communication system ranging from highly formal and centralized at Carson to highly informal and more decentralized at Sewell.

Summary

This chapter has provided in-depth case studies of four effective middle schools in the state of Louisiana. The schools in which these case studies were conducted were differentiated on the basis of leadership pattern as well as SES, community type, and organizational structure. The case studies provide details of how the members of these organizations function as shared leaders, and what their perceptions are as to their involvement in leadership in the school.

The four schools included in this chapter represent the three primary patterns of leadership identified in effective schools through the analyses conducted in Phase II. They include a Type II (principal/assistant principal) pattern school, a Type III (overall faculty involvement) pattern school, and a Type IV (principal/assistant principal/teacher) pattern school, all of which were mid-SES schools. Also included was a Type V school in which no primary pattern was identified which represented the low-SES group of schools, and provided the opportunity for intra-district comparisons with the mid-SES Type III school.

In addition, the chapter discusses the communication networks that exist within these schools. Both formal and informal methods of communication are discussed to provide the reader with an understanding of how these activities either enhance or detract
from shared leadership with the schools. The communication methods within these schools varied greatly, and ranged from highly formal and centralized to highly informal and decentralized. However, it should be noted that each of these methods provided both benefits and disadvantages to the sharing of leadership within the school.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview of the Study

This study was designed to examine the presence or absence of shared leadership in effective middle schools in Louisiana. These schools' primary pattern of leadership was determined based upon faculty perceptions of their involvement in instructional leadership activities. The basic premise of the study was that due to the organizational structure and staff size in middle schools, the ability of principals in these schools to function as the solitary instructional leader may be constrained.

Research indicates that principals in effective schools at the secondary level spend less time on instructional matters than do principals in effective elementary schools (Heck, 1992; Martin & Willower, 1981; Virgilio, Teddlie, & Oescher, 1991). Several organizational factors may influence this behavior. First of all, departmentalization and staff size are believed to make it more difficult for secondary principals to serve as the instructional expert with a large group of staff members trained in a wide variety of specific subject areas (e.g., Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Virgilio, et al., 1991). In addition, earlier research in the area of middle schools specifically indicated that leadership in these schools is a shared responsibility in which principals, assistant principals, department heads, team leaders, and teachers have all become players (Miller, 1988; Sithole, 1995; Spirito, 1991). This research further indicated that the role of instructional leader is frequently left to grade level teams while the principal maintains a more managerial role.

The results of this study indicate that sharing of leadership does exist in many effective middle schools in some form. While it may not have reached the level of the
teacher in all schools or in all areas, there does clearly appear to be sharing of this role within the administrative levels of most schools in the study. In addition, even in those effective schools where teachers were involved in leadership activities, certain tasks which are more managerial in nature have remained within the domain of the principal. In some cases, these tasks are not even shared with the assistant principal. As the data shows, few schools in the study practice shared leadership to the extent that has been recommended in the literature. However, there do appear to be pockets of shared leadership within schools that are influenced by contextual factors of the school.

This chapter begins with a brief response to each of the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Following this, the discussion continues with conclusions that can be drawn from the study and implications for future research.

Research Questions

The four research questions are responded to in the order that they were presented in Chapter 1. This order follows the logical sequence of the study's methodology.

Question I

What patterns of instructional leadership can be identified in effective middle schools based on perceptions of the faculties?

A. Which members of the faculties are included as sources of instructional leadership?

B. Does the sharing of instructional leadership extend beyond the administrative levels of the school to include teachers and other members of the faculty?
Four primary patterns of instructional leadership were identified through the Faculty Involvement Study utilized for the data collection in Phases I and II of this study. These patterns were:

- principal involvement only (Type I),
- principal/assistant principal involvement (Type II),
- overall faculty involvement (Type III), and
- principal/assistant principal/teacher involvement (Type IV).

These patterns indicate that, in some instances, teachers are involved in leadership activities at the school level. In most schools, these activities lie primarily in the areas of school climate and instructional organization, while tasks in the area of governance are still primarily handled at the administrative level. Leadership activities in which teachers are primarily involved include items on the survey such as developing instructional goals for the school, communicating high expectations for all students, encouraging discussion of instructional issues, communicating to parents the importance of learning, and establishing a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code. Administrators tended to retain control of tasks such as interviewing and hiring instructional personnel, clarifying the instructional responsibilities of professional staff members, and allocating materials needed to accomplish instructional goals.

The leadership patterns identified through this study indicate that instructional leadership in effective middle schools can be either a shared or solitary activity depending on the particular activity and the context of the school. The case studies provide examples
of three schools in which although one leadership pattern may have been more prominent in the analyses, others were at work within the school also.

In the case of Sewell, although the faculty's perceptions indicated that the largest number of items on the survey involved all members of the faculty, there were several items for which other patterns were operating. These included communicating to parents the importance of learning, encouraging the use of innovative teaching methods, and making regular classroom visits, all of which were considered the domain of the principal. In addition, activities such as interviewing and hiring, developing a clear discipline code, and assigning teachers to specific classes or teams were seen as the role of the principal and assistant principal together.

In contrast, Allen provides a case in which most of the leadership is perceived as emanating from the administrative levels of the school. However, the faculty perceived overall faculty involvement on five items including activities such as involving parents in the school program, developing instructional goals for the school, and communicating high expectations for all student. In addition, they perceived that the administrators and classroom teachers alone were responsible for certain activities including evaluating and selecting instructional materials, providing expertise on instructional matters and curriculum issues, and ensuring systematic monitoring of student progress. These results clearly indicate that faculty perceptions as to the role of various persons in the area of instructional leadership is clearly dependent on the activity to be accomplished.

Additionally, the analyses of the frequency of the primary leadership patterns crossed by SES of the student body indicated a statistically significant difference between
mid- and low-SES schools. This finding indicates that mid-SES schools do not fit the mold of "principal as primary instructional leader" that has long been espoused in school effectiveness research. As a result of this finding and others that indicate similar differences in elementary schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993), leadership in effective mid-SES schools should be reconsidered and reconceptualized.

Question II

What communication patterns exist in effective middle schools?

A. What positions within the social networks are held by those members who have been identified as instructional leaders in the school?

B. What types of networks are prevalent in effective middle schools in which a variety of leadership sources are identified? Hierarchical structures? Dense, flat webs?

Based upon the Social Network Analysis done in Phase III of the study, it appears clear that a school's communication network is highly dependent upon the organizational structure and formal communication procedures. Through these analyses, it was determined that each of the case study schools presented a differing network of communication based on the Centrality-Cohesiveness Model adopted by Durland (1996). These networks ranged from the more centralized, highly cohesive network at Carson to the decentralized, less cohesive network at Sewell.

Based upon the findings at Sewell, it appears that the communication network of a school may become less cohesive and less centralized as the school becomes more
decentralized. These results are clearly contradictory to the findings of Durland (1996) which indicated that principals in effective elementary schools had higher "centrality" scores, and that higher network density was also characteristic of these schools. This indicates that consideration must be given to the grade level configuration and organization structure of schools in the use of Social Network Analysis. While Durland's model (1996) assumed the prevailing view of the principal as the major source of leadership in the school, it is apparent that this is not the case in all effective schools especially at the middle school level.

The faculty of Sewell had fully embraced the middle school reform concepts which call for the separation of the school into teams or small communities (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Lipsitz, 1984; Martin, 1993). As a result of this structure, the teachers had planning times with other members of their team, and were primarily seen conversing with members of their own team rather than with persons from throughout the school community. This may account for the low cohesiveness of the faculty as a whole, and indicates that cohesiveness might be better measured at the team level in such schools.

As for the centrality of the principal at Sewell, his role in this school was more of change facilitator than of manager. It is not surprising, therefore, that while he was not ranked first in the network, he was linked to the individual who was in this position. While he did not play the lead in communication within the school, he was clearly operating behind the scenes constantly in facilitating change within the schools. His role was much like that described in the Concerned Based Adoption Model which identifies six
sets of actions of change facilitators (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987; Pol, 1996).

An interesting proposition is presented in the case of Sewell. While the present principal had developed a very decentralized, team-oriented approach to the management of the school, there is some question as to whether or not such a system could be maintained if the present principal were to leave the school. Research in the area of principal succession indicates that great care would need to be taken selecting and socializing the new principal in this school if the present balance were to be maintained (Hoy & Miskel, 1993). As noted by Norton (1995), care must be taken in selecting principals based upon the context of the school. Typically, a successor who would be considered an insider in this specific context, such as the present assistant principal, would probably be the most likely candidate to maintain the present culture of the school.

The emphasis on the administrator's leadership style in the success of this school is also supported by the Typology of School Effectiveness and Leadership (Slater & Teddlie, 1992). This model includes administrator appropriateness as one of the contextual factors that impact schools, noting that, depending on the maturity level and abilities of the teachers within the school, the administrator must determine whether there is need to emphasized either the structural or the cultural aspects of leadership. Sewell provides a clear example of a school in which the cultural aspects of schooling have been emphasized, creating clear cultural expectations for both the teachers and students. The appointment of an administrator who elected to emphasize more structural, or formal, aspects of the system, would be extremely detrimental to the effectiveness level of this school.
In contrast, the principal and faculty at Carson presented a clearly different picture in which the structural aspects were highly emphasized. The role of this principal was distinctly more managerial in nature, and having taken over the helm mid-year, he seemed determined to maintain the status quo for the time being. This principal placed himself in a highly central position in the communication network through the very structured formal communication he utilized with his faculty. He was also highly visible on the campus, and made himself available to both teachers and students. Having served previously as the school’s assistant principal, this principal may have already had a clear position within the network prior to taking on the principalship.

It was also apparent that a concerted effort was made to maintain the cohesiveness of the faculty. While the school was beginning to convert to a team concept much like the one used at Sewell, there was still a clear focus on building a community that included the entire school. Prior to the opening of school, most of the faculty members had participated in a weekend faculty retreat that focused not only on developing plans for the coming year with members of one’s grade level team, but also on working with others in the same subject area to coordinate instruction across grade levels. It was clear that a good part of this weekend was also devoted to developing friendships that would stimulate a community feel within the school.

The sociometric analyses of the case study schools indicate that the communication networks of effective middle schools in which shared leadership occurs are generally dense, flat webs. There appears to be little hierarchical arrangement within these networks, indicating that there is greater equality among the members of the network.
Question III

How do the communication networks of effective middle schools correspond to the perceived sources of instructional leadership in these schools?

A. To what degree do the ranked individuals within the communication networks correspond to those individuals perceived by the faculty to be sources of instructional leadership?

B. How does the centrality of the principal as measured through Social Network Analysis correspond to the faculty perceptions of him/her as a source of instructional leadership within the school?

The communication networks for the four case study schools were highly related to the leadership patterns that were identified in each of the schools. As discussed above, the Sewell and Carson sites provide an interesting juxtaposition of communication network measures which indicate that shared leadership can exist in either centralized or decentralized communication networks.

The network at Allen presented a case in which although the principal had a higher centrality level than those in the other schools, he failed to be ranked in his own network, or to be linked to the persons who were highly ranked. This finding is congruent with the limited formal communication from the principal at the site, and his top-down approach to leadership. It is apparent that, in this case, the principal was somewhat removed from communication with the general faculty, but retained his status as instructional leader in conjunction with the assistant principal.
This finding indicates that in order for shared leadership to include both the administrative and instructional members of a faculty, it is important for the principal to maintain a place in the communication network that connects him to key members of the network. This can be done either by maintaining a position of high centrality as was done by the principal at Carson, or by maintaining links with those persons who are highly central to the network as was the case at Sewell. As noted in the response to Research Question I, this finding is in contrast to Durland's conclusions (1996) for effective elementary schools.

Question IV

How do the internal processes of effective middle schools facilitate or hinder the functioning of these multiple leadership sources?

A. What types of linkage mechanisms are utilized in effective middle schools to increase the cohesiveness of their faculties?

B. How do these multiple leadership sources function to achieve the instructional goals of the school on a day to day basis?

This question set was focused on considering those aspects within the school which created a climate in which shared leadership might occur. They were expected to include communication plans, organizational structures, and other factors that might enable the faculty to make decisions that impacted the daily functioning of the school. In some cases, these factors were expected to release faculty members from the traditional bureaucratic requirements in the school, and enable them to plan independently for the best instructional climate possible.
It is clear based on the evidence found at Carson that cohesiveness of a faculty can be influenced through formal attempts at communication by the principal. In this case, the principal held regular faculty meetings, put out a regular weekly newsletter for his staff, and had planned and participated with them in a weekend planning retreat. These methods of linking the faculty to one another and to himself have effected the level of cohesiveness in this school as compared to the other three schools.

In addition, highly structured instructional organizations that provide for communication between the principal and the teams or departments also appear to be very important to the success of shared leadership in these schools. While Carson provided the most explicit plan for this area, Sewell also exhibited a highly developed team approach to instruction. Sewell also provided for the common planning time of team members during the school day in order to alleviate the need for after hours meetings. When this was discussed with the principal, his response was that it made the teachers happy and that "happy teachers are good teachers". The more developed the plan for such teaming or sharing of instructional responsibilities is, the more likely sharing of leadership is to occur.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that leadership exists in effective middle schools in the state of Louisiana as both a shared and solitary activity. While schools in some contexts possess structures in which the principal acts as a more solitary leader, there are schools in other contexts in which leadership becomes shared, at least with the assistant principal, and in some cases, with instructional personnel. As discussed in Chapter 4, the sharing of leadership in this study was more prominent in schools serving mid-SES student
populations and located in suburban areas. While it should not be concluded that shared leadership cannot occur in low-SES, rural schools, the findings of this study indicate that it is less likely in these settings. Considering this finding, it becomes apparent that the old adage of the principal as the primary instructional leader (Edmonds, 1979) may continue to hold true for these schools.

However, this conceptualization, long espoused in School Effectiveness and Improvement research and literature, may not be valid for mid-SES schools. While this study found clear differences in the leadership patterns in low- and mid-SES middle schools, the work of others (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993) has found such variations in the role of principals in low- and mid-SES elementary schools. These findings lead to the conclusion that there is a need to rethink and reconceptualize leadership in mid-SES schools. This is especially true with the current trend toward decentralization and site-based management.

It should also be noted that based upon the findings of this study, it appears that the primary leadership pattern can vary within a school depending upon the activity under question. Typically, in this study, administrators remained in control of managerial tasks, while teachers indicated their greatest involvement in leadership to be occurring in the same instructional areas that have traditionally been the domain of teachers.

While this does not fit the call for the involvement of teachers in all areas of school leadership (Rice & Schneider, 1994; Smylie & Denny, 1990), it does indicate that some sharing of leadership does occur in these settings. It also reminds those of us interested in research and reform in this area that teachers in many schools are just like those at Allen,
content with what they have because of the lack of any input they have suffered in previous settings. It also serves as a reminder that until administrators are provided with training on how to develop teacher leaders, and teachers are provided training in how to serve as leaders for adults who are their equal, little change will occur in this area.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made for encouraging shared leadership in middle schools:

- Establish teams of teachers either by grade level or department, and give them the freedom to develop instructional programs that meet the needs of their students.
- Provide common planning time for these teams to enable them to meet together regularly to plan their instructional program and develop a sense of community.
- Monitor the progress of these teams either through periodic visits to their team meetings, or through regular written reports to the administration. This will enable the administrative staff to offer suggestions to the team or to help them cut through bureaucratic requirements that may be impeding their progress.
- Develop clear methods of communication to keep all members of the school community informed. Both formal and informal methods should be included in such a plan. While having an open door policy may sound good, it does not insure that all members of a school community have equal access to the same information.
- Divide the school into wings or areas for each of the teams or grade levels to allow close contact between the teachers and students on that wing. Allow the teams to decorate their area of the building, and encourage them to provide an area to
display student and teacher awards and accomplishments. As was the case with
Sewell, this arrangement develops the pride of both the teachers and students, and
builds both school and team spirit.

Recommendations for Further Study

Methodological Lessons from the Current Study

Three major methodological lessons for future research in this area developed out
of this study. These are (1) utilize the best instrument or questionnaire available; (2) use
both qualitative and quantitative data sources; and (3) use the appropriate unit of analysis.
Each of these is elaborated on below.

(1) While the Faculty Involvement Survey in its present format was
appropriate in the present study, some revisions to it may be useful for the future. First of
all, the use of two levels of responses to indicate the degree of involvement in each activity
was not necessary for the present study. The purpose of the present study was to measure
the presence or absence of involvement of the various individuals not the degree of their
involvement. Thus, the two level response criteria made analysis of the data for this
purpose more difficult.

Instead, respondents should have been asked to indicate whether or not each of the
individuals represented in the role categories was involved in the leadership task. This
would have eliminated the need to collapse the response patterns as was done in the
analyses for this study. Additionally, in the future, the four primary response patterns
identified in this study might be used as a Likert-type scale of response choices, thus
eliminating the need to do such analyses.
The questionnaire was also rather lengthy and, in some cases, redundant which was frustrating to some of the respondents. It would be highly recommended to either combine some of the items that measure common activities, such as "provides expertise on curriculum issues" and "provides expertise on instructional issues", or to remove some of the items that may be viewed as solely the domain of the principal.

(2) The use of both qualitative and quantitative data sources is helpful in all research studies for the purposes of triangulation. In this study, the two types of data complemented each other and verified the findings at each phase of the data collection. The quantitative data sources in this study were necessary to identify a sample of schools, while the qualitative data sources provided the in-depth analyses necessary to answer the research questions.

(3) The original focus of this study was at the school level for the effective schools. However, it became apparent early in the study that analysis of the response patterns for individual items was also important. These analyses allowed for conclusions to be developed as to the extent of shared leadership in these schools.

Additionally, it is important to note that the organizational structure of schools should be the determining factor for the appropriate unit of analysis for Social Network Analysis. While the network of the school as a whole is important, for schools such as Sewell which have developed a more decentralized structure, analyses must also include the level of the team or department to provide accurate representations of the communication networks in these schools.
Areas for Further Study

- Conduct studies that include both positive and negative outliers. While this study provided an overview of leadership in effective schools, future studies should provide more detailed comparisons between more and less effective schools. Based on the continuum of outlier studies delineated by Stringfield (1994), this would be the next logical step for research in this area.

- Conduct longitudinal studies into the stability of shared leadership within effective schools over time. These studies would provide insight into the ability of schools such as Sewell to maintain a decentralized approach to leadership over an extended period. They would also enable the study of the effects of principal succession on such schools.

- Conduct more in-depth studies of schools in which shared leadership is occurring. These studies should include larger samples of schools that are more representative on the context variables of SES, community type, and organizational structure.

- Conduct additional studies into the professional development programs provided to teachers and administrators that prepare them for the sharing of leadership. These studies should follow participants back into their schools to determine how these programs are implemented in practice and the effect they have on shared leadership at the school level.

- Conduct studies into the effect of the physical arrangement of middle schools to determine if the designation of certain halls or areas for each grade level impedes or encourages the development of a shared leadership model within a school.
Such studies would provide insight into the ability of such arrangements to meet the needs of both teachers and students in middle schools.

- Conduct additional research that would provide analyses into the various activities identified as leadership tasks and the involvement of the numerous school faculty members in such activities. These studies should include interviews with faculty members to determine their level of interest in participating in these various tasks, and how they might be encouraged to become more active in areas that have traditionally been the role of administrators.
REFERENCES


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Northway, M. L. (1940). A method for depicting social relationships obtained by sociometric testing. Sociometry, 3, 144-150.


APPENDIX A:
MODIFIED SOURCES OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP SURVEY

Directions: Listed on the left of pages 2 - 4 are tasks and functions usually associated with instructional leadership. On the right are listed the positions of the individuals who often perform those tasks and functions. For each position listed, indicate to what extent that person, or persons, in your school perform(s) that task or function at the present time by writing one of the letters defined below in the appropriate box.

L -- provides leadership in this task or function

C -- contributes to this task or function but does not provide leadership

If the person does not currently perform or contribute to that task or function, leave the box blank. If no one in your school currently performs or contributes to that task or function, leave all the boxes in that line blank.

The following positions are used to identify instructional or administrative personnel:

Principal -- the principal or head of the school
Assistant Principal -- an assistant administrator
Department Head -- the head of a group of teachers in a single subject area
Team Leader -- the head or coordinator of a team of teachers
Special Ed/ Title I -- a school-based Special Education or Title I teacher
Teacher - a classroom instructor

Consider what the person in each position actually does as you think about each task or function. For all appropriate positions, record:

__ L ___ Provides leadership

__ C ___ Contributes but does not provide leadership

____ Leave box blank if L or C is not appropriate

On page 5 are some additional questions regarding your present position and teaching experience. Please be sure to complete these questions after you have finished the rest of the survey.
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or all appropriate positions, record

| L | Provides leadership |
| C | Contributes but does not provide leadership |
|   | Leave box blank if L or C is not appropriate |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK OR FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED/TITLE I</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Ex. A. Observes teachers' instructional methods. |
|                                                 |
| L | L | C | C | C |

| Ex. B. Allows teachers to exercise professional freedom. |
|                                                         |
|                                                         |
| Ex. C. Gives teachers feedback on their weekly lesson plans. |
|                                                             |
| L | C | C |

1. Develops instructional goals for the school.
2. Communicates the school's instructional goals to teachers and students.
3. Helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units.
4. Clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional role.
5. Interviews and recommends the hiring or placement of instructional personnel.
6. Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the instructional goals of the school.
7. Develops the school's master schedule.
8. Assigns teachers to specific classes or teams.
9. Allocates materials needed to accomplish instructional goals.
10. Evaluates and selects instructional materials.
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For all appropriate positions, record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>Provides leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contributes but does not provide leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leave box blank if L or C is not appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK OR FUNCTION</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED/TITLE I</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Sees to it that the necessary support personnel (aides, Title I teachers, etc.) are available to assist teachers in accomplishing instructional goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Communicates the importance of learning to parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Organizes staff development programs that are related to the instructional goals of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Emphasizes use of test results and other assessments for program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Schedules assemblies that have an instructional purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Secures additional resources and funds for instructional purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Makes regular classroom visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Encourages teachers to observe each other's classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communicates high expectations for all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Provides help to teachers when teaching methods are unsuccessful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Establishes a safe and orderly school environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Provides expertise on instructional matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For all appropriate positions, record

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L</em></td>
<td>Provides leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C</em></td>
<td>Contributes but does not provide leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Leave box blank if L or C is not appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP TASK OR FUNCTION</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED/TITLE I</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Coordinates instructional program across grade levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Establishes a school policy on student promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Ensures systematic monitoring of student progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Coordinates instructional program across subject areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Works to improve the instructional program of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Makes critical decisions about instructional program of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Involves parents in the school program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Protects faculty from undue pressure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Develops a clear discipline code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Recognizes and rewards student accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Works to keep faculty morale high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Provides expertise on curriculum issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions (all answers are confidential):

37. The name of your school: ____________________________________________

38. Your present position (circle one):

   Principal                   Assistant Principal          Special Ed/ Title I
   Teacher                     Counselor                   Other (identify)   _________________

39. Do you serve as a Department Head? Yes No

   Team Leader? Yes No

40. Your sex (circle): Male Female

41. Your age: ________

42. The number of years you have been an educational professional: __________

43. The number of years you have been in your present school: __________

44. The number of years you have been in your present position: __________
APPENDIX B: MODIFIED SOIL SURVEY
ITEM GROUPINGS FOR FACTOR ANALYSIS

Governance
5. Interviews and recommends the hiring of instructional personnel for the school.
7. Develops the school's master schedule.
8. Assigns teachers to specific classes or teams.
30. Makes critical decisions about the instructional program of the school.
31. Involves parents in the school program.
32. Protects faculty from undue pressure.

School Climate
1. Develops instructional goals for the school.
12. Communicates to parents the importance of learning.
15. Schedules assemblies that have an instructional purpose.
18. Encourages teachers to observe in each other's classes.
19. Communicates high expectations for all students.
22. Establishes a safe, orderly environment with a clear discipline code.
33. Develops a clear discipline code.
34. Recognizes and rewards academic accomplishments of students.
35. Works to keep faculty morale high.

Instructional Organization
2. Communicates the instructional goals for the school.
3. Helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units.
4. Clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional position.
6. Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the school's instructional goals.
9. Allocates materials needed to accomplish instructional goals.
10. Evaluates and selects instructional materials.
11. Sees to it that the necessary support personnel (aides, Ch. 1 teachers, etc.) are available to assist teacher in accomplishing instructional goals.
13. Organizes staff development programs that are related to the school's instructional goals.
14. Emphasizes the use of test results and other assessments for program improvement.
16. Secures additional resources and funds for instructional purposes.
17. Makes regular classroom visits.
21. Provides help to teachers when their teaching methods are not successful.
23. Provides expertise on instructional matters.
24. Coordinates the instructional program across grade levels.
25. Establishes a school policy on promotion.
26. Ensures systematic monitoring of student progress.
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27. Gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching.
28. Coordinates the instructional program across subject areas.
29. Works to improve the instructional program of the school.
36. Provides expertise on curriculum issues.
APPENDIX C: FACULTY INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

Directions: Listed on the left of pages 2 - 4 are tasks and functions usually associated with the daily functioning of a school. On the right are listed the positions of the individuals who are often involved in those tasks and functions. For each position listed, indicate to what extent that person, or persons, in your school is involved in that task or function at the present time by writing one of the numbers defined below in the appropriate box.

2 — Highly involved in this task or function
1 — Moderately involved in this task or function
0 — Leave box blank if 1 or 2 is not appropriate

If the person is not currently involved in that task or function, leave the box blank. If no one in your school is currently involved in that task or function, leave all the boxes in that line blank. The following positions are used to identify instructional or administrative personnel:

Principal -- the principal or head of the school
Assistant Principal -- an assistant administrator
Dept. Head/Team Leader -- the head of a group of teachers in a single subject area or the head or coordinator of a team of teachers
Ancillary -- any ancillary personnel including Title I, Special Ed Resource, Librarian, Guidance Counselor, etc.
Teacher - a classroom instructor

Consider what the person in each position actually does as you think about each task or function. For all appropriate positions, record:

___ Highly involved in the task
___ Moderately involved in the task
____ Leave box blank if 1 or 2 is not appropriate

On page 5 are some additional questions regarding your present position and teaching experience. Please complete these questions after you have finished the rest of the survey.
For all appropriate positions, record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPT HEAD/TEAM LDR</th>
<th>ANCILLARY</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2 Highly involved in this task

1 Moderately involved in this task

Leave box blank if 1 or 2 is not appropriate

Ex. A. Observes teachers' instructional methods.

2 2 1 1 1

Ex. B. Allows teachers to exercise professional freedom.

Ex. C. Gives teachers feedback on their weekly lesson plans.

2 1

1. Develops instructional goals for the school.

2. Communicates the school's instructional goals to teachers and students.

3. Helps relate the school's instructional goals to curriculum units.

4. Clarifies the instructional responsibilities of each professional role.

5. Interviews and recommends the hiring or placement of instructional personnel.

6. Encourages the use of innovative teaching methods to achieve the instructional goals of the school.

7. Develops the school's master schedule.

8. Assigns teachers to specific classes or teams.

9. Allocates materials needed to accomplish instructional goals.

10. Evaluates and selects instructional materials.
For **all** appropriate positions, record

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highly involved in this task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderately involved in this task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**11.** Sees to it that the necessary support personnel (aides, Title I teachers, etc.) are available to assist teachers in accomplishing instructional goals.

**12.** Communicates the importance of learning to parents.

**13.** Organizes staff development programs that are related to the instructional goals of the school.

**14.** Emphasizes use of test results and other assessments for program improvement.

**15.** Schedules assemblies that have an instructional purpose.

**16.** Secures additional resources and funds for instructional purposes.

**17.** Makes regular classroom visits.

**18.** Encourages teachers to observe each other's classes.

**19.** Communicates high expectations for all students.

**20.** Encourages discussion of instructional issues.

**21.** Provides help to teachers when teaching methods are unsuccessful.

**22.** Establishes a safe and orderly school environment.

**23.** Provides expertise on instructional matters.
For **all** appropriate positions, record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly involved in this task</th>
<th>Moderately involved in this task</th>
<th>Leave box blank if 1 or 2 is not appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPT HEAD/TEAM LDR</th>
<th>ANCILLARY</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Coordinates instructional program across grade levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Establishes a school policy on student promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ensures systematic monitoring of student progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Gives teachers non-evaluative feedback about their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Coordinates instructional program across subject areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Works to improve the instructional program of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Makes critical decisions about instructional program of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Involves parents in the school program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Protects faculty from undue pressure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Develops a clear discipline code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Recognizes and rewards student accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Works to keep faculty morale high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Provides expertise on curriculum issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions (all answers are confidential):

37. The name of your school: ______________________________

38. Your present position (circle one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
<th>Special Ed/Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Do you serve as a Department Head? Yes No
   Team Leader? Yes No

40. Your sex (circle): Male Female

41. Your age: _______

42. The number of years you have been an educational professional: _______

43. The number of years you have been in your present school: _______

44. The number of years you have been in your present position: _______
APPENDIX D: SUPERINTENDENT'S LETTER

14233 Bywood Ave.
Baton Rouge, LA 70819
Date Sent

Superintendent
District
Address
Town, LA Zip Code

Dear Superintendent (Name),

I am requesting your permission to contact the principals of the following middle schools in your district in order to ask them to participate in a research study: (school names). The attached survey is designed to measure the patterns of shared leadership in schools. I am conducting this study as part of my doctoral dissertation at Louisiana State University.

If your permission is granted, I will mail each of these middle school principals a letter indicating your approval to contact them. The letter will request their cooperation in collecting this information from their teachers at a faculty meeting. This survey is designed to take a minimal amount of time to complete.

I would greatly appreciate your permission to contact the principals of the middle schools indicated above. I will be contacting you in a few days to discuss this request with you further. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (504) 388-2182.

Sincerely,

Robin G. Jarvis
APPENDIX E: PRINCIPAL'S LETTER

14233 Bywood Ave.
Baton Rouge, LA  70819
Date Sent

Dear Principal (Name),

Your superintendent, (name), has given me permission to contact you regarding a study I am conducting as part of my dissertation research at Louisiana State University. I am requesting your cooperation in collecting information on leadership in middle schools. The attached survey is designed to take a minimal amount of time to complete, and should be distributed and completed by your professional faculty members at a faculty meeting.

Please call me at (504) 388-2182 if you have any questions about the research study or survey. If you are willing to participate in this study, please return the enclosed postcard as soon as possible. Upon receipt of this postcard, I will mail you a packet containing surveys for your teachers, directions for administering the surveys, and a self-addressed/stamped envelope for returning the surveys to me.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robin G. Jarvis
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Principal/Assistant Principal Interview

1. What is your total school enrollment?

2. Is there a formal plan at this school to involve faculty members in leadership or decision making activities? How does it work? Who initiated it? Why? Has it been successful? How have the teachers responded to it? How long has it been in use?
3. Is your school involved in any restructuring or school improvement program that requires the involvement of faculty or other stakeholders in leadership/decision making? Was it school or district mandated? How does it work? Who is involved?
4. How is time made available for faculty members to participate in these types of activities? When are committee meetings held? Do they disrupt instructional time or require teachers to be released from the classroom in order to participate? Do they require teachers to come early or stay late in order to participate?

5. If teachers are required to put in additional time to participate in these activities, how are they compensated? Are they compensated?
6. Was or is any guidance/staff development provided for faculty members to prepare them for involvement in leadership/decision making? Assistance to make informed choices? Who plans these sessions? What are they about?
Teacher/Department Head/Team Leader Interview

1. Is an effort made to involve teachers in decision making or leadership in this school? In what ways is this done?
2. Do you serve on any committees in the school? Which ones? What are they responsible for? When are committee meetings held? Are you compensated in any way for extra time you may put in participating in these activities? How?
3. Is your school involved in any kind of special program that requires the involvement of Teachers, parents, community members, or students in decision making? How does this program work?
Department Heads/Team Leaders only

4. What unique responsibilities do you have as the department head/team leader? When do you carry out these duties? How are you compensated for extra time you may spend involved in these tasks?
5. How is your relationship with the principal/assistant principal? How frequently are meetings held with these administrators and the department heads/team leaders?
6. How often are departmental/team meetings held with the teachers in your department/team? What is done during these meetings? When are they held? Who attends other than the teachers in the department?
APPENDIX G: SOCIOMETRIC SURVEY

Your school is participating in a state wide study on leadership in effective middle schools. As part of this study, I would like to ask you some questions about the communication patterns in your school. The information is part of a research project and will not be used by your school or your school system in any way.

A sample question is included on the next page, followed by the two questions I would like you to answer. After you complete the questionnaire, please place it in the large folder labeled R. Jarvis. The folder will be collected from your school on

______________________________.

Thanks for your cooperation and help with this survey. If you have any questions you may contact the research at:

R. Jarvis  (504) 388-2182
Sample Question

Consider the following list of staff members at your school. Please put a check by the name of each person with whom you discussed school related academic matters last week. Then go back and indicate which three persons you communicated with the most about academic matters last week in your school. Do this by marking 1, 2, or 3 by their names.

_x_ Jane Brown
_x1_ John Bynum
___ Jill Clark
___ Jane Devereaux
___ Bill Eagles
___ Mary Fish
___ John Maxim
_x_ John McMillan
___ Esther Nobles
_x3_ Estelle O'Brian
___ John Popham
_x2_ Elizabeth Smith

(This respondent had talked to five people the week before about school related academic matters. Additionally, the respondent had talked to John Bynum the most, Elizabeth Smith the second most, and Estelle O'Brian the third most.)
Question Number One

Consider the following list of staff members at your school. Please put a check by the name of each person with whom you discussed school related academic matters last week. Then go back and indicate which three persons you communicated with the most about academic matters last week in your school. Do this by marking 1, 2, or 3 by their names.

SCHOOL NAME

_____ Faculty list
Question Number Two

Consider the following list of staff members at your school. Assume that you were on a committee that was organized to improve your school. Please put a check by the names of each person that you would like to be on the school improvement committee with you. Then go back and indicate the three persons that you would most like to be on the committee with you. Do this by marking 1, 2, or 3 by their names.

SCHOOL NAME

_____ Faculty list
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