INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript 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.

The characteristics and behaviors of principals who are effective instructional leaders and the development of an inventory describing those behaviors

Labelle, Peggy Joan, Ph.D.

Wayne State University, 1990

NOTE TO USERS

THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT RECEIVED BY U.M.I. CONTAINED PAGES WITH SLANTED PRINT. PAGES WERE FILMED AS RECEIVED.

THIS REPRODUCTION IS THE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

THE CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS
WHO ARE EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INVENTORY
DESCRIBING THOSE BEHAVIORS

By

PEG LABELLE

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School of
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1990

MAJOR: EVALUATION
AND RESEARCH

Approved by:

_Ronald R. Marietta_____ _Oct. 29, 1990_
Adviser   date

_Ronald V. Lu_____

_Wendell M. J_____

_____

Acknowledgements

I am very appreciative of the continual support, understanding and guidance of my advisor, Dr. Marcotte, through this somewhat lengthy endeavor. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Hough, Dr. Sosnowsky, Dr. Bass, and Dr. Urick for their support and input.

Sincere gratitude is extended to Arlene Kutchey who, in addition to the word processing, took a special interest in this project.

Finally, I would like to express my love and gratitude to my husband, Frank, who patiently and unselfishly took care of our lives, and provided for me the wisdom and guidance I needed to accomplish my goal.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

During the past several years, the educational community has entered an era of significant change. In the last decade, the ability of school and professional educators to produce knowledgeable and literate students has been closely scrutinized. National reports such as "A Nation at Risk" (1983) and the Carnegie Foundation report "The Condition of Teaching" (1983), have critically discussed the "State of the Art" in public education. Countless articles and research studies have looked at school effectiveness and those components indicating effectiveness. As a result, the educational community has begun to reassess its practices and methods of educating its students. Many school boards, parents, parent organizations, businesses, industries, teachers and school administrators are working together to chart a new course for their schools. The effort is a cooperative one, each party recognizing that skills specific to one's responsibilities, communication between groups, and commitment to work toward common goals are the keys to success.

Because of his/her key role and high visibility in the school setting, the principal has been the focus of significant educational research. Most of these studies view the principal in two roles: building administrator and instructional leader.

Today's practicing school principals are well aware that

their daily responsibilities include productive communication with support staff, students, parents, other administrators, board members, the community and their staff. In fact, most principals have put together detailed lists and files to help them cope with the daily management of their buildings. The research focusing on successful schools, however, points to another dimension of the principalship that is often ignored; that is, the principal's role as instructional leader. These studies indicate that on both a daily basis and over the long term, the most significant factor influencing positive change in the school is the effectiveness of the principal. As the educational leader, he/she must communicate the need for high instructional standards to the staff (Hall et al, 1984; Adler, 1988; Joyce, 1986; Hagar and Scarr, 1983; Keefe, 1987; Gardner, 1988).

Current literature clearly differentiates between the roles of administering a school and serving as an educational leader. In their discussion of educational leadership, Snyder and Anderson (1986) discriminated between the roles by stating that the educational leader "must have a clear vision of what a school ought to be, and a keen sense of how a staff can work toward that ideal." Additionally, they stated that "an effective principal must have a personal sense of mission in a particular job, a mission that is communicated continuously to the staff" (p. 77).

Richard Hostrop (1975), author of Managing Education for

Results, believed that the information explosion of this
century has increased our communication problems. He
proposes that "what passes for communication in most
organizations including schools - is based on assumptions
that have proven to be invalid" (p. 133). Hostrop cited
Drucker's four principles of communication as a general
perspective in viewing that process:

1. Communication is perception.

2. Communication is expectations.

3. Communication is involvement.

4. Communication and information are totally

   different though totally interdependent.

Like Drucker, Hostrop recognized that the components of
successful communication are elusive. He noted that we
learn about communication by doing mostly the wrong things.
Understanding the need for good communication and the
problems that seem inherent in that process, one must
question the chances for success when the constraints of the
daily routine in school prohibit involvement and meaningful
dialog, particularly between principals and their staff.

Nevertheless, educators have become increasingly aware
of their own need for clearer lines of communication. One
way that need has been addressed in several school districts
is by involving individual buildings in "school improvement
projects". Local universities, including Wayne State
University, have provided staff development consulting
services and modest financial support for these projects

through grant monies from the Higher Education Appropria-
tions Act. Such projects have been successful in promoting
communication between teachers and principals through a
six-step staff development model requiring the collaboration
of both groups in goal setting and shared decision making
(Sparks, 1984).

However, in spite of the positive strides educators are
making in communicating with each other, one facet of
administrator-staff relationship has only recently been
discussed. That area is staff evaluation of the principal's
role as supervisor and educational leader. A survey of the
literature indicates a need for continued research regarding
this matter (Larsen, 1987; Stimson and Applebaum, 1988;
Irwin, 1985; Bailey, 1984). Therefore, teacher to principal
feedback and the criterion both parties believe to be
important in assessing the principal's effectiveness was the
focus of this study.

Statement of the Problem

Today's principal is bombarded with problems related to
the complicated task of maintaining communication and
administering his/her school. Most principals either fail
to take the time or claim that they do not have the time to
read the literature or reflect on their own operational
style of educational leadership (Goodlad, 1984). They may
set yearly goals for professional growth but rarely have
either a forum or a methodology by which to evaluate their

own progress toward those goals. Most principals rarely or
never ask for input from their staff either informally or
formally. Perceptions of their own leadership behaviors,
especially those of ineffective principals, are frequently
inaccurate. For example, Larsen (1987) found differences in
the ratings principals gave to themselves and the ratings
teachers gave them on instructional leadership behaviors.
Larsen reported that the teachers tended to perceive the
principal as less effective in implementing leadership
behaviors than the principal perceived him/herself.
Teachers in low-achieving schools showed significantly
greater discrepancy from the principals' self-rating than
did the teachers at the high-achieving schools. In general,
they perceived their principals as implementing the
instructional leadership behaviors significantly less than
the principals perceived themselves as implementing these
behaviors.

In his article on faculty feedback, Bailey (1984) stated
that the administrator's "effectiveness is directly related
to their own ability to engage in administrative improvement
practices." He pointed out that the "emphasis on faculty
feedback is on administrative improvement rather than
administrative evaluation." He went on to say that
"self-styled faculty feedback instruments are ideal for
administrators who are interested in improving their
leadership skills" (p. 5-6).

Irwin (1985) concluded after a study of over 400

research reports that "the most powerful predictor of instructional effectiveness is leadership style . . . . that it is imperative that an instructional leader be aware of his/her own leadership modality and value system, and be capable of self analysis and assessment" (p. 7).

A feedback instrument can provide the vehicle needed for principals to formally invite teacher feedback or to simply use in the self-evaluation and goal-setting process.

Implications of the Problem

As an introduction to his article, "Assessing Administrative Performance," Rentsch (1976) commented on the dearth of information in that area by stating:

> The school administrator, as the person most directly responsible for making resource allocation decisions, is the person usually considered to be most accountable for the quality and quantity of teaching and learning taking place in his unit. For this reason, one would expect that the assessment of administrative effectiveness would be an area in which great progress has been made.
>
> However, if current literature is an accurate indicator, scant attention has been focused on this area. The questions—in what way, to what extent, and how systematically should administrative assessment be organized—have so far gone unanswered (p. 77).

John Goodlad (1984), in his chapter titled "Improving the Schools We Have," argued that "existing processes involving the identification of problems, the gathering of relevant data, discussion, the formulation of solutions, and the monitoring of actions" are self-renewing capacities "lacking in most schools, largely because the principal

lacks the requisite skills of group leadership." Goodlad's position was one of many taken by educational researchers in the past few years regarding the skills principals need.

He further made a case for leadership and school improvement by citing an earlier study which found that "most of the school principals of the participating schools lacked major skills and abilities required for effecting educational improvement." He stated that the principals "did not know how to select problems likely to provide leverage for school wide improvement, how to build a long-term agenda, how to assure some continuity of business from faculty meeting to faculty meeting, how to secure and recognize a working consensus . . . . Most were insecure in their relations with faculty and rarely or never visited classrooms. Some were hopelessly mired in paper work, exaggerating the magnitude of the tasks involved in part to avoid areas of work where they felt less secure." He went on to state that "these were not substandard principals . . . many of them were believed by their superintendents to be better than average in their leadership abilities" (p. 271-320).

Reasons for support of an administrative assessment process vary from individual to individual. Principals, teachers, and scholars differ concerning the goal of principal feedback. Agreement about the anticipated outcome, however, is unanimous. Whatever the assessment process, it should provide new information that will help

principals to perform their job better, if circumstance permits. Principals, in turn, need to look in a proactive way at what their colleagues, the recent research, and teachers say about practices and behaviors that work. Sampson (1983), in a Phi Delta Kappa Seminar, addressed the issue of principal attitude toward self change. Sampson believed that the key to the ideal principal is "to have both acquired skills and the desire to acquire more" (p. 8).

Teachers feel strongly about having a voice in providing principals with their feedback. That fact was documented by Buser and Banks (1984) in an article about their study on evaluating principals. The study posed three main questions: (1) Who should evaluate the principal? (2) What should be the purpose of evaluation? (3) What should be the conditions of evaluation? In reporting the results of question one (Who should do the evaluation?), the authors stated that "almost 9 of 10 (87 percent) of the teachers felt the principal should be evaluated by the teachers" (p. 2). Such support comes out of a need for teachers to communicate with their principals about any issue important to them. Both groups are normally preoccupied with the day-to-day responsibilities and crises of school life.

Communication in schools most often revolves around such isolated issues as student discipline, scheduling conflicts, and shortage of supplies. Teachers need to be given the opportunity to share their perceptions of school life in a

reflective and safe environment. Principals also need to take the opportunity to listen to what their teachers say with an informed and objective attitude.

In the concluding remarks on their study about principal power and the empowerment of teachers, Stimson and Appelbaum (1988) briefly discussed the training needs of principals and the importance of feedback. It was their view that principals need to find ways to receive and act on feedback from their teachers. They noted that "in hierarchical organizations, it is often difficult for subordinates to talk frankly to their superiors; consequently, principals must usually initiate the dialogue" (p. 316).

Principal Feedback as a Process

For the past several years, school administrators have begun looking more closely at their own management styles. The focus of articles in the professional journals has evolved from a "get-the-most out of your staff" approach to more recent discussions of the need for administrators to receive subordinate feedback. For example, journals in recent years from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (N.A.S.S.P.) typify the change that has taken place. The trend toward principal evaluation is illustrated in the literature. In the sixteen journals reviewed by the writer, sixty-five articles directly addressed principal-teacher relationships in the manager-evaluator sense of the word. This number does not include

articles that referred to principal-supervision in curriculum, specific content areas, school climate, and academic freedom. Of greater interest are ten of the sixty-five articles that discussed the value of principal evaluation, what more recent articles describe as "principal feedback."

In 1976, principals were concerned with the issues of humaneness, leadership, staff development, and tentatively, self-evaluation. At the beginning of the 1980's, principal effectiveness, participatory decision-making, Theory X versus Theory Y management styles, and shared decision-making were topics in many professional journals. By January of 1984, several articles addressed principals' concern about their own administrative behavior. Gerald D. Bailey (1984), of the Education Department at Kansas State University, listed the steps in a teacher-to-principal feedback process in his article, "Faculty Feedback for Administrators: A Means to Improve Leadership Behavior" (pp. 5-9).

Very little was documented regarding principal assessment, as the review of N.A.S.S.P. bulletins of the early eighties indicates. Yet the need for such an activity has begun to generate support from a broad group of educators in the field. Buser and Banks (1984) documented that support in Banks' doctoral work. His research asked four questions about the evaluation of principals. The questionnaire was sent to elected heads of the state affiliates of the

American Association of School Administrators, the National
Association of Elementary School Principals, and the
National Education Association. In contacting the above
groups, Banks assumed that, typically, they were
practitioners working in their field and would, therefore,
have views representative of their respective groups.

Three questions most pertinent to their discussion and a
brief summary of the findings follow:

Question 1. Who should evaluate the principal?

a.	the superintendent	95%
b.	self-evaluation	94%
c.	central office personnel	72%
d.	the teachers	66%

It must be noted that, as a separate group, 87% of the
teachers felt principals should be evaluated by the
teacher.

Question 2. What should be the purpose of evaluation?

a.	to assist in professional growth	98%
b.	to improve educational leadership	97%
c.	to acknowledge quality performance	92%

Question 3. What should be the focus of evaluation?

a.	the principal's effectiveness in the administrative process: planning, supervising and decision making.	100%
b.	the principal's effectiveness as an administrator of specific responsibilities: curriculum, fiscal plant, management, etc.	98%
c.	the personal characteristics of the principal - leadership, appearance, preparation, personality, etc. (pp. 1-4).	90%

Another research study dealing with the concept of
principal feedback was reported by Chamberlain (1980).

Sponsored by the Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals and Bowling Green State University, the project, "Survey of Administrative Functional Efficiency: Project S.A.F.E.", was designed to provide faculty feedback for elementary principals. Two major areas the study investigated were communication and staff development, and the trait differences between high efficiency and low efficiency principals. Desirable and undesirable traits were established. The abstract for Project S.A.F.E. stated that "results of the data analyses indicated that teachers perceived the following traits as desirable in the behavior of elementary school principals: (a) adventurous, (b) aggressive, (c) ambitious, (d) decisive, (e) determined, (f) discerning, (g) enthusiastic, (h) forceful, (i) humorous, (j) relaxed, (k) stimulating, and (l) well-read. Those traits commonly perceived by teachers as undesirable in the behavior of elementary school principals were: (a) passive, (b) possessive, (c) preoccupied, and (d) secretive."

In 1976, the Hauppauge School District in Long Island, New York, became involved in a project concerning teacher evaluation of administrators. Their rationale was stated by Joseph Sanacore (1976) when he chaired the project. Sanacore stated: "Since teachers have improved through administrative assessment, it seems probable that administrators can improve through teacher evaluation" (p. 98). Areas addressed in the evaluation instrument were administration and supervision, with a focus on professional

characteristics, personal characteristics, relationship with
staff, relationship with students, and relationship with the
community.

Thomas Butera (1976) stated his position regarding
teacher evaluation of the principal by saying:

> Perhaps the only way a principal can ensure adequate
> feedback concerning the "nitty gritty" of his daily
> performance is to involve those who have continuous
> contact with him--his teachers!
>
> Their collective opinions can form the foundation for
> self-evaluation and improvement of performance. When
> the principal solicits this information voluntarily
> and in an organized fashion, it poses no threat to
> him and allows the staff a means of constructively
> making their observation and concerns known (p. 84).

According to Lyman (1987), "the level of trust between
supervisor and teacher is a major factor in determining the
quality of assistance the supervisor will be able to provide
to the teacher." In his discussion of trust building, the
author suggested that principals engage in a collaborative
staff development project with teachers. Part of the
project involved teachers generating a list of supervisory
behaviors and practices that (1) contributed to their
professional growth and enhanced their trust in the
supervisor, and (2) caused them worry and concern and
reduced their trust in the supervisor. Lyman cited a study
conducted in 1986 of 150 teachers in seven school districts
in Kansas. Teachers identified the following behaviors and
traits:

Effective Supervisor	Ineffective Supervisor
Honest	Two-faced
Open-minded	Close-minded
Warm	Impersonal, cold
Consistent	Inconsistent
Understanding	Condescending
Relaxed	Formal
Fair	Plays favorites
Willing to admit mistakes	Can't admit when wrong

Clearly, the process of encouraging teachers to communicate with their principals must be coupled with the desire of principals to evaluate themselves. This desire must be further combined with a process of self-assessment and renewal if the principal is to continue to develop his/her leadership skills.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to address one aspect of teacher-to-principal communication through the development of an inventory that described the critical characteristics and related behaviors of principals who function as instructional leaders. The reason for such an inventory was to provide a standard and usable communication tool for practicing principals in assessing their own skills as instructional leaders and to seek input from their staff.

Those tasks identified as the most critical in completing the study were:

1. to identify, through a search of the literature, those characteristics and behaviors demonstrated by successful principals who function in their schools as educational leaders;

2. to synthesize and categorize the information
   and to write item statements for each
   category/domain that describe the desired
   principal behaviors;

3. to obtain the input of practicing principals
   and teachers regarding the appropriateness of
   the domains and the content of the item
   statements for each domain;

4. to analyze all data collected and to make
   appropriate comparisons;

5. to extrapolate from the analysis accurate
   conclusions that will contribute to current
   research and promote further study.

Reasons for the Study

Most principals do not have a formal means by which to assess their own behaviors or a way to ask teachers for constructive feedback. Because of this informational gap, they are often unaware of both the positive things they are doing and the changes they may need to make in their behavior to become more effective in their role. A well-designed feedback instrument which incorporates the input and judgment of highly regarded principals and teachers in identifying the characteristics and behaviors needed to be effective instructional leaders would provide the principal with a valuable tool in evaluating his/her own performance.

Organization of the Study

The instrument developed in this study was called the Principal Feedback Inventory. The study was conducted in seven stages:

- the literature search
- analysis of findings from the search, the development of domains and the writing of items for the inventory
- phase I Delphi review of the inventory by a selected group of Macomb County educators
- analysis of the data from Phase I and revision of the inventory
- phase II Delphi review of the revised inventory
- analysis of the data from Phase II and final revision of the inventory
- field administration of the final inventory in three Macomb County schools.

Definitions

1. Principal Feedback Inventory - a survey instrument with a five point Likert type scale that lists behavioral descriptors of the traits and skills demonstrated by principals who are described as effective instructional leaders.

2. Central Office Administrator - a Superintendent of Schools or Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum

who has also functioned as a principal.

3. Principal - any principal, assistant principal or associate principal who is currently working in that capacity in a public school setting.

4. Teacher - any K-12 teacher who is currently working in a public school setting.

5. Reviewers - selected central office administrators, principals and teachers in Macomb County who participated in critiquing and reviewing the Principal Feedback Inventory.

Chapter II

Review of the literature

Introduction

For the researcher, it is difficult to reconcile what appears to be a realistic expectation and valid need for educational leadership with the reality of mundane administrative practices in today's schools. An obvious discrepancy presently exists between what principals and teachers see as vital leadership behaviors and the practice of those behaviors.

While many principals successfully function as educational leaders, a greater majority rarely display any interest in the instructional program or toward the efforts of the teaching staff and curriculum. An understanding of the concepts taught in a particular discipline, assisting in the development of innovative ways to deliver instruction or the nurturing of new and creative ideas among staff members, simply doesn't exist. Yet the public, central office administrators, the teaching staff and principals themselves overwhelmingly attribute the responsibilities, traits and behaviors of instructional leaders to the principalship.

The constraints of time, emergencies, student discipline and other administrative responsibilities are the most frequent reasons principals give for their neglect of the instructional program. The research verifies the existence of such claims. However, the research also provides many

18

examples of truly dynamic leadership and points to the
potential such leadership unleashes among the staff as well
as principals themselves.

Both sides of the debate are well documented. In an
effort to better understand the history, perceptions and
expectations that surround the issue, the researcher has
closely examined the literature that describes typical
principals as well as those studies that involve the work of
exemplary principals who function as educational leaders.

The Principal Who Functions as Manager

The behaviors of typical principals as compared to
the behaviors of effective principals were described by
Leithwood and Montgomery (1982). The authors stated that
"leadership by typical principals is largely administrative
. . . the primary goal is a smoothly running organization
. . . the principal is a major school disciplinarian"
(p. 322). In reviewing other studies the authors also found
that "the typical principal is quite distant from curriculum
or instructional decisions and initiates few changes in the
school's program . . . emphasis is placed on the existing
professional competence of teachers and the value of
'leaving teachers alone to teach'. . . the principal does
not engage the staff in goal or priority setting for
students and . . . there is a lack of achievement
orientation" (p. 323).

Tye and Tye (1984) reported that the majority of

teachers in all but three of the 38 schools they studied "believed that their principal encouraged teachers 'to experiment with their teaching.'" However, the researchers also found that the principals did not initiate discussions about teacher attempts or desires to be innovative. In fact, they found little evidence that the principals were "exercising instructional leadership; rather their behaviors seem(ed) generally to reinforce the isolation and autonomy of their teachers" (p. 321). They observed that

> the quality of the principal's leadership appeared to vary considerably from school to school. In general . . . the teachers . . . reported very infrequent contacts with their principals on such substantive matters as discipline, curriculum, instruction, interactions with parents, and staff relations (p. 321).

Teachers in the study indicated that they themselves had initiated the few discussions that had occurred, but they did not seem to feel, on the whole, that these discussions with the principal had been particularly helpful.

Principals in Giannangelo and Malone's study (1987) were criticized for their lack of leadership in the curriculum and instruction area. The authors stated that the reasons teachers gave for this opinion were that principals

- were too absorbed with "clerical type" matters;
- were not knowledgeable about the ongoing curriculum;
- lacked recent classroom experience;
- possessed very little, if any, information regarding current trends in education; and
- were extremely lacking in teaching techniques and methodologies other than the information dissemination (lecture) strategy.

Giannangelo and Malone also stated that "teachers very strongly indicated that they did not feel confident seeking

assistance from their principals regarding academic matters" (p. 7-8). In fact, their teachers indicated that "administrators unnecessarily busied themselves with paperwork and other tasks so that they wouldn't have to be concerned with academic matters" (p. 8). Only 15.3% of the teachers said that their principals functioned as educational leaders.

In Joyce's (1986) view, a closer relationship existed between the logistics of school operation, i.e., food services, transportation and procurement of supplies, than in programming where curriculum and instruction were involved. He said this was partly because many school administrators were oriented toward logistics and community relations, not instructional leadership. Joyce states that many administrators confessed that they were not competent to head their faculties in updating curriculum and instruction.

Guzzetti and Martin (1984) asked both elementary and secondary principals to report the frequency of their own instructional improvement activities. Of the stratified random sample selected, 219 (almost 20%) of Colorado's principals responded. No significant difference was found between principals at the elementary, junior high and senior high level in the time spent on instructional improvement tasks in comparison to the time spent on their business management activities. Their findings were consistent with Newberg and Glatthorn (1982), Firestone and Herriott (1982),

and Howell (1981). In fact, principals in Howell's study spent from 32 percent to 40 percent on office responsibilities, while the area of curriculum which included student scheduling, coordinating, supervision and observation took only 14% of the principals' time. Howell concluded that instructional leadership was compromised so greatly that "if instructional leadership was required to steer the ship of state, that ship was sadly adrift" (p. 333).

The role of the principal in curriculum and instructional leadership was examined by Berlin, Kavanaugh and Jensen (1988). Principals, superintendents and a group of secondary school teachers in graduate classes were surveyed. The three groups were asked to rank seventeen items according to how the principal "Does" function and how he or she "Should" function. The researchers found high between group correlations on rankings of the seventeen items on the questionnaire. However, there were significant differences between what the teachers said a principal should do and what he or she was seen as actually doing. For example, the principals ranked "Rewards innovation/good teaching" as the third most important function they "should" perform; at the same time, the item fell to a rank of eight in the "Does" category. The same item was ranked 5.5 by teachers as a behavior principals "Should" perform while giving the item a rank of 11 as a behavior the principals actually demonstrated.

While Berlin et al. were "encouraged" by the group consensus concerning important curriculum leadership tasks, they were quick to point out the differences between expectations and the frequency of performance as judged by the teachers. This study again reinforced the discrepancy between principal and teacher perception.

Teacher/administration disagreement regarding district instructional services was corroborated by Cawelti and Reavis (1980). Teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents and their assistants in 16 school districts were asked to rate the adequacy of curriculum improvement. The authors reported that only 28% of 357 teachers rated these services high compared with 34% of the supervisors and 41% of the principals (p. 237).

Grace, Buser and Stuck (1987) interviewed thirteen outstanding principals and their staffs. In addition to identifying the characteristics that made these principals outstanding, they asked which characteristics and behaviors reduced the administrators' effectiveness. The behaviors included:

- Becoming desk or office-bound
- Relying too heavily on "the way we've always done things"
- Becoming a slave to paperwork
- Using time inefficiently or ineffectively
- Overreacting to trivial incidents
- Lacking knowledge of school programs/curricula
- Assuming the role of troubleshooter rather than being goal and achievement-oriented
- Staying on one's own turf rather than seeking professional associations with colleagues
- Insisting on autocratic decision-making procedures

. Failing to listen to the concerns and
suggestions of constituents (p. 75-76).

Heckman's statement that "principals are more likely to act
as 'gate keepers' than facilitators of school improvement"
could well summarize the above list (1987, p. 80).

Clearly differences between typical principal and
effective principal behaviors do in fact exist. However,
school districts, teachers and principals themselves often
assume that managerial practices are the accepted norm in
the principalship. For example, Leithwood and Montgomery
(1985) found that only 10% of the principals, in their four
studies, were seen as working to their highest potential.
More importantly, they found that most school systems
considered the lowest level of performance a minimally
acceptable standard rather than unacceptable.

Hagar and Scarr (1983) reported that an investigation of
building administrators in their school district revealed
that leadership and management skills were needed in the
areas of:

1. Planning - establishing priorities and
   involving staff in planning.
2. Directing - setting of goals and objectives.
3. Organizing - establishing systems to carry
   out plans.
4. Human Effectiveness - establishing positive
   and motivating relationships with staff and
   others.
5. Controlling and Monitoring - The
   leadership/management skills to carry out
   effective staff and program development.

The expectations established by Hagar and Scarr's
district provide a standard for any district endeavoring to

shift the focus of their administrative work toward educational improvement.

Principal as Manager - Facilitator

The concept of the principal functioning as school manager while teacher leaders carry out instructional leadership functions has been examined and supported by several researchers. Rallis and Highsmith (1986) suggested that the "disparity between principals' roles is too great for them to be effective managers and leaders at the same time" (p. 301). They noted that school maintenance functions spring from legitimate "immediate" needs, while leadership functions, a dichotomy of the managerial role, end up being passed over. Their principals would do what they say they are trained to do best; that is, to manage. Teachers would serve as instructional leaders - visionaries who would foster a developmental approach to skill building - insiders who speak a common vocabulary with their colleagues. This study suggested that the effective principal creates an environment in which procedural obstacles to innovation are removed, and teachers, treated as professionals, can themselves improve instruction. The authors believed that "creating such a safe and professional climate is the first step that must be taken in order to bring forward the instructional leaders - the master teachers - who are already present in our schools" (p. 303).

In discussing the twenty-four Chicago building

principals they shadowed, Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz and
Porter-Gehrie (1982) found that the principals committed
major segments of time to:

1. school monitoring behaviors (touring school
   corridors; receiving information; checking
   on activities in progress);
2. serving as school spokesperson (giving
   information to people outside the school,
   including administrative superiors);
3. serving the school staff internally as
   disseminators of information and group
   leaders (giving instructions to subordinates,
   socializing with the faculty, criticizing
   or commending a staff member); and
4. serving the school as both disturbance handlers
   and resource allocators (p. 689).

The authors also stated that "for the most part, the tempo
of life in a principal's workday is not conducive to serene
reflection and ordered, thoughtful decision making"
(p. 689).

Goodlad (1984) recommended the employment of head
teachers to serve as school instructional leaders. The
author states that

> developing and maintaining a school that is first rate
> in all characteristics . . . is a full time job . . . .
> It is naive and arrogant to assume that principals,
> who may or may not have been effective teachers, can
> acquire and maintain a higher level of teaching
> expertise than teachers engaged in teaching as a
> full-time occupation (p. 302-303).

Miller and Lieberman (1982) believed that "opportunity
for real leadership is marked by serendipity and opportunism
- by seizing the moment as it comes." They challenged the
notion of the principal as a powerful influence for
educational change and school improvement, saying that "in
reality . . . there is a huge gap between what the role of

the principal is supposed to be and what it actually is."
They believed there are two worlds: what the principal
"ought" to be and what he "is."

Ought	Is
Leader	Manager
Helper	Evaluator-Judge
Sharer of Knowledge	Keeper of Secrets
Democratic	Autocratic
Concerned with Individuals	Concerned with Total Organization
Long-range	Ad hoc, Spontaneous, Situational
Innovator	Maintainer
Champion of Ideas	Master of the Concrete

(p. 367)

Concern about these same limitations, traditions and the
demands on the principal's role were also expressed by
Wolcott (1984), DeFigio and Hughes (1987), and Gardner
(1988).

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) proposed that the
maintenance function of the principal "is as much, if not
more, a function of the organizational environment . . .
than a consequence of the intention of individual princi-
pals" (p. 24). They said that "while many principals might
dream of being effective instructional leaders by enhancing
activities of teaching and learning in their schools, in
reality, their experience is shaped by the press of
administrative and managerial functions that mitigate
against that dream becoming fact" (p. 24).

Gersten, Carnine and Green (1982) argued that it may not
always be necessary for site administrators to be actively
involved in instructional leadership. They explained that

activities which define instructional leadership can be
carried out, in part, by teacher leaders, reading
coordinators, parent groups, federally supported change
agents, or a combination of all. The authors stated that
regardless of whether or not the principal serves as a
strong instructional leader, schools cannot wait for these
"knights in shining armor" to emerge (p. 49). In a similar
vein, Hallinger and Murphy (1987) "caution . . . those who
would cast the principal in the role of the white knight,
heralding in an era of radically improved schools"
(p. 181).

Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) suggested that secondary
principals who delegate the responsibility for instructional
leadership simply feel that they can serve a more useful
role by providing general managerial direction, rather than
trying to improve directly on curricular and instructional
matters. Their argument for a team approach at that level
was based on the belief that secondary schools are more
loosely coupled or "decentralized," due to (a) the size of
the faculty; (b) the specialized curriculum decisions the
teacher must make, fostering increased autonomy; (c)
specialization among secondary teachers, which necessarily
results in less "expert power" for the secondary principal
(p. 52).

The realities of the principalship were also discussed
by Miller and Lieberman (1982) following a description of a
week in Miller's life as a high school assistant principal.

They conceptualized the principal's role in the following way:

- Omniscient Overseer - The principal has to know everything happening in the building.
- Confidant and Keeper of Secrets - The principal gains knowledge through a variety of sources and must keep those confidences.
- Sifter and Sorter of Knowledge - The principal must make decisions about problems, tasks and a variety of situations on a minute by minute and daily basis.
- Pace Setter and Routinizer - Regularity of the building is set by the principal.
- Referee - The principal runs interference between groups and individuals where the rules are often unclear.
- Linker and Broker - The principal provides the linkages between people, ideas and resources within the building and outside of it.
- Translator and Transformer - The principal is a policy maker and policy implementer.
- Paper Pusher, Accountant and Clerk - The principal is ultimately the manager and therefore accountable for "maximum production" and "minimum dissonance."
- Disciplinarian - The principal sets a tone for what's expected, what's tolerated and what is punished.
- Scapegoat - Because the principal is in charge he/she is the first to be blamed for problems and shortcomings.
- Educational Leader - Every principal wants to be the educational leader; however, there is little time built in for meaningful dialogue, planning and evaluation.
- Moral authority - It is the principal's notion of justice that prevails (p. 364-67).

As has been suggested, the principal's role has clearly changed in focus. Rather than expecting the principal to serve as instructional expert, recent scholars have suggested that he/she function as the facilitator for the instructional program. In this capacity, the principal's expertise is used to organize and direct the work of others.

In arguing for this approach, Mintzberg (1973) and Drucker (1980) promoted the concept of managers serving a linking function, motivating staff, and enabling people to do work. Both researchers believed that the manager should provide subordinates with direction, ask what they do and inquire about what kind of help they need.

Warner and Stokes (1987) examined instructional leadership responsibilities of over 200 principals at the secondary level. They discovered that responsibility for instructional leadership . . . was a shared responsibility. In other words, the principals involved assistant principals, department chairs, teachers and/or curriculum specialists in this process.

Cheryl Snell (1989), principal of a model elementary school, described the evolution of her role as an administrator by stating, "You can't be a manager anymore. You have to be more of a facilitator." Facilitative leadership, such as providing opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles, seek professional development, and gain recognition, was also seen by over 50% of Guzzetti and Martin's principals as the most effective strategy for instructional improvement (1984).

In her interview with Ron Brandt (1989), Lieberman said that the principal of the future, will spend "more time than is the case today facilitating the work of teams of teachers." She referred to Phil Schlechty's notion of the principal as "leader of leaders" then proposed that

principals engage in shared decision-making

> rather then assuming that one person is in charge who
> has to make all the tough decisions. It dignifies the
> idea that in any organization people have a variety of
> strengths to be nurtured and that all can be leaders
> in one way or another (p. 26).

Sergiovanni (1984), in discussing leadership roles in
secondary schools, stated that feelings of guilt are common
as principals are increasingly consumed by school management
and organizational affairs. As a result, he said that the
gap between reality and ideal has "personal consequences for
the principal and organizational consequences for the
school" (p. 3). In reconciling this gap, Sergiovanni said
that some principals become cynical and withdrawn. Because
of this reality, he believed that principals should view
themselves as educational statespersons rather than
educational leaders. In this capacity, the principal would
then be primarily concerned with the overall education
program, basic philosophy, general goals and objectives and
the broad structure and design for education.

When viewing the role of the principalship, it is
important to differentiate between the management styles of
traditional principals, who are most comfortable dealing
with paperwork, scheduling problems, discipline and daily
crises, and those of educational leaders. Snyder and
Anderson (1986) in their systems approach to school
organizations, said that the management function of the
educational leader is to work with teachers collaboratively
and maintain "dynamic equilibrium" through the following

characteristics:

- enough stability to achieve goals.
- enough continuity to ensure orderly change.
- enough adaptability to reach change.
- enough innovativeness to be proactive when conditions warrant (p. 50-51).

They suggested that principals must reexamine their priorities and reconsider their time and energy allocation. They contended that the time principals spend on managerial tasks is voluntary, that it is easier to handle daily trivia than to engage in instructional improvement activities. According to Snyder and Anderson, by avoiding the interaction of instruction, principals deprive themselves of a much higher level of job satisfaction.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Joyce (1986) similarily concluded that many organizations are over-managed and underled. Bennis and Nanus differentiated between the two roles, stating that "managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing" (p. 21).

Cawelti (1982) found that when principals debated whether they should be managers or educational leaders, the managerial role they perceived was handling logistics, schedules, policy interpretation, etc. Like Snyder and Anderson, he saw management as leadership knowledge and behavior that allows the principal to look at his/her own work in the areas of planning, organizing, directing and controlling in a facilitative way.

The principal's dilemma, balancing the reality of building management with the expectations for instructional

leadership, has been well recognized by the educational
community. School personnel must deal with this issue,
seeking appropriate operational changes allowing principals
more instructional input. Obviously, the resolution of that
issue will not come easily. In seeking solutions for the
problem, it would seem important to look at the structure of
the school and how it functions as a dynamic organization.

The Structure of Schools

School structure and the rigidity or fluidness of the
organization have significant influence on the work of
principals and teachers. Whether the school is seen as a
"loosely" or "tightly-coupled" organization or a combination
of both, principals must understand the need for their own
administrative practices to complement and enhance the
situation.

The influence educational administrators have on
classroom practices was studied by Deal and Celotti (1980).
In this study, elementary administrators and teachers were
asked to describe the instructional and organizational
patterns of the schools and districts in which they worked.
The purpose of the research was to compare the perceptions
of teachers and administrators about how the roles, policies
and administrative practices affected classroom organization
and instruction. The researchers discovered that these
elementary schools were loosely coupled with teachers
functioning autonomously in their respective schools. Links

between grade levels within individual districts were also seen as independent.

Deal and Celotti pointed out several implications:

1. Formal control may work in projects involving curriculum topics and the physical plant of the school, but instructional practices are not easily effected through such formal channels.
2. Because of the loose coupling of the educational organization, the staff, an organization itself, is more adaptable to change.
3. Structural looseness can reduce effectiveness due to teacher isolation, lack of consensus about rules and practices, and inadequate communication and professional sharing and dialog.
4. Activities, meetings and policies that formalize or tighten up the organization provide teachers and administrators opportunities to dialog, problem solve and function in a professional capacity (p. 472-473).

Organizations that live by the loose-tight principle "are on the one hand rigidly controlled, yet at the same time allow (indeed insist on) automony, entrepreneurship, and innovation from the rank and file. They do this literally through 'faith' - through value systems." (Peters and Waterman, 1982, p. 318).

According to Sergiovanni (1984), the combination of tight structure and loose structure corresponds very well to three important human characteristics associated with motivation: commitment, enthusiasm, and loyalty to school. He stated that teachers, students, and other school staff need to:

1. Find their work and personal lives meaningful, purposeful, sensible, and significant.
2. Have some reasonable control over their work activities and affairs and be able to exert reasonable influence over work events and circumstances.

3. Experience success, think of themselves as winners, and receive recognition for their success (p. 13).

He believed that people are willing to make a significant investment of time, talent, and energy in exchange for enhancement and fulfillment of these three needs (p. 13). For example, in the excellent schools he studied, a strong culture and clear sense of purpose exists. He pointed out that "this combination of tight structure around clear and explicit themes, which represent the core of the school's culture, and autonomy for people to pursue these themes in ways that make sense to them, may well be a key reason for their success" (p. 13).

Like Sergiovanni, Ulrich (1982) also believed that diverse ideas about the school's mission are common under conditions of loose coupling. In his opinion, administrators of loosely coupled systems should pay close attention to the issues on which people agree; he believed that these issues hold the system together and give it direction.

A discussion of the school structure would be incomplete without the added variable of the situation or environment school leaders function in and the leaders' own style of leadership. Harris (1976) noted that it is likely that there are certain attributes present among individuals who "possess abilities to lead others toward organizational achievement and sound interpersonal interaction, and who also have the ability to be situationally adaptive"

(p. 183). These attributes are:

1. Willingness to assume responsibility
2. The ability to be perceptive
3. The ability to be objective
4. The ability to establish proper priorities
5. The ability to communicate.

Likewise, Dwyer et al. (1984) observed that the most important lesson they learned from the 42 principals they interviewed was "recognition of the diversity of approaches to instructional management" (p. 37). They noted that principals "hold tightly to their own experiences as educators and their beliefs about important outcomes for their students" (p. 37).

According to the Leadership Contingency Model proposed by Fiedler (1967), task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in group situations which are very favorable or unfavorable, while relationship-oriented leaders perform best in situations that are moderately favorable. Such favorableness was seen by Fiedler as "the degree to which the situation enables the leader to exert his influence over his group" (p. 13). Fiedler, Chemers and Mahar (1976) said that Contingency Theory or "situational control" is dependent on two interacting or contingent factors: the personality of the leaders, which determines their leadership style, and the amount of control and influence which the situation provides leaders over their groups behavior, the task, and the outcome.

In an earlier discussion, Fiedler and Chemers (1974), Likert (1961), and Lipham, Rankin and Hoeh (1985) all proposed that leadership is a result of matching the

attributes of the leader with the demands and constraints of

the leadership situation. In other words, leader behavior

is more strongly determined by the situation than by what

the individual would like to do or thinks he ought to do.

Fiedler and Chemers concluded that

> the leader who may be quite employee centered and
> considerate in situations in which he feels in complete
> control tends to become concerned with the task in
> situations in which his control of the group is minimal
> (p. 53).

Vroom (1973) wrote that

> the situation does play an important role in determining
> the nature of the leaders decision process. . . .it
> makes as much sense to talk about autocratic and
> participative situations as it does to talk about
> autocratic and participative managers (p. 121).

He further stated that

> behavior in leadership positions is influenced not only
> by the situation, and by the average tendency of the
> leader to behave participatively or autocratically, but
> also by the interaction of the situational variables and
> the individual differences (p. 121).

Sams (1987) study of the leadership styles of successful

middle school principals verified the writing of previous

researchers. She found that:

- When circumstances are favorable, the principals
  do employ a variety of styles; yet all behave in
  a more human relationship orientation.
- When circumstances are unfavorable, the principals
  also employ a variety of styles; yet all behave in
  a more task-oriented mode.
- The principals' employment of style is clearly
  situational.
- The teachers' perceptions of their principal's
  leadership style tend to be more closely aligned
  when things are going well.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) pointed to the fact that

districts often present their own set of problems for the

principal. The district itself may be "excessively hierarchical" and highly rigid or "loosely coupled" with lack of agreed upon priorities and clear directions. Failure to provide resources and adequate funding is a common problem. Communication between central administrators and both principals and teachers is often viewed as insufficient (p. 331-333).

Duke (1988) investigated four principals who were thinking seriously of quitting their jobs. All four were in their mid-thirties, bright and very successful. Duke concluded that

> in spite of - or perhaps because of - their successes, these four principals appeared at times to be victims of the very personality traits that had helped them to succeed. Creative, compassionate, aggressive, and demanding, they were worn out, and they seriously questioned the wisdom of continuing (p. 308).

He cautioned supervisors to be sensitive to the principal's view of meaningful or trivial work, suggesting that the needs of principals are often overlooked in an effort to meet the needs of students and teachers.

Trump (1986) found that student discipline problems and faculty resistance to new ideas were the primary impediments preventing principals from working on instructional improvement.

The Structure of Secondary Schools

The secondary school and its organizational structure vary significantly from the elementary setting. Hallinger and Murphy (1987) noted that few findings regarding the

impact of elementary school principals have been validated

at the high school level. They took the position that

> secondary schools differ from elementary schools in
> several important respects, including goal structure,
> administrative organization, student and faculty
> characteristics, curricular organization and delivery,
> and linkages to parents and the community (p. 188).

It was their belief that, under the direction of the

secondary principal, "curriculum coordination, instructional

supervision, and monitoring of student progress must be

accomplished partly through the work of other administrative

staff" (p. 188).

Firestone and Herriott (1982) found that elementary

schools had more of a shared sense of purpose with greater

emphasis on basic skills instruction than secondary schools.

Departmentalization at the secondary level also affected the

principal's influence because secondary teachers are seen as

"subject matter specialists" (p. 52). Staff size was also

seen as another factor limiting the principal's influence on

secondary teachers.

None of the four junior high principals in Newberg and

Glatthorn's study of effective schools was perceived to be

providing instructional leadership. They took the position

that instructional leadership at the junior high is more

"diffuse and complex" than it is at the elementary. The

leadership role is more apt to come from a teacher than the

principal. The researchers propose that the instructional

leadership function should have two levels: general and

specific. Secondary schools need instructional leaders with

special expertise in specific content areas, allowing
administrators to "provide vision, direction and
coordination" (1982, p. 11).

Anderson and Nicholson (1987) investigated the
instructional leadership roles of principals, assistant
principals, and department chairpersons in eight high
schools. The 300 teachers who were surveyed perceived
principals, assistant principals and department chairpersons
as performing different instructional leadership functions;
yet no one group was seen as consistently providing high
leadership on any more than a few items. Principals were
viewed as least involved in instructional functions, while
assistant principals were seen as most involved. At the
same time, the relationship of teachers to chairpersons was
strongest when teachers sought help with classroom problems.
Significantly, in spite of this finding, principals and
assistant principals, when acting as instrutional leaders,
were considered more important than department chairpersons.
In other words, teachers attributed a dimension of power to
the two roles that department chairs did not possess.

Kelly (1980) indicated that secondary principals were
concerned with the conditions on the school's emotional,
social and cognitive environment and outcomes for students,
such as achievement and self-concept. However, in spite of
their interest and concern, these same principals indicated
that climate and outcomes were not systematically studied or
monitored. In fact, the average of any kind of assessment

in this area was less than 20 percent of the time. Kelly,
in reporting the study, admonished secondary administrators
by stating that meaningful changes in conditions and
outcomes were not likely to occur until the principals
themselves exercised leadership in assessing and developing
the climate of their schools.

The leadership behaviors of two hundred secondary
principals were investigated by Warner and Stokes (1987).
Their principals claimed primary responsibility for carrying
out 32 of 38 instructional leadership functions in their
school; however, they only assigned to themselves
responsibility for 14 of the 38 functions. The researchers
concluded that monitoring and instructional activities were
carried out, although it was not clear whether the principal
was responsible. Warner and Stokes cautioned against
concluding that principals are ineffective as instructional
leaders. Instead, they suggested that we look more closely
at their role and function in planning, organizing and
directing the school, and evaluating instructional
leadership activities effectively and appropriately carried
out by others.

Keefe (1987) and Heckman (1987) agreed that, like
teachers, school administrators lose familiarity with
instructional content and skills they no longer teach as
their personal teaching skills diminish and university
training becomes dated. Keefe theorized that principals
then grow uncomfortable with the responsibilities of real

instructional leadership, concentrating instead on "keeping the ship afloat" (p. 50). He believed that principals must update themselves on current content and organizational and methodological trends.

Principal as Instructional Leader

The difference between principals who function as building managers and principals who perform as educational leaders has been closely examined by the educational community. Smith and Andrews (1989) looked at the attitudes and values of 21 effective principals regarding instructional leadership activities, actual time spent on such activities, as well as the time spent on management functions. The data was then compared with a previous study of average principals by Andrews and Hallett. The table below was presented by Smith and Andrews to demonstrate the difference between their Strong Instructional Leaders and Average Principals.

Percentage of Time Spent on Job Dimensions

Job Dimensions	Average Principals	Strong Instructional Leader
Education program improvement	27	41
School-community relations	6	7
Student-related services and activities	28	18
Building management, operations and district relations	39	34
Average hours per day	10+	10.75+

According to Smith and Andrews, the Average Principals

indicated that while they ideally should spend 27 to 35% of their time in the areas of instructional improvement, they actually spent only 17 to 24%. The authors also pointed out that while Strong Instructional Leaders spent more time than the Average Principal on instructional improvement activities, there was little difference between the two groups in the area of building management. Instead, Strong Instructional Leaders spent less time on student-related services and activities (p. 23-30).

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) compared the approaches of typical principals and effective principals to routine administration and school management duties. The authors found "basic differences." They stated that

> typical principals reported being drowned in a
> sea of administrivia with no time left to attend
> to program improvement. Effective principals on
> the other hand managed such matters easily including
> the complexities of building a temporary system to
> support innovative program activities" (p. 330).

In her research on "effective schools," Barbara C. Taylor (1986) looked at the language of twenty-two principals, three from model schools in "light house districts" and nineteen from schools in the process of school improvement. She found that the "effective change principals" in her study were successful because they used strategic dialogue or sense making in their daily staff interactions. These were combined with (a) a criterion for the school's academic effectiveness, (b) the working relationship between principal, teachers, parents and students, (c) the setting of professional standards, and

(d) the enforcement of equitable discipline.

A case study of four low socio-economic status schools by Brookover et. al. (1979) further indicated the influence of principals on school environment and student achievement. The researchers looked at two predominantly white and two predominantly black schools. In each category, one school was a high achieving (A) school, the other a low achieving (B) school. While the summary referred to the collective attitudes and practices of both teachers and principals, the authors found practices of the principals in the high achieving schools to be different from those in low achieving schools.

Deal and Cellotti (1980) also believed that administrators can influence classroom activities and student achievement. They suggested that principals work more closely with teachers, get to know what they do, and offer support and advice as a "senior 'colleague'" (p. 473).

Hall, Rutherford, Hord and Huling (1984) investigated the leadership styles of principals in three studies they conducted in elementary schools. The focus of their work was on the change facilitator style of the principals. The three styles were:

> Responders - who place heavy emphasis on teachers as strong professionals and emphasize strong personal relationships (p. 24).

> Managers - who demonstrate responsive behaviors to situations and people, provide basic support and facilitate teacher use of innovation (p. 24).

> Initiators - who demonstrate clear, decisive long-range goals and policies. They tend to have strong beliefs and expectations about schools and teaching and work. They solicit input from staff, then make decisions in terms of school goals (p. 23).

The authors found that, even though curriculum implementation took place in all schools, there was more quality and quantity in schools with Initiator style principals than in schools with Manager and Responder styles. The researchers also reported that teachers in Manager type schools perceived a more positive school climate than those in schools featuring Initiator type leadership. Teachers in schools of Responder style principals were much less positive. Hall et al. attributed this finding to the fact that Manager style principals strive to keep things running smoothly and protect their teachers while "Initiator style principals listen to their teachers but have high expectations and keep pushing" (p. 26).

Teacher perceptions of the principal's role were studied by Giannangelo and Malone (1987). Overwhelmingly, 90.2% of the teachers stated that the principal's role should be that of instructional leader. While principals talked about the importance of the instructional leadership role, 79% of the teachers believed that much more time, energy, and effort was devoted to the building manager role. Teachers said that administrators were overly-concerned with non-academic administrative matters. In fact, only 15.3% of the teachers felt that the principals functioned as instructional leaders.

When Grace, Buser and Stuck (1987) asked thirteen outstanding principals and their staff members what outstanding principals do that makes them outstanding, the recurring response was that outstanding principals

- develop and maintain a healthy climate in which to work and learn.
- emphasize good instruction.
- regard personnel evaluation as an effective means of instructional improvement.
- seek means to help their staff members grow professionally.
- communicate effectively with all constituents.
- know and accept their own strengths and limitations.
- recognize and reinforce others who do outstanding work.

Hagar and Scarr (1983, p. 40) studied time spent by building administrators on various leadership/management activities:

| | Time Allocation | | | |
| | Elementary | | Secondary | |
Managerial Functions	Actual	Ideal	Actual	Ideal
Student Services	21%	12%	40%	24%
Community Relations	16%	14%	14%	15%
Operations	13%	9%	14%	10%
Instructional Leadership Functions				
Staff and Program Development	24%	35%	17%	27%
Evaluation	26%	30%	15%	24%

The district used the results of this study to institute a professional development effort targeting needed leadership and management skills. As a result, Hagar and Scarr reported a number of positive changes in the district, including a rise in elementary test scores and a significant change in teacher instructional and classroom management skills.

Adler (1988) believed that principals play a critical role in reforming education. He stated:

- That the principal of a school should be the principle teacher and educational leader of the school community;
- That the principal and faculty of a school should themselves be actively engaged in learning; and
- That the desire to continue their own learning should be the prime motivation of those who dedicate their lives to the profession of teaching (p. 309-310).

The principal's role as instructional leader was also advocated by Keefe (1987). He pointed out that certain behaviors are necessary for effective leadership. Unlike Adler, he argued that instructional leadership does not require that a principal teach or spend a majority of time with teachers and students, only that the principal establish the expectations for good teaching and learning. Keefe conceptualized leadership into four domains:

1. Formative - a firm and secure knowledge base.
2. Planning - with a current knowledge base, the principal is prepared to assist teachers with instructional planning.
3. Implementation - the principal must know the attributes of quality instruction, validate effective practices and help teachers find better ways when their efforts are not working.
4. Evaluation - systematic collection of evidence such as achievement test scores, attendance, library and media usage, and discipline problems.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) believed that "domains of knowledge" as they relate to skills should be the focus of identifying the competencies of educational leaders. They referred to the Katz model and the basic skills on which he believed successful supervision rests. Those

skills included:

1. Technical skills, which refer to the
    supervisor's knowledge, methods, and
    techniques to perform specific tasks.

2. Human skills, which refer to the
    supervisor's ability and judgment in
    working with and through people.

3. Conceptual skills, which refer to the
    supervisor's ability to view the school,
    the district, and the educational program
    as a whole (p. 25).

Even Rallis and Highsmith (1986), who persuasively
argued for a principal as manager/teacher as instructional
leader model for school, attributed the same skills to the
instructional leader that most teachers say they want to see
in their principal: a high level of trust, sincere interest,
approachability, a spirit of commitment and cooperation.
The authors said that the distinguishing characteristics of
effective instructional leaders are apt to be a set of
attitudes and beliefs rather than a set of skills and
behaviors.

The research generally supports the notion that strong
instructional leaders organize the managerial side of their
job to allow themselves time to spend on curriculum and
instruction. Principals who function in this way are
successful in spite of the obstacles and constraints of the
normal school setting. They successfully facilitate
instructional change.

Specific areas in which these outstanding principals
seem to shine include influencing staff morale, creating a
vision and developing goals for the school, creating a

sense of trust and serving as change agents for the school
program.

Principal Leadership Behaviors and Staff Morale

The research clearly indicates that the attitude and
actions of the principal in his/her daily work have
immediate and long-term effects on the morale of staff
members. If the school is a positive and productive place,
the principal, to a large extent, has been the controlling
influence in how teachers perceive their work environment.
When asked to name the principal's most important goal,
Gardner (1988) pointed to morale. He believed that teachers
"need help from principals who can lead the way in building
respect for them as professionals." Gardner, who felt
strongly that teachers should be treated like professionals
and have professional duties, stated that "by building the
teachers sense of themselves as professionals, principals
build the school as a community" (p. 77).

Principals "give people pride in what they do" (Peters
and Waterman, 1982, p. 180). Blumberg and Greenfield (1980)
said that "excellent principals treat each teacher as a
unique individual, with particular wants and needs" (p.
132). The authors also noted that an excellent principal
feels personally responsible for the welfare of all of his
or her people on and off the job.

The relationship between teacher morale and the
principal's administrative leadership style was studied by

Allred (1980). Halpin's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was used to score the principal's leader behavior. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) was administered to determine teacher morale. Allred found in his study of 268 teachers that high morale was significantly related to Halpin's two dimensions of leader behavior (Initiating Structure and Consideration), although the correlation coefficients for teacher morale and the Consideration dimension were generally higher.

Fiedler and Chemers (1974) described the Consideration dimension as the degree to which the supervisor shows concern, understanding, warmth and sympathy for the feelings and opinions of subordinates and the degree to which he/she is considerate of their needs and welfare and is willing to explain supervisory actions. Initiation of Structure behaviors is related to the assignment of roles and tasks within the group, scheduling work assignments, defining goals, setting work procedures and standards, and evaluating work. Fiedler and Chemers suggested that considerate supervisors are more likely to provide their subordinates with rewards, while supervisors who initiate structure may reward selectively for high performance.

Mahrer (1985) also used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire to obtain a teacher morale score, as well as The Profile of Organizational Characteristics developed by Likert (1967), to identify the leadership styles of principals. The morale of his 450 teachers was the lowest among those who perceived

the leadership style of their principal to be Exploitive
Authoritative (autocratic). The Benevolent Authoritative
leadership style (next to the most autocratic) revealed the
next lowest morale scores. Likert's Consultative leadership
style ranked second highest, with the highest scores for
morale among principals who were perceived as Participative
style leaders. Although the differences were not
significant, morale appeared to be generally greater among
elementary teachers than among junior high and senior high
teachers.

Hallinger and Murphy (1987) also differentiated between
the type of leadership needed at the secondary and at the
elementary level. They took the position that secondary
school principals cannot rely on the same type of direct
leadership activity utilized by their peers at the
elementary level. They said that in high schools

> the larger staff and student populations, the
> multileveled organizational structure, and the
> specialized subject area knowledge of teachers all
> limit the principal's ability to be personally
> involved in all aspects of instructional
> management. . . .[therefore] the principal must rely
> more on indirect, facilitative, and symbolic modes
> of expression, providing direct intervention in
> selected situations" (p. 188).

Work-related value systems of teachers, the perceived
leadership behaviors of principals, and the relationship to
teacher morale was studied by Clark (1981) in seven inner
city secondary schools. Halpin's Leader Behavior
Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), the Work Values
Questionnaire (WVQ) and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

(PTO) were used. Like Allred, Clark's findings led him to conclude that the higher the score on either of the leader dimensions of Consideration or Initiating Structure on the (LBDQ), the stronger the relationship with teacher morale, although the relationship between morale and Consideration was stronger than the relationship between morale and Initiating Structure. In his concluding discussion Clark stated that

> managers could increase the opportunities for teachers to experience job satisfaction if they would learn more about value systems and subsequently adopt leader behavior which is based on the value systems of teachers rather than their own (p. 66).

Andrew, Parks, and Nelson (1985) reviewed approximately 300 reports, surveyed 300 schools and conducted case studies in 10 school systems. The following is a summary of their findings related to the characteristics and behaviors of principals who had a positive effect on teacher morale:

- Personal Characteristics of the Administrator: In the schools with better morale, principals were outgoing, friendly and good organizers. They were described as "open, helpful, student-centered, systematic, responsive and fair." In no case did schools nominated as having poor morale report that the administrator demonstrated open, warm or consistent types of behaviors.

- Communications: School systems with good morale used informal as well as formal networks of communication. Districts with poor morale relied on formal systems of communication; faculty meetings focused only on academic and discipline problems.

- Sense of Mission: In contrast to poor morale schools, the principal in good morale schools worked closely with teachers, and their schools had a well-articulated curriculum.

- Participation in Decision Making: Although none of the schools visited exhibited the participatory management style of Likert's System Four management in the better morale schools, there was greater involvement of teachers in decision-making, particularly in those matters that affected them professionally.

- Recognition of Teachers' Contributions: Schools with better morale generally had better systems, both formal and informal, for recognizing teacher's contributions.

- Discipline: In schools with poor morale administrators and teachers often raised the issue of discipline. In schools with good morale, discipline codes were developed by teams of teachers and students with considerable input from the administration.

- Staff Development and Recruitment: Even though all schools in the case studies had some form of staff development in schools with better morale, teachers were very much involved in planning staff development programs, and administrators actively encouraged teachers to further their training.

A Sense of Vision

Snyder and Anderson (1986), Cawelti (1984), and Newberg and Glatthorn (1982) took the position that while princi-pals must not only be knowledgeable about present day concepts and methodologies, they must also have a clear vision of what school ought to be, a skill for enabling groups to work productively toward common purposes, a commitment to working with the staff while they work toward new ideals of schooling, and a personal sense of mission that is communicated continuously.

According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), their leaders were social architects who understood their organizations and the way they worked. They created a vision for the organiza-

tion, conveyed the vision to everyone and institutionalized the goal through employee commitment. They stated that:

- Leaders were able to articulate and define the vision or goal of the organization and give it meaning (p. 40).
- Each leader had a distinctive style in which he/she communicated (p. 146-150).
- All leaders knew the facts about the organization and knew why they were pointed in a particular direction (p. 40).
- Leaders were creative at discovering problems. The highest form of discovery always requires 'problem finding' (p. 41).
- In no case did . . . effective leaders delegate the task of shaping the social architecture (of the organization) to anyone else (p. 150).

Peters in an interview with Koerner (1988) supported the current focus on the importance of the principal as the school leader. He said that we make too much of distinguishing between the manager and leader; both approaches are crucial to success. He viewed the person in charge as a visionary who sees him/herself as a institution shaper. He said that the best leaders receive an "unbelievable kick" out of watching other people attempt new approaches.

"Leadership gives an organization its vision and its ability to translate that vision into reality. Without this translation, a transaction between leaders and followers, there is no organizational heartbeat" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 20-21).

Gardner (1988) said that principals must "have a keen sense of what their school at its heartbeat can be" and "fend off the pressures that want to change it in another direction." He proposed that

the real problem . . . is not the choice between
changing and not changing, because change is going
to happen. Rather, it's how leaders can choose
change that's going in the direction where their
vision points (p. 76).

According to Peters and Austin (1985), "you have to know
where you are going, to be able to state it clearly and
concisely, and you have to care about it passionately"
(p. 284). In their view successful visions are also
realistic. They noted that "nothing is more demoralizing
and ultimately useless than unachievable vision" (p. 286).

Goal Setting and School Outcomes

The attitudes and beliefs of principals are also evident
in the way they go about developing the goals of the school
and monitoring outcomes. Ubben and Hughes (1987), Hersey
and Blanchard (1969), Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), New-
berg and Glatthorn (1982), and Drucker (1986) all stressed
the need for principals with a clear sense of direction and
a sincere commitment to providing opportunities for staff
participation in the goal setting and planning processes.

From his assessment of eight studies, Sweeney (1982)
stated that "principals do make a difference." He
found . . . leadership behavior to be positively associated
with school goals and outcomes. Specific leadership
behaviors that emerged were: (1) emphasizes achievement,
(2) sets instructional strategies, (3) provides an orderly
school atmosphere, (4) frequently evaluates student
progress, (5) coordinates instruction, and (6) supports
teachers (p. 349).

Identification of goals and the planning to achieve those goals are integral to the success of the school community. The function of effective principals in this process was described by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982). They believed that effective principals "used the process of planning and goal formulation to encourage participation of teachers in decision-making."

Perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader and the impact on reading and math achievement of students were examined by Andrews, Soder and Jacoby (1986). The researchers concluded that students in schools administered by principals rated by teachers as strong instructional leaders had significantly greater gain scores in reading and math than schools administered by principals rated as average or weak. The most significant gains were made by black students and free lunch students. However, in schools administered by weak instructional leaders, these same students lost 2.34 points and .09 points respectively.

Kelley (1980) and Drucker (1986) believed that the principal is the individual in the school most responsible for the climate of the school and the productivity and satisfaction attained by students and staff.

Bogue (1985) believed that the act of leadership is to apply a touch of optimism and to hold high expectations of performance. He noted that it would be well [for managers] to remember that:

- Expecting others to do their best is not the same as ensuring success, but it will increase probability.
- Expecting others to give their best should not be used to make others the prisoners of our expectations but to free their potential.
- Expecting others to explore the far limits of their potential is not the same as making achievement sound easy. There must be real challenge to human effort and ingenuity associated with that expectation (p. 29).

Thirteen studies cited by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) indicated that effective principals:

a. place the achievement and happiness of students first in their priorities,
b. view themselves as instructional leaders whose function is to ensure that students . . . are provided with the best possible programs,
c. are exceptionally clear about their own . . . goals for students and these goals usually center on the basics,
d. focus the majority of energies and those of the staff on solving problems that are related, providing a basic education and balanced curriculum to students (p. 320).

The authors also pointed out that while the effective principal works toward instructional leadership, routine administration, and human relations, the principal will "sacrifice smooth interpersonal relationships . . . for the sake of a more effective program" (p. 321).

Clark, Lotto and McCarthy (1980) found in their study that staff development and inservice training programs were present and were focused on specific school and program goals. This staff development effort was seen as "evidence of leader initiative for school improvement" (p. 469). Successful schools were characterized by clearly stated curricular goals and objectives. The principal was seen as

key in effecting student achievement through initiative and monitoring.

Mitchell (1987) closely studied fifteen teachers over a period of a year. He concluded that "beliefs about the goals of education play a major role in motivating teachers - both in energizing their commitment to particular teaching activities and in guiding their selection of strategies for preparation and presentation of lessons" (p. 226). In other words, once good teachers perceive the merit of an activity, they are motivated to do their best.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) described all ninety leaders in their study as having unparalleled concern with outcomes. It was their belief that successful leaders are the most results oriented individuals in the world, whose compelling vision pulls people toward them. Such individuals combine intensity with commitment, making them magnetic leaders. These leaders:

1. [Were] superb listeners.
2. Established formal and informal channels of communication.
3. Spent a substantial portion of their time interacting with a wide variety of other people inside and outside of the organization. They were great askers.
4. Were synthesizers of information (p. 87-109).

Professional growth and goal setting were fostered by effective principals in the studies examined by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982). The principals

> encouraged teachers to spend large portions of time in instruction. . . .promoted norms supporting individual initiative, risk taking and continual change. . . .publicly and unambiguously express(ed) support for new practices related to program improvement (p. 327).

The authors noted that effective principals also attempted
"to develop trust," making "themselves available as sounding
boards for teachers' problems or new ideas." Leithwood and
Montgomery pointed out that "in contrast, less effective
principals tend not to give expression to their endorsement
of teacher practices; their style of interaction is more
formal and authoritarian" (p. 327). They also "fail to
consider the emotions and values of teachers."

Trust

Lyman (1987) suggested that when supervisors respect
teachers, demonstrating empathy and sensitivity, they foster
a collegial, collaborative relationship. For school im-
provement efforts to succeed, teachers must begin to view
themselves as proactive classroom managers, possessing the
capacity to help students learn and work with other
managers, like principals. He said that

> in order to empower teachers to view themselves as
> managers, supervisors need to demonstrate trust,
> demonstrate belief in the importance of the teacher's
> role, demonstrate willingness to collaborate with
> teachers and build collegial relationships based on
> equality and mutual regard (p. 2).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Peters (1988) said that
trust is integrity, respect, accountability, predictability,
and reliability.

According to Fiedler and Chemers (1974)

> the leader's authority depends on his acceptance by his
> members. If others are willing to follow him because
> of his pleasant personality, his trustworthiness, or
> his charisma, the leader has little need for the
> organizational support provided by task structure and

position power. If the leader is distrusted, his situation will necessarily be less favorable even when organization support is at his disposal (p. 64).

Lightfoot (1983) said that her

good high schools reveal a sustained and visible ideological stance that guards them against powerful and shifting societal intrusions; that what is often perceived as solitary leadership in schools is fueled by partnerships and alliances with intimate, trusted associates (p. 25).

A factor analysis of teacher perceptions of their principal and school climate was done by Watson, Crawford and Kimball (1985). Analysis of their 78 item survey indicated one very strong factor, primarily affective in nature. The highest loading items were "treats staff with respect" and "is open and friendly."

Principal as Change Agent

The success of the principal in working with the staff is clearly dependent on the level of trust between the parties. Another reality of their life is the expectation of teachers, parents, students and central administration that the principal will succeed in making appropriate changes. If the principal is to function as a change agent in the school and assist teachers in moving in that direction, the factors of trust and commitment to the staff must be present.

Saario (1979) described three skills and attitudes that are key to such a leadership role: (a) the use of expert advice in developing more informed judgment and decision-making, (b) developing sensitivity to others, and

(c) keeping in mind that goals should not be rigid makers of success.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) noted that "all leaders faced the challenge of overcoming resistance to change through the achievement of voluntary commitment to shared values" (p. 185). They described their transformative leaders as "catalysts . . . capable of deploying their ideas and themselves into some consonance and thereby committing themselves to a greater risk - the exposure and intimacy that most of us emotionally yearn for, rhetorically defend, and in practice shun." They said the new leader "is one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change" (p. 3).

Earlier research on the principal as "change agent" was reviewed by Brookover and Erickson (1975). They cited Eicholz, Rogers and Mahans' conclusions that the principal's position was the one in which change was most likely to be initiated. However, Eicholz found earlier that only one in five principals in his study acted as a change agent (p. 88).

Mintzberg (1973) said that "as entrepreneur the manager initiates and designs much of the controlled change in his organization. He continually searches for problems and opportunities" (p. 98). In this same vein, Blake and Mouton (1981) noted that an attitude and practice of independence is a key to "the capacity of some people to exercise

leadership of exceptionally high quality and to lead others in new and uncharted ways rather than merely to keep an ongoing system running smoothly" (p. 58).

Leadership Styles and Behaviors

While further review of the leadership styles and behaviors of principals might in some instances be redundant, the need for a broad understanding of the literature dictates discussion of the attitudes and practices that successful principals bring to their work.

Clark, Lotto and McCarthy (1980) identified ten factors positively associated with successful urban schools. Those factors related to school leadership were:

1. The leadership style or behavior of the principal - Principals in effective urban schools initiated programs, set policy, obtained resources, motivated and supported school improvement.
2. Leader attitudes - Leaders in these schools "did more" according to the researchers. They set goals and objectives, standards of performance, created a productive working environment, obtained needed support, and influenced and motivated teachers.

Lightfoot (1983) found that each of her principals defined his/her role and relationships differently, exhibiting styles that "reflected their own character, temperament and individual inclinations as well as the demands and dynamics of the institution" (p. 325).

Nottingham (1983) cited Bates and Kiersey and the four leadership styles they identified: the judicial leader who is a competent judge of consequences and alternatives, an

anticipator of consequences who is willing to take risks;
the negotiator or trouble shooter who has the skills to
bring together parties in dispute; the visionary leader,
described as a "portrait painter of possibilities,"
establishes a sense of direction, persuading others that the
vision can be achieved; and the catalyst, an agent of change
who taps the potential of people, finding and nourishing
talent and bringing out the leadership in every person.

Smith and Andrews (1989) concluded that there are four
broad areas of strategic interaction between principals and
teachers: (1) the principal as resource provider, (2) the
principal as instructional resource, (3) the principal as
communicator, and, (4) the principal as visible presence.
They found that teachers tended to agree on 18 specific
statements:

Principal as Resource Provider

	Percentage		
	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
1. My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.	95	68	41
2. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.	90	54	33
3. My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.	90	52	33
4. My principal is considered an important instructional resource person in this school.	79	35	8

Smith and Andrews concluded that strong resource providers
did not regard the school budget as an expenditure plan;

instead, it was seen as an expendable allocation. These same leaders viewed the entire school community and district as a potential resource.

Principal as Instructional Resource

	Percentage		
	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
1. My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.	89	78	75
2. My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.	72	47	25
3. My principal's evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching.	78	46	17
4. My principal helps faculty interpret test results.	54	35	9

Although the three groups varied little with respect to encouraging different instructional strategies, there were clear differences in instructional leadership behaviors, particularly when dealing with teacher problems and evaluation.

Principal as Communicator

	Percentage		
	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
1. Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal.	80	49	25
2. My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.	85	41	17
3. My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance.	90	63	17
4. My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.	90	49	17

	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
5. My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters	92	50	17
6. My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance.	68	29	18

Strong instructional leaders communicated a sense of professionalism and provided a clear vision of the school. Even though they were not seen as frequently providing feedback to teachers about classroom performance, strong leaders encouraged teachers to innovate.

Principal as Visible Presence

	Percentage		
	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
1. My principal makes frequent classroom observations.	72	31	17
2. My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	94	68	66
3. My principal is a "visible presence" in the building to both staff and students.	93	75	46
4. My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.	97	64	50

According to the researchers, the extent to which the principal was visible to both the staff and students was the most important factor. They term strong instructional leaders as "visionaries who are out and around" (p. 36).

One resource area of importance is the recruitment of good teachers (Lightfoot, 1983; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Mazarella, 1982; Arnn and Mangieri, 1988). Bartell and Willis (1987) asked outstanding Japanese and American

principals to rank their responsibilities for instructional leadership. While both groups selected evaluating teachers and articulating goals, Japanese principals ranked recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers as their highest variable.

Secondary principals in the state of Virginia ranked formulating school goals, participating in the selection of all instructional personnel, and visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques as their most important instructional leadership activities (Warner and Stokes, 1987).

Ubben and Hughes (1987) believed that positively influencing the quality of the staff through the selection process may be the most important long-term action of the principal. They said that "the level of authority given a principal in employing staff becomes a major factor over time in the principal's ability to influence the makeup of the staff" (p. 22).

Peters and Austin (1985) advocated the practice of Management By Wandering Around (MBWA). They believed that MBWA is a practical concept allowing the manager to simply listen, empathize and stay in touch with all levels of the organization. The authors stated that the real "technology of leadership. . . .leading a school, small business or a Fortune 100 company is primarily paying attention" (p. 32). Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) also advocated the practice of Management by Walking Around. They noted that "excellent

principals practice the one-minute management approach by visiting every teacher each day for approximately one minute" (p. 131).

Outstanding leadership characteristics were identified by Levine and Stark (1982) in their study of three school district improvement programs in Brooklyn, New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. While the researchers noted that they saw outstanding administrative leadership at both the building and district level, they pointed to two leadership characteristics apparent at all of the schools. The first was administrative support and skill in providing a "structured institutional pattern" (p. 45). Supportive leadership in these instances focused on such things as school security and careful but informal accounting so that teacher volunteer time was compensated in some way. The researchers explained that this support was "embodied not so much in any single policy or action but more by a pervasive concern for problems teachers face every day in the school . . . and understanding of the teachers point of view" (p. 45). The second predominant characteristic was the willingness of administrators to interpret rules in a manner that enhanced the effectiveness of their institutions. Rules and regulations were "bent. . . .and freely interpreted with a view to improving the effectiveness of the school" (p. 45).

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) suggested that leaders in high performing systems can nurture school champions by:

1. Removing obstacles that impede the progress of champions.
2. Tolerating champions even when they are a nuisance.
3. Tolerating and nurturing failure.
4. Becoming knowledgeable about high risk-oriented achievers.
5. Becoming a strong advocate of experimentation and innovation and letting everybody know it.

Dwyer (1984) and his researchers talked with 42 principals who were viewed by their peers as successful instructional leaders. Principals in the study were found to be highly visible, meticulous in their attention to detail and predictable in their daily activities and relationships with the staff.

Peters and Waterman (1982) said that because of attention, "the mere Hawthorne effect," productivity goes up (p. 271). They viewed attention as a symbolic behavior, the result of the leader's concern.

Peters and Austin (1985) also recognized that this critical dimension of "quality that truly successful leaders understand is about care, people, passion, consistency, eyeball contact and gut reaction" (p. 106). The authors asked their successful leaders what the company looks for in a prospective employee. Unequivocally, the response was "someone who is a caring person" (p. 289).

Teacher Isolation

Most educators, including principals, have long accepted the condition that teachers should be allowed to teach behind their closed doors with little interference. Many

teachers prefer the autonomy and comfortableness of their situation, often successfully resisting administrative and/or peer efforts to introduce change. Heckman (1987) described such a condition when he stated that "working alone, teachers soon begin to distrust both the ideas of and the interactions with others who stand in the way of their major source of rewards - the students" (p. 80). He indicated that teachers in most schools "remain isolated from one another. . . .do not discuss very much what they do in their classrooms. . . .do not discuss significant classroom problems nor seek collegial solutions to them" (p. 71). He recommended a renewal process that requires teachers and principals to work together to solve school problems.

Tye and Tye (1984) viewed teacher isolation, as well as lack of involvement in the change process and staff development, as impediments to an effective change process. The authors stated that in their research in 38 schools, "most . . . teachers worked alone in self-contained classrooms and had little or no opportunity to observe other teachers at work. They seemed to know little about their colleagues' relationships with students, their job competence, or their educational beliefs" (p. 320). Tye and Tye also reported that linkages to professional sources of knowledge outside of the district were also "haphazard and weak" (p. 320).

Goodlad (1984) found that teachers appeared to function

in an autonomous way; however, their autonomy "seemed to be exercised in a context more of isolation than of rich professional dialogue about a plethora of challenging educational alternatives" (p. 186). Teachers were most influenced by their own interests, background and experiences and their students' interests and experiences. They rarely collaborated with peers, visited other schools or observed one another in classrooms, even though three quarters said they would like to observe other teachers at work.

The issue of teacher isolation was touched upon by Weick (1982) in his discussion of loosely coupled schools. He stated that ties among people in schools are weaker and more unpredictable. As a result, teachers become uncertain and lonely. Snyder and Anderson (1984) noted that

> the lone wolf principal and the isolated teacher are like dinosaurs from another age. . . .we need to rid our schools of isolated work patterns and, instead, inspire in teachers a sense of shared purpose and shared success in redefining schooling outcomes and work patterns (p. 37).

Classroom isolation is a reality with which teachers must deal. The literature clearly indicates a need for the principal to involve teachers in school planning and dialogue with the rest of the professional staff.

The Power of the Principalship

Principals, by virtue of their position, have the power to control many circumstances in the lives of teachers and students. How successful they are in creating a positive,

dynamic environment will to a great extent depend on the relationships they develop with their staff, especially the isolated teacher. In turn, those relationships are dependent on how the principal uses the power of his/her role.

In examining this area, Katz and Kahn (1978) believed that truly successful leadership comes from referent power, a personal liking between leader and follower, and expert power, which depends on the knowledge and the ability of the leader. They noted that these skills contrast to the organizationally given powers of "punishment and legitimate authority."

Expert and referent power, described by the authors as important in facilitating any organization's work, cannot readily be conferred by the organization. In other words, a given school principal may have a legitimate title; however, the unofficial role of referent and expert power will only happen if the principal functions in a leadership role. In fact, the authors said that "even legitimate power, if unaccompanied by referent and expert power, may produce a sullen and grudging performance" (p. 520). They cited studies done by Student in 1966 and 1968 which indicated that performance measures of legitimate power, coercive power and reward power had low to negative correlations with good performance, while a general pattern of positive correlations existed among supervisors possessing expert and especially referent power.

In describing their successful managers, Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that "we must learn to perceive power for what it really is, . . .the reciprocal of leadership" (p. 16-17). They viewed power as the "basic energy needed to initiate and sustain action or . . . the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it" (p. 17).

In Drucker's view, power is to be shared. He believed that "managers can not and will not be able to maintain control unless they build 'property' that is, the employe(e), into the power structure and control of enterprise" (1986, p. 190).

Shared Decision-Making and Empowerment of Staff

The empowerment of teachers, as Drucker suggested, has been widely discussed and written about since the mid-eighties. In a study of 23 principals and 132 teachers in the Anchorage School District, Stimson and Appelbaum (1988) investigated the use of personal power and positional power. Like Drucker, the authors viewed power as a resource to be shared. The authors found that most teachers believe their principals relied on personal power. Positive correlations were found between teacher satisfaction and all three personal power styles, while positional power styles were negatively correlated with teacher satisfaction. The authors also found that "most teachers lack meaningful opportunities to make decisions concerning their pro- fessional lives" (p. 315). However, they discovered that

satisfied teachers believed that their principals cared
about their opinions and responded to their concerns and
principals who took the time to build coalitions - to
plant ideas with key teachers and then slowly build
support - were among the most effective in influencing
change in their schools (p. 315).

They concluded that power sharing, through collaboration and
participative decision-making, can give teachers a sense of
ownership and enhance their self-esteem (p. 316).

In Goodlad's study of nine high schools, six emerged as
less satisfying and three as more satisfying (1984). He
reported that "there were striking differences in
perceptions of their own professional power and autonomy
between principals of schools perceived to be 'more' and
'less' satisfying." Goodlad wrote that:

Principals of schools that teachers found 'more
satisfying' felt themselves to be significantly more
in control of their jobs and use of time and to have
more influence over decisions regarding their own
schools than did principals of schools perceived as
'less satisfying'. Without exception, the principals
of the 'more satisfying' schools saw the amount of
influence they had as congruent with the amount of
influence they thought principals should have
(p. 179).

Key decision-making about professional matters affecting
one's work is a perogative of very few teachers, said Ann
Lieberman (1989). She stated that "when it becomes
legitimate for teachers to work together, they not only
get a sense of themselves as a group, they begin to help
each other solve problems they cannot solve by themselves"
(p. 25).

Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) also believed that there is
value in shared leadership. Changes in administration

staffing will still allow the school to continue functioning; organizations are "best served by leaders who empower others" (p. 41).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) advocated teacher empowerment, stating that "leadership stands in the same relationship to empowerment that management does to compliance. The former encourages a 'culture of pride,' while the latter suffers from the 'I only work here' syndrome" (p. 218).

Boyer (1988) claimed that "the profession of teaching . . . will remain imperiled - not because salaries or credentials are too low - but because day to day conditions in the schools leave many teachers more responsible but less empowered" (p. 62). He cites recent national research done by the Carnegie Foundation that discovered that:

- nearly one-third say they have no role in shaping the curriculum they are asked to teach.
- more than 50 percent do not participate in planning their own inservice education programs.
- seventy percent are not asked to help shape retention policies at their school.
- and more than 60 percent are not involved in deciding which students will be "tracked" into special classes (p. 62).

Boyer stated that he found it "ironic" that industry involves plant workers in decisions, but the school reform movement "risks moving in the opposite direction" (p. 62).

The principal's key influence on student achievement through empowerment of the staff was described by McCormack-Larkin (1985) in her article about Milwaukee's Project Rise. In five years, 18 Milwaukee elementary schools raised their achievement levels significantly. The

author stated that "principals reported a change in their role as building manager to include being an instructional leader" (p. 33). The principals met with other principals from effective schools who emphasized successful practices in curriculum development, monitoring instruction, classroom visitations and focusing on instructional issues in staff meetings. McCormack-Larkin reported that principals worked closely with grade level teams and individual teachers to develop awareness of building goals and the teacher's responsibility to be involved, make decisions, and function as advocates for change.

Teachers in Striplin's study (1987) indicated they wanted to be involved, to improve, to set and attain goals, to be high performing, to have school spirit, to work together, and to have input into decisions. Additionally, they wanted to be treated as professionals and their principal to be credible.

Bennis and Nanus' (1985) leaders designed open organizations that were both participative and anticipative. Within these organizations, "employees were given a genuine sense of responsibility for their unit and its progress" (p. 209). Employees were also given "a stake in the creation of new innovations and ideas" (p. 211).

Gardner, in an interview with the NASSP Bulletin (1988), noted that "the whole movement toward the revolution of initiative and responsibility is appropriate. . . .if principals can let teachers make some of the decisions,

we'll have viable schools" (p. 74). In his opinion,
principals who delegate more decision-making to teachers
"enhance their (own) leadership" (p. 78).

Likert (1961) said that a leader seeks to "minimize the
influence of his hierarchical position," and endeavoring to
deemphasize status by:

- listening well and patiently,
- not being impatient with the progress being made
  by a group,
- accepting more blame than may be warranted for
  any failure or mistake,
- giving group members ample opportunity to express
  their thoughts,
- being careful never to impose a decision upon the
  group.
- putting his contributions often in the form of
  questions or stating them speculatively,
- arranging for others to help perform leadership
  functions which enhance their status.

The impact of management-employee collaboration and team
building on productivity was reported by Mays (1945). He
cited the Western Electric study in which management and
researchers found that increased illumination yielded high
production in both experimental and control settings. Mays
concluded that: 1) the organization of working teams, and
2) the free participation of teams in making decisions about
their work were the two areas that most directly affected
the outcomes of the experiment.

The effort of effective principals to seek the expertise
of their staffs and involve them in decision-making was
pointed out by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982). The authors
noted that effective principals "seek staff advice on
important issues, encourage participation early in the

decision making process. . . .view[s] the decision-making process as shared and treat[s] the teacher as an equal in the process" (p. 326).

The business world has to a great extent revolutionized its pattern of adversarial relations and established team building within and between work groups. Ouchi (1984), like the proponents of today's educational leaders, states that within organizations

> the individual strivings of division heads must not be reined in, but those individual efforts must have a collaborative rather than an adversarial climate within which to operate. The collaboration must never become dominant, however, or the advantages of autonomy and individualism will be lost and the organization will degenerate into a ponderous bureaucracy (p. 24).

He further proposed that the "task of top management. . . .is to coordinate the efforts of individuals in such a way that each works to his or her highest level of ability" (p. 25).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) said their leaders talked about "persistence and self knowledge; about willingness to take risks and accept losses; about commitment, consistency and challenge. . . .above all they talked about learning" (p. 187-88).

Drucker (1980) also recognized that productivity requires continuous learning. He suggested that such learning requires that:

> 1. People are constantly challenged to think through what they can do to improve what they are already doing. He says this follows the Japanese Zen concept of learning: that one learns in order to do better what one already knows how to do well.

2. Managers are willing to ask employees
   systemmatically and to listen to their answers.
3. Managers accept the fact that the person who
   does the job is likely to know more about it
   than the person who supervises (p. 24-25).

Johnson and Johnson (1989) proposed that "relationships

and interactions among people determine how truly effective

a school will be. They noted leadership can be demonstrated

by:

1. Challenging the status quo of the competitive/
   individualistic tradition.
2. Inspiring a vision of what the school could
   be if cooperative learning for students and
   cooperative teaming for staff members were
   used frequently and consistently.
3. Empowering teachers by organizing them into
   cooperative teams (e.g., collegial support
   groups, task forces, and ad hoc decision-making
   groups).
4. Leading by modeling the use of cooperative
   procedures.
5. Encouraging staff members to continue their
   quest to be better and better cooperative
   learning teachers.

Teachers contract negotiations have provided another

forum for the empowerment of teachers. Hough (1978) noted

in his article "Power and Influence in the Change Process"

that, in addition to contractual provisions for inservice

programming, teacher unions have successfully pressed for

language that has given teachers a say in the curriculum

development process.

According to Rutter et al. (1979) schools with positive

outcomes, decisions tended to be made at a senior level

rather than staff room; however, teachers stated that their

views and opinions were represented and considered in the

decision-making process (p. 193). The authors also noted

that

> attendance was better and delinquency less frequent in
> schools where courses were planned jointly. . . .group
> planning provided opportunities for teachers to
> encourage and support one another. Exam successes
> were more frequent and delinquency less common in
> schools where discipline was based on . . . expectations
> set by the school rather than left to individual
> teachers to work out for themselves (p. 192).

Little's study of mastery learning and the role of

principals in working with teachers was discussed by

Lieberman and Rosenholtz (1987). Successful principals

(a) announced expectations for shared work and shared talk,

(b) allocated resources and rewards for working together,

and, (c) provided daily opportunities for interaction among

teachers.

Teacher Supervision

A number of authors distinguish between the adminis-

trative practices of clinical supervision and teacher

evaluation. Cawelti and Reavis (1980), Glatthorn (1984),

and Snyder and Anderson (1986) agreed that the purpose of

teacher supervision and evaluation is to facilitate the

professional growth of teachers, focusing on characteristics

of teaching that are substantive and related to effective

teaching, rather than on trivial factors.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) and Krajewski (1980)

viewed clinical supervision as "face to face" encounters

with teachers about teaching events, with the intent of

fostering professional development and improving

instruction.

To a great degree, any meaningful principal/teacher communication regarding the teacher's role in delivering instruction is related to both clinical supervision and teacher evaluation. For purposes of this discussion, administrator function in the area of clinical supervision and teacher evaluation will be generically referred to as teacher supervision.

Unfortunately, in this area of teacher supervision principals received very low marks. While supervisory skills were clearly desired behaviors by principals and teachers alike (Bossert and Peterson, 1987; Glatthorn, 1984; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982); while principals themselves said that teacher supervision is an extremely important activity; and while teachers prepared their best lessons and approached their post observation conferences with high expectations, the process generally was not executed well. More importantly, it was not helpful, particularly in the eyes of teachers.

Seyfarth and Nowinski (1987) contended that teachers received very little feedback about their teaching performance. In fact, the researchers reported that twenty-three percent of the respondents in their study "were not able to recall a single instance during their teaching careers when they had receiving feedback from a principal or supervisor that they believed helped them do a better job in the classroom." They further stated that "of those who reported they had been helped, only a few could cite changes in their

teaching behavior as a result of the comment" (p. 48). In other words, the observation and commentary were so superficial and fleeting that there was neither enough understanding or ongoing support to help the teacher make a positive change in his/her teaching repertoire (p. 48).

Frequently, administrator and teacher perception of the success of the function did not agree. Cawelti and Reavis (1980) reported on urban teachers who had experienced clinical supervision. Of the group, only 15-25% rated supervisory services high. At the same time, the supervisory groups felt that overall supervision had improved and was somewhat better than reported by the teachers. In the area of teacher evaluation, the researchers said that only about one third of their respondents (teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents and assistants) felt that teacher evaluation was being done well.

Huddle's National Institute of Education (NIE) study asked teachers to what extent the principal, the department head, other administrators, and other teachers had helped them improve their teaching or solve instructional or classroom management problems (1985). While nearly half of the teachers (46%) said their principal had been moderately helpful, 20% said they had been of "no help," 2-3% viewed administration as a hindrance, and only 13% said they had been extremely helpful. Huddle also reported that the helpfulness rating for principals was slightly below that of other teachers and department heads.

Deal, Neufeld and Rallis (1982), Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), Krawjewski and Veatch (1988), Cawelti (1980), Guzzetti and Martin (1984) and Newberg and Glatthorn (1982) concluded that typical principals do very little evaluation of teachers' instruction. Furthermore, when they do, teachers often feel highly dissatisfied. Moreover, the evaluation is generally not helpful in motivating them and improving instruction.

Classroom observation and feedback as a tool for instructional leadership was studied over a period of two years by Little and Bird (1987). They found that classroom observation and feedback, considered useful to teachers in the study, were almost non-existent, even in some schools with an established reputation for instructional leadership.

To illustrate their findings, the researchers selected data from five schools included in the study. Two schools typified the "ideal" in observation practices; in three schools, observation practices were viewed by teachers negatively and with disinterest:

Instructional Leadership "Close to the Classroom"
in Secondary Schools

| | Level of Leadership | |
	High (2 schools)	Low (3 schools)
Professional Relations Between Teacher Observer	Relations based on principles of reciprocity with regard to focus and method	Relations based authority; obligations and rights surrounding evaluation

Teacher Testimony	High praise and commitment; leaders in the classroom are thorough, knowledgeable and useful	General disinterest: leaders' visits to the classroom are infrequent, lack depth

Little and Bird's discussion was another addition to the growing body of information suggesting that teacher evaluation truly useful in helping teachers grow professionally is possible, but rare.

A list of eighteen behaviors described as the key components of instructional leadership was identified by Smith and Andrews in their research of over 4,000 teachers (1989). Five of the eighteen items dealt with teacher needs and practices directly related to evaluation/supervision. In each instance, the percentage ratings given to even the strongest (principal) instructional leaders were significantly lower than ratings for the majority of the other items. As compared to percentages in the mid-eighties to mid-nineties, teachers reported the following ratings:

	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
Principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional problems or concerns	72	47	25
My principals evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching	78	46	17
Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal	80	49	25

	Strong Leader	Average Leader	Weak Leader
My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance	68	29	18
My principal makes frequent classroom observations	72	31	17

A clear pattern emerged from the data. Even strong instructional leaders were not good about visiting classrooms. When they did, very little feedback was given to the teacher. Principals were not asked for help with instructional problems with good reason. The first issue involved the lack of time and attention principals give to the supervision of teachers and the instructional process. The second issue had to do with the need of the principals to further develop skills and better understand the supervisory process.

A key component of instructional supervision is the Supervisory Skill of the principal. Ryan stated the position in Levine and Associates (1985) that administrators often had a very limited a priori knowledge of instructional methods with a high probability of improving student learning. Therefore, they could not readily predict successful teacher performance, regardless of the supervisory process they used.

Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1984) theorized that supervisors (principals) have avoided classroom contact and direct attempts to influence instruction because they lack the skills to do so. Cummings and Schwab (1974) and

Alfonso, Firth and Neville cited (1) lack of awareness about how appraisal fits into an overall model for effective management of people and (2) lack of an understanding for integrating performance appraisal into a professional development effort as primary reasons for resistance.

Clinical supervision and the perception of elementary principals regarding their own supervisory skills was studied by Golanda (1982). Conclusions of his findings were:

1. Many principals lack an understanding of the teaching/learning process;
2. Most principals lack clinical supervisory skills and do not distinguish between the formative and summative functions of supervision;
3. Principals desire to improve these skills;
4. Professional development programs appear to be the only viable means of accomplishing this feat;
5. Women appear somewhat better suited than men to effectively perform clinical supervisory activities (p. 239).

Olivero (1982) reported similar findings in a survey of California principals about their own inservice needs. The top five competencies they chose to work toward were school climate, personnel evaluation, team building, internal communications, and supervision.

Alternative Models of Evaluation

Another factor that many researchers and practicing administrators and teachers have begun examining is alternative supervisory models. Such models provide teachers with input and options for supervision. To that same end, principals themselves may very well provide a

supervisory function that looks very different from those previously described. The key to an alternative models approach is obviously a collaborative decision of the principal and teacher.

Huddle (1985) contended that evaluation performed infrequently has limited validity. He proposed that teachers be actively involved in the development, operation, and revision of the evaluation process. He referred to Natriello's findings and a Rand Corporation study that found that when teachers were involved and held responsibile for their own evaluation programs, program quality improved.

Glatthorn (1984) believed that "all teachers can profit from . . . monitoring when it is performed by a sensitive and trusted leader" (p. 5). He proposed a system of differentiated supervision that gives teachers choices of four types of supervision, given the principal's right to veto an unwise choice. The four types were:

1. Clinical Supervision - an intensive process with conferencing on lesson planning, lesson observation, data analysis and teacher feedback.
2. Cooperative Professional Development - a collegial model in which small groups of teachers agree to work together for their own professional growth.
3. Self directed Development - [an approach] enabling the individual teacher to work independently on professional growth concerns.
4. Administrative Monitoring - the administrator works with the staff, making brief unannounced visits to ensure that assignments and responsibilities are carried out in a professional manner (p. 4-5).

Goodlad (1984) argued that "the only models for evaluating teaching that have proved reasonably

effective . . . are those of peer review." Unlike
Glatthorn, Goodlad's position on this issue was related to
his desire for "establishing a bond of trust between the
principal and teacher if the principal is to be both
evaluator and judge" (p. 302).

In their effort to identify the dimensions of school
improvement, Pajak and Glickman (1989) studied four school
districts with demonstrated improvement in student
achievement sustained for several consecutive years. The
authors in this study observed that

> in all the schools and central offices they visited
> was a continual dialogue about improving instruction.
> School, department, grade level, and system meetings
> emphasized planning, implementing, and reviewing
> curriculum and instruction. Teachers exchanged ideas
> and materials with each other, and individual teachers
> frequently had central office supervisors, principals,
> instructional lead teachers, or peers to visit, talk,
> and plan with them for classroom improvements.

They further stated that

> teachers did not view these visits as evaluative but
> instead as a source of help for improving what they were
> trying to accomplish with their students.

The researchers also noted that

> in two of the three school systems, teachers and
> principals made no mention of formal teacher evaluation
> as contributing to their improvement. Instead they
> talked about the direct assistance provided to them in
> terms of feedback, discussion, planning, and provision
> of resources. Teachers viewed peers and supervisors
> as working with them, not on them, to help improve
> instruction. In these schools, talking about students,
> lessons, and curriculum was the norm, not an aberration
> (p. 62-64).

Huddle (1985) discussed Showers' study on "peer
coaching." Her work revolved around the training of
teachers to supervise peers and the effectiveness of that

supervision model. She found that teachers make excellent peer coaches, demonstrating the ability to provide companionship, reflection and perception checking while sharing common successes and frustrations.

The Principal as an Advocate for Staff Development

A final area to be addressed here is staff development, a renewal process for both principals and their staff. Oftentimes, school districts, principals and teachers view staff development as too time-consuming, expensive, and unproductive. It is the wise principal who recognizes that the time, effort and dollars spent on well-planned and meaningful professional development efforts will result in a productive staff and, ultimately, a productive school.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) recognized the critical importance of professional development as another vehicle for strengthening teaching skills, involving staff in collegial dialogue, and program improvement. To that end, they stated that effective principals

> carefully structured professional development in
> their schools. . . .assist staff in gaining
> access to consulting staff and other district
> resources. . . .provide teachers with opportunities,
> within and outside their own schools, to visit and
> interact with other teachers for purposes of
> professional development.

Conversely, typical principals acted primarily as "school administrators," provided "minimum inservice," and were "involved only in making the mechanical arrangements" (p. 327).

The authors further stated that effective principals

> make decisions themselves about who will participate in
> innovative school projects: they ensure the selection
> of influential staff members who will provide strong
> leadership in this way, . . .often disperse decision
> making power, delegating authority, but within a
> central frame work . . . with which he or she is in
> agreement (p. 326).

They described effective principals as frequently

"involved . . . in program activities during the start-up

stages, . . .attending all or at least early inservice

sessions provided for teachers. . . .selecting team members,

attending planning meetings when needed and hosting social

gatherings." Less effective principals had "limited or no

participation" in teacher inservice (p. 326).

Staff development, according to Joyce (1986), is the key

to curriculum implementation and instructional improvement.

He stated that the "primary task in staff development is to

develop an ecology in all schools that nurtures professional

growth." In his view, the purposes of staff development

were to enrich the lives of teachers and administrators, to

generate continuous efforts to improve schools, and to

create conditions that foster continuous professional skill

development.

Lezotte (1981) also recognized the importance of such

involvement. He stated that

> inservice training programs must recognize the
> vital role of the administrator in the change
> process. . . .one of the characteristics of
> effective change programs is the active, continuing
> support of the administrator. Similarly, one of
> the characteristics of effective schools is the
> high level of instructional leadership evidenced
> by the building principal (p. 15).

According to Snyder and Anderson (1986), staff development is the key to student achievement. They stated that

> there exists a strong relationship between the knowledge and skill levels of the staff and the instruction they provide. For this reason we view continuous adult learning as the key to altering student achievement norms. It is our contention that the functioning knowledge base of the staff relates directly to the patterns of learning that result from the schools program (p. 293).

Professional Development of the Principal

Districts and principals themselves need to endorse a meaningful process for accountability and certification (Eggington, Jeffries and Kidd-Knights, 1982; Snyder and Drummond, 1988; Walker and Vogt, 1988). School districts and principals must also place strong emphasis on inservice education programs that provide up-to-date information and training related directly to the instructional leadership role (Blumberg, 1987; McCormack-Larkin and Kritek, 1982; Gardner, 1988; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; and Joyce, 1986).

In reporting his reactions and reflections concerning his ethnographic study of an elementary principal, Wolcott (1984) pointed to several weaknesses in principal preparation programs. He noted that:

1. Training is focused on specialized aspects of school district administration, particularly the superintendency or central office.
2. Relevant and critical aspects of the principalship, particularly evaluation of teacher performances, are explored only lightly, if at all. He stated that "administrators feel compelled (and in fact are compelled) to present a facade of having pursued a totally rational course" when in fact they know that their knowledge base and judgment are faulty (p. 119).

Ginsberg (1988) argued that there is a need for a more specific definition of the instructional leadership process. He took the position that the structure of the principalship must change dramatically if principals are to be effective instructional leaders. The first change must be altered training and selection programs to emphasize skills identified as important to the principal's role.

In Mintzberg's view the classroom must be used to teach managing skills and to develop insights into the job and its complexity. He noted that "managing is an art, not a science. Most methods managers use are not properly understood; hence they are not taught or analyzed in any formal sense" (1963, p. 174).

Olivero (1982) found it "incredible that inservice opportunities for principals are so deficient." He felt that true educational leadership will only happen through an administrative staff development that has as its "bottom line . . . desired student outcomes" (p. 341). His criteria for an effective program was

   a. support of the superintendent and board of
       education and that the superintendent models
       this support through involvement in the staff
       development process;
   b. that administrators involved identify their
       own inservice needs;
   c. a variety of experiences in which to apply and
       get feedback on new learning;
   d. that it be continuous and holistic;
   e. a tie between newly learned skills and students
       outcomes;
   f. that an inservice program enable principals to
       anticipate changes and challenges to their job.

Cawelti (1982) claimed that the pressures on school

administrators have caused principals to focus narrowly on
leadership problems and training needs that do not reflect
the skills needed by contemporary school administrators.
The biggest leadership problems his principals listed were
motivating teachers to accept new ideas, time management,
communication, getting things accomplished, being too
directive, involving others, paper work, and discipline.
He proposed a training program that entailed: (a) training
in leader behavior, (b) training in management skills
of planning, organizing, directing and controlling,
(c) training in instructional leadership - curriculum
development, clinical supervision, staff development and
teacher evaluation, and (d) traditional (generic)
administrative course topics such as school finance,
theory, law, and personnel (p. 325-327).

Andrews, Soder and Jacoby (1986) found significant
differences in the reading and math achievement gains of
students in schools of principals who were prceived as
strong instructional leaders. In reporting their findings,
the authors outlined the criteria for general policy
development in the hiring and training of principals. The
authors suggested:

1. preservice training programs - with desired
    leadership behaviors an integral part of
    the training program exit criteria;
2. a selection process that
    a) looks at the principal behaviors
       associated with academic achievement,
    b) targets the criteria established in
       preservice training programs,
    c) articulation of school district
       needs between the districts and the
       training programs;

    3. continuing education - to ensure that desired
        principal behaviors are reinforced;
    4. formal principal evaluation based on explicit
        goals for desired behaviors (p. 14-15).

To Barth (1987) staff development evolves into a concept
of ownership that means teachers and principals become
"seriously involved in all aspects of their own professional
development" (p. 268). In his article titled "The Principal
and the Profession of Teaching," the author described the
success of the Harvard Principals Center. The premise upon
which the principals center was based is the development of
a program for professional growth that was designed by the
principals themselves. Barth took the same position about
the fostering of professional growth experiences for
teachers. He suggested that any initiative from a teacher
and everything the principal does is potential staff
development. He believed that in order for teaching to
become a profession, teachers must feel professionally
recognized. That will only come about when they function as
providers of information, involved in the rewarding
experience of conveying their knowledge to other adults.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) described their leaders as
enthusiastic learners, open to new experiences, who "treated
mistakes as opportunities for self improvement" (p. 204).

The attributes of commitment, openness, and enthusiasm
for learning exemplify the truly effective leader. In
examining the role of the administrator in the university
setting, Bogue (1985) discussed the fact that faculties
should be concerned about those who assume administrative

roles, believing there is nothing to be learned. He wisely wondered how administrators can hope to inspire learning in others without setting a model of curiosity themselves. He believed that the effective leader possesses an active curiosity, a spirit of inquiry, a touch of irreverence, and a compulsive use of the word "why."

Chapter III

Methodology and Procedures

Introduction

Principals function as vital figures in the school setting. Their role is a dual one: educational leader and support person. A key to success in the performance of their duties is that principals continually analyze their own behaviors and the impact of those behaviors on the learning that takes place in their schools. One option in assessing his/her own behaviors is for the principal to seek and receive feedback from other professional colleagues, including his/her own staff.

The purpose of this study was to address this critical issue of teacher-to-principal feedback through the development of an inventory that described the characteristics and behaviors of principals who function as instructional leaders. The input of practicing principals and teachers was utilized through a Delphi review of the inventory.

Methods and procedures critical to completing this study were:

1. a review of the literature related to the principal and instructional leadership and documentation of the findings from this search.

2. the development of a model of broad domains that describes the function of principals as instructional leaders.

3. to write item statements for each domain that describe the desired characteristics and behaviors.

95

4. to conduct a review of the inventory with a selected group of educators.

5. to analyze the responses of the reviewers and make appropriate revisions.

6. to administer the final inventory in a field setting and gather information about the reaction of teachers to the concept of providing feedback to the principal.

Literature Search

The research that was used to create the original feedback inventory in this study focused on the concept of educational leadership and those related factors in the principalship that lead to high achieving schools. A search of the literature, related to educational leadership, revealed a wealth of articles and research studies. Because of the amount of material, excerpts and summaries written for the literature chapter were titled with one or more descriptors that briefly summarized the citation. These descriptors provided an organizational guide for the researcher in developing the final draft of the literature chapter as well as the subtitles and sequence.

Development of the Principal Feedback Inventory

Final draft of the literature chapter and the list of descriptors also provided the information needed to develop the model of domains for the Principal Feedback Inventory. All of the descriptors were recorded on separate index cards. A mapping procedure was then used to organize the descriptors into semantic groups. The result was a model

comprised of nine domains.

Methodology in this juncture of the study focused on a qualitative approach to evaluating the literature and making assessments of the information or data that was presented. Skrtic (1985), in his discussion of naturalistic inquiry, stated that qualitative methods such as interviews, observations and documentary or records analysis are best employed by the "human instrument." His qualitative process required an "adaptable data-collection instrument that can ascribe meaning to data as they emerge" (p. 189). In the instance of the mapping procedure, the researcher functioned as the human instrument. The process of analyzing and synthesizing the above data and the methodology employed in mapping the data were clearly qualitative in nature.

The second stage of developing the Principal Feedback Inventory required careful review of the literature and the writing of items that reflected the content of the review. A pool of 250 items was originally developed. Because many of the original group were very similar, only 175 items were retained for Phase I of the data collection. Each item was then analyzed for content and assigned to one of the nine domains. This procedure provided for further evaluation of the model and allowed the researcher to refine the definitions that had been written for each domain.

Validity

The conditions for establishing validity of an

evaluation instrument were adhered to in developing the Principal Feedback Inventory. Content validity, according to Gronlund (1981), "refers to the extent to which a test measures a representative sample of the domain of tasks under consideration" (p. 68). The task of the researcher at this point in the study was to develop a feedback instrument that reflected the traits and behaviors of principals who functioned as effective instructional leaders. It is the contention of the researcher that the domain of tasks to be measured were successfully identified and documented within the literature chapter. The procedure of semantic mapping further provided the outline or specifications for the inventory. Because the condition for content validity is representative sampling, careful attention was given to ensure that the items written were representative of the semantic map and the literature.

Construction of the items for the inventory took place after content areas (domains) of the instrument were established and defined and the objectives or, in this case, the descriptors were identified.

Kerlinger (1973) also pointed out that content validation is basically judgmental and that each item in a measurement instrument must be weighed or judged for its relevance. He stated that usually other "competent" judges should evaluate items in such an instrument, thus providing an independent source of expertise. This independent condition of validation was met through the use of a selected group of reviewers.

Population of Reviewers

The Principal Feedback Inventory was critiqued by Macomb County, Michigan, central office administrators; principals; and teachers working in the field. Educators asked to review the instrument were recommended by selected members of the Macomb County Association of Curriculum Administrators (MACA). Dr. Wendell Hough, Professor of Education, Wayne State University; Dr. Ron Pollack, Director of Program Development, Macomb Intermediate School District; and the author identified ten MACA members who selected the educators participating in the study. A pool of five central office administrators with experience as principals, ten elementary and ten secondary principals, and twenty elementary and twenty secondary teachers were invited to take part in the item review. Each reviewer was contacted personally or via telephone by the researcher and invited to participate in the study. The purpose of the study and the procedure for data collection were explained in these conversations. Because the study focused on teacher feedback directed to the principal, a slightly higher percent of teachers were included in the pool of reviewers.

It should also be noted that eighteen (almost thirty percent) of the reviewers were men and forty-seven (over seventy percent) were women. These percentages reflect the ratio of women to men nominated to participate in the study by the MACA representatives.

Striplin (1987) referred to Spradley's work in her

discussion of the informants used in research. According to Spradley, good informants know their culture well, are thoroughly involved, are knowledgeable, and use their knowledge well to make interpretations and solve problems.

Criteria for selection of the MACA representatives and the reviewers for this study were: (a) their demonstrated understanding of the qualities and skills needed in educational leaders; (b) their stated belief in the concept of principal feedback; (c) their belief in the need for self-evaluation; and (d) their recognition of the value and need for professional development at all levels.

Guba and Lincoln (1982) referred to such participants in research studies as "stakeholders" because they were closely associated with or affected by the entity under study. In using this group of selected viewers, it was assumed that their attitudes, professional skills, and standards would provide a level of understanding of instructional leadership that would not necessarily be found in a randomly selected population of teachers and administrators.

Phase I Data Collection

A two stage Delphi procedure was used to further critique and develop the Principal Feedback Inventory. In Phase I, reviewers were mailed a packet of materials which included an explanation of the contents of the inventory and the purpose of the procedure and the inventory itself (See Appendix A).

The inventory was presented by domain. Reviewers were asked to respond to all of the inventory items on a scale of A through E; an A indicated the most important leadership behaviors, while an E indicated leadership behaviors considered the least important. A forced choice method was also used; reviewers were required to assign a rank of E to 50 of the 175 items. Space was provided at the end of each of the nine domains for reviewers to make comments or additions to the inventory. Scores assigned to the inventory ranged from 1.0 for the items identified as (A) Most Important to 5.0 for the item identified as (E) Least Important.

A pool of sixty-five reviewers agreed to participate in the project. Materials for the data collection were mailed to each. The package included a stamped return envelope to be mailed back to the researcher. Reviewers were given one week to return their inventory. After ten days, those who had not returned the material received a reminder call. Data were compiled from the responses. A mean, standard deviation, and rank were calculated for each of the 175 items. Items above 3.0, the median of the 1-5 scale, were eliminated from the inventory in the first phase of the Delphi process. Comments of the reviewers were also used to evaluate and revise items. The rank of the items at or below 3.0 within each domain was also used to calculate a mean rank score for each of the nine domains.

Phase II Data Collection

The inventory generated for Phase II of the study was 100 items in length. In Phase II of data collection, reviewers again received a packet of materials explaining the purpose of the procedure and the revised inventory (See Appendix B). Reviewers were asked to respond to the instrument of 100 items on the same A through E scale previously used. A forced choice method was again used. In this phase, reviewers were required to assign a rank of E to 20 of the 100 items. Space was also provided for additions or comments to the inventory. Reviewers were given one week to respond. After ten days, those who had not returned the material received a reminder call.

A mean score, standard deviation, and rank were again generated for each of the items. Items above the 3.0 mean were eliminated. Comments of the reviewers were also analyzed. This appraisal led to further modification of the inventory. The rank of the items at or below 3.0 within each domain was also used to calculate a mean rank score for each of the nine domains.

A time interval of approximately four weeks elapsed between data collections.

Once the data were generated for Phase II of the Delphi, a Spearman rank-difference correlation was used to calculate the difference between the rank of the items from Phase I and Phase II of the data collection.

Limitations of the Study

A limiting factor of the research lies in the fact that the population of reviewers in the study was confined to a select group of educators in Macomb County. Theory about the generalizability or external validity of research findings asks whether the results of such a study can be generalized to other subjects, groups, and other conditions (Kerlinger, 1973). In other words, will findings from the research with a selected group of educators in Macomb County have validity or meaning for educators in a variety of educational settings outside of the county.

In his discussion of generalizability, Kerlinger differentiated between (1) basic research and its strong emphasis on control of the internal variables within the study and (2) applied research with its concern for generalization to other persons and other situations. Kerlinger asked three questions about generalizability: (1) To which populations can the findings of the research study apply? (2) If the social setting in which the experiment was conducted changes will the relationship or findings hold?; and (3) Are the psychological and sociological variables of the research representative of only the experimental group, or do they have application to other populations in other settings?.

The researcher would contend that the study under discussion has application for educators outside of Macomb County for the following reasons: (1) the study itself was

based on a comprehensive literature search drawn from journals, texts and articles written from the experiences and research of authors across the country; (2) the authors themselves represented a variety of organizational settings; (3) the psychological and sociological setting of schools, particularly the relationships between principals and teachers, are very similar.

In examining the issue of generalizability, Barth (1982), in his book about the principalship, suggests that problems of education are generic and generalizable from one setting to another, while solutions to problems are particular and unique to the context of each situation. He places the burden upon the reader "to determine which, if any, parts of [his] account. . . .might be generalizable to other settings" (p. 190). In view of today's national emphasis on the principal and educational leadership and the wide body of research in that area as evidenced by the present study, it would seem valid to propose that the findings from the present study have applicability to educators in other settings outside of Macomb County.

Field Administration

The purpose of this study was to develop an inventory of the characteristics and behaviors needed by principals to function as effective instructional leaders in their schools. A second purpose was to acquire information about the feasibility of using the instrument as a feedback tool

in a field setting. A questionnaire included in field administration of the inventory addressed the following questions:

    a.   The logistics of administration, such as, the time to complete the inventory and the response scale.

    b.   The content of the inventory itself.

    c.   The written feedback process and teacher reaction to this means of communicating with the principal.

Field administration of the inventory took place in three school districts in Macomb County. An elementary, a middle school and a high school participated in the study.

The elementary school housed a population of approximately five hundred students and a professional staff of eighteen. The middle school housed a student population of approximately 600 hundred and a professional staff of twenty-five. The high school population of students numbered approximately 1700 with a professional staff of over eighty teachers.

Field administration in the elementary school was conducted by the researcher in a morning staff meeting. In the two secondary schools, field administration was done through the school mail. Each principal wrote a short note encouraging staff members to participate in the study. Staff members received the materials a day later in their school mail. The teachers were given three working days to

return the inventory to a designated return box in the office. A manila envelope with the researcher's name and address was provided for the returns.

Field administration materials (Appendix C) included a letter from the researcher briefly describing the project and providing directions about completing the Principal Feedback Inventory. The inventory included a description of each domain, followed by the item statements for that domain area. A scantron card was provided for teacher response to the items on the inventory. A Likert type rating was used with the following scale:

```
A = to a very great extent
B = to a great extent
C = to some extent
D = to a small extent
E = to a very small extent
```

A separate sheet with a list of the domains and space for additional teacher comments was also included.

Finally, teachers were asked to complete a brief questionnaire asking their reaction to the process of giving their principal written feedback and the viability of doing so on a regular basis.

Chapter IV

Findings of the Study

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to address one aspect of teacher-to-principal communication through the development of an inventory that described the critical characteristics and related behaviors of principals who function as instructional leaders. The reason for such an inventory was to provide a standard and usable communication tool for practicing principals to assess their own skills as instructional leaders and use in seeking input from their staffs.

The first task in this endeavor was to identify through a search of the literature those characteristics and behaviors demonstrated by principals who functioned in their schools as educational leaders. Toward that end, the research and literature related to educational leadership was thoroughly investigated. During the search process, it became abundantly clear that there was no shortage of material with which to work.

Findings in the Research and Literature

Investigation of the research and literature related to instructional leadership revealed several generic factors that influence the relationship of principals and teachers and, ultimately, the instructional program of the school.

Those factors guided development of the structure for the

literature chapter in this study. The factors dealt with:

- Principals who function primarily as managers
  of the school.
- The concept of the principal as manager and
  facilitator of the instructional program.
- The structure of schools.
- The unique structure of the secondary school.
- The principal who functions primarily as the
  instructional leader.
- Leadership and staff morale.
- The principal as the visionary of the school.
- Goal setting and school outcomes.
- Trust
- The principal who functions as change agent.
- Leadership styles and behaviors.
- Teacher isolation.
- The power of the principalship.
- Shared decision-making and the empowerment
  of teachers.
- Teacher supervision.
- Alternative models for supervision and
  evaluation.
- The principal as an advocate for staff
  development.

Findings in the Development of the Inventory

Because the feedback inventory was to be developed from

the previous research once the first draft of the literature

chapter was written, the literature was carefully reviewed.

From this review process, a list of approximately sixty

descriptors was generated which identified the

characteristics and behaviors previous researchers and

experts attributed to principals who functioned as

instructional leaders. The list of sixty characteristics

and behaviors was semantically mapped several times. This

process yielded a final cluster map of nine domains which

provided the model for the feedback inventory (See Table 1).

Table I

Model of domains for Principal Feedback Inventory

Number	Title of Domain	Description of Domain
I	Communicates a clear sense of mission	The principal communicates a clear sense of mission. The attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community is frequently directed toward the activities and progress of the school. The principal is enthusiastic and optimistic about the goals of the organization and provides direction for these goals through his/her vision of the kind of place the school ought to be.
II	Skillfully and strategically plans for the school	The principal is a skilled and strategic planner. The principal is knowledgeable and skilled at anticipating building, staff and student needs. Problem finding as well as simultaneous planning for the present and the future of the school is done with the input of others and with careful attention to detail.
III	Sets high standards	The principal communicates a high set of professional and academic standards for him/herself, the staff, and students. The principal closely monitors and evaluates student performance and behavior as well as the continuity of the instructional program. Objectivity and commitment to the educational purpose of the organization and the potential of students are the benchmarks employed in this assessment.

(table continues)

Number	Title of Domain	Description of Domain
IV	Is visible to everyone in the school	The principal is seen as visible and involved in the school program. The principal is a frequent visitor in classrooms, and spends a great deal of time observing and working with the staff in the delivery of the educational program. The principal also closely listens to staff members as they converse about their concerns, needs and aspirations for the work they are doing.
V	Builds positive staff relationships	The principal supports and builds positive staff relationships through a shared sense of trust. The principal demonstrates concern and commitment to each staff member, is sensitive to their needs, and gives support and recognition for their acomplishments and efforts. Creativity is nurtured, innovation is encouraged, and failure is accepted.
VI	Promotes shared decision-making	The principal consults with the staff and actively involves them in a shared decision-making role. The principal develops a sense of team by empowering staff members to assess the needs of the school and plan for those needs. Through these efforts the principal serves as a catalyst for improvement and change.

(table continues)

Number	Title of Domain	Description of Domain
VII	Skillfully administers the school and acquires the needed resources	The principal uses his/her power, on a daily basis, to acquire needed resources for the school such as administrative, parental or ourside support for special projects. The principal actively recruits talented staff at every level and finds ways to utilize the staff as well as reward outstanding performance. The principal is a skilled negotiator who facilitates change and effectively responds to adversity.
VIII	Functions as a skilled instructional leader and resource to the staff	The principal functions as a supervisor and colleague to teachers in the school. In this role, he/she observes the work of the staff frequently and in various settings. The principal consults with the staff about their instructional efforts, provides feedback through counseling and coaching, and acts as a resource in assisting teachers in identifying their own strengths and those skills needing improvement.
IX	Involves the staff and themselves in professional development activities	The principal works with the staff in identifying the professional development needs of everyone in the school; also seeks input from the staff about their own effectiveness. The principal demonstrates an enthusiasm for learning and involves the staff and themselves in the quest for new knowledge.

Once the model was developed and the description for
each domain written, the literature chapter and supporting
material were again reviewed and items for the inventory
written. The original inventory was comprised of 175 items
(see Appendix A).

Reviewers

Review of the inventory was carried out through a two
stage Delphi procedure. A selected group of administrators
and teachers served as reviewers. Each of the group of
sixty-five participants was contacted personally or by
telephone and invited to participate in the study. When the
project was explained, every potential reviewer contacted,
without exception, expressed an interest and willingness to
participate in the study. This commitment and enthusiasm
were demonstrated in the response rate for both phases of
the data collection. Fifty-seven teachers responded in
Phase I; fifty-five of the responses were useable.
Forty-nine responses were received and included in Phase II
of the data collection, although another six responses were
received at a later date.

Findings of the Data Collection

In Phase I of the study, the reviewers were instructed
to rank each of the 175 items on a scale of A - E, an A
indicating the most important items and an E indicating
least important. At least 50 items were also to be

assigned an E ranking.

The same ranking scale was used in the Phase II data collection. However, because the item pool only numbered one hundred, the reviewers were asked to assign an E ranking to twenty items.

The mean and rank were computed for each item in Phase I and Phase II (See Table 2).

A list of the items in their rank order from Phase I of the study and the rank of the group from Phase II can be found in Appendix C. A Rank-Difference Correlation (Spearman rho) was also calculated for the 100 pairs of items that were retained from Phase I and ranked again in Phase II of the Delphi process. The correlation coefficient, $r = .814$, was significant at the .01 level. While findings in the study indicated that the spread of items across the 175 ranks was very even, the significant correlation of ranks, from the first data collection to the second, clearly indicated that the reviewers were consistent about the value they placed on specific characteristics and behaviors.

The twenty items which ranked at the top of the inventory in both data collections, as demonstrated in Appendix C, were a clear indication that credence was placed in the principal who cares about the staff, sets high standards, and understands the academic program. Reviewers also said that the principal should demonstrate integrity and enthusiasm, involve the staff in decision-making, and be aware of his/her own strengths and weaknesses.

Table 2

Item mean and rank for Principal Feedback Inventory

Domain	Item No.	Phase I Mean	Rank	New Item No.	Phase II Mean	Rank
I	1	2.45	75	1	2.89	88
	2	1.42	4	2	1.63	7
	3	2.93	111	* 3	2.81	79
	4	2.18	46	4	2.57	70
	5	2.93	112	* 3	2.81	79
	6	1.89	24	5	2.36	48
	7	3.24	135	–	–	–
	8	3.95	165	–	–	–
	9	2.93	113	6	3.286	98
	10	1.98	31	* 9	2.08	27
	11	2.27	57	* 7	1.89	21
	12	3.07	124	–	–	–
	13	2.67	93	8	2.81	80
	14	2.22	50	* 7	1.89	21
	15	2.04	38	* 9	2.08	27
	16	2.53	81	10	2.42	55
	17	1.62	13	11	1.85	18
	18	1.56	8	12	1.51	5
II	19	3.45	151	–	–	–
	20	1.67	14	13	1.77	12
	21	3.91	164	–	–	–
	22	2.20	47	*14	1.83	16
	23	3.42	149	–	–	–
	24	4.20	171	–	–	–
	25	1.93	29	*14	1.83	16
	26	2.76	97	15	3.26	97
	27	2.20	48	16	2.51	61
	28	2.64	90	17	3.0	92
	29	3.31	144	–	–	–
	30	4.22	172	–	–	–
	31	3.40	147	–	–	–
	32	2.51	80	18	2.51	62
	33	3.11	127	–	–	–
	34	2.49	78	19	2.36	49
	35	4.44	174	–	–	–
	36	3.40	148	–	–	–
	37	3.16	134	–	–	–
	38	1.78	17	20	2.49	58

(table continues)

Domain	Item No.	Phase I Mean	Rank	New Item No.	Phase II Mean	Rank
III	39	3.98	167	–	–	–
	40	2.09	41	21	2.36	50
	41	1.87	23	22	1.73	9
	42	2.15	45	23	2.20	38
	43	2.87	105	24	2.87	86
	44	4.09	170	–	–	–
	45	3.35	146	–	–	–
	46	2.50	75	25	2.49	59
	47	1.38	2	26	1.44	3
	48	2.27	58	*27	1.95	24
	49	3.26	141	–	–	–
	50	1.91	27	*27	1.95	24
	51	2.42	68	28	2.57	71
	52	2.64	91	29	2.91	90
	53	1.93	30	*27	1.95	24
	54	3.25	140	–	–	–
	55	2.71	96	30	2.89	89
	56	2.00	33	31	2.20	39
	57	2.42	69	32	2.16	37
	58	3.85	163	–	–	–
	59	1.45	5	33	1.77	13
IV	60	2.64	92	34	2.34	47
	61	1.60	11	35	2.44	57
	62	3.27	142	–	–	–
	63	1.73	15	36	1.75	11
	64	3.24	136	–	–	–
	65	3.95	166	–	–	–
	66	3.24	137	–	–	–
	67	2.25	54	37	2.20	40
	68	3.15	133	–	–	–
	69	2.85	101	38	2.85	83
	70	2.47	77	39	2.36	51
	71	1.50	6	40	1.46	4
	72	3.11	128	–	–	–
	73	3.07	125	–	–	–
	74	2.62	89	41	2.51	63
	75	1.60	12	42	1.77	14
	76	2.91	109	43	3.16	96
	77	2.55	85	44	2.53	64
	78	2.98	119	45	2.81	81

(table continues)

Domain	Item No.	Phase I Mean	Rank	New Item No.	Phase II Mean	Rank
V	79	2.00	34	46	2.12	35
	80	2.02	37	47	2.20	41
	81	2.33	63	*48	2.10	30
	82	2.13	43	49	2.06	26
	83	1.91	28	50	2.10	31
	84	3.45	152	-	-	-
	85	2.53	82	51	2.53	65
	86	2.22	51	*48	2.10	30
	87	1.80	20	52	1.63	8
	88	4.42	173	-	-	-
	89	2.55	85	53	2.42	56
	90	1.78	18	54	1.83	17
	91	1.24	1	55	1.42	2
	92	2.31	60	56	1.87	19
	93	4.0	168	-	-	-
	94	4.0	169	-	-	-
	95	1.82	21	57	1.73	10
	96	3.49	153	-	-	-
	97	2.95	114	58	3.04	93
VI	1	2.13	44	59	2.40	54
	2	3.05	122	-	-	-
	3	2.80	98	60	2.87	87
	4	2.42	70	*61	2.49	60
	5	3.31	145	-	-	-
	6	1.89	25	62	2.08	28
	7	3.24	138	-	-	-
	8	3.55	154	-	-	-
	9	1.98	32	63	2.20	42
	10	2.31	61	64	2.67	76
	11	2.04	39	65	1.79	15
	12	3.69	161	-	-	-
	13	1.91	26	66	2.12	36
	14	1.78	19	67	1.95	25
	15	3.13	131	-	-	-
	16	2.56	87	*61	2.49	60
	17	2.0	35	68	2.31	46
	18	3.65	159	-	-	-
	19	2.05	40	69	2.65	74
	20	2.54	83	70	2.85	82

(table continues)

Domain	Item No.	Phase I Mean	Rank	New Item No.	Phase II Mean	Rank
VII	21	2.82	99	*71	2.79	78
	22	2.33	64	*72	2.20	43
	23	2.85	100	73	3.06	94
	24	2.91	108	74	3.10	95
	25	2.85	102	75	2.64	73
	26	2.25	55	76	2.10	32
	27	3.09	126	-	-	-
	28	2.20	49	77	1.89	22
	29	2.22	52	78	2.38	52
	30	3.24	139	-	-	-
	31	3.13	132	-	-	-
	32	2.96	117	79	2.53	66
	33	2.96	118	79	2.53	66
	34	2.31	62	80	1.87	20
	35	2.09	42	80	1.87	20
	36	2.00	36	80	1.87	20
	37	2.87	106	*72	2.20	43
	38	3.04	121	-	-	-
	39	2.35	65	*71	2.79	78
	40	2.67	94	81	2.95	91
VIII	41	2.91	110	*82	2.85	84
	42	2.44	73	83	2.67	77
	43	2.35	66	*82	2.85	84
	44	2.87	107	84	3.47	99
	45	3.56	157	-	-	-
	46	2.42	71	85	2.57	72
	47	3.80	162	-	-	-
	48	1.59	10	*86	2.28	45
	49	3.05	123	-	-	-
	50	2.29	59	87	2.56	69
	51	2.58	88	88	2.53	67
	52	1.85	22	89	1.93	23
	53	3.0	120	-	-	-
	54	3.11	129	-	-	-
	55	2.95	115	90	3.69	100
	56	2.70	95	*86	2.28	45
	57	2.25	56	91	2.08	29
	58	2.35	67	*82	2.85	84
	59	3.44	150	-	-	-
	60	3.65	160	-	-	-
	61	1.58	9	92	1.37	1

(table continues)

Domain	Item No.	Phase I Mean	Rank	New Item No.	Phase II Mean	Rank
IX	62	2.87	103	93	2.85	85
	63	2.47	76	*94	2.38	53
	64	3.28	143	–	–	–
	65	2.96	116	95	2.65	75
	66	2.43	72	*94	2.38	53
	67	3.11	130	–	–	–
	68	4.44	175	–	–	–
	69	2.87	104	*96	2.55	68
	70	2.24	53	97	2.22	44
	71	2.56	86	*96	2.55	68
	72	3.56	155	–	–	–
	73	3.65	158	–	–	–
	74	3.56	156	–	–	–
	75	1.76	16	98	2.10	33
	76	1.42	3	99	1.59	6
	77	2.45	74	*100	2.10	34
	78	1.56	7	*100	2.10	34

N=175   N=100

Note: Items are numbered 1-97   * Indicates new items
       in Domains I-V.   that were combined
       Numbers repeat 1-78   from two or more
       in Domains VI-IX.   items on the
                                     original inventory.

       Items with a mean of 3.0
       or above in the Phase I
       Delphi were eliminated
       from the Phase II Inventory.

The mean score in Phase I ranged from 1.24 for the highest ranked item to 4.44 for the lowest rank. Fifty-six items scored between 3.0, the median of the 1.0 - 5.0 scale, and 4.44, the lowest rank. The mean score in Phase II ranged from 1.37 for the highest ranked item to 3.69 for the lowest rank. Only nine items scored between the 3.0 median and 3.69, the lowest rank.

There was no particular clustering of low, middle or high rankings in any one of the domains in either data collection. In both instances, each domain contained a spread of items across the rankings. However, the mean score of the items within each domain provided a set of rankings among the nine groupings (See Table 3).

As evidenced by Table 2 and Table 3, reviewers were consistent in Phase I and Phase II about the importance they placed on the principal's support of the staff and the building of positive relationships. Credence was placed in the principal who was perceptive and found ways to commu-nicate with others, especially when there were differences. Reviewers also valued the principal who was sensitive and treated the staff as professionals (Domain V).

Analysis of the remaining domains clearly reveals that reviewers also wanted the principal to create or foster an environment that encouraged shared decision-making, team building, and a sense of collegiality. The teachers' own sense of responsibility was contingent on their involvement in making decisions about the work of the school (Domain

Table 3

Rank of domains for Principal Feedback Inventory

Domain		Phase I Mean of Items N=175	Phase II Mean of Items N=100	Phase I Rank of Domain	Phase II Rank of Domain
I	Communicates a Clear Sense of Mission	57.06	41.0	5	3
II	Skillfully and Strage-gically Plans for the School	55.56	43.0	4	4
III	Sets High Standards	51.46	43.5	3	5
IV	Is Visible to Everyone in the School	62.58	39.0	6	2
V	Builds Positive Staff Relationships	46.93	28.33	1	1
VI	Promotes Shared Decision-Making	50.69	46.9	2	6
VII	Skillfully Administers the School and Acquires the Needed Resources	79.31	53.3	9	9
VIII	Functions as a Skilled Instruc-tional Leader and Resource to the Staff	67.7	51.8	8	8
IX	Involves the Staff and Themselves in Professional Development Activities	64.45	49.7	7	7

VI). Priority was given to the development of objectives
that reflected the mission and goals of the school.
Reviewers also said that they wanted a principal who
passionately cared about the mission of the school and
believed all children could learn (Domain I). To that same
end, there was a belief among the reviewers that they wanted
a principal who demonstrated integrity and decency and who
also assumed the responsibility for providing an orderly
atmosphere. High academic standards and a challenging
instructional program were also trademarks of the
instructional leader (Domain III). Reviewers wanted their
principals to be visible in the school, to listen and to
focus on the students and teachers (Domain IV). Knowing the
needs of the school and making good judgments in estab-
lishing priorities were also seen as important (Domain II).

Items within the domains that were related to admin-
istration of the school, teacher evaluation, and staff
development generally ranked lower than those within the
other six areas. However, the reviewers clearly said that
the principal should be open to suggestion, aware of his/her
own strengths and weaknesses, and committed to his/her own
professional growth (Domain IX). Sensitivity in carrying
out supervisory and monitoring activities was also seen as a
critical ingredient in motivating the staff (Domain VIII).
Reviewers also said they were looking for a principal who
would effectively and skillfully manage the school (Domain
VII).

A discussion of the findings from this project would not be complete without reporting the response of the reviewers to the overall task of ranking the inventory. Sixty percent of the group wrote comments or talked personally with the researcher after Phase I of the data collection. Almost without exception, they found the task of assigning a rating of E to 50 of the item statements extremely difficult. In fact the word "difficult" became synonymous with any dialog about the review process. Reviewers felt that all of the items were important and were uncomfortable assigning a rank of E to characteristics or behaviors they saw as valuable. Many reviewers said they traded off some items and gave an item they saw as somewhat related a higher rank. A high percentage of the group also commented on the time they dedicated to the task. Invariably, they reported having spent 2-3 hours on the review process. The second phase of the Delphi review generated similar personal conversations and comments from approximately fifty percent of the group. Again, the term "difficult" was most commonly used to describe the reviewers' reaction to the task.

The response of the reviewers to the inventory brings the researcher to a final point regarding the findings; that is, the broad distribution of the items on the rating scale. While it is clear that a high correlation existed between items in both phases of the data collection, the difficulty of the task for the reviewers and the even distribution of all of the scores points to the value of all of the items on

the original inventory. The researcher believes that it should be noted that even though lower ranked items did not appear on the Phase II inventory or the final instrument, they were clearly not discounted by the reviewers or seen as unimportant.

Field Administration of the Principal Feedback Inventory

Researchers such as Buser and Banks (1984), Bailey (1984), Chamberlain (1980), Sanacore (1976), Butera (1976), and Lyman (1987) endorsed the concept of principal feedback and have documented teacher support of such a process. The purpose of this study was to develop a feedback inventory that principals could use in assessing their own skills as instructional leaders as well as use to seek input from their staff. To that end, one of the final tasks of the study was to administer the Principal Feedback Inventory in a school setting and, secondly, to gather information about the perception of teachers to the feedback process. Field administration of the final inventory and questionnaire took place in three schools: an elementary, a middle school, and a high school. See Appendix D. Data were collected from sixteen elementary teachers, sixteen middle school teachers, and forty-one high school staff. Completion of the inventory by the teachers averaged twenty minutes to a half-hour, although a few teachers said they spent as much as an hour. Over ninety-five percent of the teachers said that the directions for the inventory were clear. Ninety-eight

percent said that the nine domains and the items within each domain described the instructional leadership skills they believed to be important. The range of ranks, A-E, on the response scale was also seen as broad enough by 95% of the teachers. Five teachers suggested the inclusion of an option allowing a respondent to code an item "not applicable."

Response to the three questions that asked for teacher input regarding the concept of providing feedback to the principal was also very positive. Teacher response to the three questions was as follows:

- Do you believe teachers confidentially and anonymously should have an opportunity to provide the principal with written feedback?

		Elementary N=16	Middle School N=16	High School N=41
Strongly Agree	5	13	10	26
	4	2	3	9
	3	1	3	2
	2	0	0	0
Disagree	1	0	0	1

- In addition to normal interaction, i.e., daily contact, department, committee or staff meetings, could this instrument provide you with a viable means of communication with your principal?

	Elementary N=16	Middle School N=16	High School N=41
Yes	12	8	26
No	3	3	6

. Would you like to have the opportunity to participate in this kind of process on a regular, i.e., yearly basis?

	Elementary	Middle School	High School
Yes	10	11	19
No	2	0	6
More often	1	0	5
Less often	5	3	5
Reviewer suggestion of every 2 years	11	0	1

Teacher response to the question, "Do you believe teachers . . . should have the opportunity to provide the principal with feedback?" reflected the findings of Buser and Banks (1984). Eight-seven percent of their teachers felt principals should be evaluated by the teachers. Eighty-nine percent of the teachers in the present study ranked the questions 4 or 5 on a 1-5 scale. However, it should also be noted that they were less sure of the viability of such an activity. When asked whether the principal feedback instrument could provide a viable means of communication, only seventy-nine percent of those who responded said yes. A few teachers suggested alternative options for providing feedback, such as third party conferences, individual meetings with department chairs, and the use of an inventory that was more open-ended.

Chapter V

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to address one area of teacher-to-principal communication through the development of an inventory that described the critical characteristics and related behaviors of principals who function as instructional leaders in their schools. The major tasks of the study were to: (a) identify through the previous research those characteristics and behaviors critical to the instructional leadership function; (b) create a feedback inventory which included those same critical elements; and (c) seek the input of a selected group of reviewers regarding the inventory.

This study not only attempted to document previous research, but to contribute to the professional development efforts of educators, particularly principals, and to make further contribution to the field of educational research.

The feedback inventory that evolved from the literature search was wholeheartedly endorsed by the reviewers. While minor modifications were made in various items, the changes were made, for the most part, to provide more clarity to the item, not to change its intent.

Previous research in the area of instructional leadership reviewed in this study clearly documented the critical importance of the principal. Student achievement, high teacher morale, and successful school programs were,

for the most part, attributed to the leadership of that one individual. Findings from the previous research that described the characteristics and behaviors of instructional leaders were corroborated by a group of highly respected educators who served as reviewers in this study.

Reviewers indicated that their expectations for principals included involvement and leadership in every facet of school life. The area of most notable interest and priority dealt with the principals' relationship with their staffs. Domain V, which targeted relationship building, consistently received the highest mean score among the domains. However, the priority given this area was evident among the highest ranking items in all of the nine domains. In both Phase I and Phase II of the research, the reviewers said that they wanted the principal to concentrate on building positive staff relationships. Close examination of items in each of the domains revealed that those most highly ranked dealt with issues related to fairness, sensitivity, integrity, openness, communication, shared decision-making, professional respect, and support of the staff.

In conclusion, the researcher would point to the difficulty reviewers reported in rating the items on the inventory. This factor led the researcher to conclude that the even distribution of mean scores and ranks in both Phase I and Phase II of the study were a reflection of the reviewers' desire to give most of the items a high rank. Admittedly, the correlation statistic indicates a high

degree of agreement from Phase I to Phase II about the
importance of the items. However, it would also seem
important not to lose sight of those items included in the
original inventory. Such a broad range of traits and
characteristics would only enhance any future effort a
researcher or principal might make in this area.

Finally, the researcher would recommend that future work
in this area of instructional leadership include alternative
models for providing such leadership in our schools.
Clearly, this study provides a comprehensive list and set of
standards for principals to consider. However, we would be
in serious error if we ignore the findings suggesting that
the principal needs to empower his/her staff and concentrate
more on building positive relationships and facilitating the
work of the professional staff in the school. The work of
educating future generations is too important to place the
responsibility of leading that effort on a single person.

Recommendations for Further Study

Several questions related to issues surrounding
educational leadership were raised in the researcher's mind
during the course of this study. It is the researcher's
belief that future work concerning leadership could well
examine:

> . the differences in the structure and culture
> between elementary, middle schools, and high
> schools and the differing roles of the principal

in those settings.

- the relationship of teacher isolation and student achievement.

- the development of a model that reflects the concept of principal as facilitator, teacher as instructional leader.

- the success of schools that are now well established in a shared decision-making mode.

- alternative models for teacher supervision and evaluation.

- administrative training programs and the relationship of the content of these training programs to instructional leadership.

Specific to this study, examination of the differences between administrators and teachers on the items and domains within the present inventory might shed light on the priorities and relationships of the two groups. This particular question was raised by several reviewers in Phase I of the study. Item analysis of the separate rankings of both groups in Phase II of the data analysis indicated a Spearman rho correlation of $r=.563$ between the administrators and teachers. The rather low correlation between the groups may well provide the basis for future research study.

A second potential area of study with regard to the Principal Feedback Inventory and the findings of this study could involve an examination of the differences between

principals who function as successful educational leaders and the level of student achievement in their schools.

Finally, a study among principals regarding their perceptions of the inventory and the concept of teacher-to-principal feedback could provide additional data about the attitude of the group toward such a professional development activity. Previous research and the findings from this study about teacher responses to the process of teacher-to-principal feedback could serve as a point of comparison.

Sergiovanni (1984) stated that successful schools have "strong and functional cultures aligned with a vision of excellence in schooling which serve as a compass setting to steer people in a common direction." Synthesis of the findings from this research study leads the author to also conclude that, to a great extent, the determining factor in successful schools is the degree to which the principal functions as the visionary and educational leader. The climate of the school and the culture in which it functions, i.e., attitudes toward teaching and learning, expectations and standards, and practices, indeed reflect the principal's own attitudes and practices.

It is the author's contention that the content of the Principal Feedback Inventory developed in this study provides for the educational community well defined criteria for future assessment of the principalship. The following definition of educational leadership conceptualizes that

criteria. The definition states that:

> effective educational leadership in the school is
> demonstrated when the principal clearly communicates
> sensitivity to the values and desires of the staff
> and treats the staff as professionals. Such
> leadership is also demonstrated when the principal
> communicates a standard of high achievable goals and
> facilitates the realization of those goals through
> strategic planning, frequent meaningful interaction
> with the staff, shared decision-making, the skilled
> acquisition of resources, supervision of the
> instructional program and the facilitation and
> implementation of an appropriate professional
> development plan for the staff as well as themselves.

In the view of Peters and Waterman (1982),

> Leadership is many things. It is patient, usually
> boring coalition building. . . . It is being visible
> when things are going awry and invisible when they are
> working well . . . listening carefully . . . frequently
> speaking with encouragement and reinforcing words with
> believable action (p. 82).

Hopefully, what has been found in this study will be used in the future by educational leaders to develop a culture for learning in our schools, to enhance their own skills as leaders and facilitators and to build coalitions with their staff.

Appendix A

Dear Colleague:

My sincere thanks for your interest in this dissertation project. You are one of a group of sixty outstanding educators recommended for participation in the study. Needless to say, your contribution is an extremely important one. As you know, the focus of my work is the principalship and the characteristics of highly effective leaders who function in that capacity. I have completed the search of the literature; and from the findings have identified a comprehensive list of characteristics and behaviors attributed to outstanding principals. Your expertise in reviewing and reacting to the list of characteristics and behaviors is necessary to this stage of the research.

The material you will find in the attached packet explains the procedure for Phase I of the research data collection.

If you have any questions at all about the materials or procedure, you may contact me at either of the locations listed below. Because of the timelines involved, I am requesting that you complete your review work within one week. Your packet of materials should be mailed to me no later than Monday, March 26, 1990.

Again you have my gratitude for your interest and support.

Sincerely,

Peg LaBelle

Attachments

Romeo Community Schools
Administrative Offices
Telephone (313) 752-4533

LaBelle Residence
68684 Highland
Romeo, MI 48065
Telephone (313) 752-9889

REVIEWER FORM
PRINCIPAL FEEDBACK PROFILE
PHASE I

Reviewer Name_____

The following descriptions and statements in this inventory are based on research findings about the characteristics and behaviors of principals who are outstanding educational leaders. Nine domain areas are described below. Each description is followed by a series of statements to be reviewed and critiqued. The purpose of your work is to rank the statements on the inventory on a scale of A through E; an A indicating most important; an E indicating leadership behaviors you consider the least important. There are 175 statements on the inventory. As part of this process you must assign a rank of E to 50 of the items. Space is provided within each domain if you wish to comment on particular items or make needed additions.

The inventory is set up into Section A (Domains I, II, III, IV, V) and Section B (Domains VI, VII, VIII, IX). Please code your ranks on the appropriate scantron card. You may want to work with the statements and record your rankings on the inventory sheets before putting them on the cards. The only tool needed in completing this task is your good judgement about which characteristics and behaviors you view as most important in the principalship.

DOMAINS

SECTION A

I. Communicates a Clear Sense of Mission

The principal communicates a clear sense of mission. The attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community is frequently directed toward the activities and progress of the school. The principal is enthusiastic and optimistic about the goals of the organization and provides direction for these goals through his/her vision of the kind of place the school ought to be.

The Principal. . .

1. works closely with central administration and the staff to develop the goals of the school.

2. works closely with the staff to develop objectives that reflect the mission and goals of the school.

3. represents the views, goals and values of the staff whenever in a linking function with others.

4. develops a collective understanding among the staff about the primary tasks of the school.

5. communicates back to the staff the views, goals and decision of others.

6. is an important source of enthusiasm for the significance of the mission and goals of the school.

7. makes sure that their vision is achievable.

8. is a portrait painter of possibilities.

9. provides information and focuses such information on school goals and program priorities.

10. successfully involves teachers and others in their vision of the school.

11. passionately cares about the school and clearly shows it.

12. is able to convince the staff to excel.

13. is willing to firmly stand for his/her ideals and communicates that stance to others.

14. has a personal sense of mission that is communicated continuously to parents, teachers students and others.

15. has a clear vision about what the school could be.

16. directs the attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community toward the activities and progress of the school.

17. is enthusiastic and optimistic about the work of the staff and students and school as a whole.

18. believes that all students can learn.

Comments _____

_____

_____

II. Skillfully and Strategically Plans for the School

The principal is a skilled and strategic planner. The principal is knowledgeable and skilled at anticipating building, staff and student needs. Problem finding as well as simultaneous planning for the present and the future of the school is done with the input of others and with careful attention to detail.

The principal. . .

19. plants ideas with key teachers.

20. knows the school well and recognizes needs when they arise.

21. asks a lot of questions.

22. is a good judge of consequences and anticipates problems.

23. leads others in new and uncharted ways.

24. continually searches for problems and opportunities.

25. uses good judgement and intuition in establishing priorities and making decisions.

26. is a good synthesizer of information.

27. establishes formal and informal channels of communication thereby gaining access to new and different information and ideas.

28. develops clearly spelled out policies related to school goals.

29. determines whether or not teachers understand and share in the expectations that have been established.

30. fends off pressures that want to change school in another direction.

31. evaluates problem solving action to ensure that problems remain solved.

32. expects and encourages open and constructive confrontation of views including their own when information gathering and problem solving are going on.

33. is meticulous in his/her attention to the details of the school environment, i.e., physical, emotional, school-community relations, staff, student achievement.

34. leads and shapes the work of the school.

35. is creative at discovering problems.

36. continually evaluates information gathering and decision-making processes in generating valid and useful information.

37. is objective when special interest groups try to influence.

38. looks at issues and problems rationally, and without bias.

Comments_____

_____

_____

III. Sets High Standards

The principal communicates a high set of professional and academic standards for him/herself, the staff, and students. The principal takes responsibility for the performance of the organization. The principal closely monitors and evaluates student performance and behavior as well as the continuity of the instructional program. Objectivity and commitment to the educational purpose of the organization and the potential of students are the benchmarks employed in this assessment.

The principal. . .

39. monitors the progress of remedial students.

40. works with teachers and students in developing realistic codes for student conduct and a system of progressive discipline.

41. provides an orderly school atmosphere and keeps disruptions to a minimum.

42. is willing to assume responsibility for the school, staff and students, and the standards by which it operates.

43. clearly states his/her expected behaviors for teachers, as a means of achieving student outcomes.

44. will sacrifice smooth interpersonal relationships for the sake of a more effective program.

45. respects level of performance at the same time demands self-discipline and responsibility.

46. places the achievement and happiness of students first in his/her priorities and helps teachers find ways to make students successful.

47. demonstrates integrity and decency.

48. ensures that all students, regardless of their status, are provided with challenging instruction that meets their needs.

49. discourages complacency and passive acceptance.

50. works closely with the staff to establish as well as monitor goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable.

51. manages the school by objectives that are agreed upon in advance and clearly understood by students, teachers and parents.

52. reviews student progress and test results and investigates problem areas particularly when lower rates of student achievement are observed.

53. sets a tone of high but attainable academic standards for students and the school as a whole.

54. closely monitors the classroom program and expects teachers to spend as much time as possible on instruction.

55. fosters among the staff a sense of allegiance and common agreement about the norms, beliefs and principles that guide the school.

56. develops pride among the staff and students in the work of the school.

57. not only places high expectations also supports effort and ingenuity.

58. focuses the majority of his/her energies and those of the staff solving problems related to providing a basic education and balanced curriculum.

59. supports the staff in their efforts to maintain high academic and behavioral standards in their classroom.

Comments_____

_____

_____

IV. Is Visible to Everyone in the School

The principal is seen as visible and involved in the school program. The principal is a frequent visitor in classrooms, and spends a great deal of time observing and working with the staff in the delivery of the educational program. The principal also closely listens to staff members as they converse about their concerns, needs and aspirations for the work they are doing.

The principal. . .

60. works closely with the staff to coordinate instruction.

61. is thoroughly familiar with the academic program.

62. is persistent in giving time and attention to anyone involved in the issues, goals and outcomes of the school.

63. listens attentively to what staff members say.

64. finds the time for the staff regardless.

65. cares about the staff and spends a great deal of time with them.

66. pays attention, is involved in all that goes on in the school.

67. makes him/herself available as a sounding board for teacher problems and ideas.

68. engages teachers in ongoing dialog about areas of interest or concern to either the principal or the teacher.

69. is persistent and knowledgeable about instructional issues they want to see implemented.

70. supports and nourishes change.

71. is visible to the staff, students and parents.

72. spends a great deal of time monitoring and working with the instructional program and the activities of the school.

73. because of their work in the educational program inspires the staff to keep going when progress is difficult or slow.

74. publicly supports and defends new practices related to program improvement.

75. is student and teacher centered.

76. is perceptive therefore receives messages clearly and distinctly.

77. utilizes informal as well as formal means of communication.

78. fosters informal decision-making through effective and frequent communication.

Comments_____

_____

_____

SECTION B

V. Builds Positive Staff Relationship

The principal supports and builds positive staff relationships through a shared sense of trust. The principal demonstrates concern and commitment to each staff member, is sensitive to their needs, and gives support and recognition for their accomplishments and efforts. Creativity is nurtured, innovation is encouraged, and failure is accepted.

The principal. . .

79. finds ways to communicate with others when differences exist.

80. keeps his/her perspective and does not overreact to trivial incidents.

81. is perceptive and responsive.

82. demonstrates his/her belief in the importance of the teachers role.

83. is seen as honest, genuine and straightforward at all times.

84. knows the students and their personal, social and academic characteristics.

85. is trusted implicitely by the staff.

86. demonstrates empathy and sensitivity in their relationships with others.

87. demonstrates a spirit of commitment to the staff and students.

88. feels committed and personally responsible to each staff member.

89. respects the beliefs and value system of individual teachers.

90. demonstrates his/her trust in the staff.

91. is fair and treats the staff as professionals.

92. supports individual initiative and risk taking.

93. is a strong advocate of experimentation and innovation and lets everybody know it.

94. functions as an advocate and protector of staff members who are innovative achievers even when they are a nuisance.

95. gives recognition to teachers for their efforts especially for particular achievements or activities.

96. arranges for staff members to perform leadership functions which enhance their status.

97. supports the staff inside as well as outside of the school.

Comments_____

_____

_____

VI. Promotes Shared Decision-Making

The principal consults with the staff and actively involves them in a shared decision-making role. The principal develops a sense of team by empowering staff members to assess the needs of the school and plan for those needs. Through these efforts the principal serves as a catalyst for improvement and change.

The principal. . .

1. makes sure that problems which involve the group are dealt with by the group.

2. is democratic in making judgements and decisions.

3. encourages collaboration without sacrificing autonomy and individualism.

4. creates effective teams because those involved are given the opportunity and responsibility for activities and decisions.

5. recognizes that, by virtue of their uniqueness, members of the school team may not always work well together.

6. ensures open communication of all relevant facts in the decision-making process.

7. supports the work of the staff without encouraging dependence or defensiveness. Hostility and indifference are absent.

8. treats differences as opportunities to be used in making creative decisions.

9. treats the staff with respect and as equals in the decision-making process.

10. seeks the advise of staff on important issues.

11. fosters an environment whereby teachers view themselves as proactive managers who have the capacity to positively affect student learning.

12. is cooperative but careful not to impose a decision upon the group.

13. through their efforts in the shared decision-making process creates in the staff a genuine sense of responsibility for their work and progress.

14. shares his/her leadership functions by involving the staff in decisions which directly affect the work they do.

15. gives staff members and students a stake in the creation of new innovations and ideas.

16. involves the staff in selecting their role and function in school improvement efforts.

17. creates an environment that encourages teachers to work together to create new options and solve problems that they cannot work through alone.

18. builds cooperative relationships among all groups in the school and challenges competitive, individualistic or adversarial traditions.

19. fosters a relationship of collegiality and collaboration with the staff based on equality, trust and mutual regard.

20. does not allow his/her ego to become an obstacle to getting the job done.

Comments_____

_____

_____

VII. Skillfully Administers the School and Acquires the Needed Resources

The principal uses his/her power, on a daily basis, to acquire needed resources for the school such as administrative, parental or outside support for special projects. The principal actively recruits talented staff at every level and finds ways to utilize the staff as well as reward outstanding performance. The principal is a skilled negotiator who facilitates needed change and effectively responds to adversity.

The principal. . .

21. is resourceful and assists the staff in gaining access to consulting staff and other district resources.

22. creates a well designed working environment that allows the staff to teach.

23. coordinates the efforts of individual teachers in such a way that each works to his or her highest ability.

24. sees to it that the staff is provided with all of the information and resources they need to make decisions.

25. puts discretionary funds and resources at the teachers disposal whenever possible.

26. uses his/her power to make needed change based on the input of the staff.

27. encourages networking inside and outside of the school for the purpose of maximizing contributions to one another.

28. manages conflict quickly and skillfully.

29. seeks the people most qualified and competent to work in the school.

30. involves him/herself in helping staff members implement special activities or projects.

31. is willing to interpret the rules in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of the school.

32. takes risks and accepts losses.

33. treats mistakes as opportunities.

34. is skilled at trouble shooting and untangling conflict.

35. uses time effectively and efficiently.

36. skillfully and efficiently manages the school.

37. provides information about procedures, schedules and other routine matters.

38. spends time outside of the school interacting and gathering new information from other scholars, leaders and planners.

39. secures the necessary support services that teachers need.

40. ensures the selection of key staff members to provide strong leadership in special projects.

Comments _____

_____

_____

VIII.   Functions as a Skilled Instructional Leader and
        Resource to the Staff

The principal functions as a supervisor and colleague to
teachers in the school.   In this role, he/she observes the
work of the staff frequently and in various settings.   The
principal consults with the staff about their instructional
efforts, provides feedback through counseling and coaching,
and acts as a resource in assisting teachers in identifying
their own strengths and those skills needing improvement.

The principal. . .

   41.   coaches and mentors the staff as they work toward
         new ideals.

   42.   makes informal as well as formal suggestions to
         teachers for improving instruction.

   43.   makes teachers feel confident in seeking
         assistance regarding academic matters and
         professional improvement efforts.

   44.   demonstrates the skill and ability to counsel
         staff members effectively.

   45.   monitors the congruence of individual staff member
         goals and the goals of the school.

   46.   encourages the use of proven instructional
         strategies.

   47.   makes brief unannounced visits to ensure that
         assignments and responsibilities are carried out
         in a professional manner.

   48.   understands the teaching/learning process.

   49.   accepts the fact that the person who does the job
         is likely to know more about it then the person
         who supervises.

   50.   gives teachers the latitude and autonomy to
         perform work in their own way.

51. views change as an evolving process therefore helps the staff recognize that professional growth efforts take time and practice.

52. carries out their supervisory and monitoring activities with a commitment and sensitivity that motivates the staff to want to improve.

53. supervises staff through frequent, ongoing observations and prompt specific feedback.

54. involves the staff in developing a plan for supervision and evaluation that provides choices for each teacher that are mutually agreed upon.

55. encourages alternative models for supervision and professional growth which staff members work together, i.e., peer coaching.

56. understands what his/her teachers do on a daily basis in their classrooms.

57. creates a safe environment in which teachers are encouraged to take risks with out fear of punishment.

58. encourages staff members to examine their own competence and set goals for their own growth.

59. motivates and energizes teachers to commit themselves to specific activities.

60. works with staff members in helping them identify their own professional goals.

61. is sensitive to the feelings of the staff and always meets privately when reprimands or differences need to be discussed.

Comments_____

_____

_____

IX. Involves the Staff and Themselves in Professional
     Development Activities

The principal works with the staff in identifying the
professional development needs of everyone in the school;
also seeks input from the staff about their own
effectiveness. The principal demonstrates an enthusiasm for
learning and involves the staff and themselves in the quest
for new knowledge.

The principal. . .

62. nurtures the individual professional development
     efforts of the staff.

63. provides the staff with opportunities within and
     outside of the district to visit and interact with
     other teachers for purposes of professional
     development.

64. enables and supports teachers at working
     independently on professional growth concerns.

65. expects teachers to be involved in identifying
     their own staff development needs.

66. encourages and arranges for staff members to
     attend workshops and conferences.

67. believes in a process of professional growth for
     themselves as well as the staff and frequently
     discusses his/her own goals.

68. encourages staff members to join professional
     organizations.

69. expects teachers to take an active role in the
     professional development of the school by
     reporting new knowledge on a formal as well as
     informal basis.

70. creates conditions and expectations in the
     school that enable(s) professional development
     to be an ongoing effort.

71. encourages interactions among teachers about
     professional issues by establishing formal
     occasions such as staff meetings.

72. resists defensiveness and saving face.

73. asks teachers for input about what they do that is
     not helpful or gets in the way.

74. asks teachers for input about what they do that enables the teacher to do their work.

75. is aware of his/her own leadership style including strengths and weaknesses.

76. is open to suggestion.

77. is committed to a plan for their own ongoing professional development.

78. is a serious and enthusiastic learner who is open to new professional development experiences.

Comments

Appendix B

<div align="right">April 23, 1990</div>

Dear Reviewer:

Please accept my sincere thanks and gratitude for your help in Phase I of my dissertation project. Your many notes and calls were appreciated. Your commitment and good humor came through loud and clear with comments such as, "I have spent hours on this. . . .my C's were almost as painful as my E's," and "sure would like to meet the principal who could do all of this." Many of you described the task as "difficult." Never-the-less your effort provided me with the information needed to revise the inventory. Your response to this new inventory is critical to the final stage of my study.

You will note that the revision is much shorter, therefore making your task a much easier one. Once I have completed the analysis of this phase of the study I will send you copies of the final results.

Please contact me if you have any concerns or questions. I am requesting that you complete the review in one week. Materials should be mailed to me no later than Monday, April 30, 1990.

A simple thank you is not enough to express my appreciation and gratitude.

<div align="right">Sincerely,</div>

<div align="right">Peg LaBelle</div>

Attachments

Romeo Community Schools
Administrative Offices
Telephone (313) 752-4533

LaBelle Residence
68684 Highland
Romeo, MI 48065
Telephone (313) 752-9889

PRINCIPAL FEEDBACK INVENTORY
PHASE II

The following inventory is based on the research findings about the characteristics and behaviors of principals who are outstanding educational leaders.   There are nine domains with each description followed by a series of statements. Please rank the statements on a scale of "A" through "E"; an "A" indicating leadership behaviors you consider the most important within each domain; an "E" indicating least important.   There are 100 statements, you must assign an "E" to at least 20 of the items.   Space is provided if you wish to recommend changes in particular items or if you wish to make additions.   Please code your ranks on the enclosed scantron card.

REVIEWER FORM
PRINCIPAL FEEDBACK PROFILE
PHASE II

I.   Communicates a Clear Sense of Mission

The principal communicates a clear sense of mission.   The attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community is frequently directed toward the activities and progress of the school.   The principal is enthusiastic and optimistic about the goals of the organization and provides direction for these goals through his/her vision of the kind of place the school ought to be.

The Principal. . .

    1.   works closely with central administration and the staff to develop the goals of the school.

    2.   works closely with the staff to develop objectives that reflect the mission and goals of the school.

    3.   represents the views, goals and values of the staff whenever in a linking function with others and communicates back to the staff the views, goals and decisions of others.

    4.   develops a collective understanding among the staff about the primary tasks of the school.

    5.   is an important source of enthusiasm for the significance of the mission and goals of the school.

6. provides information and focuses such information on school goals and program priorities.

7. passionately cares about the school and its mission and clearly shows that commitment to parents, teachers, students and anyone interested in the school.

8. is willing to firmly stand for his/her ideals and communicates that stance to others.

9. has a clear vision about what the school could be and successfully involves the staff and others in that vision.

10. directs the attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community toward the activities and progress of the school.

11. is enthusiastic and optimistic about the work of the staff and students and school as a whole.

12. believes that all students can learn.

Comments_____

_____

II. Skillfully and Strategically Plans for the School

The principal is a skilled and strategic planner. The principal is knowledgeable and skilled at anticipating building, staff and student needs. Problem finding as well as simultaneous planning for the present and the future of the school is done with the input of others and with careful attention to detail.

The principal. . .

13. knows the school well and recognizes needs when they arise.

14. uses good judgement and intuition in establishing priorities, making decisions and anticipating problems.

15. is a good synthesizer of information.

16. establishes formal and informal channels of communication thereby gaining access to new and different information and ideas.

17. develops clearly spelled out policies related to school goals.

18. expects and encourages open and constructive confrontation of views including their own when information gathering and problem solving are going on.

19. leads and shapes the work of the school.

20. looks at issues and problems rationally, and without bias.

Comments_____

_____

III. Sets High Standards

The principal communicates a high set of professional and academic standards for him/herself, the staff, and students. The principal takes responsibility for the performance of the organization. The principal closely monitors and evaluates student performance and behavior as well as the continuity of the instructional program. Objectivity and commitment to the educational purpose of the organization and the potential of students are the benchmarks employed in this assessment.

The principal. . .

21. works with teachers and students in developing realistic codes for student conduct and a system of progressive discipline.

22. provides an orderly school atmosphere and keeps disruptions to a minimum.

23. is willing to assume responsibility for the school, staff and students, and the standards by which it operates.

24. clearly states his/her expected behaviors for teachers, as a means of achieving student outcomes.

25. places the achievement and happiness of students first in his/her priorities and helps teachers find ways to make students successful.

26. demonstrates integrity and decency.

27. works closely with the staff to establish high but realistic and achievable academic standards for students and the school and ensures that all students, regardless of their status, are provided with challenging instruction.

28. manages the school by objectives that are agreed upon in advance and clearly understood by students, teachers and parents.

29. reviews student progress and test results and investigates problem areas particularly when lower rates of student achievement are observed.

30. fosters among the staff a sense of allegiance and common agreement about the norms, beliefs and principles that guide the school.

31. develops pride among the staff and students in the work of the school.

32. not only places high expectations also supports effort and ingenuity.

33. supports the staff in their efforts to maintain high academic and behavioral standards in their classroom.

Comments_____

_____

IV. Is Visible to Everyone in the School

The principal is seen as visible and involved in the school program. The principal is a frequent visitor in classrooms, and spends a great deal of time observing and working with the staff in the delivery of the educational program. The principal also closely listens to staff members as they converse about their concerns, needs and aspirations for the work they are doing.

The principal. . .

34. works closely with the staff to coordinate and monitor instruction and the activities of the school.

35. is thoroughly familiar with the academic program.

36. listens attentively to what staff members say.

37. makes him/herself available as a sounding board for teacher problems and ideas.

38. is persistent and knowledgeable about instructional issues they want to see implemented.

39. supports and nourishes change.

40. is visible to the staff, students and parents.

41. publicly supports and defends new practices related to program improvement.

42. is student and teacher centered.

43. is perceptive therefore receives messages clearly and distinctly.

44. utilizes informal as well as formal means of communication.

45. fosters informal decision-making through effective and frequent communication.

Comments_____

_____

V. Builds Positive Staff Relationship

The principal supports and builds positive staff relationships through a shared sense of trust. The principal demonstrates concern and commitment to each staff member, is sensitive to their needs, and gives support and recognition for their accomplishments and efforts. Creativity is nurtured, innovation is encouraged, and failure is accepted.

The principal. . .

46. finds ways to communicate with others when differences exist.

47. keeps his/her perspective and does not overreact to trivial incidents.

48. is perceptive and demonstrates empathy and sensitivity in their relationships with others.

49. demonstrates his/her belief in the importance of the teachers role.

50. is seen as honest, genuine and straightforward at all times.

51. is trusted implicitely by the staff.

52. demonstrates a spirit of commitment to the staff and students.

53. respects the beliefs and value system of individual teachers.

54. demonstrates his/her trust in the staff.

55. is fair and treats the staff as professionals.

56. supports individual initiative and risk taking.

57. gives recognition to teachers for their efforts especially for particular achievements or activities.

58. supports the staff inside as well as outside of the school.

Comments_____

_____

VI. Promotes Shared Decision-Making

The principal consults with the staff and actively involves them in a shared decision-making role. The principal develops a sense of team by empowering staff members to assess the needs of the school and plan for those needs. Through these efforts the principal serves as a catalyst for improvement and change.

The principal. . .

59. makes sure that problems which involve the group are dealt with by the group.

60. encourages collaboration without sacrificing autonomy and individualism.

61. creates effective teams because those involved are given the opportunity and responsibility for activities and decisions in school improvement efforts.

62. ensures open communication of all relevant facts in the decision-making process.

63. treats the staff with respect and as equals in the decision-making process.

64. seeks the advise of staff on important issues.

65. fosters an environment whereby teachers view themselves as proactive managers who have the capacity to positively affect student learning.

66. through their efforts in the shared decision-making process creates in the staff a genuine sense of responsibility for their work and progress.

67. shares his/her leadership functions by involving the staff in decisions which directly affect the work they do.

68. creates an environment of collegiality and mutual regard tht encourages teachers to work together to create new options and solve problems that they cannot work through alone.

69. fosters a relationship of collegiality and collaboration with the staff based on equality, trust and mutual regard.

70. does not allow his/her ego to become an obstacle to getting the job done.

Comments_____

VII. Skillfully Administers the School and Acquires the Needed Resources

The principal uses his/her power, on a daily basis, to acquire needed resources for the school such as administrative, parental or outside support for special projects. The principal actively recruits talented staff at every level and finds ways to utilize the staff as well as reward outstanding performance. The principal is a skilled negotiator who facilitates needed change and effectively responds to adversity.

The principal. . .

71. is resourceful and assists the staff in gaining access to consulting staff and other resources they need.

72. provides information about procedures, schedules and other routine matters, therefore creating a well designed working environment that allows the staff to teach.

73. coordinates the efforts of individual teachers in such a way that each works to his or her highest ability.

74. sees to it that the staff is provided with all of the information and resources they need to make decisions.

75. puts discretionary funds and resources at the teachers disposal whenever possible.

76. uses his/her power to make needed change based on the input of the staff.

77. manages conflict quickly and skillfully.

78. seeks the people most qualified and competent to work in the school.

79. takes risks, accepts losses and treats mistakes as opportunities.

80. uses time effectively, skillfully and efficiently manages the school.

81. ensures the selection of key staff members to provide strong leadership in special projects.

Comments_____

_____

VIII. Functions as a Skilled Instructional Leader and Resource to the Staff

The principal functions as a supervisor and colleague to teachers in the school. In this role, he/she observes the work of the staff frequently and in various settings. The principal consults with the staff about their instructional efforts, provides feedback through counseling and coaching, and acts as a resource in assisting teachers in identifying their own strengths and those skills needing improvement.

The principal. . .

82. coaches and mentors the staff and makes them feel confident in seeking assistance regarding academic matters and their own professional inmprovement efforts.

83. makes informal as well as formal suggestions to teachers for improving instruction.

84. demonstrates the skill and ability to counsel staff members effectively.

85. encourages the use of proven instructional strategies.

86. understands the teaching/learning process and what teachers do in their classrooms on a daily basis.

87. gives teachers the latitude and autonomy to perform work in their own way.

88. views change as an evolving process therefore helps the staff recognize that professional growth efforts take time and practice.

89. carries out their supervisory and monitoring activities with a commitment and sensitivity that motivates the staff to want to improve.

90. involves the staff in developing a plan for alternative models of supervision and evaluation that provides mutually agreed upon choices.

91. creates a safe environment in which teachers are encouraged to take risks with out fear of punishment.

92. is sensitive to the feelings of the staff and always meets privately when reprimands or differences need to be discussed.

Comments_____

_____

IX. Involves the Staff and Themselves in Professional Development Activities

The principal works with the staff in identifying the professional development needs of everyone in the school; also seeks input from the staff about their own effectiveness. The principal demonstrates an enthusiasm for learning and involves the staff and themselves in the quest for new knowledge.

The principal. . .

93. nurtures the individual professional development efforts of the staff.

94. provides the staff with opportunities within and outside of the district to visit and interact with other teachers for purposes of professional development.

95. expects teachers to be involved in identifying their own staff development needs.

96. encourages intractions among teachers about professional issues by establishing formal occasions such as staff meetings in which new understandings and knowledge are shared.

97. creates conditions and expectations. in the school that enable(s) professional development to be an ongoing effort.

98. is aware of his/her own leadership style including strengths and weaknesses.

99. is open to suggestion.

100. is serious and enthusiastic learner who is committed to a plan for their own ongoing professional development.

Comments _____

_____

Appendix C

Items by rank for Principal Feedback Inventory

Phase I	Phase II	
1	2	is fair and treats the staff as professionals.
2	3	demonstrates integrity and decency.
3	6	is open to suggestion.
4	7	works closely with the staff to develop objectives that reflect the mission and goals of the school.
5	13	supports the staff in their efforts to maintain high academic and behavioral standards in their classroom.
6	4	is visible to the staff, students and parents.
7	34	is a serious and enthusiastic learner who is open to new professional development experiences.
8	5	believes that all students can learn.
9	1	is sensitive to the feelings of the staff and always meets privately when reprimands or differences need to be discussed.
10	45	understands the teaching/learning process.
11	57	is thoroughly familiar with the academic program.
12	14	is student and teacher centered.
13	18	is enthusiastic and optimistic about the work of the staff and students and school as a whole.
14	12	knows the school well and recognizes needs when they arise.
15	11	listens attentively to what staff members say.
16	33	is aware of his/her own leadership style including strengths and weaknesses.

Phase I	Phase II	
17	58	looks at issues and problems rationally, and without bias.
18	17	demonstrates his/her trust in the staff.
19	25	shares his/her leadership functions by involving the staff in decisions which directly affect the work they do.
20	8	demonstrates a spirit of commitment to the staff and students.
21	10	gives recognition to teachers for their efforts especially for particular achievements or activities.
22	23	carries out their supervisory and monitoring activities with a commitment and sensitivity that motivates the staff to want to improve.
23	9	provides an orderly school atmosphere and keeps disruptions to a minimum.
24	48	is an important source of enthusiasm for the significance of the mission and goals of the school.
25	28	ensures open communication of all relevant facts in the decision-making process.
26	36	through their efforts in the shared decision-making process creates in the staff a genuine sense of responsibility for their work and progress.
27	24	works closely with the staff to establish as well as monitor goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable.
28	31	is seen as honest, genuine and straightforward at all times.
29	16	uses good judgement and intuition in establishing priorities and making decisions.
30	24	sets a tone of high but attainable academic standards for students and the school as a whole.
31	27	successfully involves teachers and others in their vision of the school.

Phase I	Phase II	
32	42	treats the staff with respect and as equals in the decision-making process.
33	39	develops pride among the staff and students in the work of the school.
34	35	finds ways to communicate with others when differences exist.
35	46	creates an environment that encourages teachers to work together to create new options and solve problems that they cannot work through alone.
36	20	skillfully and efficiently manages the school.
37	41	keeps his/her perspective and does not overreact to trivial incidents.
38	27	has a clear vision about what the school could be.
39	15	fosters an environment whereby teachers view themselves as proactive managers who have the capacity to positively affect student learning.
40	74	fosters a relationship of collegiality and collaboration with the staff based on equality, trust and mutual regard.
41	50	works with teachers and students in developing realistic codes for student conduct and a system of progressive discipline.
42	20	uses time effectively and efficiently.
43	26	demonstrates his/her belief in the importance of the teachers role.
44	54	makes sure that problems which involve the group are dealt with by the group.
45	38	is willing to assume responsibility for the school, staff and students, and the standards by which it operates.
46	70	develops a collective understanding among the staff about the primary tasks of the school.

Phase I	Phase II	
47	16	is a good judge of consequences and anticipates problems.
48	61	establishes formal and informal channels of communication thereby gaining access to new and different information and ideas.
49	22	manages conflict quickly and skillfully.
50	21	has a personal sense of mission that is communicated continuously to parents, teachers students and others.
51	30	demonstrates empathy and sensitivity in their relationships with others.
52	52	seeks the people most qualified and competent to work in the school.
53	44	creates conditions and expectations in the school that enable(s) professional development to be an ongoing effort.
54	40	makes him/herself available as a sounding board for teacher problems and ideas.
55	32	uses his/her power to make needed change based on the input of the staff.
56	29	creates a safe environment in which teachers are encouraged to take risks with out fear of punishment.
57	21	passionately cares about the school and clearly shows it.
58	24	ensures that all students, regardless of their status, are provided with challenging instruction that meets their needs.
59	69	gives teachers the latitude and autonomy to perform work in their own way.
60	19	supports individual initiative and risk taking.
61	76	seeks the advice of staff on important issues.
62	20	is skilled at trouble shooting and untangling conflict.

Phase I	Phase II	
63	30	is perceptive and responsive.
64	43	creates a well designed working environment that allows the staff to teach.
65	78	secures the necessary support services that teachers need.
66	84	makes teachers feel confident in seeking assistance regarding academic matters and professional improvement efforts.
67	84	encourages staff members to examine their own competence and set goals for their own growth.
68	71	manages the school by objectives that are agreed upon in advance and clearly understood by students, teachers and parents.
69	37	not only places high expectations also supports effort and ingenuity.
70	60	creates effective teams because those involved are given the opportunity and responsibility for activities and decisions.
71	72	encourages the use of proven instructional strategies.
72	53	encourages and arranges for staff members to attend workshops and conferences.
73	77	makes informal as well as formal suggestions to teachers for improving instruction.
74	34	is committed to a plan for their own ongoing professional development.
75	88	works closely with central administration and the staff to develop the goals of the school.
76	53	provides the staff with opportunities within and outside of the district to visit and interact with other teachers for purposes of professional development.
77	51	supports and nourishes change.
78	49	leads and shapes the work of the school.

Phase I	Phase II	
79	59	places the achievement and happiness of students first in his/her priorities and helps teachers find ways to make students successful.
80	62	expects and encourages open and constructive confrontation of views including their own when information gathering and problem solving are going on.
81	55	directs the attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community toward the activities and progress of the school.
82	65	is trusted implicitly by the staff.
83	82	does not allow his/her ego to become an obstacle to getting the job done.
84	64	utilizes informal as well as formal means of communication.
85	56	respects the beliefs and value system of individual teachers.
86	68	encourages interactions among teachers about professional issues by establishing formal occasions such as staff meetings.
87	60	involves the staff in selecting their role and function in school improvement efforts.
88	67	views change as an evolving process therefore helps the staff recognize that professional growth efforts take time and practice.
89	63	publicly supports and defends new practices related to program improvement.
90	92	develops clearly spelled out policies related to school goals.
91	90	reviews student progress and test results and investigates problem areas particularly when lower rates of student achievement are observed.
92	47	works closely with the staff to coordinate instruction.

Phase I	Phase II	
93	80	is willing to firmly stand for his/her ideals and communicates that stance to others.
94	91	ensures the selection of key staff members to provide strong leadership in special projects.
95	45	understands what his/her teachers do on a daily basis in their classrooms.
96	89	fosters among the staff a sense of allegiance and common agreement about the norms, beliefs and principles that guide the school.
97	97	is a good synthesizer of information.
98	87	encourages collaboration without sacrificing autonomy and individualism.
99	78	is resourceful and assists the staff in gaining access to consulting staff and other district resources.
100	94	coordinates the efforts of individual teachers in such a way that each works to his or her highest ability.
101	83	is persistent and knowledgeable about instructional issues they want to see implemented.
102	73	puts discretionary funds and resources at the teachers disposal whenever possible.
103	85	nurtures the individual professional development efforts of the staff.
104	96	expects teachers to take an active role in the professional development of the school by reporting new knowledge on a formal as well as informal basis.
105	86	clearly states his/her expected behaviors for teachers, as a means of achieving student outcomes.
106	43	provides information about procedures, schedules and other routine matters.
107	99	demonstrates the skill and ability to counsel staff members effectively.

Phase I	Phase II	
108	95	sees to it that the staff is provided with all of the information and resources they need to make decisions.
109	96	is perceptive, therefore receives messages clearly and distinctly.
110	84	coaches and mentors the staff as they work toward new ideals.
111	79	represents the views, goals and values of the staff whenever in a linking function with others.
112	79	communicates back to the staff the views, goals and decision of others.
113	98	provides information and focuses such information on school goals and program priorities.
114	93	supports the staff inside as well as outside of the school.
115	100	encourages alternative models for supervision and professional growth which staff members work together, i.e., peer coaching.
116	75	expects teachers to be involved in identifying their own staff development needs.
117	66	takes risks and accepts losses.
118	66	treats mistakes as opportunities.
119	81	fosters informal decision-making through effective and frequent communication.
120	-	supervises staff through frequent, ongoing observations and prompt specific feedback.
121	-	spends time outside of the school interacting and gathering new information from other scholars, leaders and planners.
122	-	is democratic in making judgements and decisions.
123	-	accepts the fact that the person who does the job is likely to know more about it then the person who supervises.

Phase I	Phase II	
124	-	is able to convince the staff to excel.
125	-	because of their work in the educational program inspires the staff to keep going when progress is difficult or slow.
126	-	encourages networking inside and outside of the school for the purpose of maximizing contributions to one another.
127	-	is meticulous in his/her attention to the details of the school environment, i.e., physical, emotional, school-community relations, staff, student achievement.
128	-	spends a great deal of time monitoring and working with the instructional program and the activities of the school.
129	-	involves the staff in developing a plan for supervision and evaluation that provides choices for each teacher that are mutually agreed upon.
130	-	believes in a process of professional growth for themselves as well as the staff and frequently discusses his/her own goals.
131	-	gives staff members and students a stake in the creation of new innovations and ideas.
132	-	is willing to interpret the rules in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of the school.
133	-	engages teachers in ongoing dialog about areas of interest or concern to either the principal or the teacher.
134	-	is objective when special interest groups try to influence.
135	-	makes sure that their vision is achievable.
136	-	finds the time for the staff regardless.
137	-	pays attention, is involved in all that goes on in the school.
138	-	supports the work of the staff without encouraging dependence or defensiveness. Hostility and indifference are absent.

Phase I	Phase II	
139	-	involves him/herself in helping staff members implement special activities or projects.
140	-	closely monitors the classroom program and expects teachers to spend as much time as possible on instruction.
141	-	discourages complacency and passive acceptance.
142	-	is persistent in giving time and attention to anyone involved in the issues, goals and outcomes of the school.
143	-	enables and supports teachers at working independently on professional growth concerns.
144	-	determines whether or not teachers understand and share in the expectations that have been established.
145	-	recognizes that by virtue of their uniqueness, members of the school team may not always work well together.
146	-	respects level of performance at the same time demands self-discipline and responsibility.
147	-	evaluates problem solving action to ensure that problems remain solved.
148	-	continually evaluates information gathering and decision-making processes in generating valid and useful information.
149	-	leads others in new and uncharted ways.
150	-	motivates and energizes teachers to commit themselves to specific activities.
151	-	plants ideas with key teachers.
152	-	knows the students and the personal, social and academic characteristics.
153	-	arranges for staff members to perform leadership functions which enhance their status.
154	-	treats differences as opportunities to be used in making creative decisions.

Phase I	Phase II	
155	-	resists defensiveness and saving face.
156	-	asks teachers for input about what they do that enables the teacher to do their work.
157	-	monitors the congruence of individual staff member goals and the goals of the school.
158	-	asks teachers for input about what they do tht is not helpful or gets in the way.
159	-	builds cooperative relationships among all groups in the school and challenges competitive, individualistic or adversarial traditions.
160	-	works with staff members in helping them identify their own professional goals.
161	-	is cooperative but careful not to impose a decision upon the group.
162	-	makes brief unannounced visits to ensure that assignments and responsibilities are carried out in a professional manner.
163	-	focuses the majority of his/her energies and those of the staff solving problems related to providing a basic education and balanced curriculum.
164	-	asks a lot of questions.
165	-	is a portrait painter of possibilities.
166	-	cares about the staff and spends a great deal of time with them.
167	-	monitors the progress of remedial students.
168	-	is a strong advocate of experimentation and innovation and lets everybody know it.
169	-	functions as an advocate and protector of staff members who are innovative achievers even when they are a nuisance.
170	-	will sacrifice smooth interpersonal relationships for the sake of a more effective program.

Phase I	Phase II	
171	-	continually searches for problems and opportunities.
172	-	fends off pressures that want to change school in another direction.
173	-	feels committed and personally responsible to each staff member.
174	-	is creative at discovering problems.
175	-	encourages staff members to join professional organizations.

Note: Because of a mean score of 3.0 or below, items ranking 120-175 in Phase I were not included in Phase II.

May 29, 1990

Dear Colleague,

In an effort to assess his/her own strengths and weak-
nesses in the area of leadership, your principal desires
input from you. As a professional collegue your opinion is
valued, your time and input appreciated. The accompanying
inventory is based on research findings about character-
istics and behaviors of instructional leaders that both
principals and teachers believe to be important.

Please take a few minutes to complete the inventory.
There are nine domains, each description is followed by a
series of statements. In providing feedback to your
principal please use the following scale. . .

        A to a very great extent
        B to a great extent
        C to some extent
        D to a small extent
        E to a very small extent

Code your rankings next to the appropriate number on the
enclosed scantron card. Use No. 2 pencil only. To ensure
confidentiality your response to each statement will be
combined with others and reported as a group mean.

A sheet that corresponds to the nine domains has been
provided for any additional comments you may wish to make.

After you have finished the inventory please complete
the enclosed questionnaire.

Please place the scantron card, comment sheet, and
questionnaire in the manila envelope that has been provided.
You may keep the inventory if your wish.

Thank you for your time and effort.

                          Peg LaBelle

PRINCIPAL FEEDBACK INVENTORY
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long did it take you to complete the inventory?

   _____

2. Were the directions clear?   Yes_____ No_____

3. In your opinion do the nine domains describe the major
   instructional leadership areas?   Yes_____ No_____
   If no, please comment   _____

   _____

4. In your opinion do the items within each domain
   accurately describe the instructional leadership skills
   in the principalship that you believe to be important?
   Yes_____ No_____ Comment_____

   _____

5. Do you believe teachers confidentially and anonymously
   should have an opportunity to provide the principal
   with written feedback?

   Strongly Agree   5   4   3   2   1   Disagree
   Comment_____

6. In addition to normal interaction, i.e. daily contact,
   department, committee or staff meetings, could this
   instrument provide you with a viable means of
   communication with your principal?   Yes_____ No_____
   Comment_____

7. Would you like to have the opportunity to participate
   in this kind of process on a regular, i.e., yearly
   basis?
   Yes_____ No_____ More often_____ Less often_____
   Comment_____

8. Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways to
   provide feedback?_____

   _____

9. Did the 1-5 response scale provide you with a broad
   enough range for ranking?   Yes_____ No_____

PRINCIPAL FEEDBACK INVENTORY

   I. Communicates a clear sense of mission._____

_____

_____

  II. Skillfully and strategically plans for the school.

_____

_____

 III. Sets high standards._____

_____

_____

  IV. Is visible to everyone in the school. _____

_____

_____

   V. Builds positive staff relationships. _____

_____

_____

  VI. Promotes shared decision-making. _____

_____

_____

 VII. Skillfully administers the school and acquires the
      needed resources. _____

_____

_____

VIII. Functions as a skilled instructional leader and
      resource to the staff. _____

_____

_____

  IX. Involves the staff and themselves in professional
      development activities._____

_____

_____

I. Communicates a Clear Sense of Mission

The principal communicates a clear sense of mission. The attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community is frequently directed toward the activities and progress of the school. The principal is enthusiastic and optimistic about the goals of the organization and provides direction for these goals through his/her vision of the kind of place the school ought to be.

The Principal. . .

1. works closely with central administration and the staff to develop the goals of the school.

2. works closely with the staff to develop objectives that reflect the mission and goals of the school.

3. represents the views, goals and values of the staff whenever in a linking function with others and communicates back to the staff the views, goals and decisions of others.

4. develops a collective understanding among the staff about the primary tasks of the school.

5. is an important source of enthusiasm for the significance of the mission and goals of the school.

6. passionately cares about the school and its mission and clearly shows that commitment to parents, teachers, students and anyone interested in the school.

7. is willing to firmly stand for his/her ideals and communicates that stance to others.

8. has a clear vision about what the school could be and successfully involves the staff and others in that vision.

9. directs the attention of the staff, students, central office, parents, and the community toward the activities and progress of the school.

10. is enthusiastic and optimistic about the work of the staff and students and school as a whole.

11. believes that all students can learn.

II. Skillfully and Strategically Plans for the School

The principal is a skilled and strategic planner. The principal is knowledgeable and skilled at anticipating building, staff and student needs. Problem finding as well as simultaneous planning for the present and the future of the school is done with the input of others and with careful attention to detail.

The principal. . .

12. knows the school well and recognizes needs when they arise.

13. uses good judgement and intuition in establishing priorities, making decisions and anticipating problems.

14. establishes formal and informal channels of communication thereby gaining access to new and different information and ideas.

15. expects and encourages open and constructive confrontation of views including their own when information gathering and problem solving are going on.

16. leads and shapes the work of the school.

17. looks at issues and problems rationally, and without bias.

III. Sets High Standards

The principal communicates a high set of professional and academic standards for him/herself, the staff, and students. The principal takes responsibility for the performance of the organization. The principal closely monitors and evaluates student performance and behavior as well as the continuity of the instructional program. Objectivity and commitment to the educational purpose of the organization and the potential of students are the benchmarks employed in this assessment.

The principal. . .

18. works with teachers and students in developing realistic codes for student conduct and a system of progressive discipline.

19. provides an orderly school atmosphere and keeps disruptions to a minimum.

20. is willing to assume responsibility for the school, staff and students, and the standards by which it operates.

21. places the achievement and happiness of students first in his/her priorities and helps teachers find ways to make students successful.

22. demonstrates integrity and decency.

23. works closely with the staff to establish high but realistic and achievable academic standards for students and the school and ensures that all students, regardless of their status, are provided with challenging instruction.

24. manages the school by objectives that are agreed upon in advance and clearly understood by students, teachers and parents.

25. reviews student progress and test results and investigates problem areas particularly when lower rates of student achievement are observed.

26. develops pride among the staff and students in the work of the school.

27. not only places high expectations also supports effort and ingenuity.

28. supports the staff in their efforts to maintain high academic and behavioral standards in their classroom.

IV. Is Visible to Everyone in the School

The principal is seen as visible and involved in the school program. The principal is a frequent visitor in classrooms, and spends a great deal of time observing and working with the staff in the delivery of the educational program. The principal also closely listens to staff members as they converse about their concerns, needs and aspirations for the work they are doing.

The principal. . .

29. works closely with the staff to coordinate and monitor instruction and the activities of the school.

30. is thoroughly familiar with the academic program.

31. listens attentively to what staff members say.

32. makes him/herself available as a sounding board for teacher problems and ideas.

33. is persistent and knowledgeable about instructional issues they want to see implemented.

34. supports and nourishes change.

35. is visible to the staff, students and parents.

36. publicly supports and defends new practices related to program improvement.

37. is student and teacher centered.

38. utilizes informal as well as formal means of communication.

39. fosters informal decision-making through effective and frequent communication.

V. Builds Positive Staff Relationships

The principal supports and builds positive staff relationships through a shared sense of trust. The principal demonstrates concern and commitment to each staff member, is sensitive to their needs, and gives support and recognition for their accomplishments and efforts. Creativity is nurtured, innovation is encouraged, and failure is accepted.

The principal. . .

40. finds ways to communicate with others when differences exist.

41. keeps his/her perspective and does not overreact to trivial incidents.

42. is perceptive and demonstrates empathy and sensitivity in their relationships with others.

43. demonstrates his/her belief in the importance of the teachers role.

44. is seen as honest, genuine and straightforward at all times.

45. is trusted implicitly by the staff.

46. demonstrates a spirit of commitment to the staff and students.

47. respects the beliefs and value system of individual teachers.

48. demonstrates his/her trust in the staff.

49. is fair and treats the staff as professionals.

50. supports individual initiative and risk taking.

51. gives recognition to teachers for their efforts especially for particular achievements or activities.

VI. Promotes Shared Decision-Making

The principal consults with the staff and actively involves them in a shared decision-making role. The principal develops a sense of team by empowering staff members to assess the needs of the school and plan for those needs. Through these efforts the principal serves as a catalyst for improvement and change.

The principal. . .

52. makes sure that problems which involve the group are dealt with by the group.

53. encourages collaboration without sacrificing autonomy and individualism.

54. creates effective teams because those involved are given the opportunity and responsibility for activities and decisions in school improvement efforts.

55. ensures open communication of all relevant facts in the decision-making process.

56. treats the staff with respect and as equals in the decision-making process.

57. seeks the advice of staff on important issues.

58. fosters an environment whereby teachers view themselves as proactive managers who have the capacity to positively affect student learning.

59. through their efforts in the shared decision-making process creates in the staff a genuine sense of responsibility for their work and progress.

60. shares his/her leadership functions by involving the staff in decisions which directly affect the work they do.

61. creates an environment of collegiality and mutual regard tht encourages teachers to work together to create new options and solve problems that they cannot work through alone.

62. does not allow his/her ego to become an obstacle to getting the job done.

VII. Skillfully Administers the School and Acquires the Needed Resources

The principal uses his/her power, on a daily basis, to acquire needed resources for the school such as administrative, parental or outside support for special projects. The principal actively recruits talented staff at every level and finds ways to utilize the staff as well as reward outstanding performance. The principal is a skilled negotiator who facilitates needed change and effectively responds to adversity.

The principal. . .

63. is resourceful and assists the staff in gaining access to consulting staff and other information and resources they need.

64. provides information about procedures, schedules and other routine matters, therefore creating a well designed working environment that allows the staff to teach.

65. puts discretionary funds and resources at the teachers disposal whenever possible.

66. uses his/her power to make needed change based on the input of the staff.

67. manages conflict quickly and skillfully.

68. seeks the people most qualified and competent to work in the school.

69. takes risks, accepts losses and treats mistakes as opportunities.

70. uses time effectively, skillfully and efficiently manages the school.

71. ensures the selection of key staff members to provide strong leadership in special projects.

VIII. Functions as a Skilled Instructional Leader and Resource to the Staff

The principal functions as a supervisor and colleague to teachers in the school. In this role, he/she observes the work of the staff frequently and in various settings. The principal consults with the staff about their instructional efforts, provides feedback through counseling and coaching, and acts as a resource in assisting teachers in identifying their own strengths and those skills needing improvement.

The principal. . .

72. coaches and mentors the staff and makes them feel confident in seeking assistance regarding academic matters and their own professional inmprovement efforts.

73. makes informal as well as formal suggestions to teachers for improving instruction.

74. encourages the use of proven instructional strategies.

75. understands the teaching/learning process and what teachers do in their classrooms on a daily basis.

76. gives teachers the latitude and autonomy to perform work in their own way.

77. views change as an evolving process therefore helps the staff recognize that professional growth efforts take time and practice.

78. carries out their supervisory and monitoring activities with a commitment and sensitivity that motivates the staff to want to improve.

79. creates a safe environment in which teachers are encouraged to take risks with out fear of punishment.

80. is sensitive to the feelings of the staff and always meets privately when concerns or differences need to be discussed.

IX. Involves the Staff and Themselves in Professional
Development Activities

The principal works with the staff in identifying the professional development needs of everyone in the school; also seeks input from the staff about their own effectiveness. The principal demonstrates an enthusiasm for learning and involves the staff and themselves in the quest for new knowledge.

The principal. . .

81. provides the staff with opportunities within and outside of the district to visit and interact with other teachers for purposes of professional development.

82. expects teachers to be involved in identifying their own staff development needs.

83. encourages interactions among teachers about professional issues by establishing formal occasions such as staff meetings in which new understandings and knowledge are shared.

84. creates conditions and expectations in the school that enable(s) professional development to be an ongoing effort.

85. is aware of his/her own leadership style including strengths and weaknesses.

86. is open to suggestion.

87. is serious and enthusiastic learner who is committed to a plan for his/her own ongoing professional development.

References

A Nation at Risk. (1983). The Report of the National
   Commission on Excellence in Education.   Presented
   to the United States Department of Education.

Adler, M.J. (1988). Reforming education: The opening of
   the American mind. New York: MacMillan.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1984). The
   supervisory skill mix.   Educational Leadership,
   41(7), 16-18.

Allred, C. D. (1980).   The relationship between teacher
   morale and the principals administrative leadership
   style. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41,
   10-A.

Anderson, C. S. & Nicholson, G. I. (1987). Instructional
   leadership - Can it be measured validly? Who performs
   what functions? NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 28-40.

Andrew, L. D., Parks, D. J., Nelson, L. A. & Phi Delta
   Kappa Commission on Teacher Faculty Morale. (1985).
   Administrators handbook for improving faculty
   morale. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.

Andrews, R. L., Soder, R. & Jacoby, D. (1986, April).
   Principal roles, other in-school variables, and
   academic achievement by ethnicity and SES. Paper
   presented at the meeting of the American Educational
   Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Arnn, J. W. & Mangier, J. N. (1988). Effective leadership
   for effective schools: A survey of principal
   attitudes. NASSP Bulletin, 72(505), 1-7.

Bailey, G. D. (1984). Faculty feedback for
   administrators: A means to improve leadership
   behavior. NASSP Bulletin, 68(468), 5-9.

Bartell, C. A. & Willis, D. B. (1987, April).
   American and Japanese principals: A
   comparative analysis of excellence in
   instructional leadership. Paper presented
   at the American Educational Research Association
   Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C.

Barth, R. S. (1987). The principal and the profession
   of teaching. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional
   leadership: concepts, issues and controversies
   (pp. 249-270). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

183

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Berlin, B. M., Kavanaugh, J. A. & Jensen, K. (1988). The principal as curriculum leader: Expectations vs. performance. NASSP Bulletin, 72(509), 43-49.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1981). Productivity: The human side. New York: AMACOM - American Management Associations.

Blumberg A. (1987). The work of principals: A touch of craft. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues and controversies (pp. 38-55). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogue, E. G. (1985). The enemies of leadership: Lessons for leaders in education. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B ., & Lee, C. (1982). The Instructional Management Role of the Principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.

Boyer, E. L. (1988). School reform: Completing the course. NASSP Bulletin, 72(504), 61-67.

Brandt, R. (1989). On teacher empowerment: A Conversation with Ann Lieberman. Educational Leadership, 46 (8), 23-26.

Brookover, W. B. & Erickson, E. E. (1975). Sociology of education. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitser, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement. New York: Praeger.

Buser, R. L. & Banks, F. A. (1984). The why, what, how and by whom of evaluating principals. NASSP Bulletin, 68(468), 1-4.

Butera, Thomas S. (1976). Principal, know thyself! NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 84-87.

Cawelti, G. (1982). Training for effective school administrators. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 324-329.

Cawelti, G. & Reavis, C. (1980). How well are we providing instructional improvement services. _Educational Leadership_, _38_(3), 236-240.

Chamberlain, L. J. (1980). _Survey of administrative functional efficiency: Project S.A.F.E._ Bowling Green: Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals and Bowling Green State University.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & McCarthy, M. M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools, _Phi Delta Kappan_, _61_(7), 467-470.

Clark, K. J. (1981). Work related value systems and teacher morale. _Dissertation Abstracts International_, _42_/12-A.

Cummings, L. L. & Schwab, D. P. (1974). _Performance in organizations_. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman.

Deal, T. E., & Celotti, L. D. (1980). How much influence do (and can) educational administators have on classrooms? _Phi Delta Kappan_, _61_(7), 471-473.

Deal, T. E., Neufeld, B. & Rallis, S. (1982). Hard choices in hard times. _Educational Leadership_, _39_(4), 298-302.

DeFigio, N. & Hughes, S. (1987, April). _The impact of a district-wide staff development effort on secondary school principals' perceptions of their role_. Paper Presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Drucker, P. F. (1980). _Managing in turbulent times_. New York: Harper and Row.

Drucker, P. F. (1986). _The frontiers of management_. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Duke, D. (1988). Why principals consider quitting. _Phi Delta Kappan_, _70_(4), 308-312.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership: routines and subtleties in the principal's role. _Educational Leadership_, _41_(5), 32-37.

Eggington, W. M., Jeffries, T. S., & Kidd-Knights, D. (1987). State-mandated tests for principals - A growing trend? _NASSP Bulletin_, _72_(507), 62-71.

Fiedler, F. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E. & Chemers, M. M. (1974). Leadership and effective management. Glenview: Scott Foresman.

Fiedler, F. E., Chemers, M. M., & Mahar, L. (1976). Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Firestone, W. A. & Herriott, R. E. (1982). Prescriptions for effective elementary schools don't fit secondary schools. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 51-53.

Gardner, J. (1988). Principals and leadership - An interview with John Gardner. NASSP Bulletin, 72(509), 70-78.

Gersten, R., Carnine, D., & Green, S. (1982). The principal as instructional leaders: A second look. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 47-50.

Giannangelo, D. M. & Malone, J. G. (1987). Teachers' perceptions of the principal's role. Research report (ED 299 672).

Ginsberg, R. (1988). Worthy goal. . .unlikely reality: The principal as instructional leader. NASSP Bulletin, 72(507), 76-82.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glatthorn, A. A. & Newberg, N. A. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.

Golanda, E. L. (1982). The elementary school principal as an instructional leader: An analysis of the perceived instructional supervisory skills, attitudes, and practices of selected Michigan elementary school principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/09-A.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grace, L., Buser, R., & Stuck, D. (1987). What works and what doesn't: Characteristics of outstanding administrators. NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 72-76.

Gronlund, N. E. (1981). Measurement and evaluation in teaching (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Guzzetti, B., & Martin, M. (1984). A comparative analysis of elementary and secondary principals instructional leadership behaviors. Research report (ED 245 399).

Hagar, J. L. & Scarr, L. E. (1983). Effective schools - effective principals: How to develop both. Educational Leadership, 40(5), 38-40.

Hall, G., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M. & Huling, L. L. (1984). The effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 22-29.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: concepts, issues, and controversies (pp. 179-203). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Harris, O. J. (1976). Managing people at work: Concepts and cases in interpersonal behavior. Santa Barbara: John Wiley and Sons.

Heckman, P. (1987). Understanding school culture. In J. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Hostrop, R. W. (1975). Managing Education for Results. Palm Springs: ETC Publications.

Hough, W. M. (1978). Power and influence in the change process. Educational Leadership, 36(1), 55-59.

Howell, B. (1981). Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 38(4), 333-336.

Huddle, G. (1985). Teacher evaluation - How important for effective schools? Eight messages from research. NASSP Bulletin, 69(479), 58-63.

Irwin, C. C. (1985, January). What research tells the teacher about instructional leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, New Orleans, LA.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1989). Leading the cooperative school. Edina, Minn: Interaction Book.

Joyce, B. R. (1986). Improving America's schools. New York: Longman.

Katz, D. & Kahn , R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Keefe, J. W. (1987). The critical questions of instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 49-56.

Kelley, E. A. (1980). Improving school climate: Leadership techniques for principals. Reston, VA.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Koerner, T. (1988). In search of excellence: A talk with Tom Peters about the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 72(512), 36-45.

Krajewski, R. J. & Veatch, L. (1988). Orienting new staff for instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 72(511), 62-66.

Larsen, T. J. (1987, April). Identification of Instructional Leadership Behaviors and the Impact of Their Implementation on Academic Achievement. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C.

Leithwood, K. A. & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 303-339.

Leithwood, K. A. & Montgmery, D. J. (1985). The role of the principal in school improvement. In G. R. Austin and H. Garber (Eds.), Research on Exemplary Schools. Orlando: Academic Press.

Levine, D. U. & Associates. (1985). Improving student achievement through mastery learning programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, D. U. & Stark, J. (1982). Instructional and organizational arrangements that improve achievement in inner-city schools. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 41-46.

Lezotte, L. W. (1981). Effective teacher training and urban school improvement. (Occasional paper no. 49.) East Lansing: Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching.

Lieberman, A. & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. In J. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw Hill.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E., & Hoeh, J. A., Jr. (1985). The principalship: Concepts, competencies and cases. New York: Longman.

Little, J. W. & Bird. T. (1987). Instructional leadership "close to the classroom" in secondary schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: concepts, issues and controversies (pp. 118-138). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lyman, L. (1987, March). Principals and teachers: collaboration to improve instructional supervision. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, New Orleans, La.

Mahrer, R. C. (1985). Morale scores of selected groups of teachers compared according to their perceptions of their principals leadership style. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46/09-A.

Mazzarella, J. (1982). Instructional leadership: Profile of an elementary school principal. OSSC Bulletin, 26(3).

McCormack-Larkin, M. (1985). Ingredients of a successful school effectiveness project. Educational Leadership, 42(6), 31-7.

McCormack-Larkin, M. & Kritek, W. J. (1982). Milwaukee's project rise. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 16-21.

Miller, L. & Lieberman, A. (1982). School leadership between the cracks. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 362-367.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper and Row.

Mitchell, D. E. (1987). Teacher incentives: Implications for school leadership. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues and controversies (pp. 204-229). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Morris, V., Crowson, R. L., Hurwitz, E., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1982). The urban principal: Middle manager in the educational bureaucracy. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(10), 689-692.

Newberg, N. A. & Glatthorn, A. A. (1982). Instructional leadership: Four ethnographic studies on junior high school principals. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education. Research report (ED 236 809).

Nottingham, M. A. (1983). Principles for principals (revised edition). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Olivero, J. L. (1982). Principals and their inservice needs. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 340-344.

Ouchi, W. G. (1984). The m-form society: How American teamwork can recapture the competitive edge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Pajak, E. G. & Glickman, C. D. (1989). Dimensions of school district improvement. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 61-64.

Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence: The leadership difference. New York: Random House.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies. New York: Harper and Row.

Rallis, S. E. & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the 'great principal': Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappa, 68(4), 300-304.

Rentsch, G. J. (1976). Assessing administrative performance. NASSP Bulletin, 60(401), 77-83.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J. with Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Saario, T. T. (1979). Leadership and the change process: Preparing educational administrators. In R. E. Herriott and N. Gross (Eds.), The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. Berkley, CA: McCutcheon.

Sampson, S. (1983-84). The Changing Role of the Principal. In D. B. Strother (Ed.), The role of the principal, (pp. 5-12). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Sams, P. H. (1987). Leadership styles of successful middle school principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48/05-A.

Sanacore, J. (1976). How teachers can evaluate their principal. NASSP Bulletin, 60(402), 98.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 14-20.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1979). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Seyfarth, J. T. & Nowinski, E. M. (1987). Administrator feedback can improve classroom instruction. NASSP Bulletin, 71(503), 47-49.

Skrtic, T. M. (1985). Doing naturalistic research into educational organizations. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution (pp. 185-220). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Smith, W. F. & Andrews, R. L. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Snell, C. (1989, November). The principal's role in school improvement. Panel discussion held at the meeting of the Macomb Association of Curriculum Administrators. Mt. Clemens, Mi.

Snyder, K. J. & Anderson, R. H. (1986). Managing productive schools: Toward an ecology. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Snyder, W. R. & Drummond, W. H. (1988). Florida identifies competencies for principals, urges their development. NASSP Bulletin, 72(512), 48-58.

Sparks, G. M. (1984). Evaluation of the Wayne State University staff development for school improvement project: Year III. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University, College of Education.

Stimson, T. D. & Appelbaum, R. P. (1988). Empowering teachers: Do principals have the power? Phi Delta Kappan, 70(4), 313-316.

Striplin, P. C. (1987). An exploratory study of teachers opinions of important competencies needed by principals to perform effectively as instructional leaders. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48/12-A.

Taylor, B. O. (1986, April). How and why successful elementary principals address strategic issues. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Trump, John O. (1986). What hinders or prevents secondary principals from being instructional leaders? Oxford, OH: Miami University.

Tye, K. A. & Tye, B. B. (1984). Teacher isolation and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(5), 319-322.

Ubben, G. C. & Hughes, L. W. (1987). The principal creative leadership for effective schools. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Vroom, V. H. & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. London: Feffer and Simons.

Walker, T. L. & Vogt, J. F. (1987). The school administrator as change agent: Skills for the future. NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 41-48.

Warner, W. & Stokes, R. (1987). Instructional leadership: What are the activities and who performs them? NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 49-56.

Watson, P., Crawford, J., & Kimball, G. (1985, April). The school makes a difference: Analysis of teacher perceptions of their principal and school climate. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.

Wolcott, H. F. (1984). The man in the principals office: An ethnography. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bibliography

Anderson, R. E. & Bartlett, C. (1984). Clearing up the
    evaluative process for the high school principalship.
    NASSP Bulletin, 68(468), 10-13.

Argyris, C. (1982). Reasoning, learning and action.
    San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barth, R. S. (1982). Writing about practice. In T. M.
    Amabile & M. L. Stubbs (Ed.), Psychological Research
    in the Classroom. New York: Pergamon Press.

Batsis, T. (1987, April). Characteristics of
    excellent principals. Paper presented at the
    Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Educational
    Association, New Orleans.

Beck, J. J. (1987). Profile of the principalship:
    A study of principal's perceptions. Research report
    (ED 289 228).

Benjamin, R. (1981). Making schools work. New York:
    Continuum Publishing.

Blank, R. K. (1987). The role of principal as leader:
    Analysis of variation in leadership of urban high
    school. Journal of Educational Research, 81(2),
    69-79.

Brandt, R. (1989). On teacher empowerment: A conversation
    with Ann Lieberman. Educational Leadership, 46(8),
    23-26.

Brookover, W. (1985). Introduction in G. Austin &
    H. Garber (Ed.), Research on exemplary schools:
    From theory to practice to policy. Orlando:
    Academic Press.

Bunzel, J. H. (1985). Challenge To American Schools.
    New York: Oxford University Press.

Burlingame, M. (1987). Images of Leadership in Effective
    Schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional
    leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies
    (pp. 3-16). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cawelti, G. (1984). Behavior patterns of effective
    principals. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 3.

D'Amico, J. (1982). Each effective school may be one of
    a kind. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 61-62.

Deal, T. (1987). Effective school principals: counselors, engineers, pawnbrokers, poets . . . or instructional leaders? In W. Greenfield (Ed.), _Instructional leadership: concepts, issues and controversies_ (pp. 230-245). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of the research on the principal as instructional leader. _Educational Leadership_, 41(5), 14-20.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. _Educational Leadership_, 37(1), 15-24.

Edmonds, R. (1982). On school improvement: A conversation with Ron Edmonds. _Educational Leadership_, 40(3), 13-115.

Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. _Educational Leadership_, 40(3), 4-11.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1983). _The condition of teaching_. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation.

Gandy, S. K. (1985). Secondary school administrators: Piagetian legel of cognitive ability as related to selective measure of school effectiveness. _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 47/03-A.

Gauthier, Wm. J. (1981). The Connecticut school improvement project. Hartford: Ct. State Department of Education.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., & Campbell, R. F. (1968). _Educational administration as a social process: Theory, research, practice_, New York: Harper and Row.

Glassman, N. S. (1986). _Evaluation based leadership_, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). _Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers_ (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Greenfield, W. (1987). Moral imagination and interpersonal competence: Antecedents to instructional leadership. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), _Instructional leadership: concepts, issues and controversies_ (pp. 56-75). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hallinger, P. J. (1983). _Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals_. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

High, R. & Achilles, C. M. (1986). An analysis of influence-gaining behaviors of principals in schools of varying levels of instructional effectiveness. Education Administration Quarterly, 22(1), 111-119.

Hoyle, J. R., English, R. & Steffy, B. (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators.

Hughes, L. W. & Ubben, G. C. (1984). The elementary principal's handbook: A guide to effective action, 2nd Ed. Newton, Mass: Allyn and Bacon.

Human Synergistics (1984). The educational administrator effectiveness profile. Plymouth, MI: Author.

Kaiser, J. (1985). The principalship. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing.

Leithwood, K. (1986). The Role of the Secondary School Principal. Policy Implementation and School Improvement. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lewis, J. Jr. (1986). Achieving excellence in our schools: by taking lessons from America's best-run companies. Westbury, N. Y.: J. L. Wilkerson.

Lezotte, L. W. (1982). A response to D'Amico: Not a recipe but a framework. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 63.

Lipham, J. (1981). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Maslow, A. (1965). Eupsychian management. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin and The Dorsey Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Mayo, E. (1945). The social problems of an industrial civilization. Andover, MA: Andover Press.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McGregor, D. (1967). The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McGregor, D. (1970). The human side of enterprise. In V. H. Vroom and E. L. Deci (Eds.), Management and motivation. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Paulu, N. (1989). Principals and school improvement: Sixteen success stories. NASSP Bulletin, 73(517), 71-77.

Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools: Vol. I. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Persell, C. H. & Cookson, P. W. (1983-84). The effective principal in action. In D. B. Strother (Ed.), The role of the principal (pp. 17-24). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S. (1982). To soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 64-69.

Russell, J. S., Mazzarella, J., White, T., & Mauer, S. (1985). Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1977). Handbook for effective department leadership: Concepts and practices in today's secondary schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). Ten principles of quality leadership. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 330-336.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: A dilemna of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 346-352.

Utz, R. D. (1980). Fiedlers situational leadership theory as a measurement of leadership variables in public, middle and junior high schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41/5.

Valentine, J. W. & Bowman, M. L. (1986). Audit of principal effectiveness: A user's technical manual. Columbia, MO: Author.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(10), 673-676.

Wilson, K. (1982). An effective school principal. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 357-361.

ABSTRACT

**THE CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS
WHO ARE EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INVENTORY
DESCRIBING THOSE BEHAVIORS**

by

PEG LABELLE

December, 1990

Adviser: Dr. Donald Marcotte

Major: Evaluation and Research

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to address one aspect of
teacher-to-principal communication through the development
of an inventory that described the critical characteristics
and behaviors of principals who function as instructional
leaders. The reason for such an inventory was to provide a
standard and usable communication tool for principals in
assessing their own skills as instructional leaders and to
seek input from their staff.

Procedure

Documentation from the literature search was used to
create a model of nine domains. The Principal Feedback
Inventory was comprised of 175 item statements within the
nine domains. The inventory was reviewed in a two phase
Delphi procedure by 55 selected teachers and administrators
who were identified as outstanding educators.

196

Findings

Reviewers were consistent in Phase I and Phase II about the importance they placed on items related to the principal's support, perceptiveness and sensitivity for the staff. A Spearman Rank-Difference Correlation was calculated for the highest ranked 100 items that were retained from Phase I and ranked again in Phase II. The correlation coefficient $r = .814$ was significant at the .01 level.

There was no clustering of items in the low, middle, or high rankings in any one of the domains in either data collection. However, the mean of the items within each domain provided the following order of importance:

1. Builds positive staff relationships;

2. Is visible to everyone in the school;

3. Communicates a clear sense of mission;

4. Skillfully and strategically plans for the school;

5. Sets high standards;

6. Promotes shared decision-making;

7. Involves the staff and themselves in professional development activities;

8. Functions as a skilled instructional leader and resource to the staff;

9. Skillfully administers the school and acquires the needed resources.

Reviewers clearly said they wanted a principal who

encouraged shared decision-making, developed a sense of collegiality within the staff, listened and was open to suggestions. They also wanted the principal to be visible, care about the school, demonstrate integrity and set high standards.

Autobiographical Statement

Peg LaBelle graduated from secondary school in 1955.
She received a Diploma in Nursing from St. Lukes Hospital,
School of Nursing in August of 1958.

In 1975, Mrs. LaBelle received her Bachelor of Science
degree in General Science and Community Health from Central
Michigan University. She received her Masters Degree in
Guidance and Counseling from Oakland University in 1977.
Mrs. LaBelle earned her Education Specialist Degree in
School Administration from Wayne State University in 1981.

From 1958 to 1976 Mrs. LaBelle worked in hospital
nursing, as a psychiatric nurse supervisor, office nurse and
school nurse. Since 1976, she has worked as an
administrator in Romeo Community Schools; from 1976 to 1985
as a Vocational Coordinator/Counselor. She has worked as a
central office administrator since 1985 and is presently the
Director of Curriculum for the school district.

Mrs. LaBelle is married to Franklin LaBelle, a chemistry
professor at Macomb Community College. She and her husband
have four grown children, a daughter and three sons.