TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE DUAL-TRACK FRENCH IMMERSION PRINCIPAL

by

Marlene J. Day

B.A., Sir George Williams University

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

April 1992

ISBN 0-315-83651-2

APPROVAL

Name: Marlene Joy Day

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: Teacher Beliefs About the Dual Track French Immersion Principal

Examining Committee:

Chair: Norman Robinson

Mike Manley-Casimir
Senior Supervisor

Peter Coleman
Professor

Peter Grimmett
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education, SFU
External Examiner

Date Approved April 2, 1992

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT THE DUAL TRACK FRENCH IMMERSION PRINCIPAL

Author: _____
(signature)

Marlene Joy Day
(name)

April 2/97
(date)

ABSTRACT

French immersion programs are typically housed in either an immersion centre, where immersion is the sole program accommodated, or a dual-track setting, where both French and English programs are implemented in the same facility. The educational validity of these two contrasting settings has been studied with conflicting results. In British Columbia, there exists a very large majority of dual-track schools. This study was undertaken with the objective of better understanding that educational setting.

This study investigates teacher beliefs about the role of the principal in the implementation of supervision of instruction and in the promotion of staff collegiality in the dual-track school. Addressed, as well, is the effect of the principal's French language skills in five areas: supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement in the school.

Sixteen teachers and four principals, representing four elementary schools in two districts in British Columbia, were interviewed. In each school the four teachers interviewed represented the following categories: primary English, primary French immersion, intermediate English and intermediate French immersion. Participants were mailed a questionnaire prior to the interview seeking personal background information and demographic statistics about the school.

Results indicate a discrepancy between principal and teacher beliefs about the administrator's supervision practices. In the area of staff collegiality, principal and teacher beliefs proved to be more similar; however, signs of underlying tensions, particularly on the part of English track teachers, were apparent. Administrators did not appear to be completely aware of these tensions.

There is evidence in this study that the bilingualism of the principal has some effect on teacher beliefs in the areas of supervision of instruction and staff development. A positive attitude and overt support for the immersion program emerge as more important to the climate of the dual-track school than the principal's French language skills. Excellent interpersonal skills and a commitment to staff participatory decision-making by the school leader are reaffirmed as critical for effective schools. Recommendations include the district's leadership role in supporting the dual-track French immersion principal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this work to my son, Tyler Edward Day, whose time with me was so compromised throughout the duration of this thesis. Gratitude is expressed to Tyler's father, Jack L. Day, who continually offered his support and understanding.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. M. Manley-Casimir for his encouragement and guidance, to Dr. P. Coleman and Dr. S. Shapson for their assistance and to the participating school districts, principals and teachers for their contribution to this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ... (cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS ... (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Canada, where English and French are declared to be the two official languages of the federal government and administration (Official Languages Act, 1969), it is essential to continually investigate the processes by which students best learn a second official language. Research has confirmed that the most effective educational method for achieving the goal of functional bilingualism is that of immersion (McGillivray, 1983; Nagy & Klaiman, 1986; Olson & Burns, 1981). French immersion is an educational program which was conceptualized by a small group of anglophone parents in St. Lambert, Quebec in the early 1960's who were dedicated to the principle of bilingualism. Because of their determination to achieve that goal for their children, an educational movement whose scope is unprecedented in North American second language education was initiated. Following two years of pressure by these parents on their school board, the first experimental French immersion program was implemented in 1965 at St. Lambert Elementary School in St. Lambert, an English speaking suburb of Montreal (Canadian Education Association, 1983).

Until recently, researchers and educators of French immersion programs have been primarily concerned with comparisons of immersion students with francophones, with regular English program students and with pupils in traditional French as a second language programs. A substantial amount of research has consistently demonstrated no loss of English skills and a favourable degree of French language competency by the immersion students (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Lambert, Tucker, & d'Anglejan, 1974; Lapkin, Andrew, Harley, Swain, & Kamin, 1981). A shift in emphasis to improving French language competency and to developing a better understanding of the immersion experience has instigated research into variables that might affect second language learning in immersion schools. Such variables include the immersion setting (housing), the role of the principal, the administrator's degree of bilingualism, design of the

program, instructional techniques, extracurricular experiences, percentage of French language instruction, entry point and student characteristics. Educators and researchers (Burns, 1986; Shapson, 1988; Tardif & Weber, 1987) are cognizant of the need to understand these factors better if French immersion is to achieve its potential as a second language education program and to realize the educational conditions which will produce optimal student outcomes.

The Problem Statement

This study examines the role of the principal in the dual-track French immersion school, focusing on both principal beliefs and practices and on teacher beliefs about these practices. The following research questions were developed based on the literature on school effectiveness and on the author's experience teaching in and administering dual-track schools.

1) From the author's experience, the use of the French language among immersion teachers, particularly in the staffroom, is a predominant issue in dual-track schools. Is this indeed a pertinent question in dual-track schools? If so, are there differences in perceptions between French immersion and English track teachers regarding this question? Is the dual-track principal aware of this potential source of conflict and does the administrator emphasize this question of language use proactively with staff members?

2) Differences in beliefs between immersion and English track teachers regarding issues such as language, educational programs, sharing of materials, school organizational factors, expectations for students and staff development are a potential source of tension in dual-track schools. Do principals take measures to minimize confrontation and to promote staff collaboration among the two tracks of teachers? If so, what types of measures are implemented?

3) Principals of dual-track schools are often unilingual English. What are immersion teachers' beliefs about the unilingualism of the administrator, particularly in the area of supervision of instruction? How do immersion teachers' perceptions compare with those of their English colleagues and of the principal? All respondents in this study are questioned about the effect of the principal's French language skills on the areas under investigation.

4) Research (Fullan, 1982; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981) indicates that an effective supervision of instruction program can positively affect student outcomes. Do principals view supervision of instruction as a priority? Do teachers perceive it to be a priority for their principal? What are teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in the instructional process? Comparisons between teacher and principal perceptions in the realm of instruction are made.

5) The literature on school effectiveness underlines the importance of teacher input into the decision-making process in the school. Such input is thought to increase teacher commitment and ownership in the change process. Is the principal proactive in involving teachers in school decision-making? If so, what methods are used? Do teachers perceive themselves as an integral part of the decision-making process in the school?

6) The dynamics of having both English track and French immersion parents in the dual-track school is a challenging aspect of the principal's role. How does the school-based administrator respond to the varying needs and demands of both groups of parents? What are teachers' perceptions regarding this response by the principal?

The above research questions were originally organized into five broad categories. They were: supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement. Because of the vast amount of data collected and the relevance of that data, these five categories were later redefined, as is explained in Chapter III.

Problem Rationale

Why study the dual-track school?

French immersion programs today are typically housed in either a dual-track school, where both English and French programs are implemented in the same facility, or in a single track setting (immersion centre), where immersion is the sole program accommodated. Typically, French immersion is introduced into an English language school which may be suffering from declining enrollment. Immersion kindergarten is implemented as an alternative to the English program and acts as the "lead" class as the French immersion program is expanded to grade 6 or 7 in that school. Ideally, an enrollment balance in the English and French programs is reached and maintained. In reality, however, declining numbers in the English stream may warrant the establishment of an immersion centre housing a single French track in that school. This expansion in the immersion program would thus necessitate English language students being transferred to a nearby elementary school. The displacement of students is one of the most sensitive and emotional issues with which school boards must deal.

The educational validity of these two contrastive housing situations has been studied with conflicting and ambiguous results. Advocates of the dual-track system cite its importance in promoting cultural awareness and national unity while those who espouse the single track philosophy emphasize enhanced achievement in the French language as a reason for its promotion. Reality in British Columbia (B.C.), however, is the existence of dual-track schools in the large majority of school districts. It is therefore essential to study the immersion experience in that educational setting.

Why study the role of the dual-track principal?

The importance of the principal in the school improvement process is well documented (Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; McLaughlin, 1984). There is no paucity of research on the indispensible contribution of the principal toward the climate of the school. There is evidence in the research, as well, that leadership processes, through their influence on school climate, are linked to student achievement. It is logical to assume that the role of the principal in the dual-track school is no less critical than that in an English track school. While there is extensive literature on the behaviour of the principal of regular English language programs, there is minimal research on the French immersion principal's leadership role, despite the fact that this second language education program has enjoyed phenomenal growth since its implementation over twenty years ago.

There is evidence that French immersion is an educational program which requires special administrative considerations (Rideout, 1987) and that dual-track principals must deal with specific administrative challenges (McGillivray,1978). Olson and Burns (1981) and Guttman (1983) highly recommend further research into the specific role of the immersion principal. A better understanding of the principal's leadership role, as well as a description of his or her coping strategies, would be invaluable.

Why study teacher beliefs about the role of the principal?

Teacher beliefs and their effect on school improvement have recently become issues for investigation. There is growing evidence that specific factors such as teacher commitment, teacher satisfaction and teacher motivation are linked to school improvement (Fullan, 1982; Guskey, 1986). Research (Blase, 1987a) also indicates that school climate has a significant impact on teachers' attitudes, expectations and motivation within a school building. The influence of teacher beliefs on the implementation of programs in a school has been investigated in the last decade

(Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Blase, 1987a). Guskey (1986) claims that teacher beliefs are significantly related to student outcomes. These claims warrant further investigation.

While research has generated descriptions of what effective principals do, teacher beliefs about the principal's role have not been closely examined. Recent studies have indicated that the principal's leadership style has a significant impact on teacher beliefs and on teacher performance (Blase, 1987a; Blase, 1987b). What is needed to understand better the complex nature of school leadership and its effects on teachers are not only descriptions of the principal's behaviours but also an understanding of teacher beliefs surrounding the principal's role.

Why compare English and French immersion teachers' beliefs and principal beliefs about the role of the principal?

Major differences characterize these two groups of teachers, including the language factor, diverse backgrounds and divergent goals. It is important for the principal to have insight into teacher beliefs so that strategies can be used to promote collaboration amongst staff members. Such understanding is critical to the school improvement process. Compatibility of beliefs between principals and both groups of teachers would make for easier, more effective implementation of programs and for the supportive learning environment which is characteristic of effective schools (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986). While several studies on teacher beliefs about the role of the principal do exist (Blase, 1987a; Blase, 1987b), there has been no attempt to investigate this area in the realm of immersion. This study is intended to shed light on the similarities and differences existing between principal and teacher beliefs about the role of the dual-track principal.

Method

Sixteen teachers and four principals, representing four elementary schools in two districts in British Columbia, were interviewed. In each school, the four teachers interviewed represented the following categories:

1) primary English
2) primary French immersion
3) intermediate English
4) intermediate French immersion

The immersion programs in the schools chosen were well established, having existed for at least six years. The criteria for selection of principals were a minimum of two years administrative experience in a dual-track school, at least one year being in their present school. Teachers were required to have a minimum of three years teaching experience, with at least one year in their current assignment.

Schools, and therefore the principals, were assigned to the author by the participating districts. Teachers' names were selected randomly in a draw conducted by the author from the names of all teachers in each school who met the criteria. Participants were mailed a questionnaire prior to the interview seeking personal background information and demographic information for the school. These questionnaires and permission for conducting the interviews were collected at the time of the interview. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed, with the exception of one teacher respondent (Teacher 8) who refused taping. The duration of the interview ranged from one to two hours.

Data from the transcribed interviews were coded according to significant factors (Tables 1 to 8) in the school effectiveness literature and to significant issues which were brought to light by the respondents. Scores are examined in detail in Chapter 1V.

Delimitations/Limitations of the Study

The following are considered to be delimitations of this study:

1. There is no attempt to cross-validate either principal or teacher beliefs with those of parents or students. This study focuses entirely on the beliefs of principals and teachers about the role of the principal.

2. There is no attempt in this study to determine the effects of either principal or teacher beliefs on student outcomes. Because of the paucity of research in the area of principal and teacher beliefs surrounding the role of the dual-track principal, student achievement results in the schools were not examined or compared.

The following is considered to be a limitation of this study:

1. No assumptions are made that the findings in this study can be generalized and applied to other contexts. Whenever analyzing data from several sites, caution must be taken not to draw unwarranted conclusions. The climate in each school is unique and dependent upon a multitude of variables. The author believes, however, that the issues investigated in this study are relevant to dual-track schools and hopes that the results will be useful to educators in these schools.

Thesis Outline

Chapter II contains a review of the literature. Its first component is divided as follows: the dual-track vs. the single track school, the principal as instructional leader, the dual-track principal and teacher beliefs. Subsequently, the issue of teacher supervision of instruction is examined. Included in this section are: the principal's role, the role of the dual-track principal, teacher

involvement in the process, teacher beliefs about supervision and barriers to implementation of teacher supervision. The research on staff collegiality is then reviewed. Issues covered are: the role of the principal, staff involvement in decision-making and the dual-track principal's role. The final section of Chapter II examines the literature on the principal's bilingualism as a factor in the administration of immersion schools.

Chapter III describes the method of this study. Included are an explanation of the rationale, the sample selection, procedures, instruments used in the data collection, and the method of analyzing the data. Chapter IV reports in detail the analysis of the responses to the interview questions by teachers and principals in the three areas investigated: supervision of instruction, staff collegiality and the bilingualism of the principal. Chapter V offers a summary of the findings of this study and recommendations for consideration.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The dual-track vs. the single track school

Proponents of the dual-track school cite its sociocultural advantages. Carey (1984) suggests that immersion is a unique Canadian vehicle advancing social interaction between anglophones and francophones and that the potential of the program as a force of social change is significant. In their B.C. French study, Day and Shapson (1983) found that parents manifested a concern for developing tolerance and understanding in their children through a French immersion education. Nearly two-thirds of these parents indicated that they preferred the dual-track school because they believed that it promoted cooperation and counteracted prejudice. Their belief in the promotion of tolerance and understanding of other cultures through immersion encompasses the idea of national unity. In a questionnaire distributed to immersion students across Canada, one respondent mentioned being "a true Canadian" as a reason for studying French (Lapkin, Swain & Argue, 1983). Burns and Olson (1981) support the "sacredness" of the dual-track school, believing this housing option provides a unique linkage between two cultures. Clift (1984) acknowledges a dramatic shift in the attitudes of English-speaking Canadians towards a better understanding of the French culture. Stern (1981) supports the potential of the dual-track school to effect change in Canada and to bring its two "founding cultures" closer together.

The immersion centre, a viable option to the dual-track school, has substantive evidence to support its validity. Findings by Lapkin et al. (1981) suggest that the single track setting may foster enhanced achievement in certain English and French language skills. They found that "centre" students scored significantly higher on two of four tests measuring receptive skills. Lapkin (1984) is of the opinion that the extent to which French is evident in the school does distinguish single and dual-track settings and that greater exposure to a wider variety of linguistic and sociolinguistic contexts in immersion centres may enhance students' productive skills. Burns

and Olson (1981) summarize clearly and succinctly the possible reasons for the findings by Lapkin et al. (1981). They include the significance of the bilingualism of the principal in a single track school, of the single track principal's ability to provide leadership with respect to curriculum goals and to the coordination of activities, of the single track staff's sense of sharing common objectives and of teachers being mutually supportive.

Lapkin et al. (1981) found that French immersion teachers in both settings unanimously preferred the single track school; mentioned by dual-track teachers was a "segregated atmosphere" in the dual-track environment. In a single track setting, staff can communicate in the target language anywhere and at any time in the school. As well, extra-curricular activities, school events and discipline are conducted in French. According to McGillivray (1978), the dual-track setting offers a less-than-total immersion experience compared to the totally integrated immersion centre where French is the regular program. Further research is needed to clarify teachers' beliefs about their housing environment.

While research surrounding the question of the housing variable is inconclusive, the reality in British Columbia is that a large number of immersion programs are located in dual-track schools. According to the British Columbia Ministry of Education (1988), over 90% of immersion programs are housed in dual-track schools in B.C. These statistics reflect the housing policy adopted by the majority of B.C. school boards which endorse the dual-track philosophy.

One reason for the predominance of dual-track schools is that the dual-track system requires fewer administrative changes upon implementation of immersion (C.E.A., 1983). As well, this option is more attractive politically as there is less chance of a need to displace English program students, which often occurs when an immersion centre is established. Senior administrators and school trustees often espouse the philosophy of cultural integration and harmony in supporting their choice of the dual-track school. They also argue that students can be more easily transported

if an equitable distribution of immersion programs throughout a school district is established rather than if transportation to a single immersion centre, perhaps not one centrally located, is required (C.E.A., 1983).

The principal as instructional leader

The significance of the role of the principal in the school improvement process has been thoroughly investigated and substantiated. Fullan (1982) portrays the effective principal as an initiator and facilitator of change, someone involved in and committed to the change process. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) define the change process in terms of the roles of the teacher and principal and their effect on valued outcomes by students.

> "The change process is conceptualized as a complex form of individual and organizational learning, resocialization, or growth. The amount and nature of growth required of the teacher is determined largely by the experiences necessary for student growth toward the attainment of valued outcomes; the teacher is a central agent in the creation of those experiences. Similarly, principal behaviours are increasingly "effective" to the extent that they facilitate necessary teacher growth and thereby indirectly influence student learning or impinge on other factors known to effect such learning." (p.310)

The challenge for administrators is formidable since the role of the principal is becoming increasingly more complex as the school-based administrator must contend with a myriad of influences. Studies show that principals spend most of their time dealing with demands characterized as brief, immediate and sporadic with little time for reflective planning (Fullan, 1982). Research by Byrne, Hines and McCleary revealed that principals are concerned about role overload and the increasing amount and kind of knowledge required in their job (cited in Fullan, 1982). The fact that more and more responsibilities are being added to the principal's role, while none are deleted, suggests a dire need for role clarification.

School effectiveness literature reports that principals who do respond to the challenge of being an instructional leader are more influential and effective. The school effects research supports the

notion that the principal's direct involvement in instruction is significantly related to gains in student achievement (Fullan 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981). In their review of well-known studies on principal effectiveness, Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) report that, in the ESAA study, strength of administrative leadership was a significant factor in the school's success in improving student achievement. Improved achievement was found where principals felt strongly about instruction, effectively communicated their beliefs about instruction to teachers and assumed a major role in the selection of instructional materials and in program planning.

Fullan (1982) cites numerous studies that conclude that principals who were actively involved in or demonstrated a direct interest in school programs significantly affected their success. Leithwood and Montgomery (1986) have suggested that the coordination of instruction is a major contribution of effective principals to school success. They state that principals are in a position to offer teachers a repertoire of actions to overcome a particular problem, thus acting as an instructor and credible resource for teachers. They report the results of the Maryland Study which indicate that effective principals spend considerable time teaching in areas of competence. Edmonds (1979) emphasizes the need for principals to monitor instruction by visiting classes, by being knowledgeable about what is occurring in classrooms in terms of instruction and by offering support and feedback. While school-based administrators cannot be expected to be knowledgeable in all subject areas, particularly at the secondary level, they can demonstrate a commitment to curriculum planning and implementation.

In her synthesis of the literature on the principal's emphasis on academic excellence, Roberts (1990) states that effective administrators spend a significant proportion of their day on activities related to instructional improvement. She cites three critical actions by instructional leaders: observing in classrooms, conferencing with teachers, and verifying that teachers assign homework. Effective principals promote the school's academic emphasis by their own actions, by

the organizational structures they put into place and by their personal beliefs. As instructional leaders, they facilitate the concentration on academics in the school by developing positive models, generating consensus and using meaningful feedback to influence school improvement. Effective administrators organize their time proactively so that the instructional program receives priority. LaRocque and Coleman (1987), in their study of leadership and commitment to change in B.C. school districts, found a focus on learning and academics in successful schools. They report that, when the principal acts as a role model for high expectations for student achievement, teachers seem to believe that their own initiatives have an effect in the classroom. Rosenholtz (1985) stresses the importance of high expectations by principals for both staff and students in respect to academic achievement.

A trait which appears to distinguish effective and ineffective principals is the setting of meaningful and relevant goals in the school. Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) summarize a number of studies on principal leadership. One such study, Phi Delta Kappa, revealed that effective leaders set goals and objectives which support high standards of performance and a productive working environment. The authors state that one of the emerging variables characterizing effective principals in all the studies was the establishment of both well-designed instructional objectives and a comprehensive evaluation system. When achievement in their schools declined, instructional objectives, programs and methods changed rapidly. In high-achieving schools, these objectives guided the instructional programs. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) describe the goals of the effective principal in terms of basic orientations toward students, teachers and the school community. An important dimension of effective leadership is the ability to have staff members express their own goals; effective principals encourage staff to examine their professional competence and set goals for growth, with a concentration on curriculum planning and instruction. In addition, effective principals orient school programs to goals which are endorsed in the community. They ensure that school goals are communicated to parents and to district staff who are perceived to be of value in achieving priority school goals. Johnson (1989), in interviews with

teachers and principals, found that coordinating the development of goals and publicizing and promoting their achievement were indicators of administrator effectiveness.

Berman and McLaughlin (1979) note that effective administrators establish norms for risk-taking among staff members. They encourage individual initiative and continual change, expressing their support for new practices related to program improvement. Leithwood & Montgomery (1982) report that principals support risk-taking by encouraging staff members to develop their own goals. A principal, interviewed in a study on principals' and teachers' perceptions of change as initiated by the principal (Stone, 1988), viewed change as "a risk-taking venture where individuals made meaning of the changes by taking and ultimately having ownership of them by being directly involved in making them happen" (p. 81). He viewed risk-taking and failure as a natural part of change. Teachers perceived their principal as a risk-taker, a source of support and someone who encouraged them to take responsibility and ownership of their behaviour.

Another critical strategy used by effective principals is that of providing staff with knowledge and skill (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) emphasize the crucial role of the principal in maintaining an ongoing, effective staff development program, believing that the staff continually requires new skills and knowledge in order to achieve and sustain excellence in educational programs. These leaders organize carefully structured professional development in the school, in which they encourage teachers to participate. They foster personal enthusiasm for improvement and a desire for ongoing professional development; they also serve as a role model for teachers in their own professional growth (Johnson, 1989). Effective principals work directly and indirectly with teachers on issues related to instruction which they have observed in the classroom, providing individual in-service in an area in which the administrator has expertise. Guskey (1986) emphasizes the need for continual teacher support and encouragement and for ongoing credible feedback during the staff development process. Effective

principals are sensitive to the needs of new teachers, providing them with a broader orientation to the school and familiarizing them with school programs, materials and methods.

Effective principals provide resources for teachers to grow professionally. They collect and distribute information about new teaching practices and discuss professional issues with other administrators (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). They provide teachers with nonteaching time by assuming instructional duties themselves, by assisting teachers in managing their time efficiently, by providing planning time outside the instructional day and by using the budget creatively. As well, they provide teachers with needed curricular materials and seek out and promote innovative ideas, materials and methods. Fullan (1982) concludes that, for successful change to occur, teachers must have the opportunity to interact, share ideas and help each other, with the assistance of the principal. The results of the Rand Change Agent Study underline the importance of this collegial interaction and of good working relationships among staff members to the successful implementation of change (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979).

The effective school principal monitors student progress very closely (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). This is accomplished by reviewing test results and investigating possible problems with teachers. In the ESAA study, improved student achievement was noted when the principal was involved in teacher evaluation (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Another common trait of effective principals seems to be the ability to actualize an organizational vision while maintaining stability in the school. Sergiovanni (1984), in his review of leadership and excellence in schools, cites Bennis' belief that a compelling vision is the key ingredient that distinguishes leadership in excellent organizations. Vision is defined as the capacity to create and communicate a picture of the desired state of affairs that induces commitment among members of the organization (cited in Sergiovanni, 1984). Sergiovanni (1984) contends that successful schools have a vision of excellence aligned with a strong and functional culture which

orients people in a common direction and provides both a set of norms and meaning for staff members. Weick (1982) believes that principals must spend considerable time with individual staff members reminding people of central visions and assisting them in applying this vision to their own activities. In this way, the administrator is teaching staff to interpret the vision in a common language. Peters and Waterman (1982), in their studies of excellent organizations, also cite the presence of a dominant culture and clear sense of purpose which provides a common thrust for its members.

Stiggins (1986) found that the administrator's constructive feedback to teachers in a "growth-oriented" system of evaluation had a positive effect on teaching performance. Both teachers and principals perceived instructional leadership to be a critical role of the principal, although teachers viewed principals as giving priority to management duties rather than to instructional functions (Seifert & Beck, 1981). Seifert and Beck (1981) report that typical principals refrain from involving themselves directly in instructional improvement in terms of visiting classrooms and conferencing with teachers. While there is no literature, to the author's knowledge, specifically on the dual-track principal's approach to supervision, it seems feasible to assume that anglophone principals would withdraw from instruction even more. This thesis investigates that question.

The dual-track principal

There is a scarcity of research on the role of the principal in the French immersion school, in either housing setting. The literature that does exist espouses the assumption that the administration of dual-track schools merits special considerations (McGillivray, 1978; Rideout, 1987). Despite the phenomenal growth of immersion programs in British Columbia, there appears to be no special training available to administrators of immersion schools (Rideout, 1987). Olson and Burns (1981) and Guttman (1983) stress that the lack of in-service for immersion principals results in their assuming a passive rather than a leadership role in the instructional process. Olson

and Burns (1981) emphatically state their concern over this apparent lack of pre-service and in-service for immersion administrators, suggesting that this leadership role has been neglected.

McGillivray is a leading figure in the literature surrounding the administration of immersion programs. He addresses the administrative problems associated with the immersion dual-track school (McGillivray, 1978). He suggests that the supervisory load facing principals is excessive. Administrators of immersion schools must be familiar with immersion teaching strategies, which differ considerably from those used in the English stream, as well as with immersion methodology. Principals of immersion schools should also be familiar with criteria for evaluating immersion students. They must be sensitive to the fragile working relationship of English program and immersion staff members. In addition, principals face the daily challenge of reassuring parents of both English and French streams concerning the quality of programs and their children's progress. Lemire (1989) offers the following perspective on the administration of the dual-track school.

> "The demands and expectations placed upon these men and woman (anglophone principals of French immersion programs) appear unrealistically high considering their lack of training and initial lack of knowledge in the area of French immersion." (p.4)

If unity and cooperation are to be developed and sustained in the dual-track school, the principal must operate the school as one entity, not as two separate units. Lebrun (1981), an experienced dual-track principal, contends that both languages must be heard throughout the school and pupils must be provided services in both languages. He states:

> "The school will strive to have its pupils acknowledge and appreciate the peaceful coexistence of two dominant languages and cultures (French and English) in their school community. However, no one group will be considered over the other." (p.7)

Of particular concern for the dual-track principal in promoting cooperation is the perception of teachers that both programs are treated equitably. Immersion principals interviewed in Lamarre's (1989) study revealed that balancing programs was a major challenge, with the potential for

conflict a constant factor to consider. Anglophone principals in her study discussed the importance of a focus on one school, uniting staff and students through common goals and integrative activities. Calabrese (1988) advocates the concept of ethical leadership where staff members are committed to equality and fairness. This style of leadership promotes equal distribution of resources, tolerance of divergent opinions and cultures, respect for all members of the school community and a balance in the rights of all groups. The concept of fairness emerged most frequently as a characteristic of effective principals in interviews with teachers in a study by Richardson and Barbe (1987).

In order for the dual-track school to be a successful vehicle for promoting empathy and understanding between the French and English cultures, integration of both "streams" of staff and students is necessary. Research on the measures taken by principals in integrating immersion and English track students is scarce. In their B.C. French Study, Day and Shapson (1983) report that a majority of immersion principals indicated that they take measures to integrate the two programs; however, integration was primarily in the area of school activities, such as field trips and assemblies. They contend that, while these efforts at integration are beneficial, consideration to other important areas, such as staff collaboration, parental cooperation and development of school policies, must be given. Day and Shapson (1983) report that integration is mentioned in very few school policies; less than 10% of principals reported that integration of the two programs was addressed in school policy. Often two parent groups exist and joint collaboration on committees and in school activities is minimal.

Rideout (1987) suggests that student integration is ideally characterized by three conditions. Staff members must reach consensus on operating the school as one unit, a viewpoint to be nurtured by the principal, either formally through policy or informally. Joint instructional and extra-curricular activities must be offered, with both languages of instruction maintained. As well, both languages should be highlighted equitably at school functions (Rideout, 1987). Rideout's

(1987) research revealed that, of 16 principals, two fulfilled these conditions. A slight majority (56%) were relatively successful at reaching these objectives. Obviously, the size of the immersion program will have an impact on integration; however, the goal of integrating students must be an important consideration in the mind of the dual-track principal.

In addition to the numerous challenges in administering a dual-track school, principals may also have to be aware of a negative attitude on the part of their colleagues toward immersion. Nagy and Klaiman (1986) interviewed 29 immersion and non-immersion principals. When questioned about their colleagues' opinion of the immersion program, the majority of participants stated that many principals perceive problems with immersion in terms of program dislocation, loss to English student enrollment and issues associated with the decline of the neighbourhood school. Although principals generally claimed that they themselves were supportive of French programs, they commented that a number of their peers had negative attitudes towards French.

Teacher beliefs

Fullan (1982) contends that "educational change depends on what teachers do and think" and that a change must be meaningful for teachers if it is to be successfully implemented. Heckman (1987) postulates that people behave in ways which reflect their value systems; before substantial change in classroom practice can occur, teachers must engage in constructive dialogue about their beliefs. Teachers will only implement changes that make sense to them; only then do they actively seek change. When the underlying concepts of innovations are internalized by teachers into their personal belief systems, these innovations will make sense and change can then occur (Heckman, 1987).

Unfortunately, teachers' beliefs are seldom examined since teachers, on the whole, work in isolation in their classrooms with little opportunity to discuss instructional practice. Lieberman & Rosenholtz (1987) underline the role of the principal in breaking down teacher isolation. They

argue that effective principals design meetings for discussion of curriculur matters and leave the administrivia for later. In this way, the principal's actions reflect his/her beliefs and values and serve as a model for teachers. Lieberman and Rosenholtz (1987) encourage educators to mobilize school improvement efforts in order to move from isolation to an open and trusting collegial mode. This can be accomplished by encouraging shared responsibilities, by providing resources, rewards and incentives and by establishing regular opportunitites for teacher interaction (Sarason, 1971).

Research (Guskey, 1986; Fullan, 1982) indicates that there is a strong link between teacher commitment and meaningful change. Teacher commitment, a prerequisite for change, reflects the individual's personal, professional and societal beliefs and experiences in each of those roles. Guskey (1986) maintains that the user's idiosyncratic commitment to an innovation must be understood and addressed by the initiator before any meaningful change can be expected. Commitment, as well, must be viewed in a context of continual modification as the individual reacts to ongoing change. Guskey (1986) also suggests that teacher beliefs will only be substantially altered if the teacher anticipates improved student outcomes. He proposes that teacher self-improvement and professional satisfaction are prime motivators in commitment to change. Other researchers have linked commitment to change to the complexity and clarity of the innovation (Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984), to the teacher's "initial size-up" of the change and personal costs (Huberman & Miles, 1984), to the congruency of the change with teacher beliefs (Huberman & Miles, 1984), to the teacher's past experience and repetoire of existing skills and to the practicality of the innovation (Doyle & Ponder, 1977/78). The relationship between teacher beliefs, commitment and change is complex and merits further research. The challenge for the principal to understand and to react to teacher beliefs is formidable. However, exploration of these beliefs through discussion would help establish a trust level and a better understanding of the effect of the principal's own beliefs and actions upon the teacher.

According to Fullan (1982), teacher commitment and meaningful teacher change result from continuous collegial interaction and from an effective, ongoing support system. He reviews studies which indicate that teachers who believe their principals to be involved, knowledgeable and helpful describe them as successful and effective. Blase (1987a) has examined the factors which teachers associate with effective principals, as well as their effect on the teachers themselves and on teachers' relationships with staff, students and parents. His study reveals that effective principals positively affect specific meanings which teachers attribute to important issues, such as participation, equitability and autonomy. Blase (1987a) analyzed the data from interviews with teachers in two dimensions of leadership: task-relevant competencies and consideration factors. Discovered were nine task-related themes and five consideration factors. The task factors include: accessibility, consistency, knowledge/expertise, clear and reasonable expectations, decisiveness, goals/direction, follow-through, ability to manage time and problem-solving orientation. The five prominent consideration factors were: support in confrontation/conflict, participation/consultation, fairness/equitability, recognition (praise/reward) and willingness to delegate authority. In summary, Blase (1987a) contends that effective school principals contribute positively to the development of three fundamental patterns in schools: associative (cohesive), social (behavioral), and cultural (values and norms).

Most relevant to this thesis are Blase's findings that the principal's leadership style has a significant effect on teachers and on the sociocultural context of the school. Principals who modelled consistency, decisiveness and clear and reasonable expectations caused a decrease in teachers' sense of frustration, uncertainty and anger. Those who were accessible and who demonstrated knowledge and expertise appeared to be responsible for increased teacher confidence, satisfaction and a sense of professionalism. Principals who portrayed clear goals and direction created in teachers a sense of commitment to the school as a whole, as well as a feeling of optimism. Similarly, teachers who perceived their principals to be fair, supportive and consultative reported an increase in teacher efficacy, professionalism, commitment and self-esteem. It is

interesting to note that the "knowledge" factor in this study refers not only to curriculum and research but also to the principal's awareness of teacher and student needs. Effective principals were those who were believed to be productively involved in the whole school and who offset any forces of favoritism. Teachers who mentioned the factor "follow-through" described principals who conducted timely supervision of instruction and who kept teachers informed.

In a further study on ineffective principals, Blase (1987b) lists the administrative qualities which impact teachers and their relationships with others in a negative way. Teachers referred to such principals as being unsupportive, avoiding conflict, authoritarian and failing to provide opportunities for teacher input. Ineffective principals exhibited favoritism, were critical, used intimidation to control staff members and failed to recognize teachers for their accompishments. Personal characteristics of ineffective principals included lacking in authenticity, lacking compassion, arrogant, unfriendly, manipulative, insecure, unintelligent, defensive, prejudiced, immature, lazy, narrow-minded and pessimistic. Blase (1987b) hypothesizes from his findings that ineffective principals have a significant negative impact on teachers' self-esteem, morale and teacher commitment. In addition, their behavior resulted in a polarization of the staff with increased competition and conflict.

Blase (1987a, 1987b) claims that the traditional studies of leadership style have focused entirely on the behavior of the principal. He advocates instead a holistic conception of leadership in which the interrelationship of values, attitudes and behaviors are examined. Blase notes that qualitative descriptions of the complex nature of leadership in terms of its effects on teachers is scarce but essential to a meaningful understanding of the values, norms and beliefs inherent in school culture. The finding by Blase that teachers' attitudes and beliefs can be significantly altered by the principal's leadership style merits further study. The implications of this finding for student outcomes suggests that research in this area is urgently needed. If teacher beliefs are intrinsically

tied to improved student outcomes (Guskey, 1986), then it is critical that principals gain a better understanding of these beliefs and respond to them meaningfully.

Supervision of Instruction

While this study investigates the formative rather than the summative nature of teacher supervision, the concepts of supervision of instruction and evaluation often appear in the same context in the literature. According to Goens and Lange, supervision has historically meant evaluation (cited in MacKinnon, 1987). In interviews with both teachers and principals in this study, respondents inevitably referred to both processes, even when the question explicitly stated supervision of instruction was being investigated. Thus, the literature review and the results section of this thesis reflect the notion that the formative and summative processes are inextricably intertwined.

The role of the principal

The primary goal of the teacher supervisory process is to improve classroom instruction. The belief that teacher supervision can be a powerful strategy for achieving school improvement underlines current research in teacher evaluation. According to the school effectiveness literature, the principal has a vital role and responsibility in improving student outcomes through the processes of teacher supervision of instruction and evaluation. Principals seem to be aware of the importance of their role in the improvement of instruction. In a 1978 study by Byrne, Hines, and McCleary, 77% of principals rated a course in supervision of instruction as essential to school administrators (cited in Fullan, 1982). It can be assumed that many principals and teachers prefer a supervisory model which promotes meaningful principal/teacher interaction in a supportive climate. Hanrahan (1987) states that there are specific supervisory behaviours which are crucial to the improvement of instruction. One such behaviour is the principal's effectiveness in evaluating teachers.

McLaughlin (1984) contends that teacher supervision allows the principal to fulfill his or her role of instructional leader by identifying and supporting good classroom practices, by integrating school goals and by providing regular assistance to teachers. Acheson and Smith (1986) are of the opinion that the quality of the principal's role as an instructional leader in supervision is related to particular strategies, such as observational techniques and effective use of feedback to teachers. Ellis (1985) supports the efficacy of an evaluation process which allows for sufficient observation time, objectivity of data collection and thorough discussion of all findings with the teacher. In their review of research on effective leadership, Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) state that frequent informal class observations were associated with high-achieving schools, as well as attention to an atmosphere conducive to learning. Effective principals participated actively in instruction and had high expectations of themselves, teachers and students. In declining schools, principals appeared to be more permissive and to emphasize informal, congenial relationships with teachers rather than the school's effectiveness. Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) cite an interesting finding from the Philadelphia study; the more frequently the principal observed reading classes in the classroom, the more improved was the students' reading. Sergiovanni (1984), in his description of leadership forces, states that the educational leader assumes the role of "clinical practitioner" by bringing expert professional knowledge to the areas of clinical supervision, teaching effectiveness and program development.

The importance of visibility by the principal is well documented in the literature on school effectiveness. A strategy used by administrators to monitor instruction is that of Management By Wandering Around (M.B.W.A.). Huntington (1984) suggests that principals make a daily brief visit to classrooms. He argues that this approach is effective in determining teachers' attitudes, kinds of teacher-student interactions, classroom environment and student-student conversations.

MacKinnon (1987) states that there are several assumptions to be addressed when investigating teacher supervision. First of all, it is assumed that the supervisor is more knowledgeable about teaching and can assist the teacher in improving classroom behaviour. Secondly, an effective model of supervision presupposes a good working relationship between the teacher and supervisor. A third underlying assumption is that teachers desire to improve in their instructional ability. These assumptions must be scrutinized when analyzing the effectiveness of teacher supervision.

McLaughlin (1984) addresses the importance of teacher motivation, satisfaction and sense of efficacy in the teacher evaluation process. She argues that teacher motivation is highest immediately following an assessment; thus, the principal must have the resources to respond promptly to the teacher's needs. McLaughlin (1984) proposes a method of evaluation, one which recognizes teacher professionalism, the legitimate role of the principal as evaluator and the significance of assessment in the school improvement process. According to her model, credible principal feedback is intrinsic to teacher motivation, satisfaction and efficacy and ultimately to school improvement. Through "authoritative and legitimate feedback" in a non-threatening atmosphere, she believes teachers will be satisfied and motivated towards professional effectiveness. The significant relationship between job satisfaction, motivation and performance was first revealed in the Hawthorne Studies (Gray and Starke, 1984). This notion of learning through implementation is congruent with Huberman and Miles' (1984) concept of commitment through program execution.

Goldhammer (1969) cites a plethora of teacher supervisory approaches, many of which he believes are invalid and unreliable. He proposes a model of clinical supervision which advocates teacher self-analysis, goal-setting, feedback and assistance, a continual process which results in satisfaction and motivation. He believes that collegiality, characterized by honest communication and sound skills and knowledge, is the key to success.

McLaughlin (1984) emphasizes the significance of establishing a common professional language between administrators and teachers in clinical supervision. The importance of "shared referents" is stressed by Little (1982). This term refers to the establishment of a common language between administrators and teachers in clinical supervision. It can be assumed that teacher trust and principal credibility are integral to the success of a clinical supervision program.

The dual-track principal

Dagenais (1990) outlines the monumental challenges facing dual-track principals, many of whom are neophytes in immersion. She contends that, without adequate competency in French and with no knowledge of second language pedagogy, these administrators are expected to provide leadership and supervision to beginning immersion teachers. As a result, many principals have assumed a "hands-off" approach to the program (Dagenais, 1990). Olson and Burns (1983) have reported the frustration experienced by administrators who do not have the ability to act as instructional leaders for immersion teachers. Whittle and Brennan (1988), both principals of dual-track schools, suggest that beginning linguistic ability in French be a mandatory requirement for principals assigned to dual-track schools. They believe that this basic knowledge of the language will ensure professional growth in teachers and credibility in the eyes of students, staff and parents. Whittle and Brennan (1988) argue that dual-track principals should be capable of leading English and French staff in the area of program implementation.

Stanutz (1988) contends that the unilingual administrator should not feel at a disadvantage in supervising immersion programs. He states:

> "Supervision is simply helping a teacher to grow. Good education is based on good educational philosophy and practice. These transcend the language of communication." (p. 70)

Stanutz maintains that teacher training can be done by the principal in English, as well as through peer coaching and workshops. In addition, more recently developed standardized tests can assist

the administrator in evaluating the immersion program. With commitment, he believes, comes credibility. He argues that peer teacher assistance can be used to offset the principal's lack of facility with the French language. Much has been written about the contribution of peer coaching methods in bringing about positive changes in teacher performance (Joyce and Showers, 1982; Smyth 1985; Manning 1986). Acheson and Smith (1986) condone separating the supervision and evaluation functions of the supervisory process. They advocate the training of principals in observation and feedback strategies for summative purposes and the training of teachers in peer observation and feedback, as part of a staff development program.

Teacher involvement

The importance of teacher input into the supervision processes cannot be overestimated. Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) state emphatically that teacher collaboration in the clinical supervision process is essential to its successful implementation and to instructional improvement. Goldhammer (1969) argues that the teacher should have a participatory role in establishing the purpose of supervision and guidelines for the process. He emphasizes the sharing of responsibility of the supervisor and teacher and the confirmation of their relationship. Teachers should be involved in establishing the time of observations, as well as the method of data collection, instruments used and lessons observed. Pre and post conferences are an integral part of Goldhammer's (1969) model.

Direct teacher participation in the development of criteria and strategies used in assessment maximizes teacher trust in and commitment to the supervisory process. Lewis (1973), in his then revolutionary "learning-centered approach to teacher appraisal", emphasized the replacement of comparative ratings of teachers with a cooperative, self-reflective program of evaluation. In a study by Duell and Davison (1987), teachers and principals reported being more comfortable with evaluation programs they considered most accurate; these involved teachers evaluating themselves. These self-evaluations were seen to be accurate by both teachers and principals. MacNaughton,

Tracy and Rogers (1984) promote a collaborative relationship between the teacher and principal in clinical supervision and evaluation; they suggest that these processes must be "individualized and personalized" to be effective. In Goldhammer's (1969) model of supervision, the intellectual autonomy of the teacher and the teacher's ability to self-analyze teaching practices are critical to the effectiveness of the process. Hanrahan (1987) cites self-evaluation as critical to an increase in teacher confidence and independence.

Teacher beliefs

Hanrahan (1987) investigated the perceptual compatibility of teachers and principals on the principal's behaviour in clinical supervision. He hypothesized that the teacher's perceptions of the principal's role as instructional leader were directly related to the degree to which principals facilitate instructional improvement through teacher evaluation. He found a significant difference between the teachers' and principals' perceptions in regards to the purpose and the success of clinical supervision, with principals being more at ease with the process. Some teachers perceived principals to be lacking in knowledge and skills; several principals criticized the time needed to implement an effective program. It is also interesting to note that teachers in this study believed conferences were held less frequently than principals believed. Hanrahan's (1987) results indicate some frustration on the part of both teachers and principals with the supervision process. He concludes that the processes of clinical supervision and evaluation are "antithetical" and interfere with the collegial nature of the principal's role. He recommends that principals be sensitive to teachers' perceptions, attend to establishing a trusting, communicative relationship and make the process teacher-centered. In a study on teachers' perceptions about their receptivity to evaluation (Glasman & Paulin, 1982), teachers' involvement and their level of trust and confidence in the evaluator's expertise were critical factors to the success of the process.

Barriers to teacher supervision

Hanrahan (1987), in a review of the literature on teacher supervision and evaluation, summarizes some of the problems associated with these processes. These include: teachers' attitudes and perceptions, incongruency of supervision and evaluation, lack of training of both teachers and principals, principals' ineffectiveness as an instructional leader, the relationship of teacher and principal, subjectivity of the assessment, lack of agreement on the criteria of good teaching practices and disagreement on desired student outcomes and basic procedures.

MacNaughton et al. (1984) report that teachers perceived supervision and evaluation as a threat associated with contract renewal. They suggest that principals must be perceived by teachers as having the necessary skills and knowledge and meaningful practices must be established before a trusting, collegial relationship can be established. Blumberg (1974) states that principals must be able to demonstrate to teachers that they possess the necessary expertise to be of assistance in problem-solving situations.

A further obstacle to the implementation of a successful supervision program is that of time. MacKinnon (1987) cites research suggesting that principals are "consumed" by their administrative duties, neglecting their pedagogical responsibilitites. Reilkoff (1981) argues that teacher supervision is hampered by a lack of time, as well as rigidity, complacency and a lack of empathy in the teacher-principal relationship. Johnston (1983) claims that the success of the program depends not only on this relationship, but also on the acceptance of the process by both teachers and administrators. While there is evidence that teachers resent evaluation due to its subjectivity and unreliability (Soar, Medley and Coker, 1983), there is research that indicates teachers' support of clinical supervision (MacKinnon, 1987). MacKinnon (1987) suggests that there has been a shift from the process of evaluation to that of supervision, with an accompanying perception of teachers of the need for the process. His review of the literature indicates that teachers want more conferencing, observations and discussion about teaching pedagogy. In his

research on teachers' acceptance of clinical supervision, MacKinnon (1987) found that over 70% of teachers expressed confidence in the process and in the ability of the principal to direct that process.

Fullan (1982) comments on the barriers between principals and teachers created by the principal's supervisory/evaluative role. The different perspectives between principals and teachers regarding this role negatively impacts upon program change. McLaughlin (1984) argues that the present evaluative system of standard checklists and brief classroom observations is futile and reflects the principal's individual biases rather than a consistent, meaningful set of criteria. She acknowledges the fact that school administrators have difficulty linking assessment and improvement purposes because evaluation creates teacher anxiety and administrative burden.

McLaughlin (1984) argues that principals lack the skills and confidence necessary to help teachers remediate. The rigorous and ongoing training in clinical and diagnostic skills which principals require is not available. She contends that there is a resulting absence of principal credibility in the eyes of teachers who thus lack confidence in the process. Levin (1979) and Krawjewski (1976) contend that most supervisors lack the the skills and training necessary to effectively analyze teacher behaviours in the clinical supervision process.

According to Sarason (1971), principals quickly learn that they cannot legislate teacher change and that insisting upon teacher change is far from effective in changing teacher beliefs and practices. Berman and McLaughlin (1979) contend that ineffective principals engage in minimal evaluation of teachers' instruction and fail to consider the beliefs, values and emotions of teachers. Dow and Whitehead (1980) report that only one in twelve principals visited teachers on a regular basis and often did not share the results of their observations with teachers, which does little for the improvement of instruction. Firestone and Wilson (1985) contend that supervision provides the optimal opportunity to effect change but is only effective when used frequently; they cite

evidence that this is not the case, suggesting that the majority of principals lack experience with meaningful supervision programs. Principals can only have a significant impact upon teachers and upon program change with meaningful personal contact (Fullan, 1982).

It is evident from the research that the supervision of instruction cycle provides the principal a crucial opportunity to affect teacher performance and subsequently student outcomes. Teachers and administrators alike share the goal of improved student achievement; this commonality should serve as an incentive for establishing a collegial relationship based upon the honest communication and trust which is essential for effective teacher supervision. It is also apparent from the research that this area of administration offers a particular challenge for dual-track principals. This study investigates the supervision of instruction process from the viewpoints of both the dual-track principal and the teacher.

Staff Collegiality

The role of the principal

Greenfield (1984) maintains that schools are fundamentally interpersonal settings; therefore the relationship between the principal's leadership style and instruction in the school is inherent in the social dynamics of that school. Blase (1987a) concludes from his interviews with teachers that leadership factors have dramatic effects on teachers and their relationships with others. He believes that the principal's effect on teacher motivation, involvement and morale enhances the possibility of productive interactions between teachers and their colleagues. In problem-solving situations, the principal has the ability to confront and reduce tensions connected with interpersonal conflict. Teachers reported that the effective principal's process of problem-solving promoted solidarity and cohesiveness in schools. Effective leaders also demonstrated fairness in decision-making which helped to establish staff unity and a sense of team, as well as promoting teachers' personal and professional identities. Individual and group efforts were recognized and achievements were celebrated as a staff. Effective principals in Blase's study developed

meaningful communication channels through which teachers were encouraged to express their beliefs, feelings and expertise, particularly in the realm of student discipline and school programs. These findings are of particular significance for dual-track schools where the potential for conflict is ubiquitous.

The most frequently mentioned criterion of school effectiveness, in a study by Johnson (1989), was an atmosphere of cohesiveness, cooperation and high morale. A second significant factor associated with effective schools was a shared expectation and desire for collaborative work with colleagues. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) summarize strategies used by effective principals in building strong interpersonal relationships and motivating staff. These leaders involve staff, participate in activities with staff and are positive, cheerful and encouraging. They ensure their accessibility to staff and they are direct, honest and sincere in their interactions with teachers. Sergiovanni (1984) argues that effective leaders assume the role of "human engineer"; they emphasize human relations and interpersonal competence and employ motivational strategies. In this way, they encourage growth opportunities and build morale through such processes as participatory decision-making. When disagreements on staff occur, Scarr (1988) advises principals to do the following: focus on issues rather than people, be open and honest, establish a process to resolve conflicts that is fair, just and sensitive to the integrity of others, develop a sense of belonging through group decision-making and develop common goals. McClure (1988) and Hunter (1989) advocate a model of shared leadership whereby teachers possess a sense of authority over their destiny and teachers' opinions and recommendations are valued.

According to Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston and Smith (1979), the principal plays a central role in developing the staff collegiality and the positive social environment in schools which promote high academic achievement, good pupil behaviour and low delinquency. Their research suggests that the actions of individuals in the school setting may combine to create a set of attitudes, values and behaviors which are characteristic of that school. Smith and Scott (1989) cite

the positive effects of the principal's adoption of a collaborative and collegial management style: school renewal, teacher satisfaction, teacher learning and cooperation among students.

The school effects research supports the fundamental role of the principal in developing and maintaining a positive school climate. In their survey of the research, Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) report that the principal is instrumental to the existence of a peaceful and purposeful school climate. Leithwood and Montgomery (1986) argue that the creation of a positive school climate and the coordination of instruction are the two major contributions of principals to school success. Anderson (1982), in her extensive review of the research on school climate, documents evidence for the strong link between school climate and student outcomes. Little (1982) states that effective principals are active endorsers and participants in the collegial environment of the school. Her research supports the notion that, in successful schools, the individual improvement of a teacher was secondary to that of the entire school. Little's (1982) study also suggests that, as teachers work together, they develop a common language and understanding proportional to the practicality of the discussions. Collegial interaction is intrinsic to Fullan's (1982) concept of "shared reality" or meaning in a context of socialization. Coleman (1984) concurs with other researchers that the principal is the dominant force in determining school climate and that the responsibility is a joint one.

Staff involvement

The importance of involving staff in decision-making is well documented; involvement heightens teacher commitment (Fullan, 1982; Huberman and Miles, 1984). Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) emphasize the role of the principal in influencing staff participation in school decisions and teacher acceptance of responsibilitites. Effective principals ensure the selection of influential staff members who are cabable of exerting strong leadership in the school. They disperse decision-making power and delegate authority within a central framework initiated by the principal. Often the principal provides the initial thrust for a project and then turns it over to staff

to coordinate. Effective principals continually seek staff members' advice on important issues and establish teams of teachers to address particular concerns. During the process of goal-setting, they solicit teachers' opinions and encourage teacher decision-making.

In a study investigating the effect of principal behaviours on teachers, Blase (1983) reports a number of behaviours causing teacher stress, two of which are lack of opportunities for input and favoritism. He contends that principals should encourage teacher input and subsequently instill a feeling of professionalism to combat teachers' sense of low self-esteem. Administrators can also impart knowledge to teachers so that they are well-informed and develop a sense of autonomy and authority. Maeroff (1988) proposes three guiding principles to teacher empowerment which have implications for principals: access to decision-making, status and knowledge. Ambrosie (1989) stresses the necessity for teacher empowerment in the form of shared decision-making. He states:

> "Teachers and principals must work closely together if schools are to succeed. More important, teachers must be involved, have the ability to influence, and in many instances be given the responsibility to make decisions related to learning." (p.57)

Heckman (1987) views the culture of the school as a holistic entity with all parts interacting and dependent upon each other. He argues that substantive changes cannot be made without involving staff in the decision-making process. Staff cohesiveness and staff problem-solving processes are two characteristics he associates with self-renewing schools. Stone (1988) contends that cohesiveness and communication are integral to the change process; he adds that the development of group dynamics takes time and commitment. He states:

> "Teachers and principal interacting and problem-solving together is crucial in developing the lines of communication between principal and teachers and teachers and students in the overall improvement of the school organization. Developing and opening the lines of group communication amongst teachers will likely manifest itself in improved interactive and organizational behaviours of the students in the school, allow for greater experimentation and risk-taking and promote a healthier attitude toward change." (p.113)

Coleman's (1986) research suggests that an increase in teachers' participation in decision-making results in a higher level of concern for the school as a whole and an improved sense of teacher efficacy. McPherson, Crowson and Pitner (1986) associate teacher decision-making with professional commitment, defined as "an opportunity to have a voice in collective decision-making, a sense of efficacy and personal importance communicated by one's peers, a belief that hard work is valued and recognized, a feeling of independence....a feeling of met expectations and involvement in the work of the organization" (p.137).

Nidich and Nidich (1986) suggest that the ability of teachers to agree upon the priority of school goals is the main indicator of staff cohesiveness and teacher morale. Efforts to improve morale and cohesiveness must focus on principal-teacher and teacher-teacher relationships and interactions in the school setting. Their review of the research on teacher morale indicates that, in schools where the principal is perceived by teachers as frequently involved in school functions, teachers' attitudes towards work-related factors were positive; these attitudes were strongly associated to student outcomes.

The dual-track principal

Rideout (1987) addresses the unique challenge of staff collegiality in dual-track schools where two distinct cultures are represented. Over the last decade, the immersion program has grown substantially, while enrollment in the English student population has declined. This trend has resulted in an increase in the hiring of francophone teachers, resulting in feelings of animosity and insecurity on the part of anglophone teachers. The effect of immersion on anglophone teachers has received a great deal of publicity, according to a 1983 national survey of school boards (C.E.A., 1983). Trustees cited teacher opposition and layoffs as one of their most formidable challenges. Olson and Burns (1983) reported teachers' federations to be vocal on the issue and unsupportive of the immersion program. While layoffs of anglophone teachers were not as prevalent as believed

(C.E.A., 1983), a reduction in the hiring of English program teachers, largely due to declining enrollment, inevitably breeds resentment and conflict.

Nagy and Klaiman (1986) studied the impact of immersion demand on English programs in Ontario. They discovered that only one-third of immersion teachers interviewed felt that they had the support of their non-French colleagues, although two-thirds of non-French teachers claimed to be supportive of their immersion peers. Approximately 60% of all respondents believed that staff morale was affected by the immersion program, with anxiety and resentment largely due to the sharing of resources.

According to Rideout (1987), and in this author's experience, a factor which potentially contributes to staff conflict is the age differentiation between English program teachers, who tend to be older and more experienced, and immersion teachers, who are often young, inexperienced and energetic. This generation gap is often reflective of diverse values, beliefs and teaching styles. A further challenge to the principal in promoting staff collaboration is the language barrier between both groups of teachers. While many immersion teachers are bilingual, others cannot communicate effectively in English; the possibility of misunderstandings and disagreement is evident. Other factors that strain relationships are the financial and human resources that are allocated to immersion programs and the reassignment of immersion students, who are having difficulty succeeding in immersion, to English programs.

In light of the above factors, it is obvious that the immersion principal of a dual-track school faces a considerable challenge in promoting staff collegiality. In order to create harmony on staff, it is essential for the principal to not only ensure equality of programs but also to be sensitive to the perception of teachers regarding equitability and fairness. Lebrun (1981) emphasizes the importance of both groups of teachers feeling as equal partners in the school, with duties and leadership possibilitites shared equitably.

Principals in Lamarre's (1989) study suggest that immersion teachers be informed about English teachers' fears. They emphasize the importance of encouraging all staff members' input in open discussions and of ensuring a perception of fairness in promoting staff cohesiveness. Several of these administrators suggested hiring immersion teachers for compatibility on staff, since some francophone teachers tend to display "militant beliefs", are "individualistic" and "temperamental" and "defy authority". These teachers were viewed as causing friction on staff, not only within the school but also within the immersion program. A resulting lack of team effort would seriously affect the climate of the school. In LaRocque's (1986) research, an individualistic approach is indicative of "classroom-oriented" teachers who view the school as an aggregate of classrooms, whereas "school-oriented" teachers tend to be collegial and flexible.

Principals must address the need for all teachers to share in curricular activities, since the curriculum is identical for both programs. On the other hand, methodology and teacher strategies may differ considerably, particularly in the primary program, due to the emphasis on second language development in immersion. Professional and staff development must reflect this difference. The effective immersion principal must respond to the challenge of building a collaborative model of shared decision-making based upon open communication, trust, honesty and fairness. A meaningful staff development program is one way of promoting staff norms of collegiality.

Two perspectives on the use of French in the staffroom emerged in Lamarre's (1989) study. Several principals appreciated the need of immersion teachers to maintain their language skills and informed English teachers of their viewpoint, aiming for a "comfort level" on this issue. Other administrators had to impose a rule of English only in the staffroom to promote communication and trust on staff. Teacher beliefs on this topic have not been researched and are investigated in this thesis.

The Bilingualism of the Principal

A pertinent question raised in recent research on immersion programs is the relevance of the bilingualism of the principal in the administration of the dual-track school. Olson and Burns (1981) and Guttman (1983) point out that a bilingual administrative staff is crucial to the successful implementation of immersion programs. Olson and Burns (1981) claim that the leadership role of the principal is jeopardized by a lack of both French language skills and knowledge of the program. They argue that many of the problems in areas such as budget and curriculum could be solved if special training and certification requirements for administrators were mandated by the government.

Guttman (1983) criticizes the neglect of school boards to ensure trained bilingual administrative staff to supervise immersion programs. She insists that the unilingual dual-track principal cannot possibly assess students' oral language ability or identify student needs. Nor can these administrators assist teachers with teaching strategies and curriculum materials. Guttman (1983) negates the concept of a dual-track school, describing it as two separate programs in one building. Clinton and Talmanis (1982) concur that long term planning for immersion schools should include a bilingual principal. Rideout (1987) cites the finding by the Canadian Education Association, in a 1983 cross-Canada survey of school boards, that only 19 of 96 boards claimed immersion programs to be usually (emphasis added) administered by a bilingual administrator. Because of the critical shortage of bilingual principals, many school boards in B.C. have largely ignored this staffing concern.

Rideout (1987) asked dual-track principals to rate their own French language skills in an attempt to relate the administrator's degree of bilingualism to the functioning of the school in terms of student integration, staff collaboration and home/school relations. She discovered that

principals developed coping strategies, such as encouraging teachers to initiate activities in French, to compensate for their lack of language skills. Her findings indicate that the unilingual English principal is able to successfully establish a safe, risk-taking climate where teachers are free to initiate integrating activities. In addition, the principal's degree of fluency was reported to be unrelated to staff collaboration. Further research designed to include larger samples of bilingual administrators is warranted.

Stanutz (1988), an experienced administrator of immersion schools, believes that the principal's role is to encourage staff members to meet the needs of students and that, although French language proficiency would be beneficial, it is not a pre-requisite to administering an excellent school. He states:

> "As in any school, the quality and success of the programs will depend greatly on the quality of the administrator. An enthusiastic, supportive, positive-thinking principal who can motivate teachers will have success, even with very limited French language skills. When the principal is enthusiastic about bilingual education in general and about his school in particular, students and teachers will also become enthusiastic. The enthusiasm will permeate the school. By supporting the teachers, we get to know the problems that have to be solved, and set the climate that will enhance this problem solving. One does not have to be bilingual to support and foster bilingualism. By praising effort, and working cooperatively to solve problems, achievement is not far behind." (p.68)

Stanutz (1988) feels strongly that the unilingual principal can promote the immersion program in a variety of ways. He believes that immersion students should have opportunities to speak and listen to French, such as making daily announcements on the public address system and speaking at special French assemblies. Immersion principals should encourage students to share successes with them; at that time they can recognize achievement and promote the advantages of bilingualism. They can be very adept at procuring needed resources and soliciting the support of the community.

Lamarre (1989) interviewed eight anglophone dual-track principals with little or no knowledge of French to investigate how they administer immersion programs while ensuring excellence in the school. Four major categories emerged from her discussions with these administrators:

commitment, understanding the context of immersion programs, communication and reliance on others. All respondents agreed that commitment to the program was a critical factor to its success and that they themselves had to believe in the program and the concept of second language instruction in order to demonstrate that commitment. A sound understanding of immersion philosophy and program needs, as well as a sensitivity to French culture, was felt to be essential to successful implementation. Excellent interpersonal skills were cited as critical in fostering a healthy school climate, as principals must constantly reassure all stakeholders in the program. A number of principals in the study indicated that they depended heavily on personnel, such as "unofficial" head teachers and coordinators, as a coping strategy to compensate for their limited French language skills. Lamarre (1989) warns principals to rethink this strategy as it could lead to teacher resentment and burnout which would affect teaching performance. As well, teachers could be making administrative decisions in areas such as the evaluation of language and pedagogy; this would be inadvisable.

Unilingual English principals interviewed in Lamarre's (1989) study did admit that their lack of proficiency in French affected their ability to judge student achievement. They felt unable to evaluate students' skills and had to rely on resource personnel in curricular areas.

Lamarre (1989) offers some suggestions for dual-track administrators:

1. School-based administrators must ensure that they are perceived to be committed to second language instruction.

2. Principals need in-service on program implementation and time to prepare for their instructional role. Discussion with experienced dual-track principals would be beneficial.

3. Principals must be flexible and open-minded as their new role will likely require transformations in their ideas, both personally and professionally.

4. Dual-track administrators should keep abreast of new research in all areas of program implementation which may affect the school and the district.

5. Unilingual principals should consider upgrading their French language skills.

5. Principals should provide release time for teachers who perform administrative duties and establish a network of resource people knowledgeable in French programs.

In conclusion, principals in Lamarre's (1989) study felt that their lack of French language proficiency did not hinder their administration of the immersion program, although they agreed that knowledge of the language would be an asset. Lamarre (1989) suggests further research investigating the beliefs of teachers on this issue, a question considered in this thesis.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Rationale

Qualitative research has gained legitimacy in the last decade as a method for investigating problems in an organization ((Miles and Huberman, 1984). This study is oriented toward a better understanding of an organization rather than to establishing statistically significant relationships between variables. The interview process is one qualitative method of shedding light on such problems, which can then be deemed worth pursuing. Research of this kind maximizes the possibility of such discovery.

Supervision of instruction and staff collegiality, two critical elements in school improvement, are investigated in this study. The bilingualism of the principal, a factor in research on dual-track schools, is examined in the context of the five areas originally investigated. The results of this aspect of the dual-track principal's leadership role are presented in Chapter IV.

Sample Selection

The following criteria were used for the selection of school districts participating in this study:

1. that they be located within a reasonable travelling distance for the research author.

2. that they have well-established French immersion programs in dual-track schools and that they be interested in this study.

3. that they express the ability to identify principals who would respond positively to participating in this research study and who met the criteria necessary to be included in the study.

As a result of the above criteria, two districts were selected. The first school district chosen is situated in the Fraser Valley of British Columbia. This district espouses the dual-track philosophy,

with its immersion programs all located in dual-track schools. The immersion programs in this district were well established, the initial program being in its tenth year of implementation. The second district was a very large and rapidly growing area in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. This district had a well-established early immersion program, with all schools in the district having immersion programs located in dual-track schools. Immersion programs had been operating in this district for twelve years, inclusive of the year in which the data was collected for this study. Because of the limited choice of schools available in District 1 which met the criteria, District 2 was asked to match the two schools in District 1 as closely as possible in terms of school size, history and student population (SES and grade level distribution).

A sample of the letter sent to each district confirming participation in this study is located in Appendix A. Two schools in each district were selected by district personnel according to the following criteria:

1. that they be dual-track schools housing both English and French immersion tracks, with the immersion stream spanning at least five years;

2. that the principals of these schools have a minimum of two years administrative experience in a dual-track school, with at least one full year in their present school.

Once district permission had been obtained, the researcher contacted participating principals to schedule interviews. During the initial contact, principals were informed of the criteria for the selection of participating teachers which were as follows:

1. that all four teachers in each school (to be selected randomly in a draw conducted by the researcher) have at least three years teaching experience;

2. that all teachers have at least one full year's experience in the particular dual-track school in which they were presently teaching (so that they would have a satisfactory understanding of the functioning of that school).

The final sample, therefore, consisted of four elementary dual-track principals, two in each participating district. Four teachers in each school took part in the study, one each representing

primary English, intermediate English, primary French immersion and intermediate immersion. As stated above, the selection of teachers was done randomly by the researcher. Teachers had been informed by the principal, previous to the selection, as to the nature and procedures of the study and had been assured that participation was strictly voluntary.

Procedures

Upon obtaining permission to conduct the study from each district, principals were contacted by telephone and interview times were established. Each principal was informed at that time that a letter of permission would be forwarded (Appendix B) to be signed and collected at the time of the interview. Also sent to each principal prior to the interview was a letter confirming the interview time (Appendix C). In addition, a preliminary questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed to each principal to be returned to the author at the time of the interview. The purpose of the preliminary questionnaire was to gather pertinent background information about each participant and school in the study to be examined in light of the results of the investigation.

All principals were interviewed in their respective schools. The procedure of the interview, entailing a series of questions pertaining to the dual-track principal, was explained. It was noted that the interview would take approximately one to one-half hours and that, with the respondent's permission, it would be tape recorded. As well, the researcher took detailed notes of the responses throughout the interview. The author explained that questions fell into five categories: teacher supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction, and parental involvement in the school. Principals did not have access to any of the questions prior to the interview.

At the termination of the interview, the researcher asked for the names of the teachers who qualified to be in the random selection. These names were classified into four categories as follows:

1. primary English
2. intermediate English
3. primary French immersion
4. intermediate French immersion

Following the draw of the four teachers' names, the author contacted each participant and explained the purpose and procedures of the study. Mutually convenient interview times were established and teachers were informed that they would be receiving a letter of permission (Appendix B) and a preliminary questionnaire (Appendix E) prior to the interview. These documents were mailed and returned to the reseacher at the time of the interview. Permission was sought to tape record the interviews at the initial contact. Only one teacher (Teacher 8) refused to be recorded and, subsequently, the interviewer took detailed notes during the interview. All other interviews were transcribed verbatim. Transcriptions, tapes and all other relevant data were destroyed immediately following completion and approval of the thesis.

All 20 interviews occurred between April and June 1989 inclusively. Anonymity of participants and confidentiality of responses were maintained in all cases. A copy of this thesis was sent to each participating district.

Data Collecting Instruments

Teacher questionnaire

This questionnaire (see Appendix E) consisted of four closed-ended and three open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions were designed to gather information on the teacher's experience in the realm of teaching (Table 9). Teachers were also asked to rate themselves on their ability to speak French on a five point scale, ranging from "not at all" to "fluently". The purpose of this question was to note any relationships between fluency and teachers' beliefs. Teachers were also asked to rate the fluency of their principal; the purpose of that question was to ascertain

any differences in both immersion and English teachers' ratings and in teacher-principal ratings. The results of these questions are presented in Chapter 1V. Open-ended questions were designed to determine teachers' educational background and to gather further information on the teacher's experience in education.

Principal questionnaire

The principal's questionnaire consisted of 17 questions, 13 closed-ended and 4 open-ended. The closed-ended questions sought primarily demographic information on the school, such as student population and the number of teachers in the English and French immersion programs (Table 10), as well as on the principal's experience in education, specifically in the dual-track school (Table 11). Principals were also asked to rate themselves on their level of fluency in the French language, using the same five point scale as that of the teachers. This information was deemed potentially useful in the analysis of principals' beliefs about the dual-track school. Results to this question are presented in Chapter 1V. Open-ended questions were designed to shed light on the principal's administrative experience. Also investigated was specific training which principals received in preparation for their principalship and for their leadership role in a dual-track school in particular. Information obtained about training for the dual-track principal's position was thought to be useful in light of the research which criticizes the lack of preparation for this role (Table 11).

Interviews

Interview questions for both teachers and principals were developed by the researcher specifically for this study as no such instruments existed, to the author's knowledge. Both questionnaires investigated responses in five major areas: supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement in the school. The majority of questions were identical for both teachers and principals so that responses could be legitimately compared. Several questions, however, differed in wording in order to reflect the unique perspective of the principal as compared to that of the teacher. All respondents

were offered the option of being interviewed in English or French; they all professed to be comfortable enough with English to be interviewed in that language.

Probe questions were developed for both sets of interviews in order to encourage participants to extend their responses, whenever the author deemed it necessary, and were used extensively during the interviews. A pilot study was undertaken prior to the actual research. Two principals and four teachers in two dual-track schools in a school district not included in the sample were interviewed using the questionnaires developed by the author. Participation in the pilot study was voluntary. Minor changes were made to several of the questions as recommendations from the interviewees. All changes were made before the first interview in the actual research and no further changes occurred throughout the study, in order to ensure validity of comparisons.

Throughout all interviews and contacts with the participants, the author took care to avoid presentation of bias. The researcher spoke little during the interviews and took great care to appear neutral to all responses. There was no deviation from the pre-determined protocol during the entire process.

Originally, the principal's role in five specific areas was investigated: teacher supervision of instruction (as a non-evaluative process), staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement in the school. As a result of the overwelming amount of data collected from the interview questions, a large part of the information gathered in interviews was not analyzed. Both the literature and the responses of participants indicated that supervision of instruction and staff collegiality bore the most impact on the effectiveness of dual-track schools. Responses from these two categories were thus preserved in their entirety. Parental involvement was eliminated from the study as there is considerable research on the immersion parent and the role of parents generally in the school. As well, responses to the interview questions did not reveal information pertaining specifically to the role of the dual-track principal in parental involvement. A

substantial part of the section school organization for instruction, which yielded data not unique to the dual-track school, was not analyzed. Several questions concerning classroom instruction from the section school organization for instuction were examined in the context of supervision of instruction. As well, the least pertinent questions from staff development were eliminated from the study while other questions were analyzed within the context of staff collegiality, as the responses shed light on principal-teacher relations in the dual-track school. Both the revised (reorganized according to the two main categories) and the original principal and teacher questionnaires are included in Appendices F, G, H and I. Because the probes extracted a considerable amount of valuable data, they are also included in these appendices.

Data Analysis

Demographic data for each of the four schools participating in this study are presented in Table 10. This information was collected from the preliminary questionnaire form mailed to principals. Data includes: total student population, French immersion student population, grades offered in both tracks, number of years immersion has existed in the school and number of English and French immersion track classroom teachers.

Responses to the interview questions were analyzed in light of the significant factors in the literature related to the three areas investigated: supervision of instruction, staff collegiality and the bilingualism of the principal. The transcribed interviews were reviewed and coded according to both relevant factors in the literature and issues raised by the participants.

The interview responses were rated on a three point scale: +1, -1 and 0. The purpose of scoring responses was to permit comparisons of teacher and principal beliefs. A score of +1 represents a positive analysis for a particular code, as it relates to the research on school effectiveness. A score of -1 reflects a negative rating of the respondent's comments for a specific

code, as reported in the literature. When a particular code received no comment on which to base a rating, a score of 0 was assigned.

Each of the four schools was analyzed separately using the system of coding outlined above for the two principal areas investigated: supervision of instruction and staff collegiality. The total score for each category of teachers, the total teachers' score and the principal's score are presented for each school (Tables 1 to 8). A thorough description of teacher and principal beliefs is furnished through the extensive use of quotes. While there is some inter-school analysis, each school is primarily examined on its own merits in order to shed light on teacher beliefs about the role of the principal in the functioning of that school.

A third aspect of the principal's role which was investigated was teacher and principal beliefs about the effect of the principal's French language skills on the five areas originally researched. Each respondent was asked to comment on the effect, if any, of the bilingualism of the principal on supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement in the school. The results of these responses are also presented in Chapter IV. Included are teachers' and principals' self-ratings of their degree of bilingualism and teachers' ratings of the French language fluency of their principal.

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

Coding of Teacher Responses

The codes for supervision of instruction were developed after studying teacher responses from the interview questions in accordance with relevant factors from the school effectiveness literature. A reliability check was conducted by the author by recoding one half of the teachers' responses to determine if the same scores were assigned to codes. With the exception of one score which was readjusted, scores matched in both assessments.

Listed below are the codes for teacher responses to questions regarding supervision of instruction, including an explanation of their significance.

Principal visitations (PV)

The code, principal visitations, refers to the principal's presence in the classroom. A teacher who commented that the principal had observed in the classroom at least once during the year was assigned a score of +1. As a result of the substantial number of teachers who said that principals frequently "pop in and pop out", these short visits were also scored as +1. If a teacher reported that the principal had never been in the classroom, a score of -1 was assigned to that teacher. Some teachers said that the principal only supervised new teachers and had not been visited themselves; they were given a score of -1. As well, the teacher who reported that the vice-principal but not the principal had been in her classroom was scored as -1.

Teacher input (TI)

Teacher input refers to the teacher's opportunity to have input into the supervision process. Teachers were scored as +1 if they had been asked by the principal for a preference in the time of observation, for input into the subject matter to be taught or "what to look for" during the visitation. Teacher #4 indicated that goals were discussed with the principal and was thus assigned a +1 score. Teacher #13 commented that considerable discussion took place regarding supervision and was also assigned a +1 score. Teachers #7, 14 and 15 indicated that supervision took place but did not mention any teacher input and so were scored as -1. In the case of Teacher #6, a score of +1 was given despite the observations being done by the vice-principal as she did have input into the process. A score of 0 indicates that no supervision occurred and therefore teacher input into the process is irrelevant.

Principal assistance with instruction (PAI)

In this category, a score of +1 was given to teachers who indicated a belief that the principal is indeed a significant factor in the quality of instruction. This belief was expressed in a variety of ways. In some instances, teachers commented that there is a great deal of informal discussion taking place regarding instruction and that the principal is obviously interested in the quality of instruction in the school. Some comments were positive but qualified; for example, one teacher said she might seek assistance and that her principal probably helps with instruction, then continued to say that indeed he helps her set personal and professional goals and there is some discussion about instruction in the school. Such teachers were scored +1. Those teachers who expressed a negative belief concerning the principal's role in instruction were rated -1, even in two circumstances where they did give an example of the principal's assistance.

Priority for principal (PP)

Teachers were asked explicitly whether or not they believed that supervision of instruction was a priority for their principal. Those who emphatically responded in the negative or who said the principal does not discuss supervision were scored -1. If teachers responded with a positive belief, even if that belief was qualified, a +1 was assigned. For example, one teacher commented that idealistically it is a priority. Several teachers said that supervision was definitely a priority in the case of their inexperienced colleagues and were also assigned a +1 score.

Confidence in the principal (CP)

This code reflects the trust and support felt by teachers for the principal which the literature claims is crucial to the climate in a school. Teachers were scored +1 if they believed the principal to be caring, supportive and trustworthy. Several teachers explained that they did not particularly have faith in the principal's knowledge of curriculum but were still scored positively as they indicated the open, personable, trustworthy nature of the principal. The score 0 was assigned to the three teachers who gave no indication of having confidence in the principal, despite the fact that

they responded yes to the direct question. There were no cases where a teacher responded negatively to the question.

Student progress (SP)

Teachers' beliefs surrounding the role of the principal in student progress was investigated as a result of the substantial amount of evidence in the research that ties instructional leadership to student achievement. A score of +1 was given to teachers who either expressed the role of the principal as important in this area or who simply gave examples of the part the principal played in student progress. Teachers who claimed that the principal had no role or a minimal one were scored -1, even though they may have given the same example as a teacher with a +1 score after probes from the interviewer. This is due to the fact that the purpose of this study is to investigate teacher beliefs about the principal.

Student evaluation (SE)

Teachers who believed that the role of the principal in student evaluation is significant or who gave at least one example of that role and did not respond negatively to the question were scored +1. Those teachers who said that the principal had no role in student evaluation, even if they were able to give one example of that role as an after thought or with a probe, were scored -1.

Coding of Principal Responses

The codes used to assess the principals' responses are identical to those of the teachers. The interpretation of them is somewhat different. For principal visitations, teacher input, principal assistance with instruction, priority for principal, student progress and student evaluation, the codes refer to the principal's perception of his or her role in the process as either an active, involved one (+1) or as negligible (-1). The code confidence in principal represents his or her perception of the teacher's belief; that is, a +1 is assigned to a principal who expressed the belief that teachers have confidence in her or him; -1 represents a negative belief.

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

Coding of Teacher Responses

The term "staff" in this thesis refers to both teachers and administrators. The codes for the study of staff relationships and collegiality in the elemenary school were devised once again from analyzing teacher responses to questions, which were developed to reflect the school effectiveness literature. Listed below are these codes. It should be noted that several codes were included as a result of studying teachers' responses and were not therefore preconceived when the questions were formulated. A score of 0 was assigned if the category was not addressed by the respondent.

Staff relations (SR)

This code reflects the relationship among staff members, including both English and French immersion teachers. Comments indicating the tone or climate of the school, as well as unity of teachers, were considered in determining the score. A +1 score is indicative of collegial relations among staff members and an overall positive climate in the school. A score of -1 was assigned to a teacher who expressed disunity in the school, poor staff relations or a general lack of collegiality.

Social functions (SF)

This category was conceptualized as a result of teachers' responses and is not reflected in the interview questions. This accounts for the frequent number of 0 scores. The code was included because of the research which supports the view that social events do provide for more congenial, closer staff relations. A +1 refers to the occurrence of social functions which take place both in and out of the school. A -1 would refer only to a negative response by a teacher to having such events.

Integration of French immersion and English students (IFES)

This category was also conceived following the analysis of teachers' responses. Although there is scant research on this topic, there is evidence that a more positive school climate prevails when direct action is taken by the staff to integrate both groups of students. This interview question was a probe and was asked of the majority of respondents. A score of +1 was assigned to a teacher who indicated that some integration of students took place. A -1 score was assigned for negative implications of integrating. Once again, a score of 0 means that the topic was not broached.

Integration of French immersion and English teachers (IFET)

This category is an integral part of staff relations; it was decided, however, to code it separately to reflect strategies used by the principal to integrate teachers, both English and French immersion. This code refers not only to specific strategies employed by the principal but to efforts by the staff to integrate. A +1 score signifies such integration. Lack of integration, reference to isolation and individualistic approaches to school events are represented by a -1 score.

Principal sensitivity (PS)

This code refers to the teacher's belief concerning the principal's awareness of and sensitivity to individual differences among staff members. It also relects the teacher's perception of equality inherent in the principal's decision-making. A +1 score indicates a belief that the principal is indeed aware of such differences and that decisions and interpersonal approaches to people are fair. In some cases, it indicates the fact that the principal promotes teacher strengths. A score of -1 indicates a lack of such sensitivity and fairness.

Risk-taking (RT)

There is considerable research suggesting that schools in which the principal encourages risk-taking and change are more dynamic, positive places to be and that staff relations are more

collegial. Since this question was asked directly to teachers, there are no 0 scores. Teachers either responded positively or negatively to the question, with some teachers giving examples of such encouragement by the principal. In some cases, a +1 indicates that the principal encourages staff members to solve interpersonal disputes on their own, with the principal acting as mediator if the issue is not resolved.

Staff involvement (SI)

Throughout the interview there were indices of the degree of staff involvement in developing policies, solving problems and making decisions which affect the functioning of the organization. Reflecting the literature, a +1 score indicates at least a fair amount of staff input into these processes, as well as support from the principal for staff involvement. A -1 score was assigned when the teacher did not mention staff involvement in the decision-making process or discussed it in a negative light. The score 0 was eliminated because there was sufficient opportunity for respondents to respond to this issue in the interview.

Principal involvement (PI)

There is an abundance of literature which professes the visibility of the principal in the school as a key factor in school effectiveness. Research suggests that the principal's presence as a role model at school events is critical to the development of a positive climate in the organization. This code represents the presence of the principal at school functions, such as staff development activities, and on various committees struck in the school. A +1 score indicates the active participation of the principal in a variety of such activities in the school. A score of -1 suggests that the principal is not a significant presence in the school or is out of the school a substantial portion of the time, as reported by teachers. No teacher was assigned a score of 0.

Coding of Principal Responses

Codes identical to those of teachers were used to measure the principal's comments on collegiality and staff relations in the school. Each principal was asked directly about the relationship of teachers as a group and more specifically about the relations between French immersion and English track staff members. As is the case for teachers, the codes social functions and integration of French and English students were not preconceived prior to the formation of the questionnnaire, thus explaining the large number of 0 scores which were assigned if the principal did not mention these indicators of school climate. The codes integration of French and English teachers, staff involvement and principal involvement were formulated as a result of specific questions asked of the principal. The author did not ask the principals directly about their sensitivity to staff issues and individual differences (code PS) but scored each principal based on their responses. Risk-taking (code RT) was scored similarly.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The two main areas of investigation, supervision of instruction and staff collegiality, have been assessed in terms of a coding process explained in Chapter III. In addition to the coding of responses, a thorough examination of data and presentation of quotes by participants are included in this chapter. Following each quote is the letter representing the school of the interviewee; this identification will allow the reader to compare teacher and principal responses among the four schools. When transcribing the tapes of the interviews, the author made every effort to record quotes verbatim. As a result of both second language speech by some French immersion teachers and the normal lack of fluency in expressing one's ideas in interviews, it has been necessary to paraphrase in certain instances. Whenever paraphrasing, the author has taken care to present the comments as close to verbatim as possible and to portray the intent of the respondents.

At the end of the interview, participants were asked to state what they believed were the principal's first and second priorities among the five categories originally investigated. The results of this question for all 20 respondents are presented in this chapter. Included, as well, is a list of the problems associated with supervision of instruction, as perceived by all interviewees.

Teachers' self-ratings of their speaking and comprehension skills in French, as well as their rating of their principal's language skills, are summarized in this chapter. Principals' self-ratings for their French language skills are also presented. Following this analysis is a synopsis of the teachers' and principals' beliefs regarding the importance of the principal's degree of bilingualism in the five areas: supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, organization of the school for instruction and parental involvement.

The identity of the one female administrator in this study has been hidden for reasons of confidentiality through the use of male pronouns.

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

Below are the results of the coding process for all four schools in the two participating districts. Following each table of results is a brief interpretation of the findings. The data is then discussed in more detail under the seven categories: principal visitations, teacher input, principal assistance with instruction, priority for principal, confidence in principal, student progress and student evaluation. The range of scores possible for teachers is -28 to +28; for principals, the total possible range is -7 to +7.

Table 1

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

District 1 School A		Teacher #1	#2	#3	#4	Principal
PV	Principal Visitations	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1
TI	Teacher Input	+1	0	+1	+1	+1
PAI	Principal Assistance with Instruction	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1
PP	Priority for Principal	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1
CP	Confidence in Principal	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SP	Student Progress	+1	-1	+1	-1	+1
SE	Student Evaluation	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1

Teacher #1 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #2 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #3 English Intermediate
Teacher #4 English Primary

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = -1
Total English Teachers Score = +8
Total Primary Teachers Score = +6
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = +1
Total Teachers Score = +7
Principal's Score = +7

It appears from the coding above that the English track teachers perceived the process of supervision in a more positive light than the French immersion teachers. They reported more visitations and more teacher input into the supervision process and believed that the principal assisted them more significantly with their instruction. Both French teachers attested to the fact that supervision was not a priority for their principal, although Teacher #1 spoke positively about the process. Comments from both English and French immersion teachers suggested that the principal had somewhat of a role in student progress but not a substantial one. Not one of the teachers believed that the principal had a significant role in student evaluation. Primary teachers reported having more supervision and teacher input into the process, as well as more assistance with instruction, than intermediate teachers. All four respondents expressed confidence in their principal; this was evident from their positive comments describing his presence in the school. The principal perceived his role as significant in all areas questioned and was assigned a +1 for Confidence in Principal, as he mentioned teachers coming to him with concerns and questions regularly and as a result of his comment about their being extremely comfortable with him.

Table 2

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

District 1 School B		Teacher #5	#6	#7	#8	Principal
PV	Principal Visitations	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1
TI	Teacher Input	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1
PAI	Principal Assistance with Instruction	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1
PP	Priority for Principal	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
CP	Confidence in Principal	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SP	Student Progress	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SE	Student Evaluation	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1

Teacher #5 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #6 English Primary
Teacher #7 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #8 English Intermediate

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = +6
Total English Teachers Score = +8
Total Primary Teachers Score = +6
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = +8
Total Teachers Score = +14
Principal's Score = +7

Once again, English track teachers perceived the supervision process somewhat more positively than French immersion teachers, although immersion teachers described the process much more positively than their counterparts in School A. In School B, the intermediate teachers viewed supervision of instruction and the principal's role in it as substantially more beneficial than their intermediate colleagues in School A and slightly more important than the primary teachers in their school. The Total Teachers Score is double that in School A indicating a more positive attitude towards the process of supervision of instruction. The principal's score is identical to that of his peer in School A and his comments suggest that supervision is indeed a priority for him.

Table 3

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

District 2 School C		Teacher #9	#10	#11	#12	Principal
PV	Principal Visitations	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1
TI	Teacher Input	0	0	0	0	+1
PAI	Principal Assistance with Instruction	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1
PP	Priority for Principal	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1
CP	Confidence in Principal	0	0	+1	0	0
SP	Student Progress	-1	+1	-1	-1	+1
SE	Student Evaluation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1

Teacher #9 English Intermediate
Teacher #10 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #11 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #12 English Primary

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = -3
Total English Teachers Score = -10
Total Primary Teachers Score = -6
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = -7
Total Teachers Score = -13
Principal's Score = +5

All teacher groups analyzed in School C have a negative score. The English track teachers seemed to view the role of the principal in supervision more negatively than their immersion colleagues. The scores of primary and intermediate teachers do not differ substantially. The total teachers' score is considerably lower than that in both Schools A and B. The principal, on the other hand, identified supervision as her number one priority of the five categories investigated. The incongruency between the principal's and teachers' scores seems to indicate substantial differences in beliefs in the areas of teacher supervision.

Table 4

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

District 2 School D		Teacher #13	#14	#15	#16	Principal
PV	Principal Visitations	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
TI	Teacher Input	+1	-1	-1	0	0
PAI	Principal Assistance with Instruction	-1	-1	+1	-1	+1
PP	Priority for Principal	+1	-1	+1	-1	-1
CP	Confidence in Principal	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SP	Student Progress	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1
SE	Student Evaluation	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1

Teacher #13 English Primary
Teacher #14 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #15 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #16 English Intermediate

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = 0
Total English Teachers Score = -1
Total Primary Teachers Score = +4
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = -5
Total Teachers Score = -1
Principal's Score = +5

The score of the primary teachers was considerably higher than that of the intermediate teachers. There was no substantial difference in the scores of the English track and French immersion teachers in School D. The score of the teachers as a whole seemed to indicate an overall perception of the role of the principal in supervision of instruction as ambivalent. Teachers reported their confidence in the administrator as a supportive, trustworthy person as well as his high visibility in the school. They did not, however, indicate a belief that he was particularly influential in the instructional process nor that teacher supervision was a real priority for the principal. It was not apparent from their answers to the interview questions that the teachers had any input into the supervision process. The role of the principal in student progress and evaluation was seen by the teachers as minor. Supporting the teachers' score on Teacher Input, the principal did not mention any teacher input into the supervision process and was thus scored 0. When asked to priorize the five categories investigated, he said staff relations and the happiness of staff and students were his number one priority. He was therefore assigned a score of -1. This administrator perceived himself as a significant factor in the other coded areas and felt teachers had confidence in his judgment and found him supportive and caring.

Principal visitations

In general, teacher and principal perceptions regarding the frequency of the principal's visitations of classrooms differed considerably. The majority of teachers stated that the principal's busy schedule did not allow for regular visits to classrooms. A number of teachers commented that, while they personally had not been visited by the principal, they were certain that new, inexperienced teachers were supervised and their instruction monitored. Principals, on the other hand, believed that they were in classrooms on a regular basis. They acknowledged, as did teachers, that priorities for supervision rested with teachers new to the profession. One principal noted:

> "I'm more interested in making sure that the beginning teacher gets started on the right foot. I will spend more time going over routines in the school, planning, and encouraging teachers to talk to people who have been there first hand. This is one way that I encourage them to build a trust level between teachers." (D)

An immersion teacher, with only one year's experience, confirmed the perceptions of more experienced teachers in reporting that she had been visited numerous times by the principal during the evaluation mode. She had appreciated the support and feedback of the administrator, especially in dealing with parents as her English language skills were very weak. Notes taken in class were shared with the teacher during a post-conference.

Frustration with the supervisory program was expressed by both immersion and English track teachers. One primary English teacher commented:

> "Personally, I haven't had any contact with the principal as far as coming into my classroom in the three years I've been here. I feel there is very little contact with me and with what I'm doing in the classroom. I suppose it's partly a matter of trust, but I feel there should be more contact with what the kids are doing. I'm presuming it's because of time constraints." (C)

An intermediate French immersion teacher indicated her frustration with the lack of contact with the principal as follows:

> "Very, very seldom has he walked in, let alone come in to check what is going on. He gives compliments here and there but has not been in to evaluate my teaching. It is my personal feeling that they should come around more often and be more aware of what is being done. He is very lenient of what is being taught." (A)

Asked why she thought the principal did not visit her classroom, she replied:

> "I have often wondered myself. I keep thinking should I ask him, but why bring it upon myself. Maybe he feels that there is no need to come around the class." (A)

The incompatibility of the supervision of instruction and evaluation processes in the minds of respondents was evident in the questioning on principal visitations. One experienced English teacher commented:

> "I involve him in the lesson. I think that it might be a defence mechanism on my part but I figure if he is involved, he can't be too critical." (A)

Several principals recognized the difficulties inherent in these two programs. One principal noted:

> "The nervousness is always there. If someone is coming in to evaluate you or even write something about what you're doing, there's always a degree of apprehension. You wear two hats, the hat of the evaluator and the hat of the guide on the side, as the helping teacher." (A)

The majority of teachers stated that principals monitor instruction by their frequent drop-in visits, which reflects the theory of management by wandering around (M.B.W.A.). One English teacher expressed her awareness of the principal's monitoring strategies as follows:

> "He monitors by being present. He will pop in and out of the room. Little excuses, like walking in and handing out a bulletin that could be in my mailbox. Once I saw him pick them out of the mailboxes and hand them out, but that is a good way to do it because then it doesn't make anyone feel uncomfortable. I want the students to see him. When they do come in for a formal observation, once or twice a year, it is certainly not a true evaluation of what the teacher is capable of doing. The way the principal pops in and out, he can really see what's going on." (B)

A French immersion teacher concurred:

> "I prefer casual observations where your life and breath don't depend on it. This way it is very relaxed. I was under the impression he was there to observe a student and that was what he based his report on." (B)

Several teachers were uncertain of the methods by which their instruction was monitored. One intermediate English teacher confessed:

> "I have no idea how the principal monitors my instruction. I think it's the style of administration because I do know of colleagues in other schools who have a different type of supervision. I think it's extremely important to have supervision. The principal gives the impression of not having the time and is very involved in activities outside the school. The principal should monitor more closely and check student notebooks, not just once a year. This can be discouraging to students." (C)

An inexperienced immersion teacher questioned about the monitoring of her instruction responded:

> "No one monitors. We are supposed to be professionals. I don't need to be supervised. He knows that I do my job, that I do the best I can. I know the B.C. curriculum, so we don't need to talk about curriculum or instruction. We talk often about what I expect, about my goals. I don't teach the way others taught before me. Some parents didn't agree. He supports me and that's important." (D)

This teacher had been visited numerous times by the administrator during the evaluation process.

While teachers had only a vague or no awareness of district policy on supervision and evaluation, principals were able to articulate policy and school procedures very clearly. One principal outlined such procedures:

> "I will be in all classrooms over the course of the year with a view to supporting teachers. I have a staff meeting at the beginning of the year with teachers, so that we can go over the district's instructional expectations and the various ways that I try to give support to teachers that I visit. I explain that any notes that I keep from visits will be shared verbatim, a copy given to the teacher." (B)

He explained that pre-conferences were not always held, as some teachers preferred him to drop in unannounced, but that post-conferences were always conducted. Few teachers in the study mentioned having conferences with principals, although not all teachers were asked that question directly.

All principals remarked that they approached the visitation of immersion and English program classrooms in a similar way. When queried further, one principal conceded that language could be an issue:

> "If there is a slight difference of opinion (between immersion and English teachers), it could be a concern of immersion teachers who feel they are being supervised by people who don't fully understand. I can see unilingual supervisors feeling

> uncomfortable sitting in on a lesson conducted entirely in French. I think there is a recognition at the same time that the process of good teaching, irrespective of language, is something that can be recognized. Even if the absolute details are not fully understood, the overall thrust is." (B)

Another administrator also acknowledged the language factor:

> "A different process might be necessary because of language differences. The teachers that are here have a fairly high level of English but still there are communication difficulties. I'm familiar with the curriculum as much as I can be, as well as the pedagogy and the methodology but I have no way of determining the level, correctness or appropriateness of the language or materials. There are certain indicators that tell us whether or not there's a satisfactory learning situation occurring. So I feel fairly comfortable, and feedback from teachers has been that my observations are fairly accurate. I can intervene and be helpful and supportive. If competency were a question, I would never ever write a report on a person without some kind of (outside) opinion." (C)

One very experienced English primary teacher stated that she did not require supervision as did newer teachers, but that she invited the principal into the class to share in special activities, particularly when parents were present.

Principals believed that they offered considerable support to teachers and that this support was appreciated. One administrator commented:

> "I make a visit two, three, four times a year, sometimes 10, 20, 30 minutes or an hour each time, depending on the nature of the lesson. I support them very highly, I think I do anyways. When I go into classrooms, I always take a pen and get down on my knees with the kids. I make sure that I check every kid's book and initial the fact that I've been there. So I'm a support person; it's also a way of helping me to know what's really going on in the class." (D)

Teacher input

The question of teacher input into the supervision process was not asked directly of teachers; rather the category was developed from interview data. The few teachers who did mention having pre-conferences with their supervisors noted that they had input into the time when the principal would visit the classroom. One primary immersion teacher was particularly positive about her part in the evaluation process:

> "Teachers play a big role in evaluation; strengths and weaknesses are evaluated. We have input into what we want the principal to see. We can request that certain

> things be mentioned that we feel are relevant and we pick the time and choose the activities." (A)

An intermediate English teacher, who was cynical about the supervision process and its stressful effects on teachers, applauded the current administrator as "his best principal" (B) for having asked for the teacher's input on the optimal time for an observation.

No principal was criticized for negating teacher input into the supervisory/evaluative processes. The most negative comment formulated was by an intermediate English teacher:

> "He would tell me that he was coming. He might ask what I wanted him to look for." (D)

Principal assistance with instruction

Teachers' beliefs ranged from no assistance with instruction by the principal to considerable participation in instructional issues. Those teachers who did not acknowledge any assistance with instruction by the principal relied on themselves and on their peers for support in instructional matters. In fact, many of the teachers who reported administrative support commented that they depended foremost on their peers for meaningful feedback. Several teachers named district helping teachers as very helpful with questions related to instruction. One experienced primary English teacher cited workshops, conferences and district primary meetings as the sources of many of her ideas. An intermediate English teacher praised the student teacher program as enhancing cooperative teaching.

Once again, the difference between experienced and inexperienced teachers surfaced:

> "I guess the principal helps with instruction. He requires me to set some personal and professional goals; that is part of our evaluation process. I think if you are perceived to be an effective teacher that the supervision system is a lot more informal than if you really need some assistance with your instruction. If I really needed assistance with instruction, I would experience a different evaluation process and more definite assistance with my instruction than I do. Supervision is redundant after the first year has gone by and the teacher has proven himself effective." (A)

The following comment by an immersion teacher reflects the literature on the principal's communication with influential staff members:

> "He drops in and we usually discuss ways to encourage some other staff members to jump on the whole language bandwagon." (A)

Other teachers commented that the principal was supportive and would assist with instructional issues when approached by the teacher but did not take the initiative to approach the teacher. Most teachers were well aware of time constraints on administrators.

A number of teachers expressed appreciation of the principal for replacing them in the classroom so that they could observe peers or attend a meeting. One immersion teacher commented that the principal covered for her when she was late. Another remarked that the principal would teach the C.A.R.E. (Child Abuse Research and Evaluation) program for those teachers who lacked the required training. One English teacher, who relied on himself, colleagues and guidebooks for setting instructional objectives, hailed the principal for "doing a fair bit of instruction" (B) and for discussing instruction at staff meetings. Several also indicated their gratitude for positive feedback from the administrator. One teacher remarked:

> "He praises me and his praise shows his understanding of and his interest in what is happening in the primary classroom." (A)

Several teachers indicated that their peers were more knowledgeable in curricular matters than the principal. One intermediate English teacher spoke frankly when asked if he would implement instructional changes suggested by the principal:

> "I honestly think that, in general, teachers are more competent at a particular grade level than the principal. It's not really the principal's forte, although some of them like to pretend it is. So whatever was suggested, I would probably discuss it with some other people who are teaching the same level and I'd think about it myself. I wouldn't just do it because someone said to do it. The principal is an expert on dealing well and fairly with people and, in that regard, I would seek his opinion." (D)

An English primary teacher revealed that some teachers were concerned about the instructional ability of several of their peers. She appeared frustrated that the problem was not being addressed. She remarked that she would approach the principal if "a real concern" arose but preferred other avenues. Queried about the principal's role in instruction, this teacher commented:

> "I think the principal should play a key role in order to really get a feel for what's happening in the school, to know where colleagues are coming from. The staff should feel that the principal is putting his hand into teaching. Staffs I've been on seem to have that little bit of extra respect for the principal who actually gets things done. It's almost just a P.R. thing. I think that at the grade seven level, it would be very valuable for the principal to teach. It gives principals that extra contact with the kids, if they're teaching something they are really good at and knowledgeable in." (C)

When questioned about curriculum implementation, this teacher responded:

> "I pretty much do anything I want. I really have the feeling that I can teach anything in this room anytime I want to, unless it's something where people would be screaming about the content." (C)

Asked how her instruction was monitored, she replied:

> "The principal gets a feel from the fact that the parents and kids are happy. I suppose that I appear to be on top of it in the classroom." (C)

Several teachers offered similar perspectives.

One intermediate French teacher questioned the ability of the unilingual administrator to assist immersion teachers with instruction. He commented:

> "Maybe it's difficult for them because they don't speak French. I don't know if it's possible to evaluate someone in another language. I know there are some workshops for that but I don't know if it's efficient." (C)

This teacher added that the unilingual principal could effectively evaluate certain aspects of immersion teaching, such as students' listening skills, but not language quality. He presented the immersion teacher's plight in having to translate materials from English to French and to communicate with anglophone parents. He revealed that some immersion teachers refused to help fellow colleagues by sharing materials. Several immersion teachers, he reported, had left the system because of a lack of support. He commented that district helping teachers were available

but had to be approached by the teacher. He himself had never asked the principal for assistance with instruction.

Questioned about the role of the principal in instruction, one immersion teacher replied:

> "It's very important to have input and supervision from the principal, I guess. I'm sure the principal would help if asked but I don't think that many teachers are interested because, of course, nobody wants to be observed or evaluated." (C)

Principals believed strongly that they assisted teachers with instruction in a variety of ways. One administrator described his instructional role as "assisting, reflecting and giving people a reflection of what they are doing" and as "looking for growth areas" (A). Another stated that there was a structured set of procedures in place for providing intensive assistance to teachers at risk to remediate areas of weakness. This principal interpreted his instructional role as "offering teachers a picture of themselves during the act of teaching and helping them understand themselves better" (B). He conceded that, while teacher observations can be conducted objectively, the process becomes more subjective when principals and teachers interpret the data together.

One principal, who was reported by teachers to be seldom in classrooms and to be excessively out of the school, believed he spent an inordinate amount of time on supervision. He remarked:

> "I spend a great deal of time on supervision, if you accept that supervising teachers is something other than just formally observing and giving feedback. Supervising teachers takes more than half my time." (C)

It must be remembered that only four teachers were interviewed in this large school. This principal expressed his love of teaching and his belief that he was a teacher of both children and teachers. He expanded:

> "It took a few years for teachers to understand that I'm not that far from the classroom and that I used to be a teacher. I like to think that I'm able to continue that teaching role by involving myself in the instructional program as much as possible. I do that in a lot of indirect ways." (C)

This administrator believed that he encouraged discussion of instructional issues. Asked to comment on teachers' perceptions of his role in the instructional process, he responded:

> "I think teachers feel that they really don't know what I do, because I'm not a person who will designate myself as the leader. I like to lead from behind. I really feel that there's strength in empowering the people to do the work, so they might think that I'm not doing anything. The leaders know that I am, because I get the resources. I guess my involvement is clearest at staff meetings or when I'm giving a presentation, but I'm not sure that the whole staff realizes that I'm as involved as I am." (C)

Priority for principal

When asked at the conclusion of the interview to identify the first two priorities of the principal among the five categories addressed, no teacher indicated that supervision of instruction was either the first or second priority for the principal. On the other hand, three of the four principals interviewed named supervision of instruction as their number one priority. These results are summarized under the heading **Principals' Priorities - Beliefs of Teachers and Principals** following this discussion of the seven coded categories. In addition, teachers were asked during the interview if they believed supervision of instruction to be a priority for their principal, giving them the opportunity to expand on their perceptions.

Several teacher respondents expressed the belief that supervision was important for principals during a teacher's initial year in the school, either as a beginning teacher or as an experienced teacher new to the school. One participant perceived the process to be more structured for these teachers. An experienced English teacher commented:

> "The principal is probably very aware of teacher supervision, especially with new teachers and some of the staff who come from Quebec. We have a rapid turnover, the same as in any French immersion staff, and I think there are more meetings with them." (B)

Another teacher mused:

> "I guess it's a priority because he makes sure that everybody is content and has his or her material. If it were my first year, he would be around five times." (B)

A primary immersion teacher noted that her principal was interested in supervision and idealistic in believing that the process was a valuable one. She believed that teachers were shortchanged as a result of the principal's involvement outside the school. An English teacher in the same school commented:

> "I used to think that maybe it was a priority but I've revised my feeling. I don't think it is now. The principal used to express supervision as his key interest but I find that he's out of the school so much." (C)

One intermediate immersion teacher was ambivalent in her perception of the supervisory process:

> "We don't really talk about it. It's not pushed. I guess he probably thinks we're doing all right. If he really felt the need for it, I guess he would do it." (D)

Two intermediate teachers, one immersion and one English, in different schools thought that supervision becomes a priority when there are problems.

Several teachers in the four schools indicated that goal-setting was a priority for their principal. One stated:

> "We are always discussing goals. You cannot function successfully without goals. If you have no goals, you have nothing." (B)

One English teacher expressed criticism of the district's role in goal-setting and concern for changes in the district:

> "The District dictates the goals, not the principal. I see that role changing very much with this new contract. I am definitely seeing more of an adminstrative role. Principals are part of administration now. We are divided. This division is getting stronger and they are going to Saturday and to night meetings with the school board. Principals are resigning." (A)

An administrator, citing teacher supervision as his number one priority, emphasized the importance of the process in developing a positive climate in the school and in maintaining the health of the organization. A second principal respondent cited the district's emphasis on teacher

supervision, the expectation being that the supervisory process would be a priority in school-based goal-setting. Expected by the district was a focus on a developmental model addressing student outcomes, discussion at staff meetings on the topic and enouragement of teachers to attend in-service provided by the district.

Confidence in principal

All teacher respondents in this study indicated that they had confidence in their principal when asked the question directly. The large majority of teachers described their principal as supportive, trustworthy and helpful. Some answers were qualified, particularly in reference to the principal's knowledge of subject areas and pedagogy. Others expressed confidence in the principal's assessment of instructional techniques and would implement suggested changes.

Representative of many teachers in the study was the belief of a primary English teacher who found her principal very approachable; however, she preferred to seek assistance from a colleague, particularly one who had expertise in a specific area. She commented:

> "He was not a full-time principal until lately so he has recently been in the trenches. He gives me lots of constructive feedback. He has credibility." (A)

Later in the interview, this same teacher revealed her suspicion of the principal's role in the supervision/evaluation processes:

> "I would talk to my peers first, especially now. Things have changed. There are definitely administrators and there are teachers. The principal is very good at helping but he leaves us on our own. He is very good that way. I have seen where a person has done the right route by going to the supervisor for assistance and has been axed. It seems to be that, all of a sudden, because you can't control a student or you have a problem and you have been honest about it, it is written down that you are unable to control the class." (A)

While expressing confidence in the principal as a person, one English teacher revealed doubt in his role in the supervisory process:

> "I think all administrators are not in the classroom teaching so really I don't think that they are up on all these things happening. The administrator should be teaching a portion of the time." (B)

Another English intermediate teacher expressed confidence in the principal with this comment:

> "He is supportive, easygoing and cooperative. I enjoy him. He has suspended twice the number of kids as in comparably sized schools. Students need consequences." (B)

An experienced English primary teacher expressed her belief in contemporary administrators:

> "If the principal is overbearing or intolerant it puts the teacher on the defensive and also erodes her self-confidence. But it seems that principals today are more interested in helping than criticizing. We seem to share our priorities and our goals more than we did many years ago. When I began teaching, the principal was more of an authoritarian and made more of the decisions. Now it's collegial, more realistic and meets the needs of the children." (D)

An experienced English intermediate teacher described the principal as sensitive to individual differences and supportive of teachers' needs. He remarked:

> "I think one of the reasons he's effective is he's quite often the balance between what the school board is trying to push and what the staff wants." (D)

For the category Confidence in Principal, administrators were scored +1 if their responses indicated that they incited confidence in teachers. Three of the four principals were scored positively. The fourth administrator received a 0 score as there was insufficient information on which to base the score and the question was not asked directly of the principal.

The following are examples of comments by administrators who received a positive score:

> "The staff knows that I know the elements of effective instruction. This staff is very, very comfortable, not in a complacent way, but we get along very well socially. We know each other as a family. I think there is an ease coming through my office and asking for help, ideas or readings." (A)

Another principal remarked:

> "I think teachers feel that, if they are dealing with known personalities, they are much more comfortable than if they are dealing with unknown, unpredictable personalities. They like to feel that the people who are supervising, and more importantly evaluating, will be fair and have the skills necessary to be fair." (B)

He continued:

> "They see me as a facilitator and helper, perhaps a coordinator. They don't see me as seeing all and knowing all, but rather a person who has more time and perhaps more expertise, that I can help implement things soundly in an instructional way." (B)

One principal stated outrightly that teachers had confidence in him and approached him with problems and concerns. The fourth administrator, who was scored 0 for this category, expressed some indication of his belief in teacher confidence with this comment:

> "I like to think that teachers feel that I support their programs and that I can and will teach, that I am involved daily as a teacher." (C)

He felt that teachers discussed concerns and possible solutions to problems with him.

Student progress

The large majority of teachers believed that principals played a role in student progress. Report cards were mentioned most frequently by teachers as the means by which administrators monitor the progress of students. Several respondents mentioned that the principal must ensure that grades and comments are congruent in reporting to parents. More experienced teachers were able to expand on the importance of the principal's role in keeping abreast of the student population. They referred to the monitoring of student progress through school-based team, support staff and conferencing with parents.

Some teachers were unaware of the methods by which principals monitor student progress. One English program participant remarked:

> "He has never asked about student progress, other than reading report cards and being aware of a few problems. We really talk a lot here, so maybe he's just aware. This is a good feeling school." (A)

An immersion teacher in the same school concurred:

> "He doesn't play much of a role in monitoring student progress. He reads reports, checks into problems and deals with parent and board concerns. We discuss student progress at the beginning and end of the year. We have to explain what our

> classes are like. We talk about instruction over a break, even on a non-instructional day." (A)

In one school, students were nominated by teachers for awards in two categories, achievement and improvement. As well, the names of students at risk were presented to the principal and discussed at a later date. An English track participant identified a sensitive issue mentioned by several other English program teachers in the study:

> "He talks to students at risk and sits in on parent conferences, especially for those students switching from French immersion to English. If the immersion teacher feels that the child is not doing well, they will move him to English. I have a lot of complaints about it and I have been very vocal. I think the child should receive learning assistance. I think there is a lot more that can be done before you just move a child to the English program. I have kids come into my room, their self-esteem is so low because they feel they have failed. It makes me so angry. We have talked a lot about that over the last couple of years and how we can improve it." (B)

An intermediate English teacher believed that her principal was highly involved in student discipline. She referred students to administration regularly for discipline but, for academic matters, only involved the principal in serious cases, such as retention. A teacher in the same school believed that the principal's role was to sign forms for psychometric testing. An inexperienced immersion teacher in another school noted:

> "He doesn't talk to me about student progress; it's my business." (D)

She believed that the principal had no role in monitoring student academic progress, only discipline. An experienced English teacher in the fourth school concurred:

> "The principal has no role in student progress. Well, he proofreads report cards. I guess some of the French immersion writing needs a fair bit of monitoring." (D)

Principals were able to clearly articulate their role in monitoring student progress in their school. One administrator explained that he met with all teachers in the fall to discuss students and any apparent problems. Regular meetings with the learning assistance teacher and with school-based team were also mentioned. Test results were monitored and shared with teachers.

Individual student plans were developed with teachers as required. One administrator defined teacher supervision as critical to the monitoring of student progress. A monthly report by teachers informed him of students at risk, of high achievers and of students improving both academically and behaviourally.

Supervision and student progress are clearly interrelated in the mind of one principal:

> "I monitor student progress by observing how students are working in their classroom. I look at their work, I look at teachers' markbooks, I review report card comments and I ask teachers questions about how grades for intermediate students are determined." (C)

This principal also indicated that previews and overviews were submitted, that children were sent to him for motivational purposes and that a referral system for students at risk was in place.

The fourth principal believed that he was highly involved in monitoring student progress:

> "I watch it all the time. I talk to teachers and they know that they can share concerns with me. I do read every report card in the school. I read all the evaluation results that come into the school. I check kids' exercise books when I tour the building and I talk to students to see how things are going. We have an extensive reading program and students' names are announced on the P.A." (D)

An interesting aspect of the discussion of student progress by teachers was their attitude towards the role of the administrator. Two teachers commenting on the principal's reading of report cards viewed the administrator's involvement in very different ways. One remarked:

> "He only reads report cards; he tells us that report cards are approaching and we should accumulate marks." (C)

Another teacher commented:

> "It is obvious that he reads all report cards; most teachers would discuss any concerns with the principal." (D)

Generally, teachers and principals differed in their perspectives of the administrator's involvement. It appeared that teachers did not always realize that administrators were actually

monitoring student progress when they performed certain acts, such as talking to students and teachers.

Student evaluation

The consensus of teacher participants was that principals had a negligible role in student evaluation. Several teachers described the role as minimal and referred to the monitoring of standardized tests as the main form of administrative involvement in student evaluation. Teachers generally believed that evaluation was entirely the domain of the teacher, although some mentioned that discussion with the principal about evaluation took place.

An experienced intermediate English teacher, who was very positive in all other aspects of the administrator's role in the school, believed that standardized testing was a directive from the district with no plan in place. She indicated that this approach was a result of the district's renewed emphasis on testing and accountability. An English teacher in the same school agreed:

> "He has very little to do with evaluation. I feel that he should be very strong in this area. He should be in the classroom more often because there are so many needs in the English program. French children are dropping into English all the time. If there is a behaviour problem, they are sent to English." (A)

A number of teachers described the principal's role in evaluation as supportive. One English teacher expressed the need to standardize evaluation in order for parents to receive a consistent message. Another stated that he would not approach the principal with evaluation questions as the administrator was not an expert in that area. Two teachers in the study believed that principals should play no part in evaluation, unless they are teaching and thus evaluating student performance.

One principal described his role in evaluation as consultative. Teachers and parents informed him of concerns and he secured necessary resources. The results of standardized tests were shared

with teachers. He commented that immersion students performed significantly better on standardized tests. The following quote expresses his concern for English track students:

> "English stream students are intimidated by their immersion colleagues. If there are any common contests in English, they feel that they can't win. One of the difficulties in a dual-track school is the need for English students to feel that they are special too. It is very easy for them not to feel special when particular cultural events are held for immersion students that they can't meaningfully participate in. We have dual-track concerts to tie the school together. We have attempted to compensate by doing some special things occasionally for English only as well. You have to be careful about not dividing the school. At the same time that you build bridges, you have to make each group feel special. There is an implication for immersion students transferring to English that, if you can't succeed in immersion, you can always go to English. That is a devastating implication. We can't be too careful." (B)

This principal stated that teachers were made cognizant of policy on student evaluation annually and that it was discussed and interpreted. Three teachers in his school believed that a policy existed but were unsure of its substance; the fourth teacher thought the policy was to restrict the retention of students. The principal commented that immersion francophone teachers were generally more traditional in their approach to student evaluation.

Principals seemed less clear about their role in evaluation than in other areas. One principal was candid:

> "I don't know if I have a role in student evaluation. What we do is look at assessment results for reading and science and discuss instructional implications. The results are recorded in the files and acted upon if necessary, but there is nothing formalized at the moment. My involvement is situational: report card time, placement meetings, revamping report cards. Evaluation is an upcoming theme in the district." (C)

The principal who appeared most certain of his role in evaluation stated:

> "We talk about criteria at the beginning of the year. We discuss the basis on which children are evaluated, making the distinction between primary and intermediate. We talk about being careful if you give a kid straight A's that he deserves it. A parent asks why his child got all A's last year and is getting C's this year. Staff evaluate why students perform poorly and try to set up programs to reflect that performance." (D)

Both teachers and principals were unable to clearly articulate a district or school policy on student evaluation. The fact that this area seemed particularly nebulous may be partially due to the substantive changes occurring in British Columbia at the time of this investigation.

Problems Associated with Teacher Supervision

One of the questions posed to all respondents concerned perceived problems related to teacher supervision. A summary of the results is presented below. The problem mentioned most frequently by both teachers and principals was time restraints. A few teachers referred specifically to the formidable amount of administrative time required by beginning teachers, primarily immersion teachers. One English teacher remarked:

> "He has to spend a lot of time with beginning French teachers. We have had so many just come for a year. Some of the teachers they have had to hire do not have any English. The principal even has to write their report cards. They are making our English kids illiterate in English. The accountability has definitely always been with the French parents. The English are left quite a bit on their own." (A)

One teacher summarized the feelings of the majority of respondents as follows:

> "I would approach him but he is so busy. There is so much coming down on him, more so with a dual-track school. He isn't able to get into the classrooms as often as he is supposed to." (A)

One principal believed the answer to the time barrier was to establish a mentor system and to promote interactive activities which highlight teacher sharing, observing and supporting each other. Another area of concern was related to the principal's authority and suspicion surrounding the teacher/principal relationship. An English intermediate teacher commented:

> "Supervision is supposed to be non-evaluative. I doubt that it's a non-evaluative judgment. They need to have faith in the teachers. Teacher supervision is based on cooperation and helping, not judging." (B)

He added that any hidden agenda of the administrator is stressful for teachers. Comments by another English intermediate teacher in a different school revealed suspicion as well:

> "I requested an evaluation from the previous principal, but he never got around to it. I felt that I was doing a particularly good job and I wanted it in my record in case I later encountered a principal who was not in favour of me." (D)

Several teachers mentioned that the demands on the principal resulted not only from the immersion teacher's lack of experience and poor English language skills, but also from cultural and attitudinal differences.

One teacher respondent foresaw possible problems with too stringent a process of supervision, with a lack of cooperation between teachers and administrators and with incompatible teacher/teacher and teacher/principal philosophies. Several participants noted stress and nervousness as factors in teacher supervision. A French immersion primary teacher believed the key to the issue of teacher supervision rested with having bilingual principals. Another urged principals to identify problems and act upon them, rather than "pretend everything is O.K." (C)

One immersion teacher candidly defined the difference between supervision of instruction and evaluation. Evaluation can be mandated; supervision cannot be implemented without the cooperation and willingness of teachers.

Problems as perceived by teachers

teachers' lack of comfort with the process

teacher unionization (equity of practices among principals)

comparison of schools

inconsistencies (number of visitations, length of reports)

amount of time required to supervise new immersion teachers

poor English language skills of immersion teachers

imbalance of English and immersion populations

evaluations based on too few visitations

time restrictions

stress caused by evaluation process

hidden agendas (of principals)

inconsistent philosophies of teachers and principals

shortage of bilingual principals

vagueness of curriculum

serious versus lax teachers (supervision essential for lax teachers)

dearth of teacher input into process

need for emphasis on open communication and problem identification

clash in personalities (overbearing principals cause poor teacher self-confidence and defensiveness)

inability of teachers to dissociate supervision and evaluation

principal's lack of curriculum expertise and knowledge of French resources

principal's apprehension of immersion program (avoids immersion classrooms)

Problems as perceived by principals

time restraints

unilingual English principals

teacher interpretation of harrassment (excessive number of visitations could cause teachers to become defensive)

Principals' Priorities - Beliefs of Teachers and Principals

At the end of each interview, the teacher respondent was asked which of the five categories he or she believed to be the priority of the principal. In many cases, the teacher offered a first and second priority. Similarly, the four principals was asked to state their priority among the five categories analyzed. Whenever there is more than one priority, they are listed in the order stated by the participant. In some cases, respondents either could not state a priority or reworded the categories. The responses are summarized below as offered by the participants themselves.

Teacher 1	Parental involvement Staff development and morale
Teacher 2	Unable to respond
Teacher 3	Supervision of instruction least priority
Teacher 4	School organization Parental involvement
Teacher 5	Staff development Staff collegiality
Teacher 6	Parental involvement French/English student relations
Teacher 7	School goals
Teacher 8	School organization Parental involvement
Teacher 9	Professional development Did not believe there was a second priority
Teacher 10	Staff development Parent/community relations
Teacher 11	Staff development Staff collegiality
Teacher 12	Staff development Priority is outside the school
Teacher 13	School organization Staff development
Teacher 14	Staff collegiality School organization
Teacher 15	Parental involvement Staff collegiality
Teacher 16	Could not respond as all categories interrelated. Last three categories (staff collegiality, school organization, parental involvement)

Principal 1	Supervision of instruction School climate, including community relations
Principal 2	Supervision of instruction
Principal 3	Supervision of instruction, including teaming Parental involvement
Principal 4	Staff and student relations/happiness Academic goals

It is interesting to note that three principals submitted supervision of instruction as their top priority, whereas not one teacher ranked this category as the principal's foremost concern in administering the organization. In fact, some teachers suggested that supervision of instruction seemed unimportant to the principal.

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

Below are the results of the coding process for all four schools in the two participating districts. Following each table of results is a brief interpretation of the findings. The data is then discussed in more detail under the eight categories: staff relations, social functions, integration of French and English students, integration of French and English teachers, principal sensitivity, risk-taking, staff involvement and principal involvement. The range of scores possible for teachers is -32 to +32; for principals, the total possible range is -7 to +7.

Table 5

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

District 1 School A		Teacher #1	#2	#3	#4	Principal
SR	Staff Relations	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
SF	Social Functions	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
IFES	Integration of French and English Students	+1	0	0	-1	+1
IFET	Integration of French and English Teachers	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1
PS	Principal Sensitivity	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
RT	Risk-taking	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SI	Staff Involvement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
PI	Principal Involvement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1

Teacher #1 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #2 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #3 English Intermediate
Teacher #4 English Primary

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = +15
Total English Teachers Score = +5
Total Primary Teachers Score = +8
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = +12
Total Teachers Score = +20
Principal Score = +7

Out of a possible total score of 3[illegible] the Total Teachers Score is +20. This would seem to indicate a fairly positive degree of co[illegible]giality in School A. The French immersion teachers rating is considerably more positive than that of the English teachers, which implies a perception of more congenial relations by the immersion teachers. It should be noted, however, that Teacher #4 is responsible for the majority of negative scores; English teacher #3 has only one negative rating. The intermediate teachers perceived the school setting in a slightly more positive light than the primary teachers. The principal was allocated a score of +7 out of a possible +8, the only category scored negatively being Principal Sensitivity. The author had minimal information on which to base the score but assigned a -1 for this code because of the principal's comments regarding French being spoken in the staffroom.

Table 6

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

District 1 School B		Teacher #5	#6	#7	#8	Principal
SR	Staff Relations	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
SF	Social Functions	0	0	0	+1	0
IFES	Integration of French and English Students	+1	+1	0	0	+1
IFET	Integration of French and English Teachers	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
PS	Principal Sensitivity	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
RT	Risk-taking	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SI	Staff Involvement	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
PI	Principal Involvement	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1

Teacher #5 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #6 English Primary
Teacher #7 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #8 English Intermediate

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = +13
Total English Teachers Score = +4
Total Primary Teachers Score = +13
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = +4
Total Teachers Score = +17
Principal Score = +7

While the Total Teachers Score was only slightly above half a possible score of 32, it should be noted that Teacher #8 was responsible for all negative scores. When the score of 0 for SF is also taken into account, the teachers score of +17 can be seen in a much more positive light. It is interesting to notice that, as occurred in School A, the Total French Immersion Teachers Score is considerably higher than the Total English Teachers Score, suggesting a more positive outlook on collegiality in the school by immersion teachers. In contrast to School A, primary teachers in School B rated collegiality substantially higher than did intermediate teachers. Principal #2 was scored +1 in all categories except SF for which he was assigned a score of 0 as he did not mention the importance of social events for teachers.

Table 7

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

District 2 School C		Teacher #9	#10	#11	#12	Principal
SR	Staff Relations	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
SF	Social Functions	0	0	-1	0	0
IFES	Integration of French and English Students	-1	0	0	-1	+1
IFET	Integration of French and English Teachers	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1
PS	Principal Sensitivity	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
RT	Risk-taking	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SI	Staff Involvement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
PI	Principal Involvement	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1

Teacher #9 English Intermediate
Teacher #10 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #11 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #12 English Primary

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = +3
Total English Teachers Score = -2
Total Primary Teachers Score = +1
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = 0
Total Teachers Score = +1
Principal Score = +5

Teachers' scores for collegiality in School C are considerably lower than those in Schools A, B and D. It is interesting to note the clustering of both positive and negative ratings. The categories of Staff Relations and Integration of French and English Teachers are scored negatively for all teachers, suggesting a poor climate in this organization. On the other hand, scores are positive in the areas of Principal Sensitivity, Risk-taking and Staff Involvement, indicating the presence of a supportive and encouraging principal who promotes teacher input. Immersion and English teachers' scores are low, with the English track teachers' rating being somewhat lower than that of their immersion colleagues. This finding is consistent with that in Schools A and B, although the differential is much greater in those two schools than in School C. There is no substantial difference between primary and intermediate ratings for collegiality. The only negative score for the principal is SR, a result of comments indicating an awareness of difficulties in this area in the school.

Table 8

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

District 2 School D		Teacher #13	#14	#15	#16	Principal
SR	Staff Relations	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SF	Social Functions	+1	0	0	0	0
IFES	Integration of French and English Students	+1	+1	0	0	+1
IFET	Integration of French and English Teachers	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
PS	Principal Sensitivity	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
RT	Risk-taking	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
SI	Staff Involvement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1
PI	Principal Involvement	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1

Teacher #13 English Primary
Teacher #14 French Immersion Intermediate
Teacher #15 French Immersion Primary
Teacher #16 English Intermediate

Total French Immersion Teachers Score = +13
Total English Teachers Score = +12
Total Primary Teachers Score = +14
Total Intermediate Teachers Score = +11
Total Teachers Score = +26
Principal Score = +7

School D has the highest Total Teachers Score of all four schools participating in this study. The four groups of teachers analyzed scored very positively, with no substantial differences among them. The only negative individual score allotted was that of PI for Teacher #16. The principal also received a positive rating for all codes except SF, as the topic was not mentioned. School D appears to be an organization where positive staff relations prevail.

Staff relations

All respondents in the study spent considerable time during the interview commenting on staff relations, demonstrating their acute awareness of the importance of this issue in dual-track schools. In three of the four schools, teacher and principal participants generally viewed staff relations as being good to excellent, with the principal a key player in developing and maintaining such relations. However, there was some variance as to the perceptions of English and immersion teachers, with English teachers being somewhat more critical of specific issues, such as the speaking of French in the staffroom. Principals were generally more positive about staff relations than teachers. In the fourth school, teachers expressed serious concerns about staff relations. Animosity between French immersion and English teachers was evident throughout the interviews. In addition to the more obvious differences of language, culture and programs, the factors of age, experience, smoking and attitudes were discussed. The principal in this school gave some indication of an awareness of these difficulties.

The issue of French being spoken in the staffroom was broached by every respondent. In schools with positive staff relations, most French immersion teachers were aware of the sensitivity of this language question. They commented that they often reverted to English in the staffroom because English teachers would be offended or would feel left out if French was spoken. Many mentioned that, while not wishing to appear impolite, they did enjoy the opportunity of speaking their native language together. One immersion teacher commented:

> "There are no bad feelings at all in this school. I felt it in other schools. The French staff refused to speak English even when they knew both languages. An English teacher left because she felt so left out of her own school. Here immersion teachers speak French all the time and you don't seem to offend the English. We feel comfortable. We are not forced to speak English. I think it is common sense and good manners to include other people. It doesn't mean that every time they walk in the door, you have to switch languages. Everyone seems to speak English; if they speak French, you don't get hurt feelings. Maybe over the years the English got used to it." (A)

An experienced English teacher in the same school who spoke French reasonably well attributed the positive school climate to the principal who recognized the autonomy of teachers. On the issue of French being spoken in the staffroom, she commented:

> "We experience a little difficulty. We do every year with a new group of immersion teachers and some narrow English program teachers who have no French language. There is always an issue as to whether or not French is spoken in the staffroom. That has caused some teachers to feel left out of situations. It was brought up quite early in the year; they found this to be rude and excluding to certain people. So the French staff agreed that, when they knew that a person didn't speak French, they would switch to English." (A)

She added that immersion teachers could continue to speak French if the conversation was professional in nature and if the English teachers had no desire to be included. She also emphasized the need of immersion teachers to converse in the French language, particularly if their first language was not French.

The other English teacher in this school had a very different perspective than her colleague. She began the interview with this comment:

> "It has taken quite a few years for the principal to realize that there has been a problem. I think that he has realized it but not accepted it. He thought that we English people would just come in and accept it very easily. But now we have realized that we are the minority and people are constantly speaking French and none of us really understand it at all. It is hard to go into the staffroom and there are twelve of them speaking French and you are the only English person. They whisper and it is rude. I leave and I have stressed that right in front of the whole staff. It is now addressed and they are working on it. All that we are told is that it is important for them to speak French to develop their language. English was never supposed to be less than 50/50 and now it is 40/60 and it is just going to get worse. I have been here five years and the first four were turmoil. We definitely do know that in English we are left on our own. These immersion people are meeting English-speaking parents and that is a concern, too. This year has been the best year; their effort has been great. It's a different group of people. A lot depends on the bilingualism of the teachers." (A)

A comment by an English teacher in another school reflects the opinions of her colleagues:

> "Relations are excellent. A few years ago the principal established a rule that you have to speak English in the staffroom. I think that it was the greatest rule because then we all understand what everybody is talking about. We are not separated in any way." (B)

An immersion teacher agreed:

> "Everyone makes an effort to be nice to everybody. If there are English teachers around, we make an effort to speak English. I would feel uncomfortable too if someone was talking away in a language that I didn't understand. It is very impolite." (B)

She added that speaking French is so automatic that sometimes immersion teachers did not realize that they were doing so.

One intermediate English teacher had a different perspective of staff relations than his peers:

> "Some people have a red-neck attitude. There are comments about French people when they are not present. They are strangers in a strange land. There is English only in the staffroom. They need the opportunity to speak French." (B)

He stressed the division between teachers and administrators since the removal by the government of administrators from the provincial teachers' federation. He agreed with this change:

> "There is a conflict between loyalties. Principals are more conservative than teachers. Administration is a non-progressive influence." (B)

There was a consensus in one school that staff relations were very strained. One English teacher expanded:

> "Over the last six years I've seen more of an isolation of staff. The English staff seem to sit at one end of the staffroom and the French at the other end. Immersion teachers speak French totally in the staffroom. We've discussed the issue. A smaller group of us said there's more of a division and it's noticeable to parents and visitors. We feel isolated. I'm not aware that anything has been done." (C)

She noted that the principal had suggested having the French coordinator discuss the problem with individuals but there had been no follow-up. She added:

> "The English staff don't want to hurt the feelings of the immersion staff. We've tried going to the principal but it hasn't worked so far." (C)

This teacher believed that teachers in the school in previous years, although less capable in English, had managed to communicate in the common language. The coordinator at that time had told immersion staff that English was expected in the staffroom.

An immersion teacher in the same school believed the conflict to be less serious:

> "The key is the individuals. There is tension, but it's not a serious problem. I don't think that the English fully understand what immersion teachers do about the curriculum. Common projects, such as conflict resolution, can create relief in tensions. As far as the talking of French in the staffroom, on top of the smoking issue, a two-camp situation has been created. The French don't smoke and they also speak French. The English smoke and they sit far away which has created a bigger gap than ever before." (C)

This teacher believed that the problem should be addressed at the beginning of the year to focus on an understanding of the two programs and to discuss strategies to unite teachers. He remarked:

> "It's important to do as much teamwork as you can, getting to know each other instead of letting it slip through. I think the French have a more cohesive idea of unity because we're not as large a group; we have a very good relationship with each other." (C)

His immersion colleague on staff identified the problems as smoking and a generation gap, with the English teachers being the older members of the staff. When asked about the language issue, he commented:

> "Immersion teachers always speak French. We have been told by other principals to speak more English. Very often the English teachers watch us. Some French feminists on staff wouldn't accept to speak English just because they are forced to do so. They are young, new teachers. The principal must not be glad to be in the middle of the two groups. I don't like to emphasize the division too much; it's not very bad. It improves and goes bad again. I know that in some schools there is so much division that the French staff were ordered to speak English. I don't think it's very acceptable to force people to speak another language." (C)

This teacher appreciated the assistance of the principal and English staff in learning English.

The primary English teacher on this staff discussed a previous division between primary and intermediate teachers which had dissipated. She noted that the staff committee was presently trying to resolve the smoking issue. She perceived the French/English division as the greatest challenge. This teacher discussed at length the issues which divided the two groups, particularly financial concerns. The English teachers, she believed, perceived the immersion teachers as wanting their own monies while they thought that finances should be placed in a common pool. She also described ways in which the English teachers had tried to be friendly with immersion teachers in

the staffroom, but without success. The principal had been approached for assistance, but to no avail.

The following comment by an experienced English teacher in the school where staff relations seemed most positive reflects the perspective of her peers:

> "I think most people are supportive of those around them. I'm really impressed with the way the English and French get along. When the English come into the staffroom, the French switch to English. People are good-natured and sensitive to the differences; they don't want us to feel excluded. There is a great deal of tolerance for differences of opinion." (D)

She explained that the principal had asked immersion teachers to speak English in the staffroom. It was a new experience for English teachers to be in the minority and she made an effort to keep in contact with immersion teachers at her grade level.

The other English teacher in the school believed that staff relations in the school had historically been positive, unlike many dual-track schools. He understood some French and enjoyed hearing it in the staffroom. He admitted that several English staff members worried because they did not understand French. The following comment is indicative of the good relations on staff:

> "Curiously, often a French teacher would bring up the question of language and offer to speak English. The English teachers would defend the immersion teachers right to speak French. Both parties are willing to do more, so it works out." (D)

An immersion teacher on this staff, who described teacher relations as congenial, had a somewhat different perspective of French being spoken in the staffroom. She commented:

> "French and English are spoken. We are encouraged to speak English only so that relations are more homogeneous, but we tend to get in a corner and speak French together. When we speak French too much, the English teachers or a French teacher will remind us at staff meetings that English in the staffroom is appreciated." (D)

Her more inexperienced immersion cohort was somewhat less sensitive to the issue of language. She remarked:

> "If I have something to say to a French teacher, I'll speak to that teacher in French. The English want to know what we're saying; they don't feel badly. We do it because we joke in French and it can't be translated." (D)

Two principals believed that staff relations were excellent and that they played a key role in promoting collegiality. One principal thought that teacher relationships were generally good, considering the size of the staff. Although the remaining principal also described the staff as collaborative and "very close", the following comment indicates some diversity of opinion on the question of staff relations in the school:

> "Immersion teachers speak French sometimes in the staffroom, in the hallways or in the office. That issue came up as part of our goals process. Some people are uncomfortable with that. I don't know if that is because they are just plain nosey and can't understand what's going on. We've talked about the need for people to speak in their own language. There's no intention of being rude and if they're uncomfortable with that, then it's their problem. I'm sure the feelings are still there, that the conversation is closed to them. Maybe it should be; maybe it's none of their business. It doesn't bother me." (A)

One principal described his role in the issue of French in the staffroom as follows:

> "I have asked, in the interest of courtesy, that bilingual staff members be aware that unilingual staff may feel very threatened if they are constantly surrounded in the staffroom by a language that they don't understand. So there is an unwritten rule of thumb that people will do the courteous thing. The bilingual staff has been very good about it. There are some good friendships between English and French staff." (B)

According to this principal, immersion teachers in the school had a reasonable degree of fluency in English.

The principal in the school where dissention between the two groups of teachers was most evident described his perception of staff relations as follows:

> "For such a large group, there's a high degree of bonding, teamwork and comradery. I promote all of us working shoulder to shoulder and, although you're an immersion teacher and your language of instruction is French, we are all teachers working together. I think realistically that language does matter. In this school, there's been a very peaceful, amicable relationship and there has been sharing and integrating activities. Speaking French in the staffroom has been commented upon from time to time. I have no strong bias one way or the other. I think that when

> the English teachers demonstrate that they are willing to speak some French in the staffroom, then the French teachers can be expected to speak English. In some instances, it makes sense that the immersion teachers do their business in French. I think politeness, consideration and sensitivity all have to come into play, but I don't think it's something that has to be designated by a rule. I like to think that we can have it all if we think more openly. If there are social or curriculum situations, English may be necessary. At this point in time, it isn't a major item where people are wanting to draw up a policy." (C)

A probe investigating this principal's views of the English teachers' perceptions on the language issue elicited this response:

> "They have not complained but sometimes they wonder why the immersion teachers are the way they are. Immersion teachers arrive earlier and drink coffee in the staffroom. When I enter they speak to me; it seems like a wonderful skill to be able to jump from one language to the other. Sometimes people say that they find this intimidating. I think that generally the staff members coexist peacefully and positively. Sometimes there are misunderstandings; when the young and the older generations discuss issues, they get irritated with each other. The English veteran has a certain territorial ownership of a program. Because the immersion teacher doesn't understand the nuances of the English language, there are some disagreements which need mediating. There is a potential for these kinds of tensions every single day if you are not understanding. Special care has to be taken, especially with teachers new to the school. I do as much as I can to help new teachers, but how much more meaningful it would be to answer questions in their first language." (C)

The following quote by a principal expresses the special sensitivity required in promoting staff collegiality in a dual-track school:

> "We work hard at maintaining a positive attitude between staff members in this school. I don't have a formula; I just make sure it happens. I'm very sensitive to people's needs. I think I'm very observant about body language. If I see people isolating themselves, I make every effort to encourage them to be part of the staff, to get into the staffroom at recess and lunch and to talk to their peers. When I go into the staffroom, I'm watching everyone. If you're not there, I give you a couple of days and then I ask you why you're not there. You'd better be able to tell me because I believe that it's extremely important that you mingle with your colleagues. If you don't feel comfortable with that, then you'd better take some other steps. Nobody feels isolated. We're also very sensitive about the language issue. We, as a staff, feel that English is the dominant language in the community and therefore it's the dominant language in the staffroom. We all work the same. I have one policy in the school; that is, this is one school and the only difference in the school is the language of instruction. All other things are equal. I have been very blunt in my sermons. I say if you're uncomfortable in a French immersion school, the transfer form is in the office. They don't go. They know how strongly I feel about it. I can't have that kind of friction." (D)

This principal remarked that immersion teachers who were having difficulty expressing themselves in English would revert to French; this did not pose a problem. When French was too pronounced in the staffroom, an immersion teacher would inevitably remind the staff to switch to English. He believed that, although the English teachers were somewhat uncomfortable when French in the staffroom was excessive, they supported the immersion teachers' desire to speak their native language.

Teachers were asked to comment on the strategies used by the principal in handling staff conflict. One English teacher replied:

> "He closes his door and makes it go away. We had one or two doozies. He tends to let them work it out; he doesn't want to jump in and fix it. He doesn't want teachers to think he's taking sides. As a teacher, I've done more fixing." (A)

The primary English teacher in this school concurred with her peer:

> "We are supposed to talk to the individual before we approach him. If nothing is working, we are to go to him, but he definitely prefers that the teachers work it out. He doesn't want to be involved and that's the best way. He mediates." (A)

An English intermediate teacher in another school commented:

> "He manages staff conflict by talking about people anonymously at staff meetings." (B)

A primary English teacher in another school described a similar approach by her principal to staff conflict:

> "He hopes it will go away. He hopes someone else will settle it." (C)

In response to the specific question on staff conflict, one principal stated:

> "Staff conflict is not necessarily a negative thing. Out of conflict comes growth and understanding. I don't tend to rescue people; they have to solve the conflict. If they want my assistance, then they ask me for it. If, however, it's becoming detrimental either to the kids or to staff morale, I'll ask them to sit down and talk about it. We have a unique school and a unique staff. I don't know if you're going to find that kind of collaboration and comfort in all immersion schools." (A)

Discussing potential sources of conflict, this principal stated:

> "English teachers sometimes feel like they're the poor sisters because there are a lot more extras for the immersion program, but it's a different program and there are different needs. Sometimes I think that the amount of money available to immersion and to school operations is inequitable. I wouldn't take anything away from immersion funding but I don't feel that the funds available for operating the school are adequate." (A)

The following quote by an administrator regarding the handling of staff conflict reflects the beliefs of teachers in his school:

> "I have described a process to staff members how staff conflict will be handled. Happily it is something I have not had to handle. If people have difficulty with each other, they are expected to first attempt to resolve it. Then I expect one or the other to draw it to my attention. Then I will mediate. We have never had to use this process." (B)

One principal believed that some personnel conflicts were resolved through open discussion. Others were mediated by himself. Several conflict situations had been referred to staff committee. Another principal claimed that the minimization of staff conflict was one of his personal strengths and there had been no conflict on staff since his arrival.

Social functions

This category developed from the responses of the respondents; a specific question on participation in social functions was not posed in the interview. One principal believed that social events played an important role in staff collegiality. He commented:

> "We're a very close staff. We get together socially to ski, to sail, to camp and occasionally to go to dances. There are various levels of participation and that is fine." (A)

He perceived no differences in the participation levels of immersion and English teachers.

An immersion teacher corroborated the principal's belief:

> "There is a close feeling amongst the staff. We have an awful lot of parties. Even after school, just putting on coffee and anyone walking in. There is a lot more talking in this school; there is a feeling of camaraderie. The principal plays the biggest role in that. He is the one who instigates all this action." (A)

Her immersion cohort described the principal as a very social person who encouraged involvement by all staff in social functions.

An English teacher on staff perceived the social initiatives of the principal differently:

> "Unfortunately, he is very much of a socialite in the school and there could be a conflict. We have a lot of social activities together, which is fine. But I am a person who believes that there is your own personal life and then there is work; I don't believe in mixing the two together. He is very much the other way and, if there is a problem on staff, you don't want to be talking about his closest friend." (A)

In another school, a year-end party and volleyball games were given as social events which brought staff members together. One principal stated that a committee was responsible for spearheading social events for staff. An English teacher in yet another school mentioned that staff of both tracks enjoyed socializing and going on field trips together.

Integration of French immersion and English students

This category also arose from the interviews of participants, thus accounting for the number of 0 scores in the tables. Integration of French and English students appears to be an extremely important aspect of the climate of a dual-track school and merits further study on its own. In this study, principals mentioned the mixing of immersion and English classrooms in the building as an integration strategy. Various events, such as field trips, were noted as a means of integrating students in the two tracks. One teacher stated that English and French Christmas concerts were held in alternating years, with both tracks participating in these performances.

An immersion teacher believed that concerts and the grade 7 exchange trip to Quebec were joint activities that promoted integration. The principal had encouraged the English class to participate in the Quebec excursion. Her English colleague had a different perspective on concerts:

> "We used to have concerts which were half English and half French. The English kids didn't understand the French and the immersion kids understood it all. The English kids started to say things about the French children. They were calling the immersion kids "frogs". They didn't want to go to the concerts; I think that they felt badly. They didn't feel they were as smart as the immersion kids. That is why we made it one of our goals (multiculturalism)." (B)

This teacher mentioned that immersion students did have the opportunity to speak French at assemblies. English students no longer attended bilingual concerts. Classes were encouraged to work together, interpersonal skills and respect being the focus of a multicultural theme.

An English teacher expressed her concern for the students as follows:

> "I find the staff divisive and we see the children divided around the playground, as well. We've tried to establish some cooperative games, where students are in small grade groups so they can get to know each other at their own grade level." (C)

She believed that many more such opportunities were needed. Her English colleague was planning to suggest a class buddying system to the principal to promote integration of teachers and students.

One principal described his deliberate attempt at integration as follows:

> "I group the classrooms according to age or grade level. I don't want to have a French or an English wing. So we mix not only the staff, we mix the kids. They're all hanging up their coats together. That's a definite plan; we've done that as a staff. We've done some buddying, particularly with the senior grades. For example, an immersion and English class have buddied to go to Victoria. It's informal; some people really don't care to work together. I don't think you can do anything to force this on staff." (A)

Another administrator stated a similar approach to integration of students:

> "Classes are mixed throughout the school, a very conscious decision. I feel that it is extremely important in a dual-track school to build every bridge you can between the programs and the personnel." (B)

An approach by one principal was to mix French and English primary classes in order to facilitate integration; intermediate classrooms were organized similarly.

Integration of French immersion and English teachers

Teachers were asked to identify the strategies the principal used to promote staff collaboration. While some teachers were not able to respond, the majority were able to offer several strategies. A few teachers stated that the administrator had no strategies to develop collegiality. Principals, on the other hand, were easily able to explain the ways they affected staff relations. The integration of teachers and students through classroom assignment was mentioned in the preceding section.

An immersion teacher explained a subtle collaborative strategy by the administrator as follows:

> "We have a theme going on in the school right now. We have a committee and the members have partnered with one or two staff members. It was his idea, but he never came out and said it. He is a good administrator." (A)

The principal facilitated the discussion of professional issues at staff meetings; teachers also discussed professional ideas informally in a social context. This teacher was pleased that immersion and English teachers discussed issues together, unlike other schools. The emphasis, she added, was on socializing rather than on professional development.

An experienced English teacher on this staff mentioned, as did several other teachers in the study, that the French as a second language program resulted in consultation between both groups of teachers. This teacher had enough French language skills to teach the program, whereas in some schools immersion teachers taught the second language program. She reported that the principal used a variety of strategies "which were partially but not formally manipulated to get people on board" (A). One approach was to ask enthusiastic teachers to collaborate with their peers in areas such as schoolwide themes. She believed that this strategy improved school spirit and encouraged isolated teachers to think more collaboratively. Committees with representatives

from both programs provided an opportunity for joint collaboration in three schools. In the fourth school, the staff operated as a committee of the whole.

An English intermediate teacher commented:

> "Collaboration doesn't come from the principal. In fact, it's happened in spite of the principal in some cases, not with this particular principal. This principal probably has some strategies, but I don't know what they are. He's much more skillful than that." (D)

An English teacher in one school was critical of the principal's failure to intervene in staff relations:

> "There haven't been adequate strategies, if any. Even the concerns which we expressed were not addressed. If they were acknowledged,we didn't get feedback. There are definitely things which should be done. There are perceptions of certain teachers concerning fairness. The principal should be aware of what one group gets and the other doesn't and explanations should be given. For example, the immersion teachers have filing cabinets and the English teachers don't. Immersion teachers even had their own laminating machine exclusively for them. These special privileges cause dissention on staff. I would also be concerned about the way parents perceive it. The grade seven immersion students have an exchange trip to Quebec; if I was the principal, I would see that the English pupils have a special event to work towards. There are many things arranged at the district level for immersion students, such as a public speaking contest. Of course, the French teachers probably feel the opposite, that the English have more opportunities. I wouldn't say that the principal has been unfair; I'm not sure that these are decisions made by the principal. Immersion teachers are perhaps held more accountable so English teachers should maybe count their blessings that they're left alone." (C)

This teacher perceived professional issues to be discussed separately by the two groups of teachers as a result of a lack of dialogue between them. The principal in this school believed that immersion teachers, who were more animated and spontaneous, worked very well as a unit. According to this administrator, the least cohesive group was that of the English intermediate teachers. Cooperative planning and encouragement of the efficient use of time were strategies used by this principal to promote staff collaboration.

Participants were asked if immersion and English teachers assisted each other with French and English language skills. One immersion teacher attributed his improved English to the assistance

of English teachers. Several English teachers mentioned helping immersion teachers with report cards, although the principal played the key role in this area. One teacher approached immersion teachers for support in the teaching of French as a second language. The majority of teachers claimed that interaction concerning language learning was unnecessary. One English teacher commented critically:

> "English teachers definitely help the French teachers with their English. They expect us to provide our materials. We have had to share readers with them. We have now decided that our materials are English and they have to purchase French materials." (A)

All respondents were questioned about the principal's role in facilitating staff development and professional dialogue. In the school which was perceived by teachers to have a social orientation, one experienced English teacher believed professional development to be disorganized and unfocused. She remarked:

> "We have had so many goals that we haven't achieved any of them. A writing school is something that you build over a period of years and you have a school philosophy that you aspire towards. When the staff turns over, you hire people who buy into the process." (A)

Immersion and English teachers discussed professional issues separately, except at staff meetings, since materials and programs differed. A typical response in this study was that issues related to language or programs were examined separately and other professional issues jointly.

An English teacher in the same school commented:

> " He usually ends up initiating something. There is a problem once a year when the French have a conference. There is no money for the English; we basically have to find something to do for a day. This year we had to stay at school and play with art ideas. I feel that the staff development is very individual in some respects; we all go off to our own workshops. I do not appreciate our staff development days together, especially when there are English and French activities; this is supposed to be school-based. He is finally starting to realize that if they can spend money, then we can spend some money on that day." (A)

The following comment further indicates this same teacher's confusion between staff and professional development:

> "He is very pro staff development. He wants us well informed and going to workshops. He is very good for providing substitutes and money from the school." (A)

This confusion is typical of a number of teachers in the study.

In another school, an English teacher believed that the principal facilitated dialogue through program and staff meetings, school-based workshops and monthly sharing meetings where teachers were obligated to present infomation from in-service sessions. The establishment of schoolwide goals was mentioned by a teacher in one school as a means to unifying staff and students.

An immersion teacher defined her principal's role in staff development as follows:

> "It's not laying something on us that the staff doesn't want. It's more curiosity, interest, and giving his opinion. It's encouraging by sharing information." (C)

The principal described his role in professional development as a facilitator and participant. He explained school policy as follows:

> "For school-based activities, the whole staff is expected to participate. It isn't a problem; teachers generally like the togetherness, as far as I know. The staff development program has to have something for everyone; it can't exclude a group, such as kindergarten teachers. It's been a fairly strong program since I've been here. There are separate programs at times, such as the teachers' association conference and the immersion conference, which is the highlight of the year for French teachers. There is also a variety of district-based in-service for both tracks. Immersion teachers are often selected to serve in staff development capacities at the district level because of their specialities. It is more unifying at the school level; the staff has said for years that it values the team approach." (C)

Once again, the terms professional and staff development do not appear to be clearly defined.

At a school where teachers described staff collegiality as excellent, one English staff member commented on staff development:

> "At the end of the year there are a lot of things just for them." (D)

She believed school-based staff development to be flexible and accommodating of individual needs. The principal's role was to encourage participation in staff development by asking for teacher input and by advocating teacher expertise.

All respondents were asked to identify strategies used by the principal to attain staff consensus on professional issues. Strategies mentioned were extensive discussion, voting, consensus building, the acceptance of individual differences, priorizing and the principal's diplomacy. One teacher mentioned that the principal wrote letters to teachers to determine their opinions. She found voting, a strategy used on her staff, uncomfortable.

One English teacher commented:

> "Separating the two programs for professional development is one way (to attain consensus) because we felt very strongly about what we wanted to do in the English program. We felt that the English program children were feeling almost like second rate citizens. So we decided that we would focus on building their self-esteem. He will break us into groups to discuss topics (separately) and then we share ideas with the whole group." (B)

An immersion teacher replied:

> "Oh, yes, the French stream gets more of this or that, but he makes sure that the English do, too." (B)

She gave the example of the principal's insistence that the English grade seven class participate in the Quebec exchange program.

Consensus building by administrators is discussed further in the section on staff involvement.

Principal sensitivity

The large majority of teachers believed that their principal was sensitive to individual differences and exhibited fairness and equality in decision-making. Few teachers gave specific examples of their principal's sensitivity in these areas; probes were generally not used to

investigate this issue. The fact that these questions were asked directly of teachers may largely account for the positive response. Several teachers commented on the administrator's ability to include all staff members in discussions and adeptness at staff collaboration. One teacher remarked that his principal was an expert in staff relations. Another stated that the principal never put teachers in a position "where their pet project would be open to criticism."

One English teacher remarked:

> "Honestly, it is definitely more pro-French. Things can be touchy. For example, there are more cultural events for the French and we are never invited. It has to be equal." (A)

A male English teacher in another school commented:

> "I've heard he favours male staff members; he has been fair with me." (B)

In another school, an immersion teacher stated:

> "He is great with personal relationships. I believe that he does foster harmonious relationships because we did have some problems last year. It is very uncomfortable for him when things are not going well. He is a very diplomatic person so he will usually help us to work our problems out." (B)

An English teacher remarked:

> "I think that he realizes that the differences are there but I don't see that anything has been done to alleviate the difficulties. Anything that has been effective has come through the staff committee. But then there were personal problems when the staff committee sent an individual to intervene." (C)

Despite this comment, this teacher was scored positively because of other remarks describing the principal's awareness of individual differences, equity in decision-making and assistance to teachers.

An immersion teacher in the same school commented:

> "Oh yes, he's sensitive to individual differences. Of course, he would like everyone to be at peace. I know there was a big fight recently. It was a conflict of

generation more than French and English. He reprimanded the young teacher who was much too aggressive." (C)

An English teacher in this school stated:

"I sense that the principal projects a feeling of more confidence to me than to some of my colleagues; in a sense, that's unfair. It is a very lonely position. I don't really get more privileges. I feel there are favoured teachers; I know which teachers the principal has a better opinion of." (C)

An English intermediate staff member remarked:

"He definitely tries to be as fair as possible. In fact, so do the French teachers; they insist upon sharing any perceived advantages." (D)

Three out of four administrators were scored positively for this category. They were rated for sensitivity based on their overall comments about staff issues and teacher differences; they were not questioned about their sensitivity. One principal was scored negatively as a result of his comments on French being spoken in the staffroom. His remarks were interpreted as reflecting a lack of sensitivity to the concerns of English staff members.

Principals were scored positively based on issues related to equity in funding, French spoken in the staffroom, awareness of individual needs in professional development and staff and student relations.

Risk-taking

All teacher and principal respondents were scored positively in this category. Teachers commented that their administrators encouraged risk-taking by supporting the implementation of new ideas in the classroom. One teacher noted that the principal allowed teachers to solve their own problems.

One immersion teacher responded to the query on risk-taking as follows:

> "He is always encouraging us to reach for goals. Try it and see, he says. He is very much into pushing us a little bit harder. A friendly type, certainly not a command from on high." (A)

An English teacher in the same school, who was critical in most other areas, replied that the principal was "great", that he told teachers not to worry about the blunders. Another English teacher mentioned that her principal encouraged attendance at in-service and was interested in new teaching strategies. Risk-taking was perceived by one teacher to be encouraged at staff meetings through open discussion.

A French immersion teacher in one school was scored positively for mentioning the principal's full support of the implementation of a new ungraded program in the school. Her immersion colleague remarked:

> "He supports new ideas. He lets you do anything you want as long as it's within the limits of what has to be done." (C)

An English teacher in the same school remarked that the principal encouraged staff development by acknowledging and supporting anything attempted by the staff. She commented:

> "He pretty much leaves it up to you and doesn't oversee every little thing you do. He is extremely responsive to staff ideas and opinions, sometimes too much so. Picturing myself in charge, I think I'd have to check the steps along the way a liitle more. He's very accommodating, unless something is really off the wall." (C)

An intermediate English teacher in another school praised his principal for encouraging ideas even when they were theoretically against policy.

Principals were not asked directly if they supported risk-taking; rather they were rated on their general responses. All were scored positively due to their support of teachers in implementation of new ideas and encouragement in professional development.

Staff involvement

All respondents were asked to describe the process used in developing school policies and in solving school problems. This question was preconceived to elicit information on staff involvement in decision-making. In fact, the issue of staff involvement was pervasive throughout the interviews. All respondents, with the exception of one teacher, were scored +1 in this category. A negative rating was assigned to this teacher due to his very critical remarks about school and district administration.

In one school, the primary immersion teacher believed that the staff played an extensive role in the development of school policies and in the solving of school problems. The majority ruled in the decision-making process. She perceived the immersion teachers to be somewhat more vocal as they outnumbered the English staff. Her immersion colleague agreed:

> "From what I see at staff meetings, it really is a consensus. There are no rules coming from up high. At my other school we had our little meetings and we'd all agree on something; then he would change it." (A)

However, this teacher perceived the English teachers as more vocal and more involved in organizing school events. She added later:

> "Staff development really is a staff thing. It is all of us talking about it. It is not imposed." (A)

This teacher, like several others in another school, felt that teachers perhaps had too much input into some decisions.

The intermediate English teacher in the same school commented:

> "There is a fine line where staff does or doesn't have input. He asks for lots wherever possible. If he is accountable, he may ask for input but he will make the decision. Some militant teachers feel this is bureaucratic, but his head is on the line. Many times the staff has gone against what he wanted to do and he has gone with it." (A)

This teacher, like several others in the study, believed that teacher input was not based on French or English but rather on personalities. She criticized the excessive input teachers had in staff development:

> "Based on what I know about implementation, he gives us too much leeway. He likes to have us actively involved in staff development and that is good. We have a consensus model. But staff development has taken place in such a hodge-podge manner. District and school staff development don't necessarily complement each other. There hasn't been pressure on the teachers by the principal to follow through on staff development and to evaluate its implementation. It is not because he is a poor principal but rather he doesn't have the knowledge to do it. In giving teachers autonomy, he hasn't pushed hard enough to force them into achieving school goals through staff development. I hope this weakness will be addressed this year because we have a very strong leader at the district level who is requiring principals to be accountable for their school goals." (A)

In another school, staff development and goal attainment were the foci of monthly staff meetings. The intermediate immersion teacher in this school believed that staff development was administration-directed with the principal presenting most suggestions and the teachers setting priorities. An English staff member agreed that decisions were often made by the principal:

> "We discuss the question during staff meetings. That does not mean that we make the decision. He will listen and then sometimes he will make the decision." (B)

She believed that no group dominated the decision-making process; there were strong personalities on both sides. She commented that class lists had previously been devised by the principal with no staff input but were now determined by teachers. According to this teacher, the principal had revised his leadership approach, giving teachers more input. There was equity in decision-making by teachers as a result of the 50-50 French/English balance.

The primary immersion teacher in the same school reported the principal's emphasis on goals in decision-making:

> "There is never a staff meeting where goals are overlooked. He asks us about three times a year what our goals are and we write them down. We both keep a record and we check periodically if these goals are being followed. We also set personal goals; he does not influence us in that. He encourages and supports us so we can't ask for more. I like to see the school functioning smoothly and I have piece of mind if goals are being fulfilled." (B)

She mentioned that some staff complained about the time spent on goal-setting at staff meetings. The principal distributed a form monthly seeking teachers' opinions on school issues. She believed that the principal played an important role in fostering consensus about staff development:

> "You volunteer to do the areas that you enjoy the most; it always seems to work out. He makes sure that everyone is involved; there is someone for every area. He is very diplomatic; he knows how to handle people. We are always encouraged to bring up ideas. He doesn't force anything on anyone." (B)

The intermediate English teacher in this school received a negative score due to comments such as the following:

> "Staff development is very top-down. Everything is changing because of the new contract so it's hard to say. We had someone do cooperative learning after school. It was terrible and we had to endure it. The principal is giving his friends work at the board office." (B)

He believed the role of the principal should be to act as a contact person and inform teachers of available in-service. Asked to comment on his feelings about staff development, he replied:

> "There is a big push in the district, maybe by the government. This is good but how is it tied to the evaluation of students. Teachers are evaluated every year; there is a double standard. In the district they talk about teacher empowerment but the superintendent says to be accountable. I can't argue with that but they should be more trusting." (B)

In one school, staff development was organized by the professional development and staff committees and presented to teachers for approval. One English teacher commented that, while goals were developed by staff and administration, there was a lack of common direction. She remarked:

> "We do not seem to have a common objective. There are too many things happening and there is an overlap. People go off to workshops and return enthusiastic, but there is no common goal." (C)

Her English colleague found all the decision-making exhausting. She believed that the English teachers rendered more input into the decision-making process since the inexperienced immersion teachers were "almost immigrants coming into the province". She commented:

> "They're struggling just dealing with their own class and are often not into school-wide activities. We have thousands of committees. Immersion teachers will not always sit on a committee. But when they want something, they'll make sure that they come to the meeting and try to get it only for French immersion." (C)

Responding to the involvement of teachers in staff development, this teacher stated:

> "It's stimulating but the instructional level has to suffer. You're doing two jobs and this has worn out some of my colleagues. Discipline gets away from you a little bit. It's harder to coordinate things schoolwide when many people are out of the school at the same time. The principal is out of the building so much because he values professional development for himself, as well as for the staff. He sees it as a way of growing professionally and of helping the school. I think it has to be done with a balance. Our first job is in the classroom and in the school." (C)

An immersion teacher in the school shared this perspective on the principal:

> "I think he's a person who really does not want to make the final decisions and therefore it sometimes takes longer to reach consensus. I can imagine another principal being firmer, saying we would like to see a certain situation and asking teachers if they could live with it. He is not without decision-making but he likes to leave it with the staff." (C)

According to this teacher, a formal process of voting involving motions and amendments was used to arrive at consensus, as well as referral to sub-committees when the process was too time-consuming. She declared:

> "Motivated staff members are committed to a common philosophy, but we have a few individuals on staff who are less motivated and that's where the ideal becomes reality. We all know that we have to do extra committee work in immersion." (C)

The intermediate immersion teacher on this staff believed the principal to be democratic, with committees making the majority of decisions. He perceived English teachers to be more involved in decision-making, being a larger group. He commented that the younger French teachers were always prepared to revolt against the ideas of the older, English staff members. The following comment indicates some dissatisfaction with decision-making in the school:

> "We decide everything. I know that some teachers, especially the European ones, don't like this. They would like more force and order, more decisions imposed by the principal, especially when they agree with those decisions. I don't mind the democratic approach; that's the North American way. Personally, I prefer that the principal order the people to obey but I know it's not accepted here. If you give too much input to the base, nothing is going to be decided." (C)

Asked about the principal's role in developing consensus, one experienced English teacher responded:

> "He tends to show clearly both sides of the issue. I also sense that, in summarizing things to help us reach a decision, you always know what he feels is the right thing, without him actually saying it. I suppose his opinion runs through the discussion and so it might influence us. We have total input. We are a committee of the whole." (D)

Asked which group of teachers offered more input, she replied:

> "It's surprisingly balanced. There are slightly more French teachers on staff and they certainly vocalize what they want to do. They are also very willing to listen to the English input." (D)

Her three colleagues agreed that staff input was encouraged and relatively balanced between both groups of teachers.

Administrators believed that school policies were developed and problems were solved collaboratively. One principal stated that issues were often mundane, such as the ringing of bells, and were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached. He commented further:

> "We do not vote. Voting creates winners and losers. So not everybody is happy but usually people go along with the decision. If they can't, they go away and sulk for a while." (A)

He stated that the English teachers had been in the school considerably longer than the immersion teachers and had formulated many of the policies. Since there was not a demand for change, these policies stood. This administrator concurred with teachers that staff development had previously been a "shotgun approach" but now had direction. He added:

> "You can't take something from the top and shove it down their throats. Involvement and ownership, the big word-teacher empowerment." (A)

One principal described his role in attaining consensus as follows:

> "I do a lot of listening. I let the vice-principal run most staff meetings so that I can watch people's faces. If things are not going the way they should or are getting side-tracked, then I will make a couple of comments to shake people up. I ask people questions and I exercise the right to jump in." (D)

He mentioned that he initiated staff development topics, reflecting his goals for the school. He believed that staff felt ownership of policies and problems as a result of their input. This administrator commented on the difficulty in organizing staff development, as the school was basically two small schools in one:

> "With the French and English components, it's really hard to come up with a common basis on which to build professional development activities. I send teachers to all kinds of workshops; when they return to the school, they share. I will either supervise their class or find money for substitutes. It's really hard with only five instructional days and three taken up by conferences and school organization and planning." (D)

Another administrator explained that policies were reviewed annually and were developed by consensus. He added:

> "Wherever this is not possible, we go with the majority and expect that those who may not be supportive will buy into it. There has never been active sabotage." (B)

A variety of strategies were used by this principal to develop consensus, including brainstorming, priorizing and moving from small to large group discussion in order to include everyone in the process. Both groups of teachers were perceived as contributing equitably to decision-making. This principal believed that teachers perceived goal-setting to be instrinsic to staff development.

Principal involvement

The concept of principal involvement is embedded in the responses of all respondents throughout the interview. Principals were scored positively if they were perceived by teachers to be instrumental in maintaining collegial relations in the school. Also considered was the principal's participation in staff development and in committee work. Minor consideration was given to the principal's role in solving personnel conflicts, in securing resources and in promoting staff social events. Teachers who repeatedly commented on the principal's absence from the school or who spoke critically of the administrator's involvement in the school were scored negatively.

The principal's role in staff collegiality was discussed thoroughly in Staff Relations and Integration of French and English Teachers and will not be analyzed in this section.

The majority of teachers perceived the principal to be interested in staff development and to be an integral part of its implementation, even though several were critical of the program's lack of direction and piecemeal structure. One teacher commented that the administrator should not be a member of the professional development committee, as it controlled the funding for professional activities. She stated:

> "The pro-D committee doesn't need him. They are there for controlling pro-D funds. He should be on the staff development committee as that directly concerns him." (A)

This teacher believed, like many other teachers in the study, that the principal's role in staff development was to be supportive, to oversee and to help set a positive tone in the school. His role was also to promote sharing of educational experiences and strategies at staff meetings and informally.

An immersion teacher in the same school commented on her dismay upon learning from a colleague about the new math curriculum. She offered this experience as an example of the absence of staff development in the school. Asked what the principal's role should be, she remarked:

> "He should be the guiding hand. Because he is evaluating everybody, he should be aware of what has to be done more than any of us. I really appreciate the fact that it is his decision what has to be done, but it is discussed with us. Whether we go along with it is really up to us." (A)

An immersion teacher in another school, when asked to describe the principal's role in staff development, concurred:

> "He is our leader. His role is very, very important. Without him at the head, pushing to have things done well, nothing might get done." (B)

In another school, an English teacher was critical of the principal's role in decision-making:

> "The principal holds an honorary position on the staff committee. The committee is taking the lid off a lot of explosive situations and diffusing them. Sometimes we have a feeling of helplessness in that we take information to the principal and nothing is acted upon. That's not deliberate but issues get shoved aside. Sometimes it's little things like the principal being on the P.A. twenty times a day. He is very responsive to our concerns. We are looking for more decision-making because you can't take every little issue and have it talked over. We need a definite structure; decisions ultimately have to be made at the administrative level. We felt that the principal shied away from decisions in a tough spot and threw it back to staff. It wasn't solved and it got ridiculous as people even said to put names in a hat to decide. We're certainly overwelmed by the weight of it all." (C)

Many teachers in the study were unsure of the principal's membership on school committees. Several believed that the administrator was involved in one or two committees but were not certain. In one school there were no standing committees due to a contractual issue; in another, decisions were made by a committee of the whole. The following comment by an English teacher is atypical:

> "He loves his meetings and likes to know what's going on." (A)

The following quote is indicative of a negative rating in principal involvement:

> "I'm not sure if the principal sits on any committees. You'll have to ask him. I don't see him that much." (B)

Several teachers commented on their appreciation of release time provided by the principal. One teacher stated that the principal facilitated professional sharing by "freeing teachers". She believed this procees helped administrators "to keep in touch with what kids are actually doing and what teachers are up against." (B)

An immersion teacher expressed her gratitude for her principal's approach to staff conflict. She commented:

> "He gives people the opportunity to talk to him." (C)

An English peer acknowledged the principal's encouragement in staff development, which was demonstrated through discussion and provision of information on in-service. An intermediate staff

member in the same school criticized both teachers and the principal for attending so many workshops, thus being out of the school excessively.

One immersion teacher described the principal's role in staff development as "keeping everyone on track" (D), ensuring that goals are set for the year and locating resource people. Her inexperienced colleague responded to the question as follows:

> "He's always concerned about what's happening. He always participates. He encourages you just by his presence. He's always asking if you understand and telling me to see him if I don't." (D)

This teacher believed that the principal was too busy to sit on committees.

Criticism of central office was expressed by this respondent:

> "The principals, including ours, are out of the school most of the time, serving on this committee and that committee. I feel that he should be in the school. The management team is misdirected on this subject. What happens in the schools is quite secondary to central office personnel. I'm sure they don't intend it to be that way, but that's the way it seems to come down. I don't think staff development is very effective. I don't blame the principal; it's the system." (D)

Asked to expand on the principal's role in staff development, he continued:

> "Right now his role is to make it look like something is happening, in order to meet the demands of the school board. There isn't enough time and a lot of this stuff is ineffective. The principal's role should be to get more professional development time, maybe the last two weeks of the year." (D)

Questioned about his role in staff development, this principal responded:

> "I perceive my role as ensuring that people are aware of the information, of encouraging them to grow professionally, of recognizing that growth is a never-ending process, and of assisting the professional development committee in every way possible to make sure that people have professional growth opportunities." (B)

Securing resources was mentioned as another aspect of his role. Asked to comment on teachers' perceptions of his role, he remarked:

> "I think they see me as a facilitator and coordinator, a helper. I think that they expect me to lead certain sessions and occasionally to stimulate their professional growth with some of my own ideas." (B)

One administrator described teachers' perceptions of the staff development program as follows:

> "I think some teachers feel that I am too involved in staff development, that we do too much in the school, that I'm out of the school too much. Other teachers feel that it's great that they have these opportunities to do things as a group and as individuals. It's fascinating how they come together: the old and the young, the primary and the intermediate, the French and the English." (C)

The following quote describes one administrator's perception of his role in staff development:

> "I sit back and push, provide the opportunity and provide information. I make myself available. Sometimes I'm out of the school too often; that's one criticism that you will hear and it's true. Just being an administrator in a French immersion school, there are so many demands on your time." (D)

BILINGUALISM OF THE PRINCIPAL

There is scant and conflicting evidence in the literature on the significance of the bilingualism of the principal of a dual-track school. The author, therefore, decided to investigate this issue by asking both teachers and principals their views on the importance of the administrator's level of French language skills. Each principal was asked to rate his or her degree of bilingualism on the preliminary questionnaire which was sent to participants prior to the interview. The five choices were: not at all, a little, reasonably well, very well and fluently. Teachers were also asked in the preliminary questionnaire to self-rate their French language skills, as well as those of their principal, using the same scale as that of the principals. The responses of all participants are presented below.

In addition, all respondents in the study were asked at the end of each of the five categories of interview questions what effect, if any, the bilingualism of the principal had on the category in question. The five sections were: supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality,

school organization for instruction and parental involvement. The results of teacher and principal responses to this question are presented below. To simplify the description, codes were used for the five categories. They are: SI (supervision of instruction), ST (staff development), SC (staff collegiality), SOI (school organization for instruction) and PI (parental involvement). The teaching positions have also been codified as follows: EP (English primary), EI (English intermediate), FP (French immersion primary) and FI (French immersion intermediate).

Teachers' self-ratings of French speaking and comprehension skills and teacher ratings of principal's degree of bilingualism

Teacher 1 (FP)	Speaks "very well". Understands "very well". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "reasonably well".
Teacher 2 (FI)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "reasonably well".
Teacher 3 (EI)	Speaks "reasonably well". Understands "very well". Principal speaks "very well". Principal understands "very well".
Teacher 4 (EP)	Speaks "not at all". Understands "not at all". Principal speaks "very well". Principal understands "very well".
Teacher 5 (FI)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 6 (EP)	Speaks "not at all". Understands "not at all". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 7 (FP)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "very well". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".

Teacher 8 (EI)	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 9 (EI)	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little '.
Teacher 10 (FP)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "reasonably well".
Teacher 11 (FI)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "not at all". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 12 (EP)	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 13 (EP)	Speaks "not at all". Understands "a little". Principal speaks "not at all". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 14 (FI)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "a little". Principal understands "a little".
Teacher 15 (FP)	Speaks "fluently". Understands "fluently". Principal speaks "not at all". Principal understands "not at all".
Teacher 16 (EI)	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little". Principal speaks "not at all". Principal understands "not at all".
Principal 1	Speaks "reasonably well". Understands "reasonably well".
Principal 2	Speaks "reasonably well". Understands "reasonably well".

Principal 3	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little".
Principal 4	Speaks "a little". Understands "a little".

It should be noted that several participants indicated that their French language skills were somewhere between two categories. Principal #2 rated both speaking and comprehension skills between "a little" and "reasonably well". Principal #3 rated her comprehension between "a little" and "reasonably well". Teacher #2 scored her principal's speaking skills between "a little" and "reasonably well". Teacher #12 rated her speaking and comprehension skills between "not at all" and "a little". The author used her best judgment from the notations on the written questionnaire form to determine the most appropriate rating.

Effect of the principals' French language skills on five categories as perceived by teachers

Teacher 1: (FP)	SI	No effect. Principal can ascertain classroom tone, task orientation of students, types of activities and discipline.
	ST	Principal must be aware of differences in English/French curriculum and be especially sensitive to lack of French materials.
	SC	Principal's effort is very positive.
	SOI	No effect. Principal takes an interest and tries hard. He is involved in both programs.
	PI	No effect. Both groups of parents have their own personalities. The administrator has good people skills.
Teacher 2: (FI)	SI	Significant negative effect. Very disappointed that there are no French administrators. This principal has most efficient language skills but still inadequate. Affects supervision adversely. No understanding of curriculum. Teachers have free rein in the classroom. Principal cannot evaluate fairly. Realizes principal can ascertain some classroom factors.
	ST	Very strong effect. Principals have no idea of the problems in immersion, for example with resources.

	SC	Principal tries to speak French. Immersion teachers feel he is not close to them and stays away because he does not understand. Teachers do not switch to English so a division was created.
	SOI	No significant effect.
	PI	No effect presently. Teacher used to feel that parents would prefer a bilingual principal, that more money and support would be available if the administrator was bilingual.
Teacher 3: (EI)	SI	Personally no effect. Feels immersion teachers would have more respect and principal would have more credibility if bilingual. Principal would be able to evaluate instructional objectives. Students are impressed when principal speaks French.
	ST	Minimal effect. Philosophy of implementation important. If principal were an expert in implementation could have more of an effect because he would tend to be more involved in immersion curriculum.
	SC	No effect personally. Teachers admire him for trying to improve his French through coursework.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect.
Teacher 4: (EP)	SI	Definitely should be bilingual to assist in the classroom. Could be bedlam when immersion teacher has no English skills.
	ST	Principal should be bilingual.
	SC	Principal frequently speaks French. Teacher comments: "He knows not to direct any French to me because I won't answer back".
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect since immersion parents not francophone.
Teacher 5: (FI)	SI	Both administrators bilingual enough to determine class atmosphere, instructional methods and discipline. Helps to understand some French but no significant effect.
	ST	Would be helpful but lack of French proficiency not detrimental.
	SC	Minimal effect. Dual-track principal has to have a good attitude.
	SOI	No effect. French coordinator is available.
	PI	Not aware of any effect.
Teacher 6: (EP)	SI	Definite effect. Principal could not evaluate questioning techniques, for example.
	ST	Teacher commented: "I'm English".

	SC	Does not know how immersion teachers feel. Does not see a problem. Program would be enhanced if principal could speak French to students. Bilingual support staff would also be valuable.
	SOI	No awareness of any effect.
	PI	Perhaps parents think more support would be provided by a bilingual principal but no awareness of parents' viewpoint.
Teacher 7: (FP)	SI	Principal's level of French sufficient to allow him to observe immersion teachers effectively. His effort to learn French is appreciated.
	ST	No significant effect. Principal's understanding of French satisfactory.
	SC	Minimal effect.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect with present principal. Immersion parents are anglophone. Teacher believes that it may have affected previous principal's relationship with parents. Immersion parents are extremely demanding and might have more confidence in a bilingual principal.
Teacher 8: (EI)	SI	Bilingualism would be helpful but not a determining factor. No effect if principal good. Principal has taken French courses.
	ST	Would be great if principal were fluent. Lack of proficiency not necessarily bad.
	SC	Principal is personable.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No awareness of an effect.
Teacher 9: (EI)	SI	No effect.
	ST	No effect.
	SC	Does not affect principal/staff relations whatsoever.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect. Parents are anglophone.
Teacher 10: (FP)	SI	A key issue. Principals must be bilingual in order to orientate new teachers effectively. Essential that they understand French culture. Supervision/evaluation system poor for both tracks but English better prepared for teaching. Clinical supervision more thorough for English. Also depends on teacher's attitude. Teachers' thinking must change. Disillusioned with supervision model.

	ST	Illogical to think that a unilingual principal can assist with curriculum such as language arts.
	SC	No effect personally but could be important for immersion colleagues.
	SOI	Probably an effect. Principal has less understanding of organizational issues such as immersion teachers teaching own English component.
	PI	No effect because parents are anglophone or at least bilingual.
Teacher 11: (FI)	SI	Not absolutely necessary but helpful for immersion teachers who are unilingual French and for motivating immersion students to use French outside classroom. Would make immersion less artificial.
	ST	Certainly makes a difference. Immersion meetings with principal must be conducted in English. Principal may feel badly.
	SC	Principal would understand immersion teachers better if bilingual. Principal could participate in conversations and not feel left out.
	SOI	Teacher wishes principal could speak French. Not essential because teachers speak English. Would be beneficial for students.
	PI	Only helpful for francophone parents.
Teacher 12: (EP)	SI	Never heard immersion teachers discuss issue. This teacher was not aware that principal was not bilingual.
	ST	Not aware of any effect.
	SC	No effect. This teacher thought principal was bilingual.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect.
Teacher 13: (EP)	SI	Used to think bilingualism of principal essential. Present principal unilingual and school runs smoothly. Principal's relationship with immersion teachers is excellent. A previous principal was bilingual and there were problems. Personality more important than bilingualism.
	ST	Apparently no effect.
	SC	Bilingualism seems unimportant but this teacher does not know why this is so. Some immersion teachers may wish principal were bilingual.
	SOI	No effect. Change in administration. Staff pleased that new administrator will be bilingual. It makes sense.
	PI	No effect.
Teacher 14: (FI)	SI	Some instructional factors cannot be evaluated by unilingual principal. Principal can determine other factors.

	ST	Would be valuable if principal bilingual as could help with achieving instructional objectives.
	SC	No problem for this teacher as she is bilingual. Could create a problem for new francophone teachers.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect.
Teacher 15: (FP)	SI	No effect. Principal able to determine classroom atmosphere.
	ST	No effect.
	SC	Not important.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect.
Teacher 16: (EI)	SI	Has some effect because principal cannot understand dialogue in classroom.
	ST	Would be helpful but this unilingual principal is still effective.
	SC	Not very important.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	No effect.
Principal 1:	SI	Issue has never been raised by teachers. Principal feels he speaks and understands French. Administrator's bilingualism is an important issue for evaluation of immersion teachers. Being evaluated by a unilingual principal would be "like doing a teaching observation without the ability to hear". Teachers would be nervous.
	ST	No evidence that it has an effect but believes it does.
	SC	Principal feels staff is pleased that he took a language course and can communicate in French. Principals need courage to do so. Sometimes immersion teachers speak too fast for him, maybe on purpose.
	SOI	No effect.
	PI	Parents not francophone so no effect. Parents appreciate when principal can address immersion students in language of instruction.
Principal 2:	SI	Some effect. Principal feels his French language skills are good. Conferences, however, conducted in English. Unilingual principals may feel uncomfortable observing French instruction. Believes immersion teachers must have misgivings about being evaluated by unilingual

principals. Feels process of good teaching can be recognized, irrespective of language.

ST Slight negative effect. Important for principal to upgrade French language skills. Believes immersion teachers accept reality of unilingual administrators and appreciate assistance.

SC Moderately important. Believes immersion teachers would like him to be more bilingual. A sign of respect for French language and culture.

SOI Has an effect because principal cannot teach in French. Teachers appreciate fact that principal will converse with students in French during French instructional time. Suggests respect for integrity of French language. Principal converses with teachers in English.

PI Not a significant factor presently. Feels some immersion parents disappointed that he was not bilingual when he was first appointed. Parents respect his efforts to improve his French. Initially English parents suspicious that principal might be too supportive of immersion. Needs of English program "horrendous". Some immersion parents might feel he is too supportive of English program.

Principal 3: SI Has an effect because unilingual principal cannot evaluate teachers' level or appropriateness of French language or immersion materials. Can evaluate learning situation, such as classroom atmosphere, and curriculum goals. Feedback from teachers indicates principal's observations are fairly accurate and evaluation reports fair. Would seek assistance if teacher competency was in question. Debriefing would be more meaningful in native language. Could be intimidating for teachers in English. Intervention in first language would be more effective.

ST Program would be more effective if administrator was bilingual. Principal understands French but not comfortable conversing. Believes teachers think bilingual principal would secure resources more quickly. Principal cannot assist effectively with instructional matters and orientation to school.

SC Orientation of new teachers to school, district and province would be facilitated more effectively and quickly by bilingual principal. Assisting with curriculum and social adjustment of teachers would be easier. Does affect relationship with immersion teachers. Principal feels intimidated to speak French and tells teachers this. Thinking of taking more French courses. Teachers are supportive. Important to have a good attitude, sense of humour and patience. Feels teachers would prefer meetings and conferences to be in French.

SOI Program would be stronger if principal bilingual. Lack of clarity in communication affects organization of school. Misunderstandings of discussions can be stressful. Wishes to show support and be involved, but immersion teachers must do everything in English for principal's benefit. A lengthly process.

PI No effect because parents anglophone and do not expect principal to speak French.

Principal 4:	SI	Teachers comfortable with principal because of high trust level. Cannot evaluate dialogue between teacher and student. Attributes such as teacher enthusiasm, student involvement and body language can be discerned.
	ST	Bound to have an effect although not a significant problem. Workshops would be more valuable if offered in French.
	SC	No effect. Principal/teacher relationship great.
	SOI	Personality more important than bilingualism. Principal must demonstrate support of program.
	PI	No effect because parents are anglophone.

In the assessment of the principals' language skills, the teachers and principal in Schools C and D generally agreed that the princpals' French skills were limited. It is interesting to note that collegial relations in School D appeared to be excellent despite the principal's lack of bilingualism. In School A, the ratings by English teachers were consistently higher than those of their immersion colleagues; the principal's self-ratings were more congruent with those of the immersion teachers. In School B, all four teachers agreed that the principal's French was limited, while the principal believed his skills were "reasonably good".

As for the effect of the principal's language skills on the five categories investigated, there are no substantial differences between the beliefs of immersion and English teachers. There were a number of English and French teachers who believed it would be beneficial for the principal to be bilingual. Immersion teachers felt more strongly about this issue than English teachers, particularly in the areas of supervision of instruction and staff development. Teacher #2 was adamant about the importance of a bilingual principal in these two categories. Teachers generally agreed that the effects of the principal's degree of bilingualism were minimal in staff collegiality, school organization for instruction and parental involvement. Administrators all agreed that the principal's lack of French skills had some effect on teacher supervision. A general trend for all participants was a progressively less significant effect for the five categories, in the order that they appear above.

School Profiles

In the literature (C.E.A., 1983) a 50/50 balance of English and French student populations is recommended for the effective implementation of programs in the dual track school. In this study, School A met this criterion. In School B, there existed an approximately 20% majority in the immersion student enrollment; this disproportion in numbers was criticized by one English teacher in the school. Staff relations, however, appeared to be fairly collegial in School B. The student enrollments in the immersion and English programs in Schools C and D were substantially different, having French and English minorities respectively. School C appeared to have the poorest school climate and School D excellent staff relations. Therefore, there is little evidence in this study to support the theory of a balance in student populations positively effecting program implementation. Further research with larger samples of schools is required to shed light on the effect of student enrollment on various aspects of the dual-track school.

In School A, teacher responses suggested that the principal had a significant role in fostering a congenial, social relationship among staff members. Immersion teachers believed that staff relations were more positive than did their English colleagues. The principal perceived the staff to be "very close", not in a "complacent" way. He gave little indication of being aware of the dissention expressed by one English staff member. While teachers reported the principal to be personable and open, their comments indicated criticism of the principal's lack of involvement in the supervision process. Although teachers believed that their administrator was likely supervising new teachers, they themselves had not been visited in the classroom. One English teacher was particularly resentful of the principal's perceived involvement with immersion teachers and believed he was too "lenient" in the instructional process. The principal, on the other hand, identified teacher supervision as his number one priority and believed he was highly involved in the process.

In School B, the beliefs of teachers and the administrator emerged as more congruent than in School A. The principal expressed the same concern for the English track students as one English

teacher who discussed extensively the negative effect of the immersion program on her pupils. Teachers perceived the principal to be visible and supportive; the principal believed he was consistently and actively supporting teachers. English teachers in School B were more positive about the principal's role in supervision than immersion teachers. Both English teachers' responses were more critical in the area of staff collegiality than those of their immersion peers. The principal, however, did not indicate an awareness of any friction among staff members. Staff relations appeared generally to be more collegial than those in School A, with the principal assuming a leadership role in promoting collegiality.

In School C, in which English teachers constituted a large majority, staff relations were very strained. All four teachers commented upon the principal's failure to intervene, even after being approached by staff members concerned about the poor climate in the school. They perceived the principal to be out of the school excessively and as weak in decision-making. The administrator was also criticized for not taking an active role in supervision of instruction. The principal, on the other hand, believed he was very involved in teacher supervision; he defined supervision, however, in a much broader sense than simply classroom visitations. His comments indicated only a vague awareness of tension in staff relations. The administrator identified the French immersion teachers as a tight-knit minority group; the two immersion teachers interviewed portrayed the French teachers as close but not particularly unified.

In School D, the teachers did not perceive the principal to be actively involved in the supervision of instruction process. Their comments on the principal's role in teacher supervision were not as critical as those of their counterparts in Schools A, B, and C; the principal's passive participation in the process seemed appreciated. Indeed, this administrator was the only principal respondent who did not identify supervision of instruction as a priority. Staff relations in the school were perceived by both teachers and the principal as excellent; one English staff member reported that rapport in the school had historically been good.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

While there are a multitude of factors affecting the operation of a dual-track school requiring investigation, this study was limited to three significant areas: supervision of instruction, staff collegiality and the bilingualism of the principal. Interview data from the areas staff development and school organization for instruction yielded some relevant information; therefore, responses to several questions in these two categories were included in the analysis. The factor parental involvement was eliminated entirely from the study.

Supervision of Instruction

The school effectiveness literature highlights the principal's key role in the improvement of instructional programs. There is substantial evidence, as well, that teacher beliefs about the principal's role in the supervision of instruction process do affect implementation of programs in the classroom. Research indicates that teachers, although they are often critical of the supervision process, respond positively to the concept and appreciate administrative feedback regarding their instructional strategies and programs. This finding is supported in this study as many of the teachers questioned the principal's lack of involvement in the supervision process; several believed that the principal should be more involved in instruction and in the monitoring of student progress.

There is considerable research on both the supervision of instruction and the evaluation processes as they relate to teaching personnel. In this study, many teachers used the two terms interchangeably. This suggests that teachers associate supervision of instruction with evaluation and that the two are inextricably intertwined. Several respondents referred to the problems associated with the two programs being conducted by the principal. Many suggested that they

would seek assistance with instruction from their peers rather than from the principal. Teacher support programs, such as peer coaching or peer mentoring, may be viable alternatives to supervision by the administrator. The principal, acting as facilitator and encouraging risk-taking, can provide the foundation for a successful peer supervision program. Findings in this study support Hanrahan's (1987) research that principal and teacher perceptions of the success of the supervision process differ considerably.

A majority of teachers believed supervision of instruction was not a priority of the principal. Principals, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of teacher supervision; three out of four identified it as their number one priority of the five areas investigated. If supervision of instruction is indeed a priority for senior and school administration, that fact should be communicated to teachers by both levels of administration at the beginning of the school year. Policies should be clearly articulated and the supervision of instruction and evaluation processes defined. District in-service for teachers and principals together would clarify the district's perspective on these issues and might help to minimize distrust. If supervision is indeed a district priority, the message to personnel must be that administrative tasks rank second to the instructional program.

In this study, many teachers expounded the belief that supervision of instruction was more of a priority for principals in the case of inexperienced teachers new to the profession. Several experienced English teachers expressed resentment for their lack of contact with the principal. Since there is historically a large turnover of immersion staff in many dual-track schools, this resentment may be directed towards those new teachers. Experienced teachers in this study suggested that they appreciate feedback from the principal on their instruction. While the barrier of time constraints is obvious, the principal cannot ignore the needs of more experienced staff members.

While the role of the vice-principal was not investigated in this study, two respondents commented positively on the contribution of the vice-principal in the instructional process. It seems plausible that the role of administrators other than the principal in the supervision process may significantly affect instruction. Further research is required to shed light on this issue.

Most teachers in this study could not explain the school or district policy for supervision of instruction. Principals, on the other hand, could clearly articulate supervision procedures in the school. These results suggest that either principals were not effectively communicating school and district policies in this area or that teachers were not receiving the message clearly. Since teacher supervision is critical to curriculum implementation and requires a high level of trust to implement meaningfully, it is important that administrators ensure teachers understand the issue thoroughly. New teachers require special consideration in this area. Process and intent must be clearly articulated by school-based administrators at the beginning of the school year.

Teachers in this study recognized that their principals were overloaded with administrivia and with parental and community demands. If the improvement of instruction in the school is of utmost importance, however, steps must be taken to ensure that classroom visitations and teacher conferencing are built into their busy schedules. Teacher supervision includes many elements in addition to classroom visitations and conferencing, such as impromptu discussions and goal-setting. An effective supervision program must be well thought out and planned.

The unilingual administrators of dual-track schools need special consideration and support in the implementation of an effective teacher supervision program. While some teacher respondents in this study questioned the unilingual principal's ability to supervise and evaluate teachers in an immersion setting, many indicated that principals can distinguish significant learning variables without knowledge of the French language. In the author's experience, seldom is in-service

unique to the immersion phenomenon provided for unilingual administrators. The district must take initiative in this area.

A supervision of instruction program cannot be successfully implemented without a trusting relationship between the principal and the teaching staff. Interpersonal skills must be a primary consideration in the hiring of school administrators. Teachers in this study expressed a belief in the supportive, fair approach of their administrators. Only when such a relationship is evident will teachers welcome the input of the principal and act upon it. In some districts, teachers are members of the team responsible for the hiring of administrators; teacher input in the selection process would build trust and empowerment.

In this study, there were two teachers who, while they respected and trusted the principal, criticized the administrator's role in instructional improvement. They believed that the principal could not be knowledgeable in all facets of the curriculum. While it is unrealistic to think that the principal can be an expert in all curricular areas, the role of instructional leader necessitates a knowledge of and an interest in curriculum. The principal's credibility as a teacher and leader in instruction is crucial to school improvement. Once again, district in-service and financial support for professional development are essential.

Staff Collegiality

The school effectiveness research provides evidence that the relationship among staff members is an important aspect of school climate. There is also support in the literature for the impact of school climate on student learning. It can be assumed that collegial staff relations affect school climate positively, while negative staff relations have a detrimental effect on school climate. The effect of staff collegiality on school climate and on student outcomes merits further investigation.

The very nature of the dual-track setting implies the existence of intergroup tensions based on language and cultural differences, reflecting those found in society. Conflictual sentiments are often camouflaged. English teachers may have feelings of job insecurity which are seldom expressed. They may have concerns about the transfer of weaker immersion students to English programs, as was expressed in this study, and about the loss of more capable students to late immersion. French immersion teachers may believe that English teachers do not understand the pressures they encounter. Indeed, one immersion teacher in this study commented on the English teachers' lack of understanding of difficulties implementing immersion curriculum. Proactive intervention by the principal is essential in order to focus both groups of teachers on educational commonalities rather than on divergent goals.

The principal's role in monitoring and nurturing staff relations is a critical one, particularly where teacher cultures, goals, beliefs and languages differ substantially. Specific strategies must be implemented by administration to strengthen staff collegiality. A strategy used by one administrator in this study supports the literature; he approached influential staff members to promote professional concepts. Sources of conflict must be discussed openly and misunderstandings clarified. An outside facilitator can provide guidance in this area; conflict resolution as a staff development focus would also be beneficial. As is evident in this study, a sensitive and humanisitic approach by principals is a crucial factor in staff collegiality. The importance of excellent interpersonal skills should be addressed in district in-service for dual-track principals.

Strategies for integrating staff and students must be pursued proactively and not left to chance. Cross program activities, such as buddy reading, whole school assemblies, common cultural performances, joint field trips and lunch hour clubs are invaluable opportunities for building collegiality. School-wide themes, platoon teaching and a common staff development program are other ways of using the collective strengths of staff members to build a whole school philosophy.

The large majority of teachers considered their principals to be fair and sensitive to teacher differences. One English teacher expressed resentment of inequitable administrative practices favouring immersion teachers. It is not enough for the principal of a dual-track school to believe both programs are being administered equitably; he/she must deal with the perception of stakeholders. This perception of equality or inequality permeates the entire functioning of the school, from the allocation of audio-visual equipment and textbooks to resources provided for professional development to support for field trips. The principal must be proactive in maintaining the fragile balance in meeting the needs of both programs.

Another challenge for the dual-track principal is in the area of goal-setting; school goals must reflect the needs of both programs and, at the same time, unify staff, students and the community. A number of teachers in this study referred to the importance of goals as providing direction for the school; many mentioned the principal's emphasis on school goals. In setting the direction for the school, the principal must constantly focus on cooperation and unity. Whether goal-setting sessions occur at the beginning or at the end of the year, it is important that teachers new to the school be involved in the process.

Staff development received harsh criticism by many teachers in this study. While some respondents praised their principals for their encouragement in the area of professional development, no school appeared to have a strong staff development program. Despite financial and time restraints, a meaningful staff development program is an integral part of school improvement and could be a unifying force in a dual-track school. Cost can be minimized by utilizing school and district staff to present in-service. Creative ideas for low-cost staff development can be explored as part of a needs assessment process.

The use of French in the staffroom was addressed by every respondent in this study. This sensitive issue elicited strong emotions, particularly by English teachers. In the one school where this topic was not overtly addressed, mistrust and resentment were obvious. This suggests that the issue of the use of French in the staffroom or in any school area outside the classroom must be broached by the principal early in the school year and constantly monitored. The leadership of the administrator is instrumental in facilitating open and honest communication among English and French staff members as they attempt to develop consensus on this question.

The transfer of immersion students from French immersion to English is another sensitive issue in dual-track schools. One teacher in this study referred to the English program as being "dumped upon" by immersion teachers who encourage weak academic students and those having behavioural difficulties to transfer out of immersion. This teacher is not unique in her perspective; such comments are evident in the literature and have been expressed to the author by a number of English track teachers. Problem-solving through open, honest discussion between immersion and English teachers and the establishment of a school policy on the issue are essential.

There is minimal research to support the effect of social events on school climate. In this study, one principal actively encouraged integration of staff members through social events, from volleyball games to weekend retreats. Relations in this school appeared congenial at best rather than truly collaborative. Two other administrators mentioned similar efforts at social integration. Only one teacher complained about the promotion of social activities by the principal. There was no mention of social events in the school with the least collegial relations. Further research in this area is warranted.

Bilingualism of the Principal

Research on the effect of the degree of bilingualism of the principal on immersion programs is scant and ambiguous. This study supports the literature which indicates that the unilingual

principal is able to evaluate some important instructional indices in the classroom, such as classroom environment. Comments by teacher and principal participants suggest that unilingual principals cannot accurately determine teacher and student appropriateness of and level of language. As well, unilingual administrators appear at a disadvantage in the supervision of curriculum implementation and in the monitoring of student progress. In this study, the principal's unfamiliarity with immersion learning resources was mentioned. One teacher in the study thought that the principal might be staying away from immersion classrooms because of an uneasiness being in an environment where the language of instruction was not understood. The avoidance of immersion classrooms in supervision has been mentioned in the research and merits further investigation. It is essential that principals are perceived by teachers to have an instructional leadership role and not simply a passive role.

Some immersion teachers in this study believed that the principal's unilingualism had a negative impact on staff development. Once again, specialized training for dual-track administrators by the district would build confidence with the immersion program. Principals would develop a sound base of knowledge, skills and attitudes to assist in building a framework for school improvement. Training in conflict management, problem-solving, group dynamics, team building and effective communication would strengthen the principals' confidence and belief in a bilingual education.

With in-service would come a better understanding of the intricacies of immersion teaching. For example, the emphasis on oral rather than written language in the early grades in immersion might concern some principals unfamiliar with the program. One immersion teacher mentioned the difficulty in attaining learning resources and the necessity of translating English materials to French; an awareness of these complexities is important for the immersion principal. Several English teachers in this study noted the culture shock experienced by some new immersion teachers; becoming more familar with the educational and professional backgrounds of immersion

teachers could help principals understand the strengths and needs of these staff members. An immersion teacher in this study commended her principal for taking an immersion summer course and for attempting to say a few words in French on the public address system daily. These are much needed indications of support for the immersion program by administration. The improvement of their French language skills through workshops or coursework would build administrators' credibility with immersion teachers, students and parents.

It is a reality in British Columbia that unilingual English principals will continue to administer dual-track schools due to a lack of bilingual personnel. It is this author's belief that the bilingualism of the principal, although beneficial, is not as relevant to the successful administration of a dual-track school as other variables. Both bilingual and unilingual principals can be effective or ineffective administrators. What is needed by the dual-track administrator is a positive attitude towards the uniqueness of the school and a sensitivity to and understanding of the issues which may arise in administering an immersion program. Support for this challenge must be provided by the district. A mentoring program and a strong network of resource people would assist the inexperienced principal in the effective administration of a dual-track school. This study supports Rideout's (1987) research that the bilingualism of the principal and staff collegiality are unrelated.

Special Considerations of a Dual-Track School

There are considerable demands on the administrator of a dual-track school above and beyond those in a single track school. One of the most challenging is the hiring of French immersion personnel. Because of the shortage of immersion teachers in British Columbia, it is often necessary to hire teachers from out of province. Those teachers hired may be unilingual French, unfamiliar with the educational changes in the province and lacking in second language methodology. Many of these teachers are new to the profession and arrive at their first teaching assignment unprepared for the cultural and professional differences. Where the immersion

program is not soundly established in a school, these teachers are also faced with a scarcity of teaching materials and may be the only teacher in that school with a similar assignment.

There has historically been a large turnover of immersion teachers in the province. This change factor impacts significantly upon the delivery of programs in the school. In this study, a teacher reported the lack of support felt by some immersion teachers. He noted that an immersion colleague had resigned in frustration. An effective school and district induction program would offer invaluable support for immersion teachers. District in-service, staff social events, a mentoring program and other forms of assistance would help immersion teachers adapt to change. The principal can facilitate the process by securing district and school resources to meet individual needs.

Although the category parental involvement was eliminated from this study, the unique administrative challenge of communicating with two groups of parents should be mentioned. In some dual-track schools, separate parent groups exist; in others, both groups operate under an umbrella committee. If only one parent group exists, equal representation by both groups of parents should be encouraged. Where two parent groups are inevitable, each should have parent representation from the other parent group. Both situations require a great deal of sensitivity and excellent communication skills on the part of the principal. It is critical that the dual-track administrator be proactive in modelling a philosophy which emphasizes unity of staff, students and parents and encourages strategies which support this philosophy. In-service for administrators on the politics of implementing a French immersion program should be provided by the district.

This study provides little evidence for a balance in the immersion and English student populations, although the school with the poorest staff relations did have the largest imbalance. Sensitivity on the part of the principal, however, is required when dealing not only with staff and students but also with the parent minority group, especially when that group is composed of

English parents in the catchment area. English track students in the minority need to be perceived to be treated fairly and equitably. Regular communication with parents, a close association with the parent executive and the encouragement of parent involvement in the school can help alleviate distrust, fear and misunderstandings. Regular newsletters, open houses, curriculum nights, a parent handbook and student-led conferences are means by which open home-school communication lines can be fostered.

Research Questions

Five research questions were presented in Chapter I. The first question presupposed the use of the French language by immersion teachers outside the classroom setting as a predominant issue in dual-track schools. The results of this study support that proposal. All respondents expressed very definite opinions on this topic, which are thoroughly discussed above. The findings in this study indicate that principals should address the issue openly with staff members early in the year to minimize conflict and to develop consensus on this language question.

The second research question posited that differences in beliefs between immersion and English teachers are a potential source of conflict in dual-track schools. In this study, the beliefs of English and French teachers differed in several areas. A number of English track teachers expressed their concern over the excessive use of French in the staffroom. While many immersion teachers supported their English colleagues on this question, they did not appear to be aware of the intensity of English teachers' feelings on the subject. Several English track teachers expressed a concern for the self-esteem of the English students; no immersion teacher mentioned this issue. One English program participant was highly critical of both the immersion program and the immersion teachers; most respondents in this study, however, were supportive of each other. In the area of staff development, several teachers expressed differences in needs between the English and immersion programs. Most of the criticism, however, was directed toward school and district administration rather than to colleagues.

The effect of the principal's French language skills, particularly in the area of supervision of instruction, was the third research question investigated. While several immersion teachers commented that it would be valuable for the principal implementing teacher supervision of instruction and evaluation programs to be bilingual, a majority of respondents believed that principals could administer a dual-track school effectively without French language skills. The effort to speak French and a supportive attitude were deemed more important than language skills. Further research on the effects of the unilingualism of the principal is warranted, particularly in the areas of teacher supervision of instruction and evaluation, goal-setting and staff development.

The fourth question examined in this study concerned teacher beliefs about the principal's role in supervision of instruction and in the instructional process. Three out of four principals identified teacher supervision as their number one priority of the five areas originally investigated. On the other hand, no teacher identified supervision of instuction as a priority for their principal. Several teachers perceived the supervision of new teachers to be important for the principal, but they themselves had not been supervised. A number of teachers believed that the principal monitored their instructional program by occasional drop-in visits. Some teachers questioned the absence of the principal from the classroom and indicated a desire for more administrative feedback. A majority of teachers believed that the administrator monitored student progress through report card reading only. No teacher respondent perceived their principal to be significantly involved in student evaluation. Several teachers believed that the principal's role in the instructional process was minimal.

The final research question addressed teacher input in the decision-making process. The school effectiveness literature underlines the importance of participatory decision-making. All teacher respondents in this study indicated that they had considerable input in the development of school policies and in the solving of school problems. All four principals indicated that they took

measures to involve teachers in goal-setting, in problem-solving and in developing school policies. Several teachers in one school complained about having too much input into decision-making; they felt that the principal should be responsible for routine decisions. All teachers is this school wanted their principal to be an assertive leader in problem-solving. This finding was unexpected and warrants investigation.

Conclusion

In 1987, provincial legislation mandated the withdrawal of administrators from the British Columbia Teachers' Federation. This historical change in provincial education created an unprecedented division between teachers and administrators which is having far reaching effects on the role of the school administrator. This division was referred to by two teachers in this study whose comments suggested suspicion and misunderstanding. Now more than ever before is it critical for the school administrator to assume a leadership role in the area of staff collegiality.

Dual-track principals, in this study, received criticism for their lack of involvement in the area of supervision of instruction by both English and immersion teachers. Staff relations, on the whole, appeared to be congenial rather than truly collaborative. An effective staff development program, reflecting common school-based goals and unifying staff members, seemed absent in all four schools. A number of immersion teachers believed that the principal's lack of French language skills had a detrimental effect on the implementation of supervision of instruction and staff development.

These findings suggest that further research is required to clarify a number of issues. The principal's role in supervision of instruction needs to be compared in dual-track, single track immersion and regular program school settings. The indices of professional collaboration need to be identified in order to distinguish congenial staff relations from true collegiality. The effect of the principal's French language skills in the areas of teacher supervision, staff development and staff

collegiality in single and dual-track schools should be further investigated. The concerns of English track staff in the dual-track school need to be addressed in order to preserve the integrity of both programs. These directions in research will hopefully assist district and school personnel in providing the optimal learning experience to both immersion and English track students in the dual-track school.

Table 9

TEACHERS' YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS SUBMITTED ON WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

		Years of Teaching Experience	Years of Experience in French Immersion	Years of Experience in Present School
	1	6	6	5
	2	7	5	1
T	3	6.5	5	6
E	4	10	5	5
A	5	10	3	3
C	6	5	4	4
H	7	10	9	9
E	8	7	3	3
R	9	32	6	6
	10	10	6	6
	11	16	5	5
	12	25	9	* 16
	13	17	4	4
	14	5	5	5
	15	10	7	1
	16	14	11	* 14

* Teacher was in the present school before it became dual-track.

Table 10

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AS SUBMITTED BY PRINCIPALS ON WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

	SCHOOLS			
	A	B	C	D
Total student population	430	438	590	521
French immersion student population	218	250	183	279
Grades offered in English program	K-7	K-7	K-7	K-7
Grades offered in French immersion program	1-6	K-7	2-7	K-7
Number of years French immersion offered in the school	5	11	7	12
Number of English track classroom teachers	8	7	14	6
Number of French immersion classroom teachers	9	9	7	10

Table 11

PRINCIPALS' EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING AS SUBMITTED ON WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

	PRINCIPALS			
	A	B	C	D
Number of years experience as a principal	11	20	6	13
Number of years as principal of a French immersion school	8	5	3	5
Number of years in present school	8	5	3	5
Specific training in preparation for the role of dual-track principal	- two first year university French courses - immersion program for teachers in Quebec	- summer institute - Ministry annual conference for administrators of F.I. schools - district meetings	- district orientation	none
Courses/workshops/ exchanges to improve French language skills and/or knowledge of French culture	- Ministry annual conference for administrators of F.I. schools - A.P.P.I.P.C.	- A.P.P.I.P.C.	- FSL workshops - national conference - conversation classes - social events	- summer institute

* A.P.P.I.P.C. = Association provinciale des professeurs du programme d'immersion et du programme cadre

Appendix A

April __, 1989

Dear _____,

Thank you for your prompt response to my request to conduct research in the _____ School District. I have outlined below the significance of my study, a brief description of the methodology, and the nature of the research report at the conclusion of my study, as you have requested.

The importance of the role of the principal in the school improvement process is well documented. There is a paucity of research, however, on the role of the principal in the dual-track French immersion school. The literature does indicate that the administration of the dual-track school requires special considerations. A better understanding of these special conditions is critical to a school's success. Very little is known, as well, about teacher beliefs surrounding the role of the principal. Recent research reveals that teacher beliefs are related to teacher performance. It is also becoming clear that teachers have very definite beliefs about the effective and ineffective principal, which may affect their performance in the instructional process. My study, entitled The Role of the Principal in the Dual-Track School: Principal and Teacher Beliefs, is designed to investigate the principal's beliefs and behaviours and both the English and French immersion teachers' beliefs about the principal's role in five areas. These are teacher supervision of instruction, staff development, staff collegiality, school organization for instruction, and parental involvement in the school. It is hoped that a better understanding of the dual-track principal's role and of teacher beliefs about this role will result in improved communication between the principal and teachers and among the teachers themselves, important factors in school success.

Two dual-track schools in _____ having at least kindergarten to grade five student populations are required for this study. The two principals and a random sample of two English program and two French immersion program teachers at various grade levels in each school would receive a brief questionnaire to obtain background information; subsequently, an interview consisting of questions about the principal's role in the five categories named above would be conducted. The principals selected must have had a mininum of two years administrative experience in a dual-track school. Only teachers with at least three years teaching experience and one year in a dual-track school can be included in the sample. Upon acceptance of this request for conducting research in _____, the questionnaire would be mailed to the participating subjects. The interviews would be conducted in May.

At the completion of the thesis, I will submit a report to the _____ Research Department. The approximate date of termination of the study is August, 1989. I am hoping that recommendations arising from the results of my study will assist _____ in better understanding the unique aspects of the dual-track principal's role and the significance of teacher beliefs about this role. My belief, based on recent research, is that congruency between principal and teacher beliefs makes for easier, more effective implementation of programs and for the more collegial, supportive learning environment which is characteristic of effective schools.

Sincerely yours,

Marlene Day

Appendix B

LETTER OF PERMISSION

Dear _____,

I am presently working as a teacher for School District _____. Concurrently, I am a graduate student in the Administrative Leadership Programme at the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University. I am researching the role of the dual-track principal to fulfill my thesis requirements.

At our interview, I will be asking you questions about the role of the dual-track principal. I assure you that all information is confidential and that your name will not appear in my thesis. The information divulged by individual principals and teachers will be known only to me.

Unless you object, I propose to tape record my interview with you as a means of ensuring greater accuracy of data. All tapes and their transcripts will eventually be destroyed, following completion and approval of my study. If you wish a copy of my thesis, one can be made available to you.

Simon Fraser University requires that I have evidence in writing of your willingness to participate in this study. For this purpose, I ask that you sign this letter and return it to me on the day of our interview.

Thank you very much for your participation in my research.

Yours sincerely,

Marlene Day

I agree to participate in this study, as it is described above.

_____

Appendix C

May __, 1989

Dear _____,

This letter is a follow-up to the conversation which we had today and is a confirmation of our interview to be held on _____.

The title of my thesis is The Role of the Dual-Track Principal: Principal and Teacher Beliefs. The dual-track principal has a particularly challenging role, considering the specific characteristics surrounding the administration of the dual-track French immersion school. My research is designed to investigate both principal and teacher beliefs about this very important role.

The criterion for selecting principals is that they must have at least two years administrative experience in a dual-track school. Interviews with four teachers at each school are also required. Criteria for their selection are: they must have at least three years teaching experience and a minimum of one year in their present school. Two English track and two French immersion track teachers, one each from the primary and intermediate divisions, would be selected randomly by myself.

If you require any further information, please don't hesitate to contact me at home _____ in the mornings or at _____in the afternoons.

Thank you for your kind attention to my request. I am sure that you will find the results of my study both interesting and beneficial.

Yours sincerely,

Marlene Day

Appendix D

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. School name_____
2. Total student population_____
3. French immersion student population_____
4. Grades offered in regular English program_____
5. Grades offered in French immersion program_____
6. Number of years French immersion offered in this school_____
7. Number of English classroom teachers_____
8. Number of French immersion classroom teachers_____
9. Number of years you have been a principal_____
10. Number of years you have been principal of a French immersion school

    _____
11. Number of years you have been principal of this school_____
12. Do you have a teaching assignment?_____

    If so, what percentage of time do you teach?_____

    What subject/grade level do you teach? _____
13. Please give your self-rating on the following statements. (Circle the most appropriate answer.)

    I speak French:

    not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently

    I understand French:

    not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently

14. Describe briefly your experience as a principal. Include assignments in all types of schools/programs and in all geographic regions.

15. Describe below any specific training which prepared you for the role of principal (include a Master's degree, PhD, summer courses, etc.).

16. Describe any special training you may have received which prepared you specifically for the role of principal of a dual-track school (include university courses, district workshops, summer programs etc.).

17. Describe any courses, workshops, exchanges etc. which you may have attended with the purpose of improving your French language skills or of gaining a better understanding of the French culture.

Appendix E

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many years have you been a teacher?_____
2. How many years have you been a teacher in a French immersion school?

   _____
3. How many years have you been a teacher in this school?_____
4. Please give your self-rating for each of the following statements. (Circle the most appropriate answer.)

   I speak French:

   not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently

   I understand French:

   not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently

   My principal speaks French:

   not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently

   My principal understands French

   not at all a little reasonably well very well fluently
5. Please briefly describe your experience as a teacher. Include grades taught, specific programs taught (F.S.L., E.S.L., early immersion, etc.) and geographical regions in which you have taught.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Please describe the education you received which prepared you to be a teacher. Include the college/university and province/country where you received your teacher training, as well as any summer programs or courses you may have attended.

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Describe any specific training you received which prepared you to be a French immersion teacher. Include college/university courses, summer programs, workshops, etc. (if applicable)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix F

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

TEACHER SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

1. Please describe your policy regarding teacher supervision. How do you communicate this policy to your staff?
   Probe: How was this policy developed?
2. Please describe the teacher supervision process in your school. Is a different process necessary for French immersion and English program teachers? If so, why?
   Probes: Does anyone assist you with the teacher supervision process?
   Do you have different procedures for teachers at risk?
   Is there any other form of teacher supervision in your school?
3. How do you think teachers feel about the teacher supervision process? Do you think the opinions of English and French immersion teachers differ on this subject? If so, why do you think this difference exists?
   Probes: Do you think French immersion teachers feel your language proficiency is a factor in teacher supervision?
4. Describe any problems associated with teacher supervision? Why do you feel these problems exist? Do you see any solutions to these problems?
   Probes: How critical a factor is time in teacher supervision?
   How do teachers' attitudes affect teacher supervision?
5. What is your role in classroom instruction?
   Probes: What percentage of your time is spent discussing instruction with teachers?
   How do you assist teachers with instruction?
   Does anyone else assist teachers with instruction?
   How are teachers' questions/concerns about instruction handled?
6. How do you think teachers feel about your role in the instructional process? What makes you think this?
7. What is your role in the monitoring of student progress?
   Probes: What percentage of your time is spent discussing student progress with teachers?
   How are teachers' concerns/questions handled?
8. What is your role in student evaluation? Does this role differ at all for English and French immersion students? How?
   Probes: What is done about results on standardized tests?
   What percentage of your time is spent discussing student evaluation/achievement with teachers, either as a staff or individually?
   Does anyone assist either or both groups with evaluation?
9. Do you have a school policy or set of goals on student evaluation? If so, how was this policy developed?
   Probes: How are teachers made aware of this policy?
   How often is this policy revised?
10. Do you feel that your level of bilingualism has an effect on teacher supervision?
11. Do you have any further comments on teacher supervision?

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

1. Please describe the relationship between staff members in general and between English and French immersion teachers in particular.
   Probes: Do French immersion teachers speak French in the staffroom?
   How do English teachers feel about this?
   Do English teachers help French teachers with their English skills? With report cards?
   Do French teachers help English teachers with French skills?
   Would you say that English teachers or French immersion teachers make more of an effort to work collaboratively with the other group?
2. What strategies do you use, if any, to promote staff collaboration?
   Probes: How do you handle staff conflict?
3. Could you describe the process used in developing school policies? In solving school problems?
   Probes: What strategies do you use to assist teachers in attaining consensus on professional issues?
   Which group of teachers, English or French, give more input into the decision-making process in the school? Why do you think this is so?
4. Are English and French immersion classrooms mixed throughout the school or are they housed in separate areas of the school? What is your philosophy on this issue?
5. Do you have a policy on staff development?
   Probes: How are teachers made aware of this policy?
6. How do you perceive your role in staff development?
   Probes: How are decisions about staff development made?
   What percentage of your time is spent discussing staff development with teachers?
   Is there a school-based professional development committee?
   Are you a member of this committee?
7. How do you think teachers feel about staff development?
   Probes: How do you think teachers perceive your role in staff development?
8. What opportunities exist for teachers to exchange ideas on professional matters?
   Probes: Do English and French teachers tend to discuss educational questions/concerns separately or jointly? Why do you think this is so?
   Do they sit together in the staffroom?
   What provisions are made for those teachers who wish to engage in professional development activities?
9. What committees exist in your school? How do they function?
   Probes: Do English and French teachers sit on the same committees?
   Do they work harmoniously?
   Are you a member of any of these committees?
10. How important is the question of your bilingualism on your relationship with French immersion teachers?
11. Do you have any other comments on the relationship among staff members or on staff collaboration?

Appendix G

TEACHER INTERVIEW

TEACHER SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

1. Describe the process of teacher supervision in your school, the definition of teacher supervision being the non-evaluative process by which the principal and other personnel assist you with instructional improvement. What do you think of this process?
   Probes: Who assists you in improving your instruction?
   What do you do if you have problems/questions concerning instruction?
   How often during the school year does the principal visit your classroom or discuss instruction with you?
   What steps precede and/or follow such a visit?
   Do you see supervision practices fulfilling school goals?
2. What role does the principal play in classroom instruction?
   Probes: How does the principal monitor your instruction?
   Does the principal assist you with instruction? How? Is this assistance beneficial?
   Does anyone else assist you with instruction? How? Is this assistance beneficial?
   Do you have confidence in your principal's assessment of your instruction?
3. Do you think teacher supervision is a priority for your principal? What makes you think this?
4. Is there a policy or set of goals about teacher supervision in your school?
   Probe: How was this policy developed?
5. Do you see any problems associated with teacher supervision? What do you think causes these problems? Do you see any solutions to them?
6. What role does the principal play in monitoring student progress?
   Probes: How often does the principal discuss student progress with you?
   What do you do when you have concerns about a student's progress?
7. What role does the principal play in student evaluation?
   Probes: What does the principal do with standardized test results?
   Do you approach the principal with concerns/questions regarding student evaluation/achievement? When?
   How often is evaluation/achievement discussed as a staff?
   Does anyone assist you with evaluation? Who?
   What do you think should be the principal's role in student evaluation?
8. Do you think the principal's level of French proficiency is a factor in teacher supervision?
9. Do you have any other comments on teacher supervision?

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

1. Please comment on the relationship between staff members generally and between French immersion and English program teachers in particular.
   Probes: Do the two groups intermingle in the staffroom regularly?
   Do French immersion teachers speak French in the staffroom?
   How do the English staff feel about this?
   Do English teachers help French teachers with their English?
   With report cards?
   Do French teachers help English teachers with French skills?

2. What strategies does the principal use to promote staff collaboration?
   Probes: Does the principal exhibit equality in decision-making?
   What strategies does the principal use to attain staff consensus on professional issues?
   Do you feel that the principal is supportive of and sensitive to individual differences among staff members?
   How does the principal handle staff conflict?
   Does the principal promote risk-taking among staff members? How?
3. What role do staff members play in developing school policies and in solving school problems?
   Probes: Which group of teachers, English or French, give more input into the decision-making process? Why do you think this is so?
4. Could you describe the process of staff development in your school?
   Probes: How are decisions about staff development reached?
   Is there a school-based professional development committee?
   Is the principal a member of this committee?
   How often do you discuss staff development at staff meetings?
5. What do you think is the principal's role in staff development?
   Probes: Does the principal encourage you to participate in staff development? How?
   How often does the principal discuss staff development with you, either individually or as a staff?
6. How do you feel about staff development in your school?
7. What opportunities exist for teachers to exchange ideas on professional issues? How is this process facilitated?
   Probes: Do English and French teachers tend to discuss educational questions/concerns separately or jointly? Why do you think this is so?
   Do they sit together in the staffroom?
   What provisions are made for teachers who wish to engage in professional development activities?
   How does the principal facilitate the professional development process?
8. What committees exist in your school? How do they function?
   Probes: Do French immersion and English teachers sit on the same committees?
   Do they work harmoniously together?
   Does the principal sit on any of these committees?
9. How important a factor is the principal's French language proficiency on staff collegiality?
10. Do you have any other comments on the relationship among staff members, on the relationship of the principal and staff, or on staff collaboration?

Appendix H

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

TEACHER SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

1. Please describe your policy regarding teacher supervision. How do you communicate this policy to your staff?
   Probes: Does your school or district have a written policy on teacher supervision?
   How was this policy developed?
2. Please describe the teacher supervision process in your school. Is a different process necessary for French immersion and English program teachers? If so, why?
   Probes: Does anyone assist you with the teacher supervision process?
   What role does this person(s) play in the process? Why was this person(s) chosen for this role?
   What percentage of your time do you spend on teacher supervision?
   Do you have different procedures for teachers at risk?
   Is there any other form of teacher supervision in your school?
3. How do you think teachers feel about the teacher supervision process?
   Do you think the opinions of English and French immersion teachers differ on this subject? If so, why do you think this difference exists?
   Probes: Can you describe any incidents involving teachers which clarify your beliefs?
   Do you think French immersion teachers feel your language proficiency is a factor in teacher supervision?
4. Describe any problems associated with teacher supervision? Why do you feel these problems exist? Do you see any solutions to these problems?
   Probes: How critical a factor is time in teacher supervision?
   How do teachers' attitudes affect teacher supervision?
5. Do you feel that your level of bilingualism has an effect on teacher supervision?
6. Do you have any further comments on teacher supervision?

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Do you have a policy for staff development?
   Probes: How are teachers made aware of this policy?
2. How do you perceive your role in staff development?
   Probes: How are decisions about staff development made?
   Who makes these decisions and by what process?
   What percentage of your time is spent discussing staff development with teachers?
   Is there a school-based professional development committee?
   Are you a member of this committee?
3. How do you think teachers feel about staff development?
   Probes: What motivates teachers to participate in staff development?
   Do you think teachers' beliefs about staff development can be modified? How?
   How do you think teachers perceive your role in staff development?
4. What is your role in classroom instruction?
   Probes: What percentage of your time is spent discussing instruction with teachers?
   How do you assist teachers with instruction?
   Does anyone else assist teachers with instruction?
   How are teachers' questions/concerns about instruction handled?
5. How are teachers' instructional objectives developed?
   Probes: Who assists teachers with the development of these objectives?

6. How are school curricular changes introduced to staff?
   Probes: How are decisions made about what new curriculum is to be implemented?
7. How is the implementation of school curricular changes monitored?
   Probes: Who monitors these changes?
   What do you think motivates teachers to make curricular changes?
8. How is the implementation of school curricular changes evaluated?
   Probes: When and how do you evaluate curricular changes?
   How do you determine when these changes have been institutionalized?
   Who participates in the evaluation?
9. How do you think teachers feel about your role in the instructional process? What makes you think this?
10. Do you feel that your level of French proficiency has an effect on staff development or on the instructional process in your school? Do you think that French immersion teachers believe that it has an effect?
11. Do you have any other comments on staff development or on the instructional process?

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

1. Please describe the relationship between staff members in general and between English and French immersion teachers in particular.
   Probes: Do French immersion teachers speak French in the staffroom?
   How do English teachers feel about this?
   Do English teachers help French teachers with their English skills? With report cards?
   Do French teachers help English teachers with French skills?
   Would you describe the majority of your teachers as classroom-oriented or school-oriented?
   Do you notice any difference between French and English teachers on this question? If so, why do you think there is a difference?
   Would you say that English teachers or French immersion teachers make more of an effort to work collaboratively with the other group?
2. What strategies do you use, if any, to promote staff collaboration?
   Probes: How do you handle staff conflict?
3. Could you describe the process used in developing school policies? In solving school problems?
   Probes: What strategies do you use to assist teachers in attaining consensus on professional issues?
   Which group of teachers, English or French, give more input into the decision-making process in the school? Why do you think this is so?
4. Are English and French immersion classrooms mixed throughout the school or are they housed in separate areas of the school? What is your philosophy on this issue?
5. What opportunities exist for teachers to exchange ideas on professional matters?
   Probes: Do English and French teachers tend to discuss educational questions/concerns separately or jointly? Why do you think this is so?
   Do they sit together in the staffroom?
   How much time do teachers spend on recess and lunch hour supervision?
   How long is the lunch hour? Do most staff members spend that time in the staffroom? Is there any discrepancy between English and French immersion teachers on this question?
   What provisions are made for those teachers who wish to engage in professional development activities?

6. What committees exist in your school? How do they function?
   Probes: Are there any grade/subject committees?
   Do English and French teachers sit on the same committees?
   How often do they meet?
   Are you a member of any of these committees?
7. How important is the question of your bilingualism on your relationship with French immersion teachers?
8. Do you have any other comments on the relationship among staff members or on staff collaboration?

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION FOR INSTRUCTION

1. How are teachers assigned to classes?
   Probes: What input do teachers have in determining their assignment?
2. How are students assigned to classes?
   Probes: Who makes the final decision about where students are assigned?
3. How are teachers assisted with class organization?
   Probes: How are groupings within each classroom determined?
4. What is your role in the monitoring of student progress?
   Probes: What percentage of your time is spent discussing student progress with teachers?
   How are teachers' concerns handled?
5. What is your role in student evaluation? Does this role differ at all for English and French immersion students? How?
   Probes: Can you compare the standardized evaluative materials which exist for English and French immersion program students?
   Are you involved in the selection of evaluative material? For which grade levels?
   For French immersion, English materials or both?
   What is done about poor results/concerns?
   What percentage of your time is spent discussing student evaluation/achievement with teachers, either as a staff or individually?
   Do you see any differences between French immersion and English teachers in their classroom evaluation of their students?
   Does anyone assist either or both groups with evaluation?
6. Do you have a school policy or set of goals on student evaluation? If so, how was this policy developed?
   Probes: How are teachers made aware of this policy?
   How often is this policy revised?
7. Can you please comment on your expectations of the students in this school?
   Probes: What percentage of the students do you feel will complete high school?
   Do you have any different expectations for French immersion and English students?
   Do you notice any difference in expectations of students between French immersion and English program teachers?
8. Can you briefly describe your policy on student discipline? Do you have a written policy on discipline?
   Probes: How was this policy developed?
   How do teachers, students and parents respond to the procedures dealing with discipline?
9. Do you feel that your level of French proficiency has any effect on the organization of the school for instruction? Do you think that French immersion teachers believe that it has an effect? Why do you think this?
10. Do you have any other comments on the organization of the school for instruction?

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOL

1. Please briefly describe the role parents play in the school?
   Probes: How do you encourage parent participation in the school?
   What kinds of activities do parents participate in?
   Do parents assist in the classroom?
   Do you notice any differences between English and French immersion teachers as to how they involve parents in the classroom or in school activities?
   Is there a school-based Parent Advisory Committee?
   What kinds of decisions do parent committee members make?
   What percentage of parents on the committee are from the immersion program?
   How are parents made to feel that they can be meaningful participants on these school committees?
   Is there a school or district policy on Parent Advisory Committees?
2. What do you feel is your role in school-community relations?
   Probes: What percentage of the day do you spend talking to parents?
   Does this differ for French immersion and English parents?
   What strategies do you use to gain parental support? Which are most successful?
3. By what means, in order of frequency, do you communicate with parents?
   Probes: Which means do you feel are most successful in promoting good school-community relations? Why?
   What means do you feel parents prefer in learning about their child's progress and about the school?
4. Please comment on the relationship between the English program parents and French immersion parents.
   Probes: What factors do you think contribute to this situation?
   How do you promote good relations between the two groups?
   How do you dissipate conflict between the two groups?
   Can you compare school and community goals concerning instruction?
5. Do you see your level of bilingualism as a factor in your relationship with either group of parents?
   Probes: Do you think French immersion parents feel that you are supportive of the program?
   Do you think English program parents feel that you sympathize with their concerns?
6. Do you have any further comments on your relationship with parents on the role of parents in the school?
7. Considering the five categories of questions on which you have just commented, could you describe what you perceive to be your priorities in your role as principal.

Appendix I

TEACHER INTERVIEW

TEACHER SUPERVISION

1. Describe the process of teacher supervision in your school, the definition of teacher supervision being the non-evaluative process by which the principal and other personnel assist you with instructional improvement? What do you think of this process?
   Probes: Who assists you in improving your instruction?
   What do you do if you have problems/questions concerning instruction?
   How does the principal monitor your instruction?
   How often during the school year does the principal visit your classroom or discuss instruction with you?
   What steps precede and follow such a visit?
   Do you receive any assistance in developing instructional objectives generally and for specific subjects?
2. Do you think teacher supervision is a priority for your principal? What makes you think this?
   Probes: Do you have confidence in your principal's assessment of your instructional techniques?
   Do you take measures to implement changes suggested by your principal?
3. Is there a policy about teacher supervision in your school?
   Probes: Who developed this policy?
   How were you informed of it?
   What do you think of it?
   Do you see teacher supervision practices as fulfilling school goals?
4. Do you see any problems associated with teacher supervision? What do you think causes these problems? Do you see any solutions to them?
5. Do you think the principal's level of French proficiency is a factor in teacher supervision?
6. Do you have any other comments on teacher supervision?

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Could you describe the process of staff development in your school?
   Probes: How are decisions about staff development reached?
   Who makes these decisions?
   Is there a school-based professional development committee?
   Does the principal attend meetings?
   How effective is this committee?
2. What do you think is the principal's role in staff development?
   Probes: Does the principal encourage you to participate in staff development? How?
   What are your principal's goals about staff development?
   Is there a school policy on staff development?
   Did you have any input into the formation of this policy?
   How often does the principal discuss staff development with you, either individually or as a staff?
3. How do you feel about staff development in your school?
   Probes: What motivates you to participate in staff development?
   Have your beliefs about staff development changed during your career as a teacher? If so,why?
4. What role does the principal play in classroom instruction?
   Probes: How often does the principal discuss instruction with you?

Does the principal assist you with instruction? How? How beneficial is this assistance?
Does anyone else assist you with instruction? If so, how beneficial is this assistance?
How are your concerns/questions about instruction handled?

5. How are your instructional objectives developed?
   Probes: Who assists you with the development of these objectives?
6. How are proposed curricular changes introduced to staff?
   Probes: How are decisions made about what new curriculum is to be implemented?
   Do you feel that you have enough input into decisions about what is implemented?
   What motivates you to make curricular changes?
   What role does the principal play in your implementation of new curriculum?
   How often does the principal discuss curricular changes with you?
7. How is the implementation of curriculum changes monitored?
   Probes: Who monitors these changes?
   What role does the principal have in monitoring curricular changes in your classroom?
8. How are curricular changes evaluated?
   Probes: Who evaluates the implementation of curricular changes in your classroom?
   When and how are curricular changes evaluated?
   What role does the principal play in the evaluation?
9. Briefly describe any in-service for implementing curricular changes which you have received in the past year.
   Probes: Do you feel the support you receive for curriculum implementation is adequate?
   Who gives you this support?
   How often do you seek the principal's opinion on curricular matters?
10. Do you feel that the principal's level of bilingualism has an effect on staff development or on his/her role in assisting you with classroom instruction?
11. Do you have any other comments about staff development or about the principal's role in the instructional process?

STAFF COLLEGIALITY

1. Please comment on the relationship between staff members generally and between French immersion and English program teachers in particular.
   Probes: Do the two groups intermingle in the staffroom regularly?
   Do French immersion teachers speak French in the staffroom?
   How do the English staff feel about this?
   Do English teachers help French teachers with their English?
   With report cards?
   Do French teachers help English teachers with French skills?
2. What strategies does the principal use to promote staff collaboration?
   Probes: Does the principal exhibit equality in his/her decision-making?
   What strategies does the principal use in attaining staff consensus on professional issues?
   Do you feel that the principal is supportive of and sensitive to individual differences among staff members?
   How does the principal handle staff conflict?
   Does the principal promote risk-taking among staff members? How?
3. What role do staff members play in developing school policies and in solving school problems?
   Probes: Which group of teachers, English or French, give more input into the decision-making process in the school? Why do you think this is so?
   What strategies does the principal use to assist teachers in attaining consensus on professional issues?

4. What opportunities exist for teachers to exchange ideas on professional issues? How is this process facilitated?
   Probes: How often do you discuss staff development at staff meetings?
   Do English and French teachers tend to discuss educational questions/concerns separately or jointly? Why do you think this is so?
   Do they sit together in the staffroom?
   How much time do teachers spend on recess and lunch hour supervision?
   How long is the lunch hour? Do most staff members spend that time in the staffroom? Is there any discrepancy between English and French immersion teachers on this question?
   What provisions are made for those teachers who wish to engage in professional development activities?
   How does the principal facilitate the professional development process?
5. What committees exist in your school? How do they function?
   Probes: Are there grade/subject committees?
   Do French immersion and English teachers sit on the same committees?
   Do they work harmoniously together?
   Does the principal sit on any of these committees?
   How often do they meet?
   How involved is the principal in the staff's professional development? Does he/she attend professional development sessions with teachers?
6. How important a factor is the principal's French language proficiency on his/her relationship with you?
7. Do you have any other comments on the relationship among staff members, on the relationship of the principal and staff, or on staff collaboration?

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION FOR INSTRUCTION

1. How are teachers assigned to classes?
   Probes: What input do you have in determining your assignment?
2. How are students assigned to classes?
   Probes: Who makes the final decisions about which classes students are assigned to?
3. How are teachers assisted with class organization?
   Probes: How are groupings within each classroom determined?
   What role does the principal play in organizing your classroom?
4. What role does the principal play in monitoring student progress?
   Probes: How often does the principal discuss student progress with you?
   What do you do when you have concerns about a student's progress?
5. What role does the principal play in student evaluation?
   Probes: Is the principal involved in the selection of standardized tests?
   What does the principal do with the evaluation results?
   Do you approach the principal with concerns/questions regarding student evaluation or achievement? When?
   What is done about these concerns and about poor results on evaluative materials?
   How often is evaluation/achievement discussed as a staff?
   Does anyone else assist you with evaluation? Who?
   What do you think should be the principal's role in the student evaluation process?
6. Is there a school policy addressing student evaluation?
   Probes: How was this policy developed?
   Did you have input into the formation of the policy? How?
   Are you in agreement with the policy?
   Is the policy revised as new teachers join the staff?
7. Please comment on your expectations of your students?
   Probes: How do you communicate these expectations to your students?

What percentage of your students do you feel will complete high school?

8. Can you comment on the principal's expectations of the students in the school.
   Probe: What does the principal do to make you think this?
9. How is student discipline handled in the school? Is there a policy on student discipline?
   Probes: How was this policy developed?
   Is the policy being implemented successfully?
   Do students and parents respond well to the procedures dealing with discipline?
   Is the policy revised as new staff members join the staff?
10. Do you feel that the principal's level of French proficiency has an effect on the organization of the school for instruction? How?
11. Do you have any further comments on the principal's role in the organization of the school for instruction?

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOL

1. Please briefly describe the role parents play in your classroom?
   Probes: Do they observe? How often?
   Do they assist you with preparation of materials? How often?
   Do they assist students? How often?
   How do you feel about parental participation in the classroom?
   Does the principal encourage you to involve parents in your classroom? How?
2. What role do parents play in the school as a whole?
   Probe: Name some activities in which parents are involved.
3. How do you see the principal's role in school-community relations?
   Please comment on the principal's relationship with the parents in the school.
   Probes: How much time does he/she seem to spend talking to parents?
   Does he/she make parents feel welcome in the school? How?
   Have you noticed any strategies which the principal uses to gain parental support?
   Do you think they are successful?
   Do you think he/she spends more time dealing with English program or French immersion parents? Why do you think this is so? How does this make you feel?
4. By what means, in order of frequency, do you communicate with parents?
   Probes: Which means do you feel are most successful for explaining your opinions to parents?
   Which means do you think parents prefer for learning about their child's progress?
5. By what means, in order of frequency, do you think the principal communicates with parents?
   Do you feel the principal is successful in communicating the school's policies to parents and in promoting good school-community relations? What makes you think so?
6. How do you think parents view school-community relations? What makes you think this?
7. Please comment on the relationship between English program parents and French immersion parents.
   Probes: What factors do you think contribute to this situation?
   What strategies, if any, does the principal use to gain parental support?
   How does the principal dissipate conflict between the two groups?
8. Do you think the principal's level of French proficiency is a factor in his/her relationship with parents? What makes you think this?
9. Do you have any additional comments on the principal's relationship with parents or on the role of parents in the school?
10. Considering the five categories of questions on which you have just commented, could you describe what you perceive to be your principal's priorities for his/her job?

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A., & Smith, S. C. (1986). It is time for principals to share the responsibility for instructional leadership with others. OSSC Bulletin, 29(6).

Alfonso, R. J., & Goldberry, L. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.). Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria, V. A.: A.S.C.D. Press.

Ambrosie, F. (1989). The case for collaborative versus negotiated decision making. NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 56-59.

Anderson, C. (1982). The search for school climate. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 368-420.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1979). An exploratory study of school district adaptation. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation.

Blase, J. J. (1983). The teacher stress coping taxonomy: Implications for research and practice in educational administration. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Blase, J. J. (1987a). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. American Educational Research Journal, 24(4), 589-610.

Blase, J. J. (1987b). Dimensions of ineffective school leadership: The teachers' perspective. American Journal of Educational Administration, 25(2), 193-212.

Blumberg, A. (1974). Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Company.

British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1988). French language education in British Columbia: 1988/89 enrolment report. Ministry of Education, Modern Languages Services Branch.

Burns, G. (1986). French immersion implementation in Ontario: Some theoretical, policy and applied issues. Canadian Modern Language Review, 42(3), 573-591.

Burns, G., & Olson, P. (1981). Implementation and politics in French immersion. Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press.

Calabrese, R. L. (1988). Ethical leadership: A prerequisite for effective schools. NASSP Bulletin, 72(512), 1-4.

Canadian Education Association. (1983). French immersion and school boards: Issues and effects. Toronto, Ont.: Author.

Carey, S. (1984). Reflections on a decade of French immersion. Canadian Modern Language Review, 41(2), 246-259.

Clift, D. (1984). Towards the larger community. Language and Society, 12, 65-68.

Clinton, A., & Talmanis, A. (1982). Administration of French immersion programs. Actes du congres nationale, A.C.P.I., 33-39.

Coleman, P. (1984). Towards more effective schools: Improving elementary school climate. Administrator's Notebook, 31(4), 45-48.

Coleman, P. (1986). Finally, a change that makes a difference: An assessment of a pilot project in school-based decision-making in a British Columbia school district. Presented at the World Congress on Education and Technology, Vancouver, B. C.

Cummins, J. (1978). The cognitive development of children in immersion programs. Canadian Modern Language Review, 34(5), 855-883.

Dagenais, D. (1990). Principal's role in French immersion. The Canadian School Executive, 9(8), 37.

Day, E., & Shapson, S. (1983). Elementary French immersion programs in British Columbia: A survey of administrators, teachers and parents. Part 1: Summary of Findings. Burnaby, B.C.: B.C. French Study, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.

Dow, I. I., & Whitehead, R. Y. (1980). Curriculum implementation study, physical education K-6: Personal well-being. Funded under contract with the Carlton Board of Education, U. of Ottawa.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. A. (1977/78). The practicality ethic in teacher decision-making. Interchange, 8(3), 1-12.

Duell, O. K., & Davison, R. (1987). Elementary principals' and teachers' views of various modes of instructional evaluation. Spectrum, 5(1), 23-33.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(1), 15-23.

Ellis, T. R. (1985). Teacher evaluation is hard work: And it should be. Principal, 64(4), 22-24.

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(2), 7-30.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press.

Glasman, N. S., & Paulin, P. J. (1982). Possible determinants of teacher receptivity to evaluation. Journal of Educational Administration, 20(2), 148-171.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision. Toronto, Ont.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Gray, J. L., & Starke, F. A. (1984). Organizational behavior: Concepts and applications (3rd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Company.

Greenfield, W. (1984). Sociological perspectives for research in educational administration. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15(5), 5-11.

Guttman, M. (1983). There's more to French immersion than social class. Interchange, 14(1), 17-23.

Hanrahan, R. D. (1987). The perceptual compatibility of teachers and principals on the principals' use of clinical supervision techniques. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, Faculty of Education, Dalhousie University.

Heckman, P. (1987). Understanding school culture. In J. Goodlad (Ed.). The Ecology of School Renewal. Eighty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1. Chicago, Ill.: U. of Chicago Press.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York, N. Y.: Plenum Press.

Hunter, E. (1989). The role of teachers in educational reform. NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 61-63.

Huntington, F. (1984). The art of mingling is a masterstroke of management. Executive Educator, 6(7), 18-19.

Johnston, S. M. (1983). Clinical supervision: An assessment after. The Canadian School Executive, 3(2), 6-8.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40, 4-10.

Krajewski, R. (1976). Clinical supervision: To facilitate teacher self-improvement. Journal of Research and Development in Teaching, 19(2), 58-66.

Lamarre, N. (1989). The experiences of anglophone elementary principals with French immersion programs. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Lambert, W. E., Tucker, G. R., & d'Anglejan, A. (1974). An innovative approach to second language training: The St. Lambert experiment. In Stephen T. Carey (Ed.). Bilingualism, Biculturalism& Education. Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta Press.

Lapkin, S. (1984). Future perspectives on administrative and pedagogical aspects of French immersion education. Contact, 3(1), 4-10.

Lapkin, S., Andrew, C., Harley, B., Swain, M., & Kamin, J. (1981). The immersion centre and the dual-track school: A study of the relationship between school environment and achievement in a French immersion program. Canadian Journal of Education, 6(3), 68-90.

Lapkin, S, Swain, M., & Argue, V. (1983). French immersion: The trial balloon that flew. Toronto, Ont.: O.I.S.E. Press.

LaRocque, L. (1984). Teacher ethos: School-oriented and classroom-oriented teachers. Unpublished manuscript submitted for publication, Simon Fraser University.

LaRocque, L., & Coleman, P. (1987). Leadership and commitment to change in school districts. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C..

Lebrun, L. A. (1981). Organizing a French immersion school. In Early French immersion: Administrator's resource book. Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education, Division of Public Instruction, Modern Languages Services Branch.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1986). Improving principal effectiveness: The principal profile. Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press.

Lemire, H. (1989). Perceptions of principals of French immersion schools in Alberta. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Levin, B. (1979). Teacher evaluation: A review of research. Educational Leadership, 37(3), 240-245.

Lewis, J. (1973). Appraising teacher performance. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company.

Lieberman, A., & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement. In J. Goodlad (Ed.). The Ecology of School Renewal. Eighty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1. Chicago Ill.: U. of Chicago Press.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.

MacKinnon, B. (1987) An exploratory investigation of the relationships among principals' leadership style and teachers' perceptions of the suitability of the clinical supervision process. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Education, Faculty of Education, Saint Francis Xavier University.

MacNaughton, R. H., Tracy, S., & Rogers, J. F. (1984). Effective teacher evaluation: Process must be personalized, individualized. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 67-73.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Teacher empowerment: A step toward professionalization. NASSP Bulletin, 72(511), 52-60.

Manning, R. C. (1986). Evaluation strategies can be improved with peer observers. School Administrator, 43(1), 14.

McClure, R. M. (1988). The evolution of shared leadership. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 60-62.

McGillivray, W. R. (1978). Administrative problems of early French immersion. Interchange, 9(4), 70-72.

McGillivray, W. R. (1983). Research on French immersion programs. Contact, 2(4), 2-5.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 193-207.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1979). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.). Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. New York, N. Y.: Teachers College Press.

McPherson, R. B., Crowson, R. L., & Pitner, N. J. (1986). Managing uncertainty: Administrative theory and practice in education. Columbus, Ohio.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook for New Methods. Beverly Hills, C. A.: Sage Press.

Nagy, P., & Klaiman, R. (1986). Attitudes to and impact of French immersion. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Educational Researchers Association, Winnipeg, Man.: O.I.S.E. Press.

Nidich, R. J., & Nidich, S. I. (1986). A study of school organizational climate variables associated with teacher morale. Clearing House, 60(4), 189-191.

Official Languages Act. (1969). Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Olson, P., & Burns, G. (1981). Immersed for change: Politics and planning in French immersion. Orbit, 12(5), 7-14.

Olson, P., & Burns, G. (1983). Politics, class and happenstance: French immersion in a Canadian context. Interchange, 14(1), 1-16.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York, N. Y.: Warner.

Reilkoff, T. (1981). Advantages of supportive supervision over clinical supervision. NASSP Bulletin, 65(448), 28-33.

Richardson, J. A., & Barbe, R. H. (1987). Fairness: An important attribute of principals in excellent schools. NASSP Bulletin, 71(500), 99-103.

Rideout, S. (1987). French immersion and regular English programs in the elementary dual-track school: A study of the role of the principal. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.

Roberts, C. (1990). A perspective on the relationship between school ethos and student academic achievement. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education, 93(3), 352-388.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon.

Scarr, L. E. (1988). Lake Washington's master plan: A system for growth. Educational Leadership, 46(2), 13-16.

Seifert, E. H., & Beck, J. J. (1981). Elementary principals: Instructional leaders or school managers. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(7), 528.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 41(5), 6.

Shapson, S. (1988). French immersion. Paper prepared for The Royal Commission on Education, Simon Fraser University.

Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(3), 178-182.

Smith, S. C. & Scott, J. J. (1989). Encouraging school staffs to collaborate for instructional effectiveness. OSSC Bulletin, 33(1).

Smyth, W. J. (1985). An educative and empowering notion of leadership. Educational Management and Administration, 13(3), 179-186.

Soar, R., Medley, D., & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(1), 239-246.

Stanutz, S. (1988). Early French immersion, the unilingual English administrator and the exceptional child. In P. Calve (Ed.). Aspects of Immersion. Ontario Educational Research Council.

Stern, H. (1981). Immersion schools and language learning. Language and Society, 5, 3-6.

Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth system - different purposes. NASSP, 70(490), 51-58.

Stone, D. G. (1988). Principal and teachers' perceptions of deliberate change in an elementary school as initiated by the principal. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Education, Faculty of Education, York University.

Tardif, C., & Weber, S. (1987). French immersion research: A call for new perspectives. The Canadian Modern Langage Review, 44(1), 67-77.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 27(2), 673-676.

Whittle, R. M., & Brennan, J. (1988). Organizing schools for French immersion, an exercise in proactive administration. Contact, 7(3), 7-9.