CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

THE IMPORTANCE OF AN ADMINISTRATOR'S ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE IN DEVELOPING STYLES OF EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

Christopher G. D. Kelly

B.A., University of British Columbia, 1973

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty of Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

December, 1986

ISBN 0-315-36327-4

APPROVAL

Name: Chris Kelly

Degree: Master of Arts (Education)

Title of Thesis: The Importance of an Administrator's Organizational Perspective In Developing Styles of Effective Instructional Leadership

Chairperson: R. Gehlbach

M. Manley-Casimir
Senior Supervisor

P.E.F. Coleman
Associate Professor

L. LaRocque
Post Doctoral Fellow

N. Robinson
Associate Professor
Simon Fraser University
External Examiner

Date approved December 4, 1986.

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

The Importance of an Administrator's Organizational Perspective In Developing Styles of Effective Instructional Leadership

Author: _____
(signature)

Chris Kelly
(name)

Dec. 4, 1986
(date)

The purpose of this study was to explore the reasons why principals behave as they do in their role(s) as instructional leader and to relate their behaviors to a basic perspective on the school as an organization. Three questions formed the study's focus: What are the behaviors felt to be characteristic of effective instructional leadership? To what extent are the behaviors evident on the part of principals in given settings? What motivates a particular principal to act, or not act, in certain ways as an instructional leader. As this study was exploratory in nature and was not intended to be quantitative, its findings were not considered to be generalizable to other settings.

A literature review focused on synthesizing findings in two major areas of research: the tasks, qualities and skills found to be common to the basic functioning of principals in all areas of their administrative work and the roles and behaviors found to be characteristic of principals who are effective instructional leaders. As the rating scale used in this study was itself developed through an extensive review of effective schools literature, its delineation of variables was used as the construct for this study's literature review. The limitations general to effective schools research were also reviewed.

The subjects for this study were selected as principals of

schools in the same school district. They were selected on the basis of their working in schools with a similar socio-economic base for the student population and their having been assigned to the school for a minimum of three years. The roles and behaviors of the subjects were initially investigated through the use of a rating scale survey of the teachers and subject in each school. The instrument measured the frequency with which instructional leadership behaviors were exhibited on the part of the principal. Each principal was then engaged in a semi-structured interview process wherein responses to specific questions as well as unsolicited responses were analyzed. Interview questions probed the key behavioral variables arrived at through analysis of the rating scale survey. The interview responses were collected on an audio cassette recorder. Student achievement on provincial assessments was also analyzed as a measure of effectiveness.

The results of the rating scale survey showed little difference in the frequency with which the principals exhibited instructional leadership behaviors. The interview data revealed similarities in the principals' perceptions of their roles as instructional leaders though some variation was evident in the emphasis given to certain instructional leadership practices and in each principal's style of leadership.

The findings of the study were cause for reflection on factors which were most likely to account for the similarity of outcomes in each case and, therefore, most likely to determine

the general instructional effectiveness of schools in this context. The findings were discussed in relation to a model which analyzes the structure of school organization as a "professional bureaucracy" and holds implications for school leadership. Implications for further research were presented.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM

Background

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why school principals behave as they do in their role as instructional leader and to relate their behaviors to a basic perspective on the school's organizational nature.

Instruction nowadays is receiving increased, detailed attention as the critical process for realizing complex goals in education. This stems from the general forces of change at play within the major fields of our society's activity. Over the course of the past few decades, two major developments in the United States appear to have given impetus to a current drive for effective instruction in our schools.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court clearly acknowledged that a school can make a significant difference in a child's achievement both as a student and as an adult. The statement affirmed a basic right of all children to equal educational opportunity and schools were consequently obliged to guarantee this right. Such forthright public acknowledgment quickly focused attention on public schools as an agent for social change and the "battleground for community struggles" (Pinero, 1982; 17). Federal, state, and district programs were

designed to address the challenge. Parents and community leaders became much more directly involved as clients and directors of the schooling enterprise. Administrator responsibilities changed rapidly in range and volume and an unprecedented emphasis was placed on a school's ability to manage both educational programs and public relations (Pinero, 1982).

> It seems that the days of safe encapsulation within the walls of the schoolhouse are at an end for most school administrators. A closed-system view of education's organizational world has been replaced by the realization that the school must necessarily be involved fully with its surrounding environment. (Morris et al, 1982;691)

In 1966, the fundamental ability of schools to guarantee equal educational opportunity regardless of racial or socio-economic background appeared to be seriously questioned by the findings of the Coleman Report, Equality of Educational Opportunity (1966). As the findings of the report were initially interpreted and subsequently reinforced through subsequent studies (Jencks et al, 1972), schools became critically viewed as making little difference in pupil achievement and as having low potential for overcoming "educational disadvantages related to poverty and minority status" (Pinero, 1982).

Obviously, the Coleman Report had a significant effect on the direction of educational research and, subsequently, on

instructional practices. Larry Cuban describes this effect as follows:

> Researchers in the mid- to late-1970's reacted sharply to the 1966 Coleman Report and its progeny, which suggested that teachers and administrators could have little effect on student achievement. One line of research was based on the linkage between teaching practices and improved test scores - the coin of the realm a la Coleman; another utilized investigations of schools which , given their ethnic and socio-economic mix of students, produced unexpectedly high test score gains. Both strands of research identified teacher behaviors and school practices that intersected neatly with practitioner wisdom on what schools should do to become academically productive. (Cuban, 1984; 130).

Researchers and innovators, either by choice or by directive, have become preoccupied with defining and determining effective instructional practices. Ministry standards have become more definite. School district policies and programs have become more explicit in their instructional guidelines and expectations. The classroom skills and strategies of teachers are becoming increasingly precise and specialized. The principal, through the role of instructional leadership, is more recently perceived as a potent catalytic agent, and this receives significant attention in the thrust for school improvement. This sequence of events is outlined by Cuban in the following way:

> Practitioners seldom wait for researchers to signal that school improvement can move forward. Nor have the substantial methodological problems in the research findings on effective schools halted policymakers from converting them into programs. With a quick look over their shoulders at a skeptical public, many school boards and superintendents,

> believing that tightly coupled organizations can affect children's academic performance, have moved quickly to implement the growing body of research on effective schools. I do not suggest that policies anchored more in faith than in statistical significance are misguided. On the contrary, I suggest that policies are forged in a crucible that mixes political realities, practitioner wisdom, technical expertise, and whatever can be extracted from research. The task is difficult because the empirical research seldom reveals clear causal links to policy, and yet practitioners, who must make decisions every day, are anxious to locate those decisions in a technical rationality. (Cuban, 1984; 130).

Schools today are regularly called upon to respond to economic, political and social changes occurring in our society. At this particular juncture in an ongoing cycle, the causes and validity of the call for effective instructional practices are a response to change. Research has been able to identify such practices with increasing precision and has also underscored the centrality of the principal's role as instructional leader in promoting and implementing these practices (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Bossert et al, 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983). An important focus for further study, therefore, is the identification of those basic factors that motivate and enable today's school principal to act as an effective instructional leader.

PROBLEM

Goodlad (1983a), Cuban (1984) and numerous other researchers, writers and practitioners acknowledge the fact that, in spite of all that has been clearly, emphatically and comprehensively established in the way of recommended behaviors, styles and practices for effective school leadership, mere access to such pertinent knowledge and information seems to do little to ensure its effective application.

In his discussion of school effectiveness research policy and practice, Larry Cuban states:

> Within the last decade a few scholars have produced behavioral descriptions of principals and superintendents. Yet the tasks that administrators choose to work on, the language they use, the discretion they employ, the symbols they manipulate, the incentives they extend, the style and commitment they project - all dance beyond the grasp of researchers. (Cuban, 1984;146)

The challenge, then, is to unveil the forces and influences that motivate effective leadership behavior, the forces and influences which produce what Cuban describes as "the connective tissue":

> . . . the connective tissue, the set of behaviors that principals engage in to develop a school climate that supports academic achievement - to gain staff commitment, to engender high expectations, to supervise individual teachers and the entire instructional program, while carrying on the varied and complex duties connected with maintaining order

> in the school - none of these complex, interacting behaviours has been linked in the literature to the production of higher test scores. . . Practitioner faith and folk wisdom sustain the conviction that school-site leadership makes a difference. (Cuban, 1984;145)

What are some of the basic factors which motivate and enable a principal to lead effectively, to make the active connection between effective theory and effective practice?

To address this central question, three further questions will be considered: (1) What are the behaviors currently thought to be characteristic of principals who are effective instructional leaders? (2) To what extent do principals in given settings display the behaviors which are characteristic of effective instructional leaders? (3) What motivates a particular principal to act, or not act, in certain ways as an instructional leader?

The following outline of the methods employed and statement of limitations for the study provide a basis for an exploration of the three questions.

Outline of Methodology. Four principals were chosen as the subjects for this study. The criteria for their selection include:

- their having been assigned to their school for a minimum of three consecutive years.

- their being employed by the same school district and, therefore, subject to common district policies, guidelines and support services.

- their being involved with schools which share a similar blend of student groups with a relatively common socio-economic background.

- their being assigned to schools with student achievement levels at, or above, district and provincial averages.

A review of current literature was used to illuminate the principal's importance as instructional leader and the behaviors associated with effective instructional leadership. The review was designed to provide a synthesis of findings on both counts.

To assess the extent to which the subjects individually display the behaviors of effective instructional leaders, the study used an instrument developed by Philip Hallinger entitled Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (1985). It lists seventy behaviors found to be characteristic of effective instructional leaders, groups them in eleven subscales of activity, and calls for a rating of the frequency with which each behavior is displayed by the principal in a given setting. The survey is completed by the teaching staff and the principal.

Focused interviews were conducted with each principal as a follow-up to key patterns and elements revealed by the surveys in each school, and as a means of identifying the factors causing the principal to act in certain ways.

Limitations. This study is an exploratory investigation of the research questions in relation to the chosen settings. As the study is confined to four schools not randomly selected, the findings are not generalizable to other settings. The study's investigator is also the interviewer. Therefore, there is a possibility of bias in the interpretation of responses. The investigator/interviewer is also a colleague of the subjects. This fact may have caused the subjects to stress the positive aspects of their performance, but may also have caused them to be particularly accurate in their responses and to avoid elaborate details.

Project Organization. This study is organized and reported in five chapters. Chapter one outlines the problem to be explored and provides background to the study questions, an overview of the methodology and a statement of limitations. Chapter two presents a literature review synthesizing recent findings regarding the principal's role as instructional leader and behaviors found to be characteristic of effective instructional leaders. Chapter three details the methods and procedures used for the gathering and analysis of data and information. Chapter four reports the findings from both the survey instrument used and the focused interviews with

principals. This chapter also comments upon the nature of the findings from these two processes. Chapter five summarizes, examines and analyzes the overall findings of the study with a view to recognizing and explaining particular patterns of leadership behavior in relation to the study's original questions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews current research findings regarding the role and effectiveness of the principal. Specific attention is given to the nature of instructional leadership. The literature review considers the limitations of the research and the broad range of responsibilities characterizing the principalship. This provides a frame of reference for a close examination of the activities and behaviors commonly held to be characteristic of effective instructional leaders.

Limitations of the Research

Many of the limitations of the research into effective schools and instructional leadership stem from methodological problems which reduce the generalizability of the findings (Hallinger, 1985). An outline of these problems is presented here as a general qualification for the review of the nature of the principalship and the roles and functions of instructional leadership presented in the subsequent sections of the chapter.

Context. School effectiveness research over the past several years has effectively refuted Coleman's (1966) assertion that the socio-economic status of students accounts almost entirely for the variance in student outcomes. While a general positive correlation can be found between a high SES

composition in a school population and achievement results (Jones, 1986), recent research on school effectiveness indicates that student achievement is also influenced by a variety of factors related to the quality of instruction, characteristics of the school organization and leadership and the impact of that school as a social system (Goodlad, 1983a; Rutter et al, 1979).

While school effectiveness research provides support for the notion that student outcomes may be subject to influence through the manipulation of within-school factors, two cautions must be considered in applying the findings. First, the generalizability of the findings has been questioned. The majority of the research was carried out in the context of urban, low-income and/or minority schools within the United States (Bossert et al, 1982; Hallinger, 1985; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Sweeney, 1982). One cannot assume that school characteristics identified as associated with achievement in these settings automatically apply to all others. Further, the research has tended to focus on "outlier" schools, those that are unusually effective are compared and contrasted with those that are unusually ineffective. The research does not support conclusions with respect to "average" schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

A second caveat relates to the correlational nature of the research. As Rowan et al (1983) point out, "most of the identified relationships between school-level factors and

school achievement have highly uncertain temporal and causal orderings." Thus, while certain clusters or patterns of characteristics seem to be associated with student achievement in specific types of schools, it cannot be said with any certainty that these characteristics cause high achievement in the schools studied, or that they will improve achievement in all schools.

Sample Size. Many studies begin by sifting through large populations using statistical procedures and arrive at case studies with samples of between 2 and 12 schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Examples include Weber, 1971: 4 schools; Venezky and Winfield, 1979: 2 schools; Glenn, 1981: 4 schools; Brookover and Lezotte, 1979: 8 schools; Levine and Stark, 1981: 4 schools; Rutter et al, 1979: 12 schools; Trisman et al, 1976: 6 schools (cited in Sweeney, 1982); Hallinger et al, 1985: 10 schools.

Measures. Outcome measures are often limited to student achievement on tests of basic skills in reading and mathematics. While this does not necessarily reduce the validity of the leadership studies, it does "tend to limit the ability to generalize findings when schools with characteristics different from those noted above and school objectives other than student achievement are considered" (Hallinger, 1985; 219). Many studies do not include data or, in some cases, a description of methodology in their reports (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Data Gathering. Methods for data gathering vary greatly across studies. Some studies use structured or unstructured interviews, some use surveys and others focus on brief or extended on-site observations (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1983; Purkey & Smith, 1982). Few studies are truly longitudinal; a notable exception being Fifteen Thousand Hours by Rutter et al, (1979). As a result, no empirical link can be made between leadership practices and higher test scores (Cuban, 1984).

Lack of Explanatory Models and Behavioral Indicators. Given that most research in linking educational leadership to school effectiveness consists either of isolated regression analyses or case studies, there is a general lack of detailed models to explain the findings (Purkey and Smith, 1983). Therefore, findings interpreted in lieu of the existence of such models yield little guidance for the development of policies or strategies for the improvement of schools through a focus on leadership (Hallinger, 1985; Purkey & Smith, 1983).

At the same time, a majority of the existing literature does little to translate general indicators of effectiveness into testable behaviors (Hallinger, 1985). Further research is needed to specify the behaviors and practices that make up such general indicators as "coordinating curriculum" or "monitoring student progress" in order to identify the conditions under which they operate and to test them in the school context (Cuban, 1984; Hallinger, 1985; Purkey & Smith, 1983). The Hallinger study (1985) is one recent attempt to specify such indicators.

With these limitations serving as a necessary background, the following section of this chapter reviews findings regarding the nature of the principalship.

The Nature of the Principalship

As this study focuses on the instructional leadership role of the principal, it is important to recognize that this is one of a variety of roles common to a principal's leadership. If the role is to occupy a place of central importance for the principal, it must be through the discretion and organizational ability of the individual principal (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Bossert et al, 1983; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

As one might expect, a wealth of studies exists on the topic of a principal's tasks. An explanation for this fact derives from an observation made in the previous chapter and in the studies themselves, that the past decade has seen a increased emphasis on the importance of the principal's roles to effective schooling. Consequently, a great deal more attention is being paid to the changing roles, functions and shifting priorities of school administrators (Austin, 1979; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

The literature is varied in its treatment of the principalship, being selective in many instances and very

general in others. It seems possible to view the topic through the use of two major areas of consideration: Daily Tasks, which administrators seemed to be most consistently called upon to perform and Recommended Qualities and Skills, which are seen to be essential to effective administration.

While these two areas of consideration are interconnected, it is useful to attempt some separate analysis, since a principal must ultimately manipulate and balance these role expectations if effective instructional leadership is seen to be a priority.

Daily Tasks. Throughout the studies reviewed, there seemed to be general agreement that the daily tasks of the principal are many, varied, occur unpredictably and average short durations of time (Howell, 1981; Mintzberg, 1979; Sackney, 1980). In many instances, the literature expressed the idea that a principal's day is typically non-typical. A principal's day tends to consist of "current, specific, non-routine, well-defined tasks" (Mintzberg, 1974) which require "more doing than thinking" (Sackney, 1980) and which emphasize verbal interaction (Mintzberg, 1974).

In an effort to analyze the daily tasks of principals, K. D. Petersen (1978) focused attention on the daily work of two principals in a large, midwestern city in the United States. His general observation, that the principal's day consists of very short tasks, was supported by findings showing an average

of thirteen activities per hour with a range of "from four to almost fifty activities per hour." Most activities were found to last an average of one to two minutes and over 85% of the principal's time was found to be taken up by tasks lasting less than nine minutes.

Ultimately, Petersen grouped the range and variety of observed activities into five major functional categories: (1) working with students, (2) working with professional staff, (3) interacting with parents, (4) planning and coordinating curricular or instructional programs, (5) general administrative tasks.

In many ways, these categories corresponded with those identified by Howell (1981) in his study of the daily activities of fourteen principals. Howell categorized the daily tasks according to paper work, parent conferences, discipline, scheduling, general supervision, and instructional leadership. He further organized these categories under broader headings of office responsibilities, faculty/community relations, curriculum, students, and professional development. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) list the "five major functional areas of responsibility" formulated by Lipham and Hoeh (1974) as: (1) The Instructional Program, (2) Staff Personnel Services, (3) Student Personnel Services, (4) Financial-Physical Resources, and (5) School-Community Relations (1980;19). Figure 2:1 illustrates a certain agreement in these identifications of major categories for a principal's tasks.

Petersen (1978) and Howell (1981), through separate studies, arrived at average percentages of time spent per category of daily activity (figure 2:2). Clearly, the average amount of daily time spent per major functional category differs from study to study and, therefore, from principal to principal. The fact that the difference is less than 10% in two cases indicates, however, that an average, predictable breakdown of time spent on major tasks does exist for the daily work of the school administrator. Of particular note in the findings of both Petersen and Howell is that the category of "Planning/Coordinating Instructional Programs" receives a comparatively small percentage of average time, 6% in Petersen's study and 14% in Howell's. What was not made clear in these studies, however, was the degree to which tasks in other categories had a direct or indirect bearing on the principal's instructional leadership role. This question calls for a consideration of the relationship between a principal's daily tasks and his or her major roles.

A common distinction used in identifying roles is an overall, general separation of a principal's activities into two major categories: that of "operational manager" as opposed to that of "instructional leader" (Roe and Drake in Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). However one categorizes and labels the roles that a principal can or should perform, it seems apparent that principals will "carve out roles from the reality they see" (Sackney, 1980). Principals will concentrate on those roles in

Figure 2:1 Functional Categories for a Principal's Daily Tasks

Petersen (1977)	Howell (1981)	Lipham & Hoeh (1974)
1. Work with students.	1. Students	1. Student Personnel Service.
2. Coordinating instructional program	2. Curriculum	2. Instructional program
3. Interaction with parents	3. Faculty and community	3. School/Community relations
4. Work with professional staff	4. Professional development	4. Staff personnel services
5. General administrative tasks	5. Office responsibilities	5. Financial/Physical resources

Figure 2:2 Average Amounts of Principals' Daily Time per Functional Category

Functional Categories	Petersen (1977)	Howell (1981)
1. Interactions with students	38%	21%
2. Planning/coordinating instructional programs	6%	14%
3. Interactions with parents	6.5%	12.5%
4. Interactions with professional staff	31%	12.5%
5. General administrative tasks	18.5%	32%

Note: Comparison of studies re average amounts (%) of time spent by principals in major categories of daily tasks (*figures do not add up to 100% in each column because some categories and figures have not been included).

which they feel most competent or comfortable and will often tend to lean one way or the other as either "operational managers" or "instructional leaders". (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Sackney, 1980; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981)

Recommended Qualities and Skills.

> Our informal observations indicated that no one style was associated with better outcomes. Indeed, it was noticeable that the heads of the more successful schools took widely different approaches. Nevertheless, it was likely that these had essential elements in common, and it is important to determine what these might be. (Rutter et al, 1979)

In their book The Effective Principal, Blumberg and Greenfield focused attention on highly effective, successful principals, each of whom had a distinctly singular style, approach and set of skills from which to draw. At the conclusion of their study, they identified three elements of effectiveness which, they observed, were common to all eight:

1. Their individual commitment to the realization of a particular educational or organizational vision,

2. Their propensity to assume the initiative and take a pro-active stance in relation to the demands of their work-world environment, and

3. Their ability to satisfy the routine organizational

maintenance demands in a manner that permitted them to spend most of their on-the-job time in activities directly related to the realization of their personal vision. They did not allow themselves to become consumed by second-order priorities. (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; 208)

The value of a principal holding to a vision for what the school should achieve was supported by the findings of Hay (1980) and Shoemaker & Fraser (1981), which emphasized the importance of a principal being able to set and maintain clear, reasonable and personal objectives for his or her efforts as a leader. Shoemaker & Fraser also stressed the value of a principal being pro-active, assuming initiative and showing assertiveness in dealing with daily demands. In their study What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal? , Goldhammer & Becker (1970) also saw the principals of schools they identified as "Beacons of Brilliance" being pro-active and assertive in their approach. In turn, these writers pointed to the importance of a principal's ability to "adapt to ambiguous situations." Other skills identified as having major importance in effective leadership include management ability, human relations skills, an ability to effectively supervise and evaluate programs and personnel, and a thorough legal awareness (Austin, 1981; Goldhammer & Becker, 1970; Hay, 1980; Sackney, 1980).

The essential attributes inclining a principal towards effectiveness may vary as do the characteristics and

requirements of school environments. Each principal applies knowledge, skills and energy according to the demands and potential of his or her situation. Sackney recommends that in all situations a principal maintain an objective view of the school as a "microcosm of its larger society" and then act as a "systems analyst" in sensing, evaluating and acting upon the major factors determining the direction and character of the school society (Sackney, 1980;4). By taking this "participant-observer" stance, the principal can become a "broker" of the influences, factors and resources which can be combined to achieve the overall goal or "vision" (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Goldhammer & Becker, 1970; Sackney, 1980). Principal expertise in instructional practices and programs was also identified as a key ingredient in meeting instructional goals and in identifying resources to meet those goals (Austin, 1980; Sackney, 1980; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981).

This review of the daily tasks and recommended qualities and skills constitutes a description of the general nature of the principalship. It serves as a background against which the roles and functions specific to effective instructional leadership are more closely examined in the final section of this chapter.

The Roles and Functions of Instructional Leadership

The principal plays an essential role in support of a school's instructional program by exhibiting strong leadership

(Austin, 1981; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Manasse, 1984; Morris et al, 1982; Pinero, 1982; Rutherford, 1985; Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981; Sweeney citing: Armer et al, 1976; California State Department Study, 1980; Edmonds, 1978; Levine & Stark, 1981; Trisman et al, 1976; Weber, 1971). On its own, "strong leadership" implies decisiveness, commitment, conviction, assertiveness and the like, but goes no further in detailing specific roles and behaviors to be associated with this description. The work of Philip Hallinger (1985) focused on a delineation of roles and behaviors associated with strong instructional leadership. The behaviors specified by Hallinger's research are organized into eleven subscales and grouped according to what he identifies as three major dimensions of a principal's functioning as instructional leader:

Through this delineation of instructional leadership behaviors, Hallinger developed the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. As this rating scale was used in this study to determine the frequency with which the subjects exhibit effective instructional leadership behaviors in their respective schools, Hallinger's organization and listing of major dimensions and principal roles has been adopted as the format for the findings of this literature review.

Dimension One: Defines the School's Mission. This dimension encompasses the principal's fundamental role as the "visionary", the formulation and communication of a vision for

Figure 2:3 Organization of Dimensions and Subscales, Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale

Defines the Mission:	Manages Instructional Program:	Promotes School Climate:
Framing School Goals	Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	Protecting Instructional Time
Communicating School Goals		
	Coordinating Curriculum	Promoting professional development
	Monitoring Student Progress	Maintaining high visibility
		Providing incentive for teachers
		Enforcing academic standards
		Providing incentives for students

(Hallinger, 1985; 221)

the school. Blumberg & Greenfield describe the effective instructional leader as one who bases his or her efforts upon a desire to make the school over in his or her own "image" (1980). These principals gradually move the school towards their own vision of what it should be (Manasse, 1984). Vaill (1982) incorporates this idea of working towards a vision in his concept of "purposing", "that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership that has the effect of inducing clarity, consensus and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes" (Vaill in Manasse, 1984;44). Effective principals are seen to have two types of vision: a vision of their school and their role within it, and a vision of the change process itself. This provides a framework for daily action and a basis for assessing effects (Manasse, 1984). The principal's vision focusses on the students' needs and strengths and on the teachers as primary vehicles through which to achieve the desired outcomes (Rutherford, 1985). The principal communicates the vision to staff and students in such a way that a sense of shared purpose exists, linking together the various activities that take place in the classrooms throughout the school (Hallinger, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1984).

Framing School Goals. In defining the school's mission, the principal has clearly defined goals that focus on student achievement. These goals are few in number, incorporate data on past performance and include staff responsibilities for achieving them. Securing input from both staff and parents in framing school goals is seen as an important process

(Hallinger, 1985). Conceptual clarity on the part of all who are involved in the instructional process is evidenced through goal specificity and results in a higher percentage of goal achievement (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Rutter et al, 1979). Purkey & Smith, in their review of six major case studies, found that a common factor was a clear set of goals serving as an emphasis for the school (1983). Effective principals are exceptionally clear about their own short- and long-term goals which usually focus on "basics." A heavy emphasis is given to the instructional objectives of teachers and clear priorities are established among the objectives which serve as a focus for instruction (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Communicating School Goals. This role is concerned with the ways in which principals communicate goals to teachers, parents and students. Goals tend to be discussed and reviewed with staff periodically during the school year. They are formally communicated via goal statements, staff bulletins, newsletters, meetings with parents, and through school assemblies. Goals are also informally communicated through daily conversations and casual interactions (Hallinger, 1985).

Dimension Two: Managing the Instructional Program. This dimension encompasses those roles involved in working directly with teachers in areas specifically related to curriculum and instruction (Bossert et al, 1982; Hallinger, 1985; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). The roles include supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student

progress, protecting instructional time, and promoting instructional improvement (Hallinger, 1985).

Instructional leaders become influential in the areas of curriculum and instruction. Decisions are made with clarity and purpose, considerable time is devoted to the coordination and control of instruction and a skillful handling of the involved tasks is apparent (Bossert et al, 1982). Instructional leaders focus on instructional management roles to ensure that students are provided with the best possible programs. This focus holds top priority in all functions and decisions (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

> At the heart of the principal's instructional management role, then, is an understanding of how school and classroom organization affects the learning experiences of children. . . An . approach . is to examine the organizational organizational structure at the school level in order to find factors that shape a classroom's instructional organization (Bossert et al, 1982;41).

Supervising and Evaluating Instruction. Effective instructional leaders do more observation of teachers' work, discuss more work problems with teachers and are more active in setting up teacher and program evaluation procedures (Bossert et al, 1982; Brookover et al, 1979; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Levine and Stark, 1981; Rutherford, 1985). Interestingly, the literature offers little evidence that close supervision results in greater student achievement (Hallinger, 1985). This role receives only limited support from research on school effectiveness (Levine and Stark, 1982; Lipham, 1981; New York

State Office of Performance Review, 1974; all cited in Hallinger, 1985). In spite of these findings, supervision and evaluation of instruction involve a complex of interrelated processes on the part of principals and teachers. They also serve as major vehicles for a variety of other distinct functions related to instructional management. Whereas a direct correlation with greater student achievement may be difficult to identify, this does not necesssarily minimize the importance of a principal's supervisory and evaluative functions in effectively managing the instructional program. Sweeney's (1982) review of eight major studies into school effectiveness indicated that all studies positively associated the behavior of "sets instructional strategies" with school outcomes (Sweeney citing:Brookover, 1976; Edmonds, 1979; Madden, 1976; New York State Performance Review, 1974; Rutter et al, 1979; School Improvement Project, 1979; Weber, 1971; Wellisch, 1978). Therefore, it can be reasonably assumed that the role of supervising and evaluating instruction would have major application in instructional leadership.

Rutherford (1985) notes that while less effective principals show little concern and involvement with teachers through supervision or evaluation, effective principals carry out frequent observations and provide frequent, often formal, feedback. Teachers seem to appreciate such monitoring behaviors because they reflect interest in quality teaching and obvious care about what the teacher is doing.

Coordinating Curriculum. According to Hallinger (1985), this role "stands out" in instructionally effective schools. Curricular objectives are closely aligned with both content and achievement tests. A high degree of continuity exists in the interpretation of curriculum across grade levels. This results from a greater interaction among teachers within and across grade levels regarding instructional and curricular issues. Behaviors associated with the coordination of the instructional program are found to be characteristic of effective principals in studies carried out by Brookover, 1976, Edmonds, 1979, the School Improvement Project, 1979, and Wellisch, 1978 (cited in Sweeney, 1982).

> As instructional organization at both school and classroom levels becomes more complex, principals may engage in more coordinative activity. . . Contingency theorists in the field of organizational analysis argue that as organizations become more complex, more coordination is needed in order to maintain a given level of performance (Bossert et al, 1982;45).

Monitoring Student Progress. Effective principals closely monitor student progress on a regular and frequent basis (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Levine and Stark, 1981). Leithwood & Montgomery (1982) found this function to be a central priority of effective principals. Effective principals emphasize standardized and criterion-referenced tests and use test results for setting goals, assessing the curriculum, evaluating instruction and measuring progress towards school goals (Hallinger, 1985).

Dimension Three: Promoting a Positive Learning Climate. Because the terms "climate" and "culture" are sometimes referred to as being synonymous, a discussion of the distinction between the two is important. Learning climate is referred to as "the norms and attitudes of the staff that influence learning in the school" (Hallinger, 1985), or as the "set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior in it" (Hoy and Miskel, 1982). The term "culture" is "reserved for the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously and that define, in a basic taken-for-granted fashion, an organization's view of itself and its environment (Schein, 1985). Culture governs "what is of worth for (the) group and how members should think, feel and behave" (Sergiovanni, 1984). Implications of culture in relation to instructional leadership will be discussed in the final chapter of this study. For now, it is important to note that, where "promoting a positive learning climate" is a major dimension of instructional leadership functions, it is a dimension which reflects the character of a more deeply imbedded culture shaped by a multiplicity of factors within the school.

Hallinger (1985) states that principals can influence climate through the creation of a reward structure that reinforces academic achievement and productive effort, through clear, explicit standards embodying what the school expects from students, through the careful use of school time, and

through the selection and implementation of high-quality staff development programs. Therefore, the instructional leadership roles associated with this dimension include: protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, providing incentives for teachers, developing and enforcing academic standards, and providing incentives for learning.

Protecting Instructional Time. Principals who successfully implement policies that prevent interruptions of classroom learning time can increase allocated learning time and, potentially, student achievement (Stallings, 1980). Interruptions to learning time typically include announcements, tardy students, and requests from the office (Hallinger, 1985). In Leithwood & Montgomery's study (1982), effective principals were found to directly influence the amount of class time devoted to instruction. In the synthesis of effective schools research Onward to Excellence (Northwest Regional Laboratory, 1984), effective principals were found to handle administrative matters with time-conserving routines that did not disrupt instructional activities. Time-use strategies were established, widely communicated, and enforced.

Promoting Professional Development. McLaughlin & Marsh's (1978) review of the Rand study highlights the value of direct principal involvement in staff development and in securing teacher commitment to ongoing training. Effective principals arrange for carefully structured professional development in their schools and encourage teachers to participate.

Professional development is seen as a vehicle for program improvement. Principals work closely with teachers to develop a program of individual in-service training to address issues identified during classroom observations (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). Effective principals regard in-service activities as opportunities for teachers to acquire the information they need to make sound decisions about personal and professional improvement (Duke, 1982).

McLaughlin & Marsh (1978) note that few schools explicity address professional training with tenured staff and, as a result, experienced teachers were found to have "turned off" to further development of their instructional skills and knowledge.

Providing Incentives for Teachers. This function relates primarily to the principal's provision of recognition to teachers for their efforts. Monetary rewards have been found to have little effect on the motivation of teachers (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). However, forms of professional recognition such as letters of commendation, informal praise and reinforcement and internal "promotions" to roles with higher levels of responsibility do appear to have positive effects on teacher motivation and on personal feelings of efficacy (Armor et al in Sweeney, 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978).

Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards. The majority

of effective schools studies underscore the importance of high expectations for student achievement (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1982; Sweeney citing: Armor et al, 1976; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; California State Department Study, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; Madden, 1976; Rutter et al, 1979; Trisman et al, 1976; Wellisch, 1978). Clearly defined, high standards convey the expectation that all students can and will master basic skills (Hallinger, 1985; Venezsky and Winfield, 1979).

Providing Incentives for Learning. In their review of school effectiveness studies, Purkey and Smith (1983) develop their own portrait of an effective school with eight organization-structure variables which are drawn from their research. One of these variables emphasizes the importance of schoolwide recognition of academic success.

> A school's culture is partially reflected in its ceremonies, its symbols, and the accomplishments it chooses to recognize officially. Schools that make a point of publicly honoring academic achievement and stressing its importance through the appropriate use of symbols, ceremonies, and the like encourage students to adopt similar norms and values (Purkey & Smith citing: Brookover et al., 1979, Brookover & Lezotte, 1979, Coleman et al., 1981, Wynne, 1980).

Rutter et al, (1979;123), noted in their research that "while links between punishment and outcome were more consistent, all forms of reward, praise or appreciation tended to be associated with better outcomes."

This chapter has reviewed the limitations of effective schools research, the nature of the principalship and the roles and functions of effective instructional leadership. The review will serve as frame of reference for the analysis and discussion of this study's results and a statement of conclusions.

CHAPTER THREE:

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to explore the reasons why school principals behave as they do in their role as instructional leader and to relate their behaviors to a basic perspective on the school's organizational nature.

The three questions to be addressed included: What are the behaviors currently found to be characteristic of principals as effective instructional leaders? To what extent do principals in given settings display the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders? What motivates a particular principal to act, or not act, in certain ways as an instructional leader?

To address these questions, it was necessary to develop a sequence of procedural steps and incorporate methods which would narrow a broad range of considerations into a manageable set of variables with which to focus an investigation of actual principal behaviors and perceptions as instructional leaders in given settings.

In describing this study's method, this chapter first presents an overview of procedures and methods, then outlines the use of the survey and, finally, details the development and application of the interview process.

Procedures and Methods

The sequence of procedures used in this study began with a consideration and selection of schools as appropriate study settings. A review and synthesis of effective schools research was then carried out to determine major considerations and variables for the study of effective instructional leadership practices. In order to determine the extent to which principal' behaviors in the study settings matched those identified through the literature review, it was necessary to develop or select an appropriate survey instrument. A survey instrument was selected and administered to the teachers and principals in each study setting to determine the presence or absence of specific instructional leadership behaviors. Once the survey data had been collected and analyzed, an interview process and guide questions were developed to probe the practices and perceptions of the principal in each setting. Interview responses were used to expand upon the survey findings and to examine each principal's basic perspective on his leadership role in relation to the nature of the school organization. Finally, a review of student performance on provincial assessments in each setting, initially carried out as a basis for selection, was detailed so that associations between student performance and instructional leadership in each setting might be considered.

Selection of Settings

Study settings were selected on the basis of the following major considerations and criteria:

Student Population. Study settings were sought which served relatively similar student populations. As pointed out in the previous chapter, a large number of school effectiveness studies have been carried out in the context of urban, poor and/or minority schools. There is some question as to whether the advances made in these schools would apply to settings in white, middle-class neighbourhoods. Consequently, this study focused on settings in the latter context to see if outcomes of effective instructional leadership similar to those described in the literature might be evidenced. Attention was paid to the neighbourhoods' general socio-economic status, the relative transience of families and the racial mix. Student achievement data were considered in relation to district and provincial means.

Length of Principals' Assignment. It is generally acknowledged that leadership effects accrue over time. For this reason, study settings were sought where the principal had been assigned for a minimum of three years.

Willingness/Ability to Participate. Obviously, the study could only be carried out in those schools where the teachers and principal would be willing and able to participate. None of the schools approached were unwilling to participate in the

study. However, because the survey stage of the study was carried out near the end of the school year, the busy schedule of activities common to this time of the year prevented some schools from being able to give time to this additional activity.

Four elementary schools in a Lower Mainland school district were selected as the study settings. Geographically, each was located in neighbourhoods which were clearly separate from each other though all were similar in their general socio-economic (middle-class) status, in the stability of the population and in the racial make-up which was predominantly white. Principals had been assigned to the schools for a minimum of five years. All four schools evidenced achievement levels at, or above, district and provincial means.

Review of Effective Schools Research

A review of recent research literature was carried out with three purposes in mind:

(a) to determine limitations common to the research into effective schools and effective instructional leadership

Knowledge of research limitations would appropriately adjust one's perspective on the realities observed in the study schools, would provide some direction for procedures and methodology and would shed light on the study's outcomes. For

example, one limitation common to studies of effective instructional leadership was the lack of a link between testable principal behaviors and indicators of effectiveness. Consequently, an objective of this study was to develop or find an instrument which would represent such a link.

(b) to determine the wide range of tasks, responsibilities and roles which are found to be common to a principal's job as school administrator.

Given that this study was to focus specifically on the instructional leadership role of the principal, it was important to place this role in the larger context of the myriad roles and accompanying tasks common to the principal's job. This background would illuminate the fact that principals who function as effective instructional leaders have, by necessity, organized all their responsibilities to allow for greater attention in the area of instruction.

(c) to determine the dimensions, roles and functions which are found to be characteristic of effective instructional leaders.

A delineation of effective instructional leadership practices would provide a framework with which to investigate, compare and analyze the instructional leadership behaviors of principals in the study settings.

References for the literature review were drawn from a number of sources including periodicals dealing with education administration, course readings, recommendations from this study's supervisors, recommendations from colleagues, university library indexes and abstracts, and access to the results of an ERIC search: "instructional leadership."

Survey

In order to determine the presence or absence of effective instructional leadership behaviors in the study schools, it was decided that a survey of each school's professional staff would be the most efficient means by which to obtain an initial picture of the principal's behaviors and to secure a basis for the generation of principal interview questions. As mentioned earlier, it was difficult to develop or find a survey instrument which clearly, comprehensively and accurately linked principal behaviors with indicators of effective instructional leadership. Ultimately, however, it was found that such an instrument had been developed and field-tested (Hallinger, 1985). Knowledge of this instrument came from a colleague studying the effectiveness of instructional leadership at the secondary school level as part of her doctoral program at Stanford. As her study was being carried out in secondary schools in Lower Mainland school districts, it was decided that the use of the instrument at the elementary level would pose no conflict and could prove informative.

Hallinger's instrument, entitled the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), lists seventy principal behaviors according to eleven subscales which are grouped within three dimensions of instructional leadership. Philip Hallinger developed the rating scale as a source of data for research into the instructional management behaviors of principals. The scale was translated into a survey instrument which was administered to teachers, principals and district personnel involved with ten elementary schools in a California school district in 1983. The development of the scale followed steps prescribed by Latham and Wexley (1981) for constructing behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS). Such scales rely on descriptions of critical job-related behaviors for the development of scale items. The strength of the BARS approach lies in its specificity; the scales make explicit to both the appraiser and the respondent exactly what is expected and what must be observed with respect to the subject's on-the-job behavior. Through a synthesis of elements from similar scales and his own exhaustive review of effective schools research, Hallinger arrived at the listing and organization of elements which make up the scale. Given the similarity of focus and context between this study and that of Hallinger's, it was considered appropriate to incorporate the PIMRS as a major data collection instrument. A full outline of the rating scale is presented in appendix one.

The instrument calls for a rating of the frequency with which principal behaviors are observed to occur in the

management of the instructional program. Respondents rate the frequency of each behavior on a five point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). The sixth point on the scale is reserved for "no judgment". The instrument is scored by calculating the item and subscale means. A "higher" mean score (that is, closer to 5) indicates that the respondents perceive the principal to perform the practice with a higher degree of frequency.

Administration of the Survey. The survey was administered to the teachers and principals in each of the four study schools in early June, 1986. In three of the schools, all members of the teaching staff and the principal completed the survey. This full participation of the staff was requested by the principal in these schools. In the fourth school, six teachers (approximately one third of the teaching staff) and the principal completed the survey. This school had recently undergone a thorough general assessment which had involved a number of surveys. It was the preference of the principal, therefore, to make participation in this study's survey optional. In all, there were forty-three respondents.

Analysis of the Survey Results. For the purposes of statistical analysis, ratings of the frequency of principal behaviors were assigned scores of 1 ("almost never") through 5 ("almost always"). A score of 6 was assigned to the response "no judgment" and a score of 0 was assigned to missing cases; where no response was indicated for an item. Respondents that

scored 0 or 6 on twenty-five percent or more of the items were eliminated on the basis of it being concluded that they could not be further considered as credible observers of the principal's instructional leadership behaviors. Survey items which received scores of 0 or 6 in twenty-five or more of the cases were deleted on the basis of it being concluded that these items were not readily understood or observed by the respondents. As a result, seven of the original thirty-nine teacher respondents were eliminated and eleven of the original seventy items were deleted from the data collected in given settings. This elimination of items resulted in the deletion of subscale 07: Maintaining Administrator Visibility. "Missing cases" which remained after these deletions were made were assigned the mean score for the particular item in the particular school. This substitution of mean scores for missing cases was suggested by the author of the instrument as it was the same procedure applied to the analysis of data in its original research application.

Further analysis of the data yielded the frequency of response scores per item, per school, the mean score per item, per school, and the mean score per subscale, per school. A reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha was also carried out per subscale, per school. One function of this reliability analysis was to determine key items in each scale; items which would most sharply reduce the alpha should they be deleted. Pearson correlation coefficients were also determined for the eleven subscales.

This analysis provided for a comparison of the mean frequencies of principal behaviors and functions between the four schools. It also provided items for key consideration in the development and execution of the interview process with individual principals.

The Interview

Purpose. The purpose of the interviews was to review the roles and functions of the subjects (principals) as reflections of their perceptions, attitudes and motives as instructional leaders. Interview responses were also sought as a source of illumination for the survey findings. In addition to these purposes, a major objective of the interview was to examine the principal's approach to instructional leadership in relation to his basic perspective on the nature of the school organization.

Design. The ethnographic interview process as described by Spradley (1979) and procedures for a focused interview were the main references used to design the interview. At the core of the ethnographic interview is a concern with the meaning of actions and events to the people we seek to understand. These systems of meaning constitute their particular culture. Culture refers to the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior (Spradley, 1979).

The ethnographic interview design for this study then,

sought to understand the meaning systems that principals use to organize their behaviors as instructional leaders. The design incorporated three important elements, explicit purpose: making clear the purpose and direction of the interview, ethnographic explanations: explaining the nature of the study, ethnographic questions: combining descriptive and structural questions.

As a focused interview, questions and procedures were designed to determine the reponses of the subjects to a situtation previously analyzed by the investigator. In other words, questions and procedures sought to determine the perceptions of principals regarding their instructional leadership roles, previously analyzed through the use of the rating scale survey. Questions and procedures were structured according to four criteria: non-direction, specificity, range, depth/personal context.

Interview Guide. As opposed to operating as a fixed questionnaire, the guide contained typical questions and areas of inquiry which made for comparability of data by insuring coverage of the same range of items, but which gave sufficient latitude to invite a broad scope of responses that might yield useful information. The guide questions were based on key elements of instructional leadership roles identified through analysis of the survey data.

An unstructured "starter" question was used to open the interview:

How would you describe your role, or roles, in relation to instruction?

This question was used to determine the principal's overview of his leadership role in the context of instruction and in relation to his influences on key members and elements in the school organization. Succeeding questions took cues and sequence from responses to this initial question.

These questions included:

How do you use goals?

What are your sources of goals?

How do you communicate the school's goals?

Do you play a role in curriculum coordination?

Do you monitor student progress?

How do you use student performance results?

How does the role of supervision and evaluation of instruction figure in your instructional leadership?

Do you play a role in the promotion of improved teaching?

Do you see the enforcement of academic standards as being significant to instruction?

Do you play a role in the promotion of student learning?

Do you play a role in the protection of instructional time?

How do guidelines, initiatives and/or services from the ministry and school district affect instruction at your school?

What would you say are your main sources of influence as instructional leader?

This question was used to illicit a review of the principal's sense of his major roles or "place" in relation to teachers and other elements of the school organization, regarding instructional leadership.

Given the general approach to instructional leadership you have described (here the interviewer would summarize for the subject the central theme(s) and perceptions of leadership revealed through responses to previous questions), why do you go about things in this way?

This last question was intended as a summary question to review the principal's basic perspective on the school organization and on relations with the teachers working within

it.

Techniques. The interview guide was used to maintain common areas of inquiry, but was not rigidly adhered to. Questions were sequenced and phrased according to the nature and flow of responses from each subject. Each interview began with clarification of the overall purpose of the project and questions moved from a general to a progressively specific scope. The main objective was to give the informant opportunity to express matters of central significance to him rather than those presumed to be important to the interviewer. This permitted subjects' responses to be placed in the proper context rather than forced into a framework or sequence which the interviewer considered to be appropriate. As much as possible, natural transitions were used to sequence the guide's main areas of inquiry.

A trial interview was conducted in advance of the study. This allowed for a source of objective feedback on the process and subsequent refinement of the same.

Permission was obtained from all subjects to use an audio tape recording during the interviews. This afforded the interviewer a closer concentration on the flow of the interview and ensured a full review of responses and associations which occurred in the course of the interview.

Conducting the Interview. The interviews were conducted at

either the subject's or interviewer's office, at the convenience of each subject. The interview lasted 45 to 60 minutes and was carried out in a single session. Fortunately, each interview was completed without interruptions or distractions.

Analysis of Responses. Once the interviews were completed, the audio tapes were transcribed. Within each transcription, responses were grouped according to the guide's areas of inquiry. Specific responses within the transcriptions were further noted for their relevance to guide questions. Full responses were highlighted where they bore direct relevance to areas of inquiry.

The audio tapes were replayed and transcriptions searched for evidence of common themes and perceptions throughout the responses; per interview and across the interviews. Ultimately, associations were made between interview responses and each category (subscale) of responses from the rating scale survey. Similarities and differences in responses, themes and overall perceptions were summarized and reported in relation to the analysis of each subscale in the survey.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The results of this study are derived from three sources of data: the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), completed by the teachers and principals in four elementary schools; interviews carried out with the principals in the four schools; and student achievement measures on provincial reading and mathematics assessments administered to grade four and seven students in the four schools in the spring of 1984.

The first section of this chapter presents a group profile of principals' instructional leadership activity yielded by group responses from teachers and principals to the rating scale survey. Subsequent sections present individual profiles of principals' behaviors and perceptions derived from a comparison of teacher survey responses, principal survey responses and principal interview data on a subscale-by-subscale, school-by-school basis. A later section reviews student performance on provincial assessments in each of the four school settings to determine whether certain relationships exist between student performance and principals' instructional leadership activity.

As pointed out by Philip Hallinger in his discussion of survey results from the PIMRS, a description of principal

behavior on the basis of teacher and principal perceptions is subject to certain limitations: perceptions are not evidence of actual behavior and may be affected by rating error. Also, these data provide only a measure of the frequency of the principal's behavior, not the effectiveness of the behavior. Behaviors may be performed frequently, but ineffectively. Similarly, certain behaviors may not need to be performed frequently in order to be performed effectively (Hallinger, 1985;226).

With these limitations in mind, interviews were conducted on a systematic basis with each principal, in part, to provide a validity check for the survey results. It is worth restating that the surveys and interviews were used to determine what it is that a principals do or do not do as instructional leaders and to attempt explanations for their behaviors on the basis of their personal perceptions of their leadership roles in relation to their perspective on the school's organizational nature.

Group Profile: Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale

The analysis of survey responses from both reporting groups addressed a basic set of questions: To what extent are principals as a group actively engaged in instructional leadership functions? Which functions do principals engage in most frequently? Which functions do they engage in less frequently? To what extent do principals' perceptions of their

instructional leadership activity correspond with teachers's perceptions? Do the combined responses of both reporting groups yield a profile of principals' instructional leadership roles, functions and behaviors? Does this profile reflect a common perspective on the nature of instructional leadership in the organizational context of the school?

In addressing these questions, group responses across the schools had to be considered in combination with independent responses within the schools. In many cases, considerable variation occurred between schools on given functions and between reporting groups (teachers vis-a-vis principals) within schools. Analysis of interview data was used to clarify and qualify principals' responses to the survey items, and to gain insights into why certain instructional leadership roles and functions are performed more or less frequently.

This report on findings examines survey data initially in an overview of group responses to the subscales and subsequently combines survey and interview data in a closer examination of each school's responses to the items in each subscale.

Table 1 lists the means and standard deviations for the ratings of teachers and principals. Both groups reported high levels of frequency on the majority of subscales. Whereas this would indicate that the principals are active in most roles and functions of instructional leadership, the high standard

Table One: Summary of the Instructional Leadership Ratings of the Principals

	Subscale	Reliability (n=33)	Teacher Rating (n=33)	Principal Rating (n=4)
01:	Framing Goals	.9007	$\bar{x}$ = 4.1 (SD =.8)	4.5 (.6)
02:	Communicating Goals	.8438	3.7 (.7)	4.0 (.9)
03:	Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	.8331	3.5 (.8)	4.0 (.8)
04:	Coordinating Curriculum	.8901	3.9 (.9)	4.2 (.9)
05:	Monitoring Student Progress	.8645	3.9 (.7)	3.7 (.9)
06:	Protecting Instructional Time	.8355	4.2 (1.0)	3.7 (.9)
08:	Promoting Improved Teaching	.7608	3.8 (.9)	4.0 (1.0)
09:	Providing Instructional Imp. & Pro-D	.8101	3.8 (.6)	4.0 (.9)
10:	Enforcing Academic Standards	.8039	3.9 (.8)	4.0 (.9)
11:	Providing Incentives for Learning	.8706	3.5 (1.1)	3.3 (1.1)

Note: All ratings are based on a Likert Scale, which runs from 1- "almost never" - to 5 - "almost always". X = mean score; SD = standard deviation.

Subscale 07: Maintaining Administrative Visibility does not appear in this table as it was eliminated from the findings.

deviations indicate a certain amount of variation in the perceptions of both teachers and principals. That the principals are generally active in the various roles and functions of instructional leadership would seem surprising given the relatively small averages of time that Petersen (1977) and Howell (1981) found principals active in the functional categories called "planning and coordinating instructional programs" (Petersen) and "instructional leadership" (Howell). Hallinger's full list of instructional leadership roles, functions and behaviors likely spans, however, all five functional categories delineated by Petersen nad Howell, respectively. In short, it is more likely the comprehensiveness of Hallinger's listings and the extreme overlap between roles and functions that accounts for high levels of activity than the fact that these principals are specifically or exceptionally active as instructional leaders, per se. On this point, one begins to question the ability of a researcher to distinguish clearly, instructional roles from other roles in a principal's administration, particularly at the elementary school level.

On most subscales, the means for principals' responses reflect a higher level of frequency. However, the differences in ratings are not marked and are reduced in significance when one considers the difference in size between reporting groups. It is only upon closer examination of individual schools that differences in ratings for particular functions become more distinct and thereby gain significance, especially when

considered in combination with interview data.

Of the group means for the subscales, those for the subscale "Providing Incentives for Learning" show comparatively low levels of frequency. Given the important functions implied by the heading for this subscale, this finding would seem to be an anomaly in the overall picture of group ratings. Instead of specifying a range of functions that would provide incentives for learning, however, the four functions associated with this subscale specify formal modes of recognition for student achievement; that is, use of formal rewards, recognition in student assemblies, seeing students in the office and contacting parents. It is quite conceivable that principals may not use such modes, but still effectively provide incentives for learning through various other functions and behaviors.

The analysis of group responses to the survey suggests that the principals are generally active in the roles and functions of instructional leadership. Except on subscale 11, the frequency of their activity does not vary significantly between subscales. The principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership activity corresponds quite closely with teachers' perceptions. The original administration of this survey by its developer, Philip Hallinger (1985), produced a similarly high frequency rate for responses. Teacher ratings (n=104) scored means greater than 3.7 on all eleven subscales. Principal ratings (n=10) were greater than 3.8 across the subscales. As was the case with the study's survey responses,

Hallinger had a relatively high incidence of non-response (missing cases) to various scale items. This would imply that the respondents had either no opinion regarding the items, or felt that these behaviors were never displayed by the respective principal. It may also be due, in part, to the large number of scale items (seventy) causing the the respondents to occasionally overlook some items in completing the survey. Standard deviations on teachers' means were also high in Hallinger's findings. In both studies, this would suggest that there was considerable variation in the frequency with which the principals performed the different instructional leadership functions. Standard deviations were somewhat lower for principals in Hallinger's findings. There was an average difference of .3 in standard deviations on principals' ratings between Hallinger's findings and those of this study. On two subscales, the difference was as great as .6. On two other subscales, the difference was .2 or less.

In his analysis of survey findings, Hallinger (1985) noted that the principals were more actively involved in managing curriculum and instruction than the literature lead the reader to expect. This observation was also true of this study's findings. Hallinger also found that the principals in his study generally did not view students as a key audience. It was the principals who were highly ranked across the eleven sunscales who maintained close contact with students. Such findings were not as clearly reflected in this study. Contact with students varied between principals and among subscale functions, but it

was noted that the principal who most often scored the highest ratings on scale items (principal 1) also scored the highest on items involving direct contact with students. A further finding of Hallinger's was that principals scored fairly consistently across the subscales. That is, principals who ranked near the top on one subscale were likely to rank highly on other subscales. This was true of principal 1 in this study. The other three principals varied in their ranking from subscale to subscale.

The extent to which the profile yielded by group responses reflects a common organizational perspective can only be determined through a closer examination of each school's survey responses, by subscale, in relation to interview data.

Subscales 1 and 2: Framing and Communicating the School's Goals

With a few exceptions, teacher and principal ratings on the functions on both subscales were generally high. Principal ratings were slightly higher than teacher ratings in most cases, but were within .7 of each other on means. These results are presented in tables 2 and 3.

These results show that principals are active in developing goals that seek improvement over current levels of academic performance, in setting target dates for goals and in assigning staff responsibilities for meeting goals. Some variation between schools was shown for the functions of using

Table Two: Subscale 01: Framing the School's Goals
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale Mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: n = 7 $\bar{x}$ = 4.0 (SD=.7)	School 1 Principal Rating: n = 1 $\bar{x}$ = 4.7	School 2 Teacher Rating: n = 6 $\bar{x}$ = 4.0 (SD=1.0)	School 2 Principal Rating: n = 1 $\bar{x}$ = 4.0	School 3 Teacher Rating: n = 8 $\bar{x}$ = 4.3 (SD=.6)	School 3 Principal Rating: n = 1 $\bar{x}$ = 4.3	School 4 Teacher Rating: n = 12 $\bar{x}$ = 4.3 (SD=.9)	School 4 Principal Rating: n = 1 $\bar{x}$ = 5.0
Function:								
1. Develop goals that seek improvement over current levels of academic performance	$\bar{x}$ = 4.3 (SD=.7)	4.0	4.6 (.9)	5.0	4.9 (.3)	5.0	4.2 (.8)	5.0
2. Frame academic goals with target dates	4.0 (.8)	4.0	3.5 (1.3)	4.0	3.8 (1.6)	4.0	4.0 (1.1)	5.0
3. Frame the school's academic goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	4.1 (.7)	5.0	4.2 (1.2)	5.0	4.7 (.5)	4.0	4.1 (1.0)	5.0
4. Use needs assessments or other methods to secure staff input on goal development	3.8 (1.0)	5.0	4.0 (1.1)	3.0	4.9 (.3)	4.0	4.1 (1.0)	5.0
5. Use data on student academic performance when developing school's academic goals	3.8 (.9)	5.0	4.2 (.7)	3.0	3.3 (1.9)	4.0	4.2 (1.0)	5.0
6. Develop goals that are easily translated in classroom directives by teachers	4.0 (.6)	5.0	3.8 (1.6)	4.0	4.5 (.5)	5.0	4.1 (1.0)	5.0

Table Three: Subscale 02: Communicating Goals
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: n=7 $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.6)	School 1 Principal Rating: n=1 $\bar{x}$=4.3	School 2 Teacher Rating: n=6 $\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=1.0)	School 2 Principal Rating: n=1 $\bar{x}$=3.8	School 3 Teacher Rating: n=8 $\bar{x}$=3.8 (SD=.6)	School 3 Principal Rating: n=1 $\bar{x}$=3.8	School 4 Teacher Rating: n=11 $\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=.7)	School 4 Principal Rating: n=1 $\bar{x}$=4.0
Function:								
7. Communicate the school's academic goals to the people (staff, students) in the school setting	$\bar{x}$=4.7 (SD=.5)	4.0	4.1 (1.3)	5.0	4.4 (.9)	4.0	4.2 (.9)	5.0
8. Refer to the school's academic goals in informal settings with individual teachers	3.4 (.4)	4.0	3.8 (1.5)	5.0	3.8 (.9)	4.0	3.7 (.9)	4.0
9. Refer to the school's academic goals at staff meetings	4.0 (1.0)	5.0	3.7 (.8)	3.0	3.9 (.8)	4.0	3.6 (.9)	4.0
10. Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers or department heads	4.0 (1.0)	5.0	4.0 (1.2)	3.0	3.7 (.9)	4.0	3.9 (.9)	4.0
11. Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school	4.1 (1.0)	4.0	4.2 (1.0)	5.0	4.9 (.3)	5.0	3.1 (1.3)	4.0
12. Refer to the school's academic goals in assemblies	2.7 (1.1)	4.0	2.3 (.8)	2.0	3.4 (.8)	2.0	2.8 (1.2)	3.0

needs assessments or other methods to secure staff input on goal development and using data on student academic performance when developing academic goals. The interview data indicated that all four schools used some form of year-end evaluation and goal-setting process involving the principal and teachers in group discussion. Actual procedures for these processes varied from setting to setting and, therefore, this fact may have caused principals and teachers to vary in the frequency with which they felt needs assessment or a review of student performance data were included in goal setting procedures. Once framed, goals were communicated in written form and circulated; primarily to staff members, to students and parents via newsletters or bulletins in some instances, and specifically to parents via PTA meetings in other instances. Frequency ratings were comparatively low for the function of referring to academic goals in student assemblies. School 1 showed a marked difference between the principal's rating (4.0) and the teachers' mean (2.7) for this function. In this school, principal 1 stated in his interview that he discouraged assemblies if he felt they might interrupt instructional time. Many assemblies held in this school were offered as an option to teachers to have their class attend only if it was felt it was in keeping with instructional purposes. Consequently, the variation of responses to this function is understandable in this particular setting.

Interview data showed that all the principals personally developed annual statements of goals reflecting instructional

and/or curricular goals yielded by annual staff goal-setting processes. In some cases, these personal statements were more specific than others. Principal 3's instructional goals were very specific and were usually assigned top priority.

Once framed and communicated, the goals in two of the schools were left pretty much to the vice principal and/or teachers to carry out. Principal 2 stated in describing the outcome of a particular instructional goal in his school:

> It has died a natural death. It obviously wasn't viable in the teachers' mind. I didn't mind that. I don't take personal ownership. If they work, they work; if they don't, they don't.

In two schools, instructional goals were closely monitored via bi-weekly meetings, in one setting, and "consistently close contact" on the part of the principal in the other. In the first school, principal 3 stated that the school's instructional goals were actually based on the culture of the school, a culture which was clearly determined before he arrived and which he actively chose to preserve. Principal 1 implied a similar source of instructional goals when he stated that the school's goal setting grew out of an annual review which was based on a shared philosophy of "nurturing the child; a Whole Child concept." He felt that this annual process had become customary in the school and automatically caused the staff to identify indicators of good and bad practices, a process which he described as a natural "self-checking system".

Subscale 3: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

Whereas the teachers' and principals' group ratings were high on this subscale, table 4 indicates that some notable differences between teacher and principal ratings occurred on certain items, in certain schools.

The function of conducting informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis received ratings which were consistently higher on the principals' part than on the teachers'. This is a significant difference, especially given the fact that this function is often identified as being most important to effective teacher supervision and instructional leadership. A similar pattern occurred for the practices of ensuring that classroom objectives of teachers were consistent with the stated goals of the school and pointing out specific strengths of the teachers' instructional practices in post-observation conferences. While acknowledging the point that differences in perceived frequency does not necessarily connote differences in perceived effectiveness, these patterns do raise some questions as to how consistently these functions are incorporated, or are capable of being incorporated into the principals' instructional management dimension of leadership. The functions of teacher supervision and evaluation involve certain dynamics which are not as influential in other functions of instructional leadership; namely, the dynamics of making judgments about teachers' professional expertise and/or competence. Consequently, teachers may be more cautious about implying effectiveness through a rating of frequency than they

Table Four: Subscale 03: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating.	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating.	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.7)	$\bar{x}$=4.4	$\bar{x}$=3.5 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=4.0	$\bar{x}$=3.3 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=.7)	$\bar{x}$=3.9
Function:								
13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis	x=3.3 (SD=.5)	5.0	3.0 (1.6)	4.0	3.1 (1.5)	4.0	2.9 (1.2)	4.0
14. Ensure that the classroom objectives of the teachers are consistent with the stated goals of the school	3.8 (1.2)	5.0	3.7 (1.2)	5.0	3.5 (1.2)	4.0	3.4 (1.0)	4.0
15. Review student work products when evaluating teachers	3.5 (.8)	4.0	3.7 (1.4)	4.0	2.7 (1.2)	3.0	3.1 (1.4)	4.0
16. Evaluate teachers on academic objectives directly related to the goals of the school	3.0 (.7)	5.0	3.7 (1.5)	2.0	3.2 (1.3)		3.1 (1.5)	3.0
17. Point out specific strengths of the teacher's instructional practices in post-observation conferences	4.0 (.7)	5.0	3.5 (1.4)	5.0	3.2 (1.3)	4.0	4.0 (1.3)	4.0
18. Point out specific weaknesses of the teacher's instructional practices in post-observation conferences	4.0 (.7)	5.0	3.8 (1.5)	4.0	2.5 (1.0)	3.0	3.7 (1.3)	3.0

Table Four: Subscale 03: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.7)	$\bar{x}$=4.4	$\bar{x}$=3.5 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=4.0	$\bar{x}$=3.3 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=.7)	$\bar{x}$=3.9
19. Note specific strengths of the teacher's instructional paractices in written evaluation	4.0 (1.0)	4.0	3.7 (1.5)	5.0	3.7 (1.6)	3.0	4.3 (.9)	5.0
20. Note specific weaknesses of the teacher's instructional practices in written evaluations	3.5 (1.2)	3.0	3.5 (1.4)	4.0	2.3 (1.2)	3.0	2.8 (.4)	3.0
21. Note student time-on-task to teachers after classroom observations	3.6 (1.6)	4.0	3.7 (1.5)	4.0	3.3 (.5)	4.0	3.3 (1.4)	4.0
22. Note specific instructional practices related to the stated classroom objectives in the teacher evaluations	4.2 (.8)	4.0	3.7 (1.5)	3.0	3.0 (1.0)	4.0	4.0 (1.0)	5.0

would be in rating other leadership functions. Correspondingly, principals may be more inclined to equate effectiveness with ratings of frequency on these functions than on others. Further, it was interesting to note that similar patterns did not emerge on teacher and principal ratings for the frequency with which specific weaknesses of instructional practices in post-observation conferences were pointed out. Perhaps a prevalent though possibly unconscious factor of guardedness was at play in these patterns of responses.

Interview data revealed that the supervision and evaluation of instruction was perceived by principals to be a central instructional leadership function in only two of the four schools. Principal 1 indicated that he was "determined to do something about incompetence". He took central responsibility for the upgrading of skills and cited two instances of "success" where he had applied a "hard-nosed, business-like approach"; an approach characterized by candid pre-conference discussions, a "clear commitment of me to them," a further commitment of time, immediate, fair and honest feedback and a formalized procedure with comprehensive documentation. Principal 3 had a close dependence on a detailed, systematic approach, a schoolwide approach that involved annual target-setting meetings with each staff member in which targets in four major areas called for a minimum of one devoted to instruction, and subsequent supervision processes which are based on these targets with a target setting sheet used as a constant reference. In this setting,

peer-coaching approaches to supervision were encouraged by the principal. Targets were reviewed with each staff member at the end of the year at which time teachers were asked if they wished to remain in the school and if they were still in agreement with the school's culture. The principal stated that if a teacher were to respond with a strong "no" to either of these questions, he would suggest that they consider another school. He mentioned that, in all his years at the school he had not experienced such a scenario. He also stated that whenever, in the course of the target setting interview, a teacher suggested a change in instructional practice, he strongly encouraged that teacher's sense of ownership in the change.

In the two other schools, principals 2 and 4 indicated that their involvement with the supervision and evaluation of instruction was modified by the degree to which they felt they could apply a personal measure of expertise to the functions. In most cases, they felt that they could contribute more in the way of support and checks for viability of processes than input into the actual methods, approaches or resources employed instructionally by teachers.

Subscale 4: Coordinating the Curriculum

Across the four schools teachers and principals were in fairly close agreement on their ratings for most functions in this subscale, with some exceptions. Table 5 indicates that, in

school 4, teachers felt that the function of making it clear who is reponsible for coordinating curricular content across grade levels is carried out less frequently than the principal indicates. However, the high standard deviation in teacher ratings shows that there was significant variation in their responses.

Generally, the ratings indicate that principals are actively coordinating curricular content across grade levels, ensuring that academic goals are translated into common curricular objectives, and ensuring that special programs are coordinated with those of the regular classroom. Lower ratings of frequency were generally indicated for the functions of ensuring that textbook content was aligned with curricular objectives, and assessing the overlap between curricular objectives and achievement tests. In all but four functions, principals' ratings were higher than teachers'.

Interview data showed that the emphasis given to this function varied in nature between principals. In three of the four schools, the principals cleanly indicated that this function was central to their instructional leadership activity. An outline of each principal's emphasis for the role of coordinating curriculum is worth considering in relation to the survey data.

In the first school, principal 1 stated that this role was "first and foremost. In the overview, curriculum and its

Table Five: Subscale 04: Coordinating the Curriculum
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	School 1 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.5	School 2 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=1.3)	School 2 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0	School 3 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=1.0)	School 3 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.8	School 4 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	School 4 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.4
Function:								
23. Make clear to teacher who is responsible for coordinating curricular contect across grade levels	$\bar{x}$=4.7 (SD=.5)	5.0	4.4 (.5)	5.0	5.5 (.7)	5.0	3.7 (1.5)	5.0
24. Ensure that the academic goals of the school are translated into common curricular objectives	4.6 (.5)	5.0	3.7 (1.6)	5.0	4.6 (.5)	5.0	4.0 (1.0)	5.0
25. Draw upon the results of school wide testing when making curricular decisions	4.1 (.9)	5.0	3.8 (1.3)	4.0	3.6 (1.7)	3.0	4.4 (.9)	5.0
26. Ensure that the objectives of special programs in the school are coordinated with those of the regular classroom	4.3 (.7)	5.0	4.2 (1.0)	5.0	4.1 (1.1)	4.0	4.5 (.7)	4.0
27. Ensure that the content selected from textbooks by teachers is aligned with the school's curricular objectives	3.7 (1.2)	3.0	3.2 (1.7)	4.0	3.0 (1.4)	3.0	3.5 (1.5)	4.0

Table Five: Subscale 04: Coordinating the Curriculum (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	$\bar{x}$=4.5	$\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=1.3)	$\bar{x}$=4.0	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.8	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	$\bar{x}$=4.4
28. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the achievement test(s) used for program evaluation	3.8 (1.2)	5.0	3.8 (1.8)	3.0	3.4 (1.4)	3.0	3.9 (1.1)	4.0
29. Participate in meetings for the purpose of reviewing or selecting instructional materials	3.8 (.7)	4.0	3.2 (1.3)	2.0	3.9 (.0)	4.0	4.1 (.6)	4.0

implementation is my major role." In operational terms, this involved working closely with primary and intermediate teams, attending in-service sessions and "getting the reading done." Formal and informal assessments were used to see how curriculum was meeting student needs. This process was "underpinned by teachers and administrators who know their stuff. Curriculum is justified on the basis of what we know and what we want to do." The principal felt that teachers held high ownership in the curriculum and were " not satisfied with what was merely in the guide." The principal felt that these functions were characterized by an "active partnership in curriculum interpretation."

In the second school, principal 2 emphasized a "supportive and facilitative" role, but not one of "initiator." He felt that his personal background had not afforded him a strong elementary experience with curriculum and so he had found it more effective to rely on his vice principal and/or particular teachers to carry out coordinating functions in curriculum. He felt he focused more on giving his staff the opportunity to "go to it" while he monitored the viability of curriculum interpretation and implementation. He found that, in most instances he had "learned from the teachers" in this role and that the functions of curriculum coordination happened, appropriately he felt, at the teacher level.

Principal 3 identified curriculum coordination as a role central to his leadership, but stated that he kept it in the

context of "what we are after." He relied on established systems in the school to carry out this role. These systems included "management team" meetings which took place twice a month and involved the vice principal, primary and intermediate coordinators and the school secretary in an ongoing review of curriculum implementation, and "administrative team" meetings which were held weekly and involved the vice principal and principal in planning strategies to influence and support teachers.

Principal 4 described his instructional leadership almost entirely in terms of "ensuring that the curriculum is thorough and consistent - based on what I know about what good teaching is and what the experts say - ensuring that basic skills are covered, but also supporting new programs because (they) generate enthusiasm." He summarized his overall leadership role by stating:

> Basically, my function is in the area of curriculum - ensuring that you have a comprehensive program in the school - making sure that someone has a resonsibility - that it's done well.

As can be seen, each principal places strong emphasis on the role of curriculum coordination, whether or not they take direct responsibility for its various functions. In each case, it was felt that primary responsibility for effective implementation rested with teachers and the principals' role was mostly one of supporting and monitoring the process. Variations in ratings on certain subscale functions in given

schools seem to reflect differences in procedures for carrying out the roles.

Subscale 5: Monitoring and Feeding Back Student Performance Results

Although this was one of the few subscales for which the principals' mean score was lower than the teachers', the means were very similar between both reporting groups in showing a fairly high frequency. At the same time, several differences in ratings for certain functions occurred in given schools. For the function of discussing the item analysis of provincial or school-wide tests with the staff to identify strengths and weaknesses in the school's instructional program, two schools showed a much lower frequency rating by the principal than by the teachers; a difference of 2.2 in school 2 and 1.4 in school 3. A similar pattern also occurred in the same schools for the function of using the results of student testing to assess progress towards school goals. This pattern suggests that teachers in these schools feel that reference to test results in shaping instructional programs occurs with sufficient frequency while the principals feel that such references are not made frequently enough. In turn, it may imply that these principals are more concerned about test results than the teachers. However, this perception was not indicated by the interview data. Both principals 2 and 3 said that they gave regular attention to test results, but did not "push them" with the staff.

Table Six: Subscale 05: Monitoring and Feeding Back Student Performance Results
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.9 (SD=.5)	School 1 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.1	School 2 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=1.0)	School 2 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.5	School 3 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.5)	School 3 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.5	School 4 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	School 4 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.6
Function:								
30. Meet individually with teachers or department coordinators to discuss pupil academic performance	3.7 (.7)	4.0	3.3 (1.6)	3.0	3.6 (1.3)	4.0	3.8 (.9)	4.0
31. Discuss the item analysis of provincial or school-wide tests with the staff to identify strengths and weaknesses in the school's instructional program	4.1 (.7)	5.0	4.2 (1.0)	2.0	4.4 (.7)	3.0	4.0 (.9)	4.0
32. Use the results of student testing to assess progress towards school goals	4.0 (1.0)	5.0	4.0 (1.0)	2.0	4.4 (.9)	3.0	4.2 (.7)	4.0
33. Distribute the results of student testing to teachers in a timely fashion	4.1 (.7)	5.0	4.3 (.8)	4.0	4.7 (.5)	4.0	4.1 (.9)	4.0
34. Inform teachers of the school's performance result on tests in written form, e.g., memos/ newsletters	3.7 (1.1)	3.0	3.8 (1.0)	5.0	4.5 (.5)	4.0	4.1 (.9)	3.0

Table Six: Subscale 05: Monitoring and Feeding Back Student Performance Results (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=3.9 (SD=.5)	$\bar{x}$=4.1	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.5)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	$\bar{x}$=3.6
35. Ensure that students are informed of the school's performance results	3.5 (1.0)	2.0	2.5 (1.5)	4.0	3.4 (1.1)	3.0	3.2 (1.2)	3.0
36. Ensure that students whose performance on tests indicates the need for special instruction are identified	4.3 (.5)	5.0	4.2 (.8)	5.0	3.9 (1.0)	4.0	4.3 (1.0)	4.0

Table Six: Subscale 05: Monitoring and Feeding Back Student Performance Results (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=3.9 (SD=.5)	$\bar{x}$=4.1	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.5)	$\bar{x}$=3.5	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.6)	$\bar{x}$=3.6
37. Ensure that the appropriate instructional programs are found for students whose performance on tests indicates a need	4.3 (.5)	5.0	3.8 (1.6)	4.0	3.7 (.7)	4.0	4.4 (.9)	5.0
38. Ensure that regular homework is assigned and checked by teachers	3.7 (1.4)	3.0	4.7 (.5)	3.0	2.4 (.7)	3.0	3.4 (1.5)	2.0

Survey ratings showed that each of the principals distribute the results of student testing to teachers in a timely fashion, but that students are less frequently informed of the school's performance results. Principal 2's perception of the frequency with which he informed students of the school's performance results was markedly higher than the teachers'. Ensuring that homework is regularly assigned and checked by teachers also received a comparatively low rating across the schools. In schools 2 and 4 the teachers' ratings were considerably higher on this function than the principals'.

The interview data showed that all four schools referred to test results in setting goals and coordinating curriculum. Each principal used test results in staff discussions, but focused the majority of their attention on monitoring student progress through visiting classrooms and dealing with students specifically referred for attention in this regard. Generally speaking, the principals considered performance results in curricular and instructional decisions, but did not see them as central, clear indicators of progress towards school goals. In a later section of this chapter, student performance on provincial assessments is reviewed in the four schools.

Subscale 6: Protecting Instructional Time

In three of the four schools, teachers' mean scores for this subscale were higher than principals', the opposite of outcomes on most of the other subscales. This would indicate

that teachers in these schools perceive the principals as being more active in protecting instructional time than do the principals. This may be due to the principals being generally more concerned about instructional time than teachers or more conscious of interruptions.

In contrast to the other functions in this subscale, teachers perceive principals as being less active in visiting classrooms to ensure that instructional time is used for learning and practising new skills and concepts than the principals indicate that they are. However, when one considers the wording of this function it seems incongruous with the preceding three functions. It may have more relevance to the role of supervising and evaluating instruction.

Teacher and principal ratings in the fourth school would indicate that, in a comparative sense, instructional time is less actively protected. High standard deviations for each of the teachers' ratings in this school indicate a wide spread of responses about the mean.

Interview data revealed that all the principals recognized the importance of this role and were specifically concerned about interruptions caused by public address announcements. One principal stated that he was "guilty of (too many) p.a. announcements" and had been "nicely slapped on the wrist" by his staff for overuse of the p.a. This situation was clearly

Table Seven: Subscale 06: Protecting Instructional Time
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.8 (SD=.3)	$\bar{x}$=4.4	$\bar{x}$=4.1 (SD=.4)	$\bar{x}$=2.6	$\bar{x}$=4.9 (SD=.1)	$\bar{x}$=3.4	$\bar{x}$=3.5 (SD=1.2)	$\bar{x}$=3.6
Function:								
39. Ensure that instructional time is not interrupted by public address announcements	4.8 (.4)	4.0	3.8 (.7)	2.0	5.0 (.0)	5.0	3.1 (1.3)	3.0
40. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	4.8 (.4)	4.0	4.4 (.5)	4.0	4.9 (.3)	5.0	3.8 (1.4)	3.0
41. Ensure that truant students suffer specified consequences for missing instructional time	--	4.0	3.7 (1.0)	2.0	4.2 (.5)	4.0	3.2 (1.6)	4.0
42. Ensure that truant students make up lost instructional time	--	5.0	3.2 (.5)	2.0	--	4.0	3.4 (1.6)	4.0
43. Visit classrooms to ensure that instructional time is used for learning and practising new skills and concepts	4.0 (1.0)	5.0	3.3 (.8)	3.0	4.0 (1.3)	3.0	4.0 (1.5)	3.0

reflected in ratings for this function in the particular school.

Principal 1 described the role as "critical - absolutely critical" and stated that "the classroom is sacrosanct". P. A. announcements were kept to a minimum and confined to five minutes before the bell. "Laid on" assemblies were generally avoided or made optional to the teachers; they could choose to attend or not attend assemblies depending on whether they felt they were relevant to the class's instructional program. He stated that the staff were quick to point out interruptions. This principal's emphasis on the role was clearly reflected in teacher ratings on the subscale; teacher ratings were consistently high and standard deviations were consistently low.

Subscale 8: Promoting Incentives to Improve Teaching

Group means for this subscale showed a relatively high frequency; teachers: 3.8, principals 4.0. At the same time, the ratings for each function within the subscale showed a generally moderate frequency across the four schools. The highest frequency was shown for the function of privately recognizing teacher efforts and performance. This would indicate that this is the primary means by which principals promote incentives to improve teaching. Principals 2 and 4 indicated a significantly higher rating than the teachers to the function of reinforcing exceptional efforts by teachers

Table Eight: Subscale 08: Promoting Incentives to Improve Teaching
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.4)	$\bar{x}$=4.0	$\bar{x}$=3.6 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=4.5	$\bar{x}$=3.4 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=3.0	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=4.6
Function:								
49. Reinforce superior performance by teachers publicly in newsletters or bulletins	x=3.3 (SD=.9)	4.0	3.5 (.5)	5.0	1.8 (.9)	2.0	3.0 (1.3)	4.0
50. Privately recognize teacher efforts and performance	4.1 (.9)	5.0	4.0 (.8)	5.0	3.6 (.7)	4.0	4.2 (.9)	5.0
51. Acknowledge exceptional effort or performance by teachers in official memos for their personnel files	3.3 (1.5)	3.0	--	3.0	3.0 (1.4)	3.0	2.7 (1.4)	--
52. Reinforce exceptional efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional development, e.g. new roles or in-service	4.0 (.8)	4.0	3.3 (1.2)	5.0	3.2 (1.3)	3.0	3.8 (1.0)	5.0

with opportunities for professional development. This finding may indicate that the teachers in these schools either felt that such opportunities did not occur freqently or were not intended as reinforcers. On the whole, the responses to items in this subscale would indicate that the role of promoting incentives to improve teaching is carried out more privately and individually than openly and generally. This was reflected in the interview responses. The principals did not generally highlight this role as being of central importance to their instructional leadership.

Subscale 9: Promoting Instructional Improvement and Professional Development

This subscale includes functions with broad relevance to a principal's overall instructional leadership activity. The functions describe practices which relate to other major roles described within the rating scale; namely, Supervising and Evaluating Instruction and Coordinating the Curriculum. Consequently, ratings on these overlapping subscale functions are further reflections of leadership activity in the previous subscales.

High group means are reflected across the individual functions except for some differences apparent in certain schools. Information regarding opportunities for professional development are circulated with high frequency in the four schools though the ratings in schools 2 and 4 showed that

Table Nine: Subscale 09: Promoting Instructional Improvement and Professional Development
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.9 (SD=.4)	School 1 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0	School 2 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	School 2 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.2	School 3 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.3)	School 3 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.6	School 4 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.6)	School 4 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.1
Function:								
53. Distribute notes, announcements, or newsletters to teachers informing them of opportunities for professional development that are related to the school's goals	$\bar{x}$=4.1 (SD=.9)	4.0	3.8 (1.1)	5.0	4.6 (.5)	4.0	4.1 (.9)	5.0
54. Select in-service activities that are related directly to the school's academic goals	4.4 (.5)	5.0	4.2 (.7)	5.0	4.5 (.5)	4.0	3.9 (1.0)	5.0
55. Support teacher requests for in-service that are related directly to the school's academic goals	4.5 (.5)	5.0	4.3 (.8)	5.0	4.7 (.4)	5.0	4.5 (.6)	5.0
56. Distribute journal articles to teachers on a regular basis	4.5 (.8)	5.0	3.4 (2.1)	3.0	3.5 (.5)	3.0	3.0 (1.4)	4.0
57. Support the use in classrooms of skills acquired during teachers' in-service training	4.3 (.7)	5.0	3.8 (1.1)	5.0	4.5 (1.0)	4.0	4.3 (.7)	4.0

Table Nine: Subscale 09: Promoting Instructional Improvement and Professional Development (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Subscale mean:	School 1 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.9 (SD=.4)	School 1 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0	School 2 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	School 2 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.2	School 3 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD-.3)	School 3 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.6	School 4 Teacher Rating: $\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.6)	School 4 Principal Rating: $\bar{x}$=4.1
Function:								
58. Arrange for outside speakers to make presentations on instructional issues at staff meetings	3.4 (.8)	3.0	3.8 (1.1)	4.0	3.2 (.9)	3.0	3.3 (1.3)	3.0
59. Provide time to meet individually with teachers to discuss instructional issues	3.0 (.6)	2.0	3.6 (1.3)	5.0	3.7 (.9)	3.0	3.7 (1.0)	4.0
60. Sit in on teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	3.8 (.9)	4.0	4.3 (.8)	3.0	3.7 (.7)	4.0	3.5 (1.0)	4.0
61. Set aside time at faculty meetings to share information concerning their classroom experiences and in-service activities	3.3 (.7)	3.0	2.5 (1.2)	3.0	3.4 (.7)	3.0	3.1 (1.1)	3.0

the principal assigned more frequency to this function than did the teachers.

Ratings for the function of selecting in-service activities that are related directly to the school's academic goals received high ratings in each of the four schools. This item is somewhat misleading, however, as it was pointed out that the principals rarely "select" in-service activities. The usual practice is for teachers to select items from in-service calendars and the principals to sign their releases. This is reflected by the corespondingly high ratings for the next subscale function: supporting teacher requests for in-service that are related directly to the school's academic goals. On the function: distributing journal articles to teachers on a regular basis, it was notable that the teacher ratings in one school had a standard deviation of 2.1. It would appear that the teachers were either confused as to what this item meant or the principal tended to distribute journal articles to only a few members of the staff. That the function of supporting the use in classrooms of skills acquired during teachers' in-service training received high ratings is hardly surprising given each principal's repeated references, during the interviews, to their supportive role for teachers. Arranging for outside speakers to make presentations on instructional issues at staff meetings received comparatively low ratings which is not surprising given the generally tight time constraints for such meetings. Providing time to meet individually with teachers to discuss instructional issues

received surprisingly low ratings given each principal's indication that individual interviews were commonly used for instructional goal setting and evaluation. Perhaps these ratings point to a lack of regular opportunities for such meetings to occur in the course of the year. The principals' practice of sitting in on in-service activities concerned with instruction received fairly high ratings of frequency from the teachers in each school. In school 2, the principal's rating was distinctly lower than the teachers'. This was the same school where the principal assigned most of the curriculum coordinating role to the vice principal and/or teachers. It is possible that this principal underestimates the teachers' perceptions of his activity in this role. Setting aside time at faculty meetings to share information concerning their classroom experiences and in-service activities received comparatively low ratings across the schools. This may serve as further indication of the tightness of time constraints or may indicate that staff meeting agendae are generally reserved more for administrative than instructional issues.

The principals' interview responses regarding functions in this subscale mirrored their perception of their general instructional leadership role as being one of supporter and facilitator. None of the principals indicated that the role of promoting instructional improvement was a central or "driving" role. Principals 2 and 4 emphasized a caution about pushing change. They stated a preference for allowing freedom for change by giving it time and ensuring support. As principal 3

put it:

> When you're talking about the type of instruction that's offered to the individual kid or when one talks about changing teaching approaches, I believe, quite strongly, that any change has to be a goal; it can't be a primary task. So, when I see that something has to be changed, I never rush into it. I try to remember that, certainly from my point of view, I want to see that changed over a period of time. I'm not going to rush into it. I think that as soon as one rushes into it then one changes that relationship that I tried to describe earlier on; that one of "we're all in this thing together and let's support each other." It changes the leadership style.

Subscale 10: Developing and Promoting Academic Standards

Although the group mean scores on this subscale were high for both reporting groups, individual functions yielded significant differences between schools. "Setting high standards for the percentage of students who should master skills objectives" was rated 5. by one principal and 3.8 by his teachers, an indication of very different perceptions of the principal's activity in this regard. On the same item in another school, the principal's rating of 2. and teachers' rating of 3.1 (with a standard deviation of 2.) indicated a marked variation in the teachers' perceptions juxtaposed with the principal's sense of infrequent activity in this function. Another principal gave no indication of activity in either this function or the one following it; either an error of omission or a statement of non-involvement. Consistently high ratings for the function of ensuring that it is known what is expected of students at different grade levels correspond with the means

Table Ten: Subscale 10: Developing and Promoting Academic Standards (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.5 (SD=.3)	$\bar{x}$=5.0	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.7)	--	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=3.2	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=3.8
Function:								
62. Set high standards for the percentage of students who should master skills objectives	3.8 (.9)	5.0	4.2 (.9)	--	3.1 (2.0)	2.0	3.7 (1.2)	3.0
63. Encourage teachers to start class on time and teach to the end of the period	4.6 (.5)	5.0	4.0 (1.2)	--	4.3 (.9)	4.0	3.8 (1.2)	4.0
64. Ensure that it is known what is expected of students at different grade levels	4.6 (.5)	5.0	3.6 (1.2)	4.0	4.0 (1.5)	4.0	3.9 (1.1)	4.0

Table Ten: Subscale 10: Developing and Promoting Academic Standards (continued)
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.5 (SD=.3)	$\bar{x}$=5.0	$\bar{x}$=4.0 (SD=.7)	--	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=3.2	$\bar{x}$=3.7 (SD=.9)	$\bar{x}$=3.8
Function:								
65. Enforce a standard for promotion that requires students to master expectations before being promoted	4.1 (.7)	5.0	3.6 (1.1)	5.0	2.1 (1.6)	2.0	2.8 (1.7)	4.0
66. Support teachers when they enforce school academic policies	4.8 (.4)	5.0	4.7 (.5)	5.0	4.4 (.8)	4.0	4.3 (1.2)	4.0

for the subscale: Coordinating the Curriculum. Ratings for the function of enforcing a standard of promotion that requires students to master expectations before being promoted showed a significant variation between the schools. In three schools, the principals' ratings were considerably higher than the teachers'; in another school, the principal's rating was contrastingly lower and very close to the teachers' ratings in that school. This function would appear to be subject to discussion in each of the schools, most likely on the reference to "mastery"; a term which implies the rationalization of teachers' instructional processes and which would therefore be contrary both to a teacher's basic sense of autonomy in these schools and the principals' proclaimed roles of supporters and facilitators as instructional leaders.

On the whole, the functions associated with this subscale seem to pose a potential conflict between two perceptions of the instructional leadership role. One perception is of the instructional leader promoting an active "partnership in instruction" through which academic standards are automatically developed and promoted in the school. The other perception is of an instructional leader who takes a more directive role in setting standards for mastery. Each perception implies different styles of leadership. Therefore, it is understandable that variations in ratings would occur for those functions where the idea of "mastery" is mentioned.

The interview data indicated a certain range of

principals' perceptions for their role in developing and promoting academic standards. Principal 1 indicated that he stressed standards by establishing expectations for the work accomplished by students. He did so through regular reviews of student work and frequent contact with students in his office. He felt that by maintaining and reviewing files of students' work he was "constantly reinforcing in the child's mind that growth and achievement are expected." Principal 4 stated that he did not stress standards; that he, in fact, spent more time asking teachers to back off expectations that are too high. As he put it:

> I don't stress standards. . . I don't pump scores, I pump understanding. I stress comfort level. Things can be introduced too early.

In schools 2 and 3, the principals felt that a stress on academic standards was an outgrowth of the teachers' overall awareness of their expectations regarding school goals, curriculum implementation and instructional processes. These principals promoted standards for work products and paid attention to test scores but did not feel that they personally took an active stance on developing and promoting academic standards, per se.

Subscale 11: Promoting Incentives for Learning

In contrast to group means for other subscales, means for this subscale showed a moderate level of frequency and close

Table Eleven: Subscale II: Promoting Incentives for Learning
Ratings of Frequency of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

	School 1 Teacher Rating:	School 1 Principal Rating:	School 2 Teacher Rating:	School 2 Principal Rating:	School 3 Teacher Rating:	School 3 Principal Rating:	School 4 Teacher Rating:	School 4 Principal Rating:
Subscale mean:	$\bar{x}$=4.2 (SD=.6)	$\bar{x}$=3.7	$\bar{x}$=3.4 (SD=1.4)	$\bar{x}$=3.2	$\bar{x}$=2.5 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.0	$\bar{x}$=318 (SD=1.0)	$\bar{x}$=3.3
Function:								
67. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honour roll or mention in the newsletter	$\bar{x}$=4.3 (SD=.8)	5.0	3.5 (1.7)	3.0	2.0 (1.5)	3.0	3.9 (1.1)	--
68. Use assemblies to honour students who have done superior work in class	4.1 (.9)	5.0	3.1 (2.0)	1.0	1.7 (1.1)	2.0	4.0 (1.2)	3.0
69. Recognize superior students by seeing students in the office with their work products	4.0 (1.0)	2.0	4.6 (.9)	5.0	3.0 (1.4)	4.0	4.0 (.9)	4.0
70. Acknowledge student improvement by contacting parents	4.4 (.5)	3.0	3.6 (1.6)	4.0	3.4 (1.4)	3.0	3.4 (1.4)	3.0

agreement between both reporting groups. A reason for this contrast may be that the functions in this subscale refer to formal modes of recognition for student achievement which are too specific as functions which would be general to promoting such incentives in the schools. Incentives for learning usually involve a wide variety of principals' functions beyond those listed. It is notable that principal 1 gave a low frequency rating to the function of recognizing superior students by seeing students in the office with their work products. It was this principal who stated that he promoted academic standards in the school through frequent contact with students coming to the office with their work.

Student Performance on Provincial Assessments

Tables 12 and 13 present the results of student performance on the 1984 Provincial Reading Assessments administered to grade four and seven students in the four study schools. These results were reviewed primarily to present a general profile of student performance in the four study schools. The review and the mean scores are not considered to be indicators of instructional leadership effectiveness in the four schools. To do so, a wide range of input and process variables for each setting would have to be carefully analyzed and discussed. Even given such analysis, the validity of using such data as measures of leadership effectiveness in a school is very much subject to debate.

Table Twelve: 1984 British Columbia Reading Assessment: Grade 4
Mean Domain Scores for Province, School District and Study Schools

Domain:	Province: mean correct	District: mean correct	School 1 mean correct	School 2 mean correct	School 3 mean correct	School 4 mean correct
1. Understands Words and Expressions	70.8	74.4	75.0	72.7	72.3	75.4
2. Literal Comprehension	75.2	79.2	81.5	77.5	78.9	81.5
3. Inferential/Critical Comprehension	70.9	73.6	73.6	72.4	74.9	71.9
4. Locates and Uses Information	78.4	81.8	89.1	78.9	84.4	73.8

Table Thirteen: 1984 British Columbia Reading Assessment: Grade 7
Mean Domain Scores for Province, School District and Study Schools

Domain:	Province: mean correct	District: mean correct	School 1 mean correct	School 2 mean correct	School 3 mean correct	School 4 mean correct
1. Understands Words and Expressions	70.4	75.4	79.3	75.6	81.0	75.0
2. Literal Comprehension	78.3	80.3	79.1	78.9	84.0	88.7
3. Inferential Comprehension	72.9	76.9	82.8	73.2	83.5	79.4
4. Critical Comprehension	70.7	74.0	82.3	72.7	75.3	70.3
5. Locates and Uses Information	77.5	80.1	83.1	82.3	85.4	83.9

As the results and discussion of survey and interview data yield some insights into instructional leadership activity in relation to the organizational nature of each of the study schools, it was felt to be worthwhile to consider a profile of the outcomes on provincial assessments in each setting.

At both the grade four and grade seven levels, the district means, expressed as % correct, were higher than the provincial means on all domains. School 1's means were higher than the district means on seven of the nine domains across both grade levels and close to district means on two domains. Sschool 3 was also higher on seven of the nine domains and lower on two. School 4 was higher on five of the nine domains, close to district means on one domain and lower than district means on three domains. School 2 was higher than district means on two of the nine domains and lower on six. To a certain degree, it can be said that a spread of performance outcomes exists among the four study schools.

Summary

According to group means, the survey data indicated that all subscales showed a relatively high rating of frequency. Therefore, it can be said that the principals in each of the study schools focused on instructional leadership and organized their general administrative activity to address that focus.

Teachers' and principals' mean ratings per subscale showed close agreement. The greatest difference that occurred between means was .5. Principals' mean scores were slightly higher than teachers' means on six of the eleven subscales, slightly lower on three and very close on two.

The interview data showed that the four principals generally described their role in relation to instruction as supportive and facilitative as opposed to being directive or authoritative. A cross section of interview responses showed that the principals recognized their teachers as being professionals who required a certain amount of autonomy and discretion in their handling of instructional processes. They felt they generally worked with teachers who were highly competent and who shared a common interests in the quality and ongoing improvement of instruction. At the same time, the principals indicated that they felt responsible for overseeing and monitoring the progress of instructional processes. Given these common perceptions and the uniformly high frequency with which they employed instructional leadership practices, frequency ratings for particular subscale functions in combination with interview responses indicated that some variation in leadership style and emphasis existed among the four principals.

Principal 1 maintained a close, direct involvement with teachers and students in relation to instructional programs. He held his teaching staff in high regard, but also held high

expectations for their performance. He identified Curriculum Coordination as being central to his instructional leadership role. He saw himself primarily as a resource for his staff and felt that his habit of teaching on a regular basis allowed him to provide models for effective teaching practices. He took primary, school-wide responsibility for instructional programs, but emphasized teacher ownership in decisions affecting those programs. He felt that his greatest source of influence on teachers was his own, observable personal commitment to the school enterprise. The average of teacher mean scores for the subscales in principal 1's school was 4.1. The average of principal 1's mean scores was 4.3.

Principal 2 described his roles in relation to instruction as "a supporter, facilitator and catalyst, but not an initiator". He did not feel that his personal background in instruction allowed him a central, knowledgable role in the coordination of curriculum. He cultivated and planned the coordination of curriculum in consultation with his vice principal and/or his most experienced teacher and regularly circulated the school to support and monitor instructional processes. He felt that a central instructional leadership focus was to give his teachers opportunities to "go to it" with regard to instructional programs, but that he was also responsible for checking the viability of instructional processes. He mentioned that he constantly learned a great deal about effective instruction from his staff and emphasized staff ownership of instructional programs. He based supervision and

evaluation of instructional programs on a sense of "mutualness" with teachers which was developed through annual goal-setting and evaluation interviews with each individual teacher. He made clear his personal standards for the quality of student work and for the general "tightness" of the school's overal operation. He referred to student performance results in discussing the general progress of instructional programs but did not "push them" with staff. He felt that his greatest influence on staff was the trust they could place in him. He saw his style as being one of a "benevolent dictator" but believed that the staff saw him as being fair, supportive and encouraging. The average of teacher mean scores for the subscales in principal 2's school was 3.7. The average of principal 2's mean scores was 3.9.

Principal 3 described his role in relation to instruction as the leader of instruction and instructional change. He acted as motivator, coordinator, "pusher" (if needed), supporter (if an area was going well), and assessor. As motivator, principal 3 ensured shared ownership in setting instructional goals and determining program changes. He strongly emphasized the influence of the school's culture on instructional processes. He felt the main quality of the culture was interaction; between teachers, teachers and students and parents. That interaction conveyed a common notion of how things were done and of expectations for stduent performance. In carrying out his leadership role, principal 3 relied heavily upon highly developed systems; systems for an annual setting and review of

goals with the staff and for developing personal goal statements. His systems included interviews with individual staff members at the beginning and end of the school year, regular management team meetings for the coordination of curriculum and weekly administrative meetings to plan supportive strategies for instructional processes. He was very careful not to upset the school's sense of partnership in instruction by introducing change too quickly or forcefully. He supported what he felt was a primary staff relationship based on a feeling of "we're all in this together." Supervision and evaluation of instruction and curriculum coordination were considered to be central to his instructional leadership. The average of teacher mean scores for the subscales in this school was 3.7. The average of principal 3's mean scores was 3.5. It was notable that this was the one setting where the principal's average was lower than the teachers'.

Principal 4 identified Curriculum Coordination as being central to his instructional leadership role. His primary responsibility was to ensure thoroughness and consistency in the interpretation of curriculum. He based his leadership interactions on his personal knowledge of what comprises good teaching; knowledge derived from experience and information from the "experts". He encouraged new instructional approaches insofar as they created enthusiasm on the part of teachers, but he also took responsibility for monitoring their viability and ensuring that basic skills were covered. Principal 4 relied on staff consensus for setting instructional goals on an annual

basis. Responsibility for meeting goals was delegated to staff committees. Supervision and evaluation of instruction was based on ensuring, initially, that the teacher was a competent instructor then focussing on the improvement of instructional strategies agreed upon as a common focus between principal and teacher. He did not push instructional change. He worked to preserve an atmosphere of freedom for teachers to apply their skills as autonomous professionals. He applied personal experience in given instructional areas and remained primarily supportive of teacher efforts in other areas. He felt that he did not stress standards for student performance as much as he stressed the importance of students gaining understanding. He encouraged teachers to hold expectations that were appropriate for each student's level of ability. Principal 4 felt that his main source of influence with staff came from creating and maintaining a general atmosphere of freedom for teachers to make their own decisions in applying instructional processes. He felt that his style was non-authoritarian. He identified the classroom as the key instructional unit and recognized the importance of maintaining consultation at that level. The average of teacher mean scores for the subscales in this score was 3.7. The average of principal 4's mean scores was 4.0.

The results of this study have yielded evidence of many similarities in the frequency with which the four principals employed major processes of instructional leadership. They have also pointed to certain differences in leadership style, often

reflected in the frequency and manner in which specific instructional leadership functions are performed. Chapter five will discuss these outcomes in relation to the central questions addressed by the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This study addressed three questions: What are the behaviors currently thought to be characteristic of principals who are effective instructional leaders? To what extent do principals in given schools display the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders? What motivates principals to act, or not act in certain ways as instructional leaders? It was expected that the answers to these questions would relate directly to the study's topic: the importance of an administrator's organizational perspective in developing effective styles of instructional leadership.

This chapter will discuss the study's results; first, in relation to the three questions and second, to the topic. The final section will deal with the study's implications for further research.

What are the behaviors currently thought to be characteristic of principals who are effective instructional leaders?

The study's literature review first detailed the range and diversity of roles and functions found to be common to the principalship. By nature, the principalship involves a wide range of major roles necessary to school administration.

Instructional leadership was listed as only one of these roles and was found to occupy, on the average, a small amount of a principal's daily time. The daily tasks of the principal were found to be many and varied, to occur unpredictably and to average short durations of time. A common distinction used in identifying roles was a general separation of a principal's activities into two major categories: that of "operational manager" as opposed to that of "instructional leader" (Blumberg & Greenfield citing Roe & Drake, 1980). However one categorizes and labels the roles that a principal can or should perform, principals will "carve out roles from the reality they see" (Sackney, 1980). Therefore, a principal who chooses to function as an effective instructional leader must organize and manipulate his or her range of administrative activity to address instruction as a primary role.

Recommended qualities and skills for administrators were also reviewed. Three elements of principal effectiveness identified by Blumberg & Greenfield (1980) included an individual commitment to the realization of a particular educational or organizational vision, a propensity to assume initiative and take a pro-active stance in relation to the demands of the work-world environment, and an ability to satisfy routine organizational maintenance demands in order to allow time for activities directly related to the realization of a personal vision. Other skills identified as having major importance in effective leadership included an ability to adapt to ambiguous situations (Goldhammer & Becker, 1970), human

relations skills, an ability to effectively supervise and evaluate programs and personnel, and a thorough legal awareness (Austin, 1981; Goldhammer & Becker, 1970; Hay, 1980; Sackney, 1980). Principal expertise in instructional practices was also seen as a key ingredient in meeting instructional goals and in identifying resources (both human and material) to meet those goals (Austin, 1980; Sackney, 1980; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981).

The skills and qualities associated with effective leadership in a general sense are assumed to serve as prerequisites for principals wishing to "carve out" or focus upon the role of instructional leadership. One can hardly imagine a principal achieving effectiveness as an instructional leader while , at the same time, possessing poor human relations skills or letting other aspects of the school's operation fall into disarray. It can be assumed, therefore, that a principal who displays the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders has satisfied these prerequisites.

In identifying the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leadership, a broad range of associated roles and functions were specified. These roles and functions were linked to the organization of items in the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale developed by Philip Hallinger (1985), a scale which attempts to translate general indicators of effectiveness into testable behaviors.

The findings of this study's literature review yielded a broad array of behaviors currently thought to be characteristic of principals who are effective instructional leaders. It is apparent that these identified behaviors are not mutually exclusive. Their interconnectedness describes the majority of on-the-job activity for a principal who frames his or her overall administration according to a primary focus on instructional leadership. The extent to which the study's four subjects displayed the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders would therefore indicate the extent to which they held instructional leadership as a primary focus for their overall administration.

To what extent do principals in given schools display the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders?

In each case, the principals displayed, with generally high frequency, the behaviors characteristic of effective instructional leaders. It follows from this that each principal met the prereqisuites of organizing their general administration around a central focus as instructional leader and demonstrating associated qualities and skills. These results produced an anomaly for the study. Given the range and specificity of behaviors that were tested for, it was expected that a certain spread would occur in the frequency with which the principals' behaviors were displayed.

A possible explanation for this outcome concerns the design of the rating scale instrument and its administration. Because the scale listed seventy instructional leadership behaviors and called for a ranking of all items, it may have pre-disposed the respondents to indicate frequencies for behaviors that would not normally have occurred to them as being characteristic of their principal's instructional leadership. Although the scale did provide for a response of "no basis for judgment" on items, the interrelatedness of many of the items would have made it difficult to indicate "no basis for judgment" in isolation on given items. Consequently, there may have been a tendency for respondents to assign a moderate, seemingly "neutral" frequency (for example, "sometimes", with a score of 3) to such less familiar items. Across the sample, cumulative ratings on such items may have inadvertently supported an overall outcome of high frequency. It is notable that the mean scores for Hallinger's findings were correspondingly high across the subscales. Given the larger sample for his study, one might expect that greater differences in ratings would occur. As it was, the mean scores for teacher ratings on his study (n=104) were similarly high across the subscales when compared with the scores for this study (n=33). Large standard deviations for teacher ratings in both studies indicated some variation in teachers' perceptions of the frequency with which the principals performed the different instructional leadership functions (Hallinger, 1985). Survey results for both studies also indicated a large number of "missing cases", a situation which may have resulted from

either a respondent's sense of the item not being applicable, or from oversight on the respondent's part while completing the lengthy form.

Other possible explanations for this outcome are discussed in relation to the third question.

What motivates principals to act, or not act in certain ways as instructional leaders?

There are various possible explanations for the uniformly high frequency with which the four principals displayed the behaviors of effective instructional leaders:

One explanation may be that each principal has, in fact, consciously applied himself as an effective instructional leader. Although high levels of frequency do not necessarily imply effectiveness, student performance on provincial assessments showed that each school performed significantly higher than provincial means and, in many cases, higher than district means. Each subject had accumulated considerable experience in his role as principal and had had sufficient time in his present school to apply the benefits of that experience. Also, each subject was exceptionally clear in describing and explaining all aspects of his instructional leadership activity. The fact that the interviewer was also a colleague of the four principals would modify a tendency to be inaccurate or overly elaborate in the interview responses.

Another explanation involves the district's processes through which the four subjects had been readied and selected for the principalship, placed in their present schools and guided in their administration. As Pfeffer (1978) points out:

> People do not attain leadership positions in a random fashion; they are selected (p.17).

> The belief in the importance of leadership is frequently accompanied by the belief that persons occupying leadership positions are selected and trained according to how well they can enhance the organization's performance. If leadership matters in affecting organizational outcomes, then this surely justifies efforts to enhance selection and training procedures. Belief in a leadersip effect, in other words, leads to the development of a set of activities, including theory building, selection, and training oriented toward enhancing leadership effectiveness. The assumption underlying these activities is that they will enable those so selected or trained to assume leadersip positions and lead organizations to increased levels of performance. (p.23)

Prior to becoming principals, each of the subjects had been teachers in the district. In line with Pfeffer's observations, each was selected for leadership according to precise district processes. Also, each principal had, at some point in his career, undergone the district's detailed training program dealing with supervisory skills. This same district is one of the few in the province to, as a matter of policy, evaluate each principal's performance every four years. A district statement of Criteria for Effective Administration is used both as a basis for this evaluation and as a reference for the development of personal goals, required of each principal

on an annual basis.

Because the design of this study had four subjects investigated who were all employed by the same school district and had been subject to its influences, policies and guidelines for a number of years, it is reasonable to expect that frequency ratings would be generally similar among the subjects.

Uniformity of behaviors may also arise from each principal's self-selection process. Pfeffer states:

> Organizations have images, providing information about their individual characteristics. Also leadership roles in organizations have images, providing information about their character as well. Persons are likely to select themselves into organizations, and into roles within those organizations, based upon their preferred images. This self-selection process would tend to work, along with the process of organizational selection, to limit the range of abilities and behaviors one would be likely to find in a given organizational role. While it is no doubt true that role incumbency shapes people's attitudes and orientations, it is also true that there is a process of anticipatory socialization, in which people mentally take on the new role before entering the position. (Pfeffer, 1978;19)

District processes for leader selection, orientation and evaluation coupled with each principal's self-selection process and anticipatory socialization may strongly determine uniformity in principal behaviors. Should these combined processes be directed towards goals in instructional leadership, it is reasonable to expect that four experienced

principals who have "come through the ranks" in the same district would display similar leadership behaviors at common levels of frequency.

A third possible explanation involves the context of the study schools. Each school was located in a white, suburban, middle-class neighbourhood. Consequently, the student populations were drawn from communities with a relatively high socio-economic status. Through the close interest and involvement of parents and a correspondingly strong achievement orientation on the part of students, high expectations for instructional practices would be brought to bear on the teachers and administration of the schools. Just as it is found that unity of purpose and expectations on the part of teachers and administration will incline students towards better performance, the reverse is also true. Unity of purpose and expectations on the part of the community and students will incline a school's professional staff towards better performance. Studies of effective schooling record the most profound effects in outlier schools, those located in urban, low-income, racially mixed schools where consistently high expectations on the part of teaching professionals have predisposed students to extend their level of performance beyond the norms and expectations of the community. In communities where performance expectations are characteristically high, teachers and instructional leaders who do not respond to those expectations may be quickly identified by both colleagues and clientele as being out-of-step with the

norms of their school's culture. This impact of school culture on leadership raises a fourth possible explanation for the uniformity of instructional leadership activity in the four study schools.

Culture has been defined as being "reserved for the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously and that define, in a basic taken-for-granted fashion, an organization's view of itself and its environment (Schein, 1985). Culture governs "what is of worth for (the) group and how members should think, feel and behave" (Sergiovanni, 1984). In their interviews, all four principals referred, both directly and indirectly to the influence of their school's organizational culture on decisions made about instructional goals and processes. Each principal indicated that his teachers held a basic interest in the school's instructional programs, in setting and evaluating goals, monitoring progress, pursuing improvement, and introducing change.

Principal 4 made indirect reference to the influence of school culture when he spoke of a "self-checking system at work in the school because of a good staff" and of an ongoing process of curriculum coordination that was "underpinned by teachers and administration who know their stuff". He felt that the teachers displayed "high ownership" in the instructional program and were "not satisfied with what was merely in the (curriculum) guide." The teachers customarily operated within a

partnership in curriculum interpretation."

Principal 3 made direct reference to the influence of his school's culture when discussing the formation of instructional goals:

> The instructional goals that I have in my booklet of goals would be based on, really, the culture of the school. In this particular school that was determined before I arrived by involving parents and staff. Essentially, since I have arrived, that culture has changed a bit, but not so much because of me; moreso because of changes in staff and in what the role of schools might be now. Those would be the things that would be the main determinants; the culture that the school has and, of course, some of the conditions that may be imposed from somewhere else. When one talks about a good school , the culture or ethos that you develop around a building is what makes it. I'm always quite pleased when, at this school, I get a little kid coming in and saying 'My mom (or my dad) says this IS a good school'. That means that the culture has spread. The main (quality of culture) in this school is the interaction between the teachers and the teachers and the children and the parents. From my point of view anyway, that has the biggest impact on the culture, but in that interaction it is important that the teachers put across a feeling that, as a staff, we all have a similar understanding of what it is we are about. We all have a similar way of doing things; of expecting children to behave, of expecting children to do work. And all those things, when they are put together, give people the feeling that 'that's a place where my child is going to be in good hands; supportive, there aren't going to be any yells and screams, but, at the same time, my kid's going to have expectations'.

When asked about changes that had taken place in the culture of his school, principal 3 pointed out that changes had resulted from the introduction of new staff members who had brought with them aspects of the culture of their former school; aspects which may work well for them personally but

were not in keeping with the present school's culture. Where the principal felt that in the past he had had more control over who came into the school as staff, he had recently been more obligated to take staff assigned to his school, staff members who expected to be left alone to carry out their own practices, often in spite of the cultural norms and beliefs of the school. He felt that the existence of a definite culture in the school was strongly indicated by the tendency of parents to come to him, within ten days of their child being with one of these new staff members, and stating "Look, that's not what we expect of (this) school."

Principals 2 and 4 made indirect reference to the influence of culture on their schools' instructional programs by indicating that the strength of those programs lay with "mature" and "competent" staff members who needed to be given "opportunities", "freedom" And "support" to "go to it".

In his book, Organizational Culture and Leadership, Edgar Schein states that "culture . . . is a learned product of group experience and is, therefore, to be found only where there is a definable group with a significant history" (1985;7). Each of the four schools had a sizable core of experienced teachers who had been operating in the school for a considerable number of years. As might be expected, these schools possessed a culture that was , indeed, a learned product of group experience. In line with this observation, Schein notes further that the culture can cause the organization to be "predisposed to

certain types of leadership" and that "leaders create cultures, but cultures in turn, create their next generation of leaders" (1985;313).

Therefore, it may well have been the case that a strong cultural belief in the priority of developing and maintaining effective instructional processes in each of the schools predisposed each of the four principals to govern their instructional leadership accordingly and, consequently, display uniformly high levels of instructional leadership activity.

It is most likely that a combination of the preceding explanations is responsible for the uniformly high levels of instructional leadership activity among the four principals. This is not to underestimate the impact of conscientious leadership in each of the four schools, or to suggest that each principal was simply guided by other factors within the school situation. Rather, it is to illuminate the fact that leadership practices develop in accordance with the overall perspective of a school's organizational nature.

The Importance of an Administrator's Organizational Perspective

The instructional leadership practices evidenced by this study's survey and interview data have been determined by a host of dynamic influences at work within the school's overall organizational environment. To the extent that each principal

has developed and acted upon a clear perspective for his school's organizational nature, appropriate instructional leadership practices have been adopted and effective styles appear to have been developed.

In his book The Structuring of Organizations, Henry Mintzberg (1979) provides detailed comparative descriptions of five main types of organizational structure. He calls one of these structural types the "Professional Bureaucracy" and includes all professional organizations such as hospitals, universities and school systems under this heading. His analysis of a school's organization as a professional bureaucracy has important implications for school leadership.

All members of a professional bureaucracy only join the organization once they have completed a compulsory, extensive period of training and indoctrination through which they acquire and learn to apply a standardized combination of knowledge and skills. This ensures that each organizational member can and will perform competently as a "professional" and thereby sharply reduces the role of centralized supervision and coordination. The complex nature of a professional's work ensures that, regardless of how standardized the skills might be, considerable discretion must remain in their application.

The fact that considerable discretion must be allowed the professional in the application of skills has a number of implications for matters of control, measurement and internal

standardization. As Mintzberg points out: "professional bureaucracies cannot rely extensively on the formalization of professional work or on systems to plan and control it" (p.351). This is due to the relative complexity and unpredictability of client needs within the professional bureaucracy. These characteristics of unpredictability and required discretion greatly influence the bases of power for administrators. A great deal of power over the regular work rests at the "bottom" of the structure, or the "operating core" of individual professionals. As a result, most professionals see this power structure as an "inverse pyramid" with professional operators at the top, and administrators below to serve them. The professional bureaucracy has a very limited hierarchy and focuses on professional expertise as a source of power. It is required that whatever pecking order does exist mirror the professional's experience and expertise. For the most part, the administrator in a professional bureaucracy must be able to draw power at the locus of uncertainty and must be extremely skilled in manipulating the dynamics of negotiation. They also serve key roles at the boundary of the organization where they are constantly called upon to mediate between professionals inside and parties outside of the organization.

Given the high level of democracy and autonomy demanded by the operators in a professional bureaucracy, some major problems of coordination, discretion and innovation are inherent in the organization. The only real source of coordination is the standardization of skills; direct

supervision and mutual adjustment are resisted as "direct infringements on the professional's autonomy". Attempts to rationalize the professional's skills (to divide them into steps) are strongly resisted because this makes them "programmable by the technostructure", a threat to a professional's basis of autonomy.

Because a relatively high degree of discretion is left in the hands of the professional, a major problem derives from the unconscientious member who comes to simply concentrate on the program he or she favours. The professional bureaucracy cannot easily deal with such operators.

Innovation also presents problems. In order for strategic change to take place, all professional operators must agree on that change. As a result, changes are characteristically slow and require a great deal of political intrigue and careful maneuvering to be effected.

In summary, a school organization is a clear example of a professional bureaucracy. Teachers make up the operating core of the organization and possess a standard set of skills acquired through their university, and ongoing in-service training. They operate in their individual classrooms with considerable autonomy and reserve the right to use a high degree of discretion in serving their students' (clients') learning needs, that is, in determining instructional program.

To be effective as instructional leaders in their schools, principals must develop leadership styles in accordance with a fundamental perspective on the school organization as a professional bureaucracy and recognize its preconditions as determinants for leadership practices. The word "styles" is used in the plural form because the results of this study suggest that, whereas individual styles may vary between principals, the nature of those styles is somewhat secondary to a principal's fundamental perspective on the school organization. In other words, just as personalities will vary between individuals, so will personal styles of leadership vary between principals. To the extent that individual styles reflect a sound working perspective on the nature of the organization, effective leadership practices may be carried out in an individualistic manner. It is when individual leadership styles are imposed in the absence of a basic grasp of the organization's nature that sharp differences in leadership effectiveness might be anticipated. This study's interview data indicated that certain differences in leadership style did exist between the four principals. Where principal 1's style may be generally described as "task-oriented and business-like," principal 2 may be best described as a "conscientious manager." Where principal 3's style may be described as "culture-oriented and systematic," principal 4 could be described as a "cautious supporter of instructional freedom." At the same time, however, the survey and interview data indicated that the four principals were relatively consistent in the instructional leadership practices they

employed and, in most cases, in the frequency with which they employed them. This consistency was extended to the practices found by the literature to be characteristic of effective instructional leaders. It can be concluded therefore, that the principals in this study and those studied in the effective schools literature shared a common perspective on the nature of the school organization, a perspective which formed a foundation for their actions and attitudes as instructional leaders. However, it is not logical to assume as a corollary of this that all these instructional leaders shared similar styles.

The interview data revealed that the principals clearly recognized the professional status of the teachers with whom they worked. A considerable degree of autonomy was afforded the teachers in their implementation of instructional processes and their interpretation of curriculum. Each principal emphasized a democratic handling of decisions affecting instruction and indicated that change had to be introduced very gradually and discreetly. The principal's instructional expertise was felt to be a major source of influence on aspects of the instructional program. It was notable that, where principal 2 sensed a personal lack of expertise in curriculum matters, he actively enlisted the involvement of his vice principal and/or other experienced staff members with whom he consulted, planned and coordinated the school's curriculum. This same principal recognized a key role at the boundary of the organization when he stated that he felt that a major source of influence with

his staff was his strong ability to mediate between the professionals inside his organization and the parents outside of it. As his was a large school accomodating both English and French immersion programs, this ability was a major element in his leadership effectiveness. In describing their respective sources of influence with staff members, the principals mentioned their ability to support the teachers, to develop and preserve a schoolwide sense of professional partnership, to model high standards of conduct, and to convey a strong, personal commitment to quality instruction. At no time were the ideas of hierarchical control or authority of office mentioned as possible sources of influence. Such attitudes are in concert with a basic perspective on the school organization as being, in Mintzberg's terms, a professional bureaucracy. In the course of his interview, principal 3 explained his leadership style and described his leadership role in this way:

> We are in an enterprise that involves people. I think that makes the difference. If it was an enterprise involving objects, my leadership style would be quite different. I think an object wouldn't mind getting kicked around a bit, but with people it's different. You really can't think of teachers as the employees in the sense of a business employee. I think teachers, because of the nature of their task, are really the drivers of the enterprise. In business it would be the other way around; your management team are the drivers. I really do think that I am just the driving instructor in a sense and, because of that, I don't always have the wheel, but I need to control that wheel.

As has been the case in this study, any investigation into the causes and effects of school leadership practices is bound to encounter a diverse and complex set of variables and

considerations. As an "enterprise that involves people" rather than "objects", inputs would appear too variable to allow a clear empirical link to be drawn between leadership behavior and student achievement. This study has explored the practices of principals as instructional leaders and has attempted to explain the behaviors of four subjects in their respective settings. It has not attempted to produce findings generalizable to other settings, nor does it assume to have fully grasped the particular features and influences of the four settings. At best, it has used elements from each of the four settings to illuminate the findings of other studies and discussions which are considerably broader in scope and more detailed in their analyses. Further investigation of instructional leadership behavior in other settings and a more detailed review of organizational theory are needed to secure the importance of a principal's organizational perspective in developing styles of effective instructional leadership.

Implications for Further Research

In attempting to identify factors which motivate school principals to act in certain ways as instructional leaders, this study has underscored the need for research to consider a multitude of influences and variables before concrete generalizations can be made regarding effective leadership behavior and style. In light of this fact, it is questionable whether further research should attempt to draw a purely empirical link between leadership effect and student

achievement. Such research calls for the control of diverse, complex and dynamic variables which are far more specific than general to school settings. In lieu of pursuing empirically-derived generalizations alone, it may be more productive to further develop research approaches which combine the results of empirical investigations, to the extent that they are applicable across broad samples of school settings, with ethnographic investigations of factors specific to school settings. In this way, further research may logically produce a hierarchy of understandings for instructional leadership effect; a hierarchy which builds from broader levels of empirically-derived generalizations, basic to effective leadership in all schools, to narrower levels of ethnographic understandings of effective leadership in particular school environments. In effect, such an approach would mirror processes presently considered basic to principals gaining a practical understanding of factors at play within their schools and, indeed, basic to teachers doing the same regarding factors at play within their classrooms.

The development of this approach calls for:

1. Further application and refinement of such instruments as the PIMRS which specify and test for behaviors which can be considered basic to effective instructional leadership.

Questions as to whether or not teachers are able to accurately indicate the presence and frequency of a principal's

leadership behaviors through the medium of such instruments should also be addressed.

2. A thorough application of organizational theory to the analysis of observed leadership behaviors and attitudes.

3. Further development of focused, ethnographic interview processes to determine a principal's attitudes and belief systems in relation to the school's organization and culture.

4. An extension of interview procedures to record teacher, parent and student perceptions regarding leadership behaviors and their effects on instruction.

5. The use of extensive on-site observations to illuminate and expand upon findings derived through the application of survey and interview processes.

6. Longitudinal application of the methods listed above, particularly those involving survey instruments, to test for the stability of findings over time.

It would also be important to test for a change in findings once a new principal had been assigned to a given setting for a period of three or more years.

APPENDIX A

RATING SCALE

Questionnaire: Instructional Management Behaviour of Principals

This questionnaire lists a broad range of possible instructional management behaviours. It asks for an indication of how often certain practices have been carried out by a principal in the past year. The nature and frequency of practices may vary greatly from setting to setting. This questionnaire makes no judgment as to the desirability or frequency of practices.

The questionnaire is based on research findings from studies of elementary schools. This particular form uses some terminology relevant to secondary schools because it has been adapted to a study of secondary schools. Please address the questionnaire, however, as a study of elementary school practices.

The questionnaire has an identification number to keep track of which schools have participated. No names will ever be associated with the study or with any discussion or publication of its results.

1. Think about how frequently the behaviour described by each item occurs.
2. "Bubble in" (in pencil) the circle under the column which indicates your answer.
3. Once completed, enclose the questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to your contact person.

Part I (●)

(A) (Optional) years working with the current principal at the end of this school year:

○ one ○ two-four ○ 5-9 ○ 10-15 ○ more than 15

(B) Grade level you teach:

○ K-3 ○ 4-5 ○ 6-7

INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS

All of the items listed in this questionnaire are practices that could be part of a principal's job. We need to assess to what extent your principal exhibits any of these behaviors. This may be used only in complete confidentiality in your responses. Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire.

What grade levels do you currently teach?

K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

In which department(s) do you currently teach?

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
I. FRAMING THE SCHOOL'S GOALS						
1. Develop goals that seek improvement over current levels of academic performance						
2. Frame academic goals with target dates						
3. Frame the school's academic goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them						
4. Use needs assessments or other methods to secure staff input on goal development						
5. Use data on student academic performance when developing the school's academic goals						
6. Develop goals that are easily translated into classroom objectives by teachers						
II. COMMUNICATING THE SCHOOL'S GOALS						
7. Communicate the school's academic goals to the people (staff, students) in the school setting						

To what extent does your principal

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
II. COMMUNICATING THE SCHOOL'S GOALS (continued)						
8. Refer to the school's academic goals in informal settings with individual teachers						
9. Refer to the school's academic goals at staff meetings						
10. Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers or department heads						
11. Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school, e.g., bulletin boards or posters indicating the importance of math and writing						
12. Refer to the school's academic goals in assemblies						
III. SUPERVISING AND EVALUATING INSTRUCTION						
13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)						
14. Ensure that the classroom objectives of teachers are consistent with the stated goals of the school						
15. Review student work products when evaluating teachers						
16. Evaluate teachers on academic objectives directly related to the goals of the school						
17. Point out specific strengths of the teacher's instructional practices in post-observation conferences						
18. Point out specific weaknesses of the teacher's instructional practices in post-observation conferences						
19. Note specific strengths of the teacher's instructional practices in written evaluation						

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
III. SUPERVISING AND EVALUATING INSTRUCTION (continued)						
20. Note specific weaknesses of the teacher's instructional practices in written evaluations						
21. Note student time-on-task to teachers after classroom observations						
22. Note specific instructional practices related to the stated classroom objectives in the teacher evaluations						
IV. CO-ORDINATING THE CURRICULUM						
23. Make clear to teachers who is responsible for co-ordinating curricular content across grade levels, e.g., the principal or department co-ordinator						
24. Ensure that the academic goals of the school are translated into common curricular objectives						
25. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions						
26. Ensure that the objectives of special programs in the school are co-ordinated with those of the regular classroom						
27. Ensure that the content selected from textbooks by teachers is aligned with the school's curricular objectives						
28. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the achievement test(s) used for program evaluation						

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
IV. CO-ORDINATING THE CURRICULUM (continued)						
29. Participate in meetings for the purpose of reviewing or selecting instructional materials						
V. MONITORING AND FEEDING BACK STUDENT PERFORMANCE RESULTS						
30. Meet individually with teachers or department co-ordinators to discuss pupil academic performance						
31. Discuss the item analysis of provincial or school-wide tests with the staff to identify strengths and weaknesses in the school's instructional program						
32. Use the results of student testing to assess progress towards school goals						
33. Distribute the results of student testing to teachers in a timely fashion						
34. Inform teachers of the school's performance results on tests in written form, e.g., memos/newsletters						
35. Ensure that students are informed of the school's performance results						
36. Ensure that students whose performance on tests indicates the need for special instruction, such as remediation or enrichment, are identified						
37. Ensure that the appropriate instructional programs are developed or found for students whose performance on tests indicates a need						
38. Ensure that regular homework is assigned and checked by teachers						

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
VI. PROTECTING INSTRUCTIONAL TIME						
39. Ensure that instructional time is not interrupted by public address announcements						
40. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time						
41. Ensure that truant students suffer specified consequences for missing instructional time						
42. Ensure that truant students make up lost instructional time						
43. Visit classrooms to ensure that instructional time is used for learning and practising new skills and concepts						
VII. MAINTAINING ADMINISTRATOR VISIBILITY						
44. Take time to talk to students and teachers during breaks and before and after school						
45. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students						
46. Attend or participate in extra-curricular activities						
47. Ensure that classes for absent teachers are covered until a substitute arrives						
48. Tutor or provide direct instruction to students						

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
VIII. PROMOTING INCENTIVES TO IMPROVE TEACHING						
49. Reinforce superior performance by teachers publicly in newsletters or bulletins						
50. Privately recognize teacher efforts and performance						
51. Acknowledge exceptional effort or performance by teachers in official memos for their personnel files						
52. Reinforce exceptional efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional development, e.g., new roles or in-service training						
IX. PROMOTING INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT						
53. Distribute notes, announcements, or newsletters to teachers informing them of opportunities for professional development that are related to the school's goals						
54. Select in-service activities that are related directly to the school's academic goals						
55. Support teacher requests for in-service that are related directly to the school's academic goals						
56. Distribute journal articles to teachers on a regular basis						
57. Support the use in classrooms of skills acquired during teachers' in-service training						
58. Arrange for outside speakers to make presentations on instructional issues at staff meetings						
59. Provide time to meet individually with teachers to discuss instructional issues						
60. Sit in on teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction						

To what extent does your principal:

	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Basis for Judgment
IX. PROMOTING INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (continued)						
61. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share information concerning their classroom experiences and in-service activities						
X. DEVELOPING AND PROMOTING ACADEMIC STANDARDS						
62. Set high standards for the percentage of students who should master skills objectives						
63. Encourage teachers to start class on time and teach to the end of the period						
64. Ensure that it is known what is expected of students at different grade levels						
65. Enforce a standard for promotion that requires students to master expectations before being promoted						
66. Support teachers when they enforce school academic policies						
XI. PROMOTING INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING						
67. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honour roll or mention in the school newsletter						
68. Use assemblies to honour students who have done superior work in class						
69. Recognize superior student achievement by seeing students in the office with their work products						
70. Acknowledge student improvement by contacting parents						

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

RE: SURVEY: INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOUR OF PRINCIPALS

Dear Respondent,

In their role as instructional leaders, there is a variety of practices that may be carried out by a school principal. This questionnaire lists this variety of practices and asks you to indicate the extent to which your principal exhibits certain behaviours. Once this has been indicated, the next step in our research will be to ask the principal why it is that they do what they do. Ultimately, we hope to be able to draw a connection between a principal's instructional leadership practices and his or her perceptions of the school's organizational structure.

We greatly appreciate your taking the time to complete the questionnaire. You may be assured complete confidentiality in your responses.

Completion of the questionnaire indicates your approval for the use of the data in the manner described above.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

Sincerely yours,

Chris Kelly

Chris Kelly

Principal, Elementary
North Vancouver School
District

Graduate Student
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

References

REFERENCES

Austin, G.R. (1979). Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness. Educational Leadership, 10-14.

Blumberg, A.; Greenfield, W. (1980). The Effective Principal. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon.

Bossert, S.; Dwyer, D.; Rowan, B.; & Lee, G. (1982). The Instructional Management Role of the Principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, (18), 34-64.

Brookover, W. (1976). Elementary School Climate and School Achievement. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Brookover, W.; Beady, C.; Flood, P.; Schweitzer, J.; & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School Social Systems and Student Achievement. New York, NY: Praeger.

Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Coleman, J.; Campbell, E.; Hobson, C.; McPartland, J.; Mood, A.; Weinfeld, F.; & York, R. (1966) Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Cuban, L. (1984). Transforming the Frog Into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy and Practice at the District Level. Harvard Educational Review (54) 2, 129-151.

Duke, D. (1982). Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness NASSP Bulletin (466) 456, 1-12.

Dwyer, D. (1984). The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principal's Role. Educational Leadership, (February), 32-37.

Becker, G.L., & Goldhammer, K. (1970). What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal? American Education (April), 11-13.

Goodlad, J.I. (1983 a). A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses. Phi Delta Kappan (March), 552-558.

Goodlad, J.I. (1983). Staff Development, Part 2. National Society for the Study of Education. University of Chicago Press (82), 36-61.

Hall, G.; Rutherford, W.L.; Hord, S.M.; Huling, L.L. (1984). Effects of Three Principal Styles on School Improvement. Educational Leadership (February), 22-29.

Hallinger, P.; Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. The Elementary School Journal (86) 2, 217-247.

Hallinger, P.; Murphy, J.; Weil, M.; Mesa, R.P.; Mitman, A. (1983). Identifying the Specific Practices, Behaviors for Principals. NASSP Bulletin (67) 463, 83-91.

Hay, G.C. (1980). How Has the Principal's Role Changed. Education Canada (20), 4.

Howell, B. (1981). Profile of the Principalship. Educational Leadership (38), 4.

Hoy, K.H.; Miskel, G.M. (1982). Educational Administration. New York, N.Y.: Random House.

Jones, P. (1986). Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.

Jencks, C.S.; Smith, M.; Ackland; H.; Bane, M.J.; Cohen, D.; Gintis, H.; Heyns, B.; & Michelson, S. (1982). Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.

Latham, G., Wexley, K. (1981). Increasing productivity through performance appraisal. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement. Review of Educational Research (52) 3, 309-359.

Levine, D.; Start, J. (1982). Instructional and organizational arrangements that improve student achievement in innner-city schools. Educational Leadership (40), 41-46.

McLaughlin, M.W.; Marsh, D.D. (1978). Staff Development and School Change. Teachers College Record (80), 69-94.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The Structuring of Human Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morris, V.C.; Crowson, R.L.; Hurwitz, E. Jr.; & Porter-Guthrie, C. (1982). The Urban Principal: Middle Manager in the Educational Bureaucracy. Phi Delta Kappan (June), 689-692.

Murphy, J.; Hallinger, P.; & Mitman, A. (1983). Problems with Research on Educational Leadership: Issues to be Addressed. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis (5) 3, 297-305.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1983). Onward to Excellence: Making Schools More Effective. Goal Based Education Program, Portland, Ore.

Pfeffer, J. (1979). The Ambiguity of Leadership. Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham: Duke University Press, 13-34.

Pinero, U. (1982). Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders. Principal (March), 16-19.

Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. The Elementary School Journal (83) 4, 427-452.

Petersen, K.D. (1978). The Principal's Tasks. Administrator's Notebook (26), 8.

Rowan, B.; Bossert, S.T.; & Dwyer, D.C. (1983). Research on Effective Schools - A Cautionary Note. Educational Researcher (12) 4, 24-31.

Rutherford, W.L. (1985). School Principals as Effective Leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, (September), 31-34.

Rutter, M.; Maughan, B.; Mortimer, P.; Ouston, J. (1982). Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sackney, L.E. (1980). Administrative Dilemmas of the Principal. The Canadian Administrator (20), 3.

Schein, E. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Leadership and Excellence in Schooling. Educational Leadership (41) 5, 4-13.

Shoemaker, J. & Fraser, H.W. (1981). What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, (November), 178-182.

Spradley, J.P. (1979). The Ethnographic Interview. New York, NY: Holt-Rinehart-Winston.

Stallings, J. (1980). Tips to principals from research on effective strategies for teaching basic skills in secondary schools. Paper presented to the National Study Group for Secondary School Principals.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership. Educational Leadership (February), 346-352.

Venezky, R.L.; Winfield, L.F. (1979). Schools that Succeed Beyond Expectations in Reading. Final Report submitted to National Institute of Education for Grant NIE-G-78-0027. Washington, DC.