1997

An investigation of leadership styles and implementation of change interventions used by principals in urban and rural public schools in Alabama.

Paul Thomas Hackett Jr
University of Alabama at Birmingham

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

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

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

UMI

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

AN INVESTIGATION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE INTERVENTIONS USED BY PRINCIPALS IN URBAN AND RURAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN ALABAMA

by

PAUL T. HACKETT, JR.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the graduate faculty of The University of Alabama and the University of Alabama at Birmingham in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

1997

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION
GRADUATE SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Degree Ed.D. Program Educational Leadership

Name of Candidate Paul Thomas Hackett, Jr.

Committee Chairs Boyd S. Rogan and Harold Bishop

Title An Investigation of Leadership Styles and Implementation of Change Interventions Used by Principals in Urban and Rural Public Schools in Alabama

This study examined three types of change facilitator styles (responder, manager, and initiator) practiced by principals as perceived by teachers working with the principals. The practice of the responder style has been characterized as allowing the school to run itself. The manager style is defined by more active leadership without a strong goal orientation. The initiator style is characterized by active leadership, collegial relationships with faculty, and strong vision/goal orientation.

The purpose of the study was to ascertain if any of the three styles as perceived by teachers were related to variables of interest. These variables included the location of the school (urban or rural), the per capita income of the community in which the school was located (below average, average, or above average), the per pupil expenditure for the school system in which the school was located (below average, average, or above average), the gender of the principals, the level of education of principals, the grade levels in the schools, and the perceptions of the principals themselves.

The study found no significant relationship between location and change facilitator style. There was no significant relationship found between change facilitator style and per capita income of community. Neither was there found a relationship between change facilitator style and per pupil expenditure for the school system, educational level of the principal, or grade levels in the schools. There was, however, a significant correlation found between the perceptions of teachers regarding change facilitator styles and the gender of the principals. More male teachers and fewer female teachers were found to

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Janey.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this project would not have been possible without the support of my committee. My committee chairmen, Dr. Boyd Rogan and Dr. Harold Bishop, guided me throughout the process with patience. Special thanks are in order to Dr. David Dagley, who served as a mentor and encouraged me to complete the doctoral program. Thanks go to Dr. Gypsy Abbott, who helped me to develop the topic for my dissertation. I especially wish to thank Dr. James E. McLean, who always found time to work with me during all phases of my study.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Janey, and my sons, Clay, Jake, and Joseph, for their patient support during the years this study was performed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

CHAPTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The leadership of educational administrators is crucial to the success of schools and school systems. Heck and Marcoulides (1993) suggested that academic achievement in elementary and secondary schools depends to a large degree on the leadership of the principal. They asserted that the level of achievement in the school is influenced by factors such as the ability of the principal to organize instruction, build strong school climate, and monitor the instructional program of the school. The research of Hall (1988) has shown that it is the behavior of the principal which influences successful implementation of innovation in a school. The work of Hall (1988) implies that principals are most effective when they serve as facilitators of change. Pavan and Entrekin (1991) state that it is the principal, among others, who must work to effect change.

Reform movements emphasizing accountability for educators have created expectations that education will change. The public emphasis is now on efficiency and accountability (Pavan and Entrekin, 1991). Because of this, the field is presently undergoing a time of unprecedented change. Carrow-Moffett (1993) stated that change will be constant in the next century. According to Gainey (1994), the United States has already experienced tremendous change from "an agrarian economy, to an industrial economy, to a service economy" (p. 27), while schools in the U.S. have "continued to stay on course with precious few changes" (p. 27).

Although school administrators have recognized the need for change in education that matches the need for change in the private sector (Anderson, 1993), reform efforts in education that focus on meeting the needs of a global economy have been largely ineffective (White, 1990). The state of Alabama, just as other areas of the country, is subject to

relationship of change facilitator styles (CFSs) to variables such as per capita income of community, per pupil expenditure in school system, gender of principal, level of education of principal, and grade levels housed in school. There is a need for research investigating the types of change interventions, or change facilitator styles, practiced by principals in the state of Alabama.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for conducting this study was to investigate the predominant change facilitator styles of elementary, middle, and high school principals in public schools in Alabama based on the perceptions of teachers in the schools led by those principals.

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers in rural and urban schools regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals.

2. There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the per capita income of the community in which the school is located.

3. There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the per pupil expenditure for the schools where those principals serve.

4. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the gender of those principals.

5. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the level of education of those principals.

6. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the grade levels housed in the schools where the principals serve.

7. There will be no significant relationship between teacher and principal perceptions regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of the principals.

Significance of the Study

Research by Hall and Hord (1984) and Evans and Teddlie (1993) established a correlation between certain change facilitator styles and the degree of implementation of changes in the school environment. Work by Hord et al. (1984) established a relationship between certain leadership styles and the willingness of secondary change facilitators within the school to engage in leadership behavior leading to change.

The field of education is presently undergoing unprecedented change in the state of Alabama. Since 1993, two governors have made educational reform a priority. Since 1991, two state superintendents of education have proposed wide-ranging reform measures, the most recent of which applies sanctions to school systems where students score below grade level on nationally normed tests.

A study ascertaining whether relationships exist between certain variables and specific change facilitator styles is warranted given the changing topography of the education field. Information gathered in this study will be of use to those in leadership positions at the Alabama SDE and at the local system level. Ascertaining patterns in change facilitator styles which are related to variables existing in the school setting will assist SDE personnel in devising strategies for effecting change in schools throughout Alabama. Making training decisions specific to certain variables may be one possible use of results of this study.

Data from this study will prove valuable in identifying personnel who are likely to practice specific change interventions. Superintendents, boards of education, and human

resource personnel will be able to create a profile which matches the change facilitator style they believe most meets the needs of a particular situation. Recruiting capability will thus be enhanced.

Methodology

A random sample of principals of schools in Alabama was selected for this study. This sample was proportionately representative of elementary, middle, and high schools in Alabama. A research packet containing two Change Facilitator Style Questionnaires was mailed to the principals selected for the study. The Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire (CFSQ) developed by Hall and Vandenberge as cited in Hall & George, 1988 was administered to teachers in the schools headed by the principals who were subjects of the study (Appendix C). The teachers were purposefully selected to represent teachers in the school of each subject principal. Each teacher responding was the Alabama Educational Association faculty representative for the school in which the principal served. Permission was sought and obtained to use this instrument in this study (Appendix A, Appendix B). Each principal was asked to respond to items on a demographic cover sheet regarding information necessary for this study (Appendix D). Demographic data necessary to the study include gender and level of education of the principal. Each principal was asked to self-administer the CFSQ in order to provide data relative to perception of his or her own change facilitator style. Permission was sought and obtained to use the CFSQ for this purpose (Appendix B). Completed instruments were returned by means of two separate self-addressed stamped envelopes, one each for the principal and teacher so that confidentiality of responses could be ensured. A follow-up telephone call was made to those who had not returned the completed questionnaire within 3 weeks.

The level of community affluence was determined by ascertaining the per capita income for the community from data collected during the 1990 Census (U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, 1990). Based on this information

the level of affluence of each community was characterized as Type 1 per capita income ($4,000 or more below the mean per capita income for communities in the state of Alabama), Type 2 per capita income (more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 below than the mean per capita income for communities in the state), Type 3 per capita income (no more than $2,000 below or above the mean per capita income for communities in the state), Type 4 per capita income (more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 above the mean per capita income for communities in the state), and Type 5 per capita income ($4,000 or more above the mean per capita income for communities in the state).

The level of economic support for each school was determined using information from the SDE relative to per pupil expenditure (State of Alabama Department of Education, 1994). Based on this information, level of economic support was characterized as Level 1 ($1,000 or more below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), Level 2 (more than $500 but less than $1,000 below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), Level 3 (no more than $500 above or below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), Level 4 (more than $500 but less than $1,000 above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), and Level 5 ($1,000 or more above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state).

Assumptions

It was assumed that the random sample of principals selected for this study would be representative of principals in rural and urban schools in Alabama. The instrument measuring the dependent variable, change facilitator style, is reliable and valid.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the fact that the results depended on the responses of purposefully chosen teachers. Also a limitation was that the designators urban and rural for schools may be problematic from the standpoint that there may be significant within-

group variation among rural and urban schools which may correlate with specific change facilitator styles for principals. This study was limited by the fact that results depend upon the willingness to participate of the principals whose styles were being studied. A final limitation was that demographic data relative to the principal and the school were self-reported.

Definition of Terms

The following includes the definition of terms which were used in this study:

Change is a process carried out by individuals in a system where innovations are implemented which enable the system to experience growth (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

The Change Facilitator (CF) is one who enables others to adopt innovations within their work. This can be accomplished by exhibiting certain behaviors. These behaviors have been documented in the work of Hall and Hord (1984).

Change Facilitator Style (CFS) is a way to categorize three distinct types of leadership behavior. CFS is determined by ascertaining the predominant type of change interventions performed by a leader.

An elementary school is a school comprised of any combination of grades K-5.

A middle school is a school comprised of any combination of grades 6-8.

A high school is a school comprised of any combination of grades 9-12.

Per capita income (income per person in a community) is used in this study as an indicator of community affluence. The indicators are the following:

Type 1 per capita income: $4,000 or more below the mean per capita income for the state of Alabama.

Type 2 per capita income: More than $2,000 but less than $4,000 below the mean per capita income for the state.

Type 3 per capita income: No more than $2,000 below or above the mean per capita income for the state.

Type 4 per capita income: More than $2,000 but less than $4,000 above the mean per capita income for the state.

Type 5 per capita income: $4,000 or more above the mean per capita income for the state.

Level of economic support is based upon the per pupil expenditure for the schools in the system where the subject works.

Level 1 per pupil expenditure is that which is $1,000 or more below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.

Level 2 per pupil expenditure is that which is more than $500 but less than $1,000 below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.

Level 3 per pupil expenditure is that which is no more than $500 above or below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.

Level 4 per pupil expenditure is that which is more than $500 but less than $1,000 above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.

Level 5 per pupil expenditure is that which is $1,000 or more above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.

Urban schools are schools in systems within 25 miles of a population center of 50,000 people or more (Stephens & Turner, 1988).

Rural schools are schools in school systems farther than 25 miles from a population center with 50,000 or more people (Stephens & Turner, 1988).

Level of education refers to the degree level achieved by the principal in the study: Bachelor of Arts/Science, Master of Arts/Science/Education, Education Specialist, Doctor of Education, or Doctor of Philosophy.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature on leadership has long recognized that leaders vary in the ways they influence the behavior of subordinates. Leadership literature lists different ways of categorizing the behaviors of leaders who are practicing the role of leadership. These ways of categorizing leadership behaviors are commonly referred to as leadership styles. Among leadership styles which describe the specific behaviors as practiced by leaders are the following: (a) facilitative leadership; (b) democratic and autocratic leadership; (c) transformational leadership; (d.) laissez faire, democratic, dictatorial, and transactional leadership; (e) situational leadership including high task and high relationship, high task and low relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task; (f) moral and ethical leadership; and (g) change facilitator styles including responding, managing, and initiating behaviors.

These methods of categorizing leadership behaviors often describe leadership behaviors in terms of their influence on the behavior of subordinates. Those who are able to influence change in the behaviors of subordinates may be said to facilitate change within the school environment. In this review, various concepts relative to the role of leader including this concept of leader as change facilitator will be examined.

Leadership Styles

Facilitative leadership. In any organization, the leadership behaviors of the leader determine the degree to which that organization is effective. Hickcox (1992), in a study of school system chief executive officers (CEOs), ascertained the degree to which effective CEOs achieved their goals by working through people rather than by exercising an auto-

cratic style of leadership. Hickcox found two elements critical to the effectiveness of the CEOs being studied: vision of the CEO and willingness of the CEO to achieve the vision by influencing others rather than by attempting to mandate change. Although this study did not establish objective criteria for the choice of effective executives, the data gathered from interviews with the subjects are valuable in that a pattern of behavior is established for executives thought to be effective by other school executives.

Lashway (1995) defined facilitative leadership as that which emphasizes collaboration and empowerment. Lashway compared the concept of facilitative leadership with the concept of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership, asserted Lashway, relied upon the inspiration of employees to perform at a high level for the good of the organization. The concept of transformational leadership has evolved, according to Lashway, to a more fluid leadership style where leadership flows in many directions rather than depending on top-down inspiration. This evolution of transformational leadership into facilitative leadership depends upon "mutuality and synergy" (Lashway, 1995, p. 1).

Gardner (as cited in Lewis, 1993) observes that a leader must not only work within the venue which he or she leads but interact beyond that venue in the world at large. Leaders must develop skills in four areas: agreement building, networking, exercising nonjurisdictional power, and institution building. According to Lewis (1993), agreement building skills are those which enable a leader to resolve differences among colleagues who bring with them a variety of perspectives. These skills enable the leader to focus everyone on a common purpose. In order to achieve this goal, the leader must develop trust with (and among) subordinates. Additionally, the leader must use networking skills which are essential to creating relationships between institutions which are critical to the success of each.

More to the point of facilitator behavior is the exercise of nonjurisdictional power. Leaders are required to develop consensus among many stakeholders in education. Often, these stakeholders are in no way subordinate to the educational leader. The leader must

be able to develop influence and create alliances which are mutually beneficial in order to accomplish a joint vision developed with input from many stakeholders (Lewis, 1993). In order to achieve the consensus and teamwork cited as key indicators of facilitative leadership by Lewis (1993), one must behave differently from traditional leaders. Facilitative leaders must spend a great deal of time with subordinates getting input and developing consensus. They must work to develop the opposing views natural in the work setting into direction and action (Lashway, 1995).

Democratic and autocratic leadership. Richards, Gipe, and Duffy (1991) found that administrators of schools of the arts in the U.S. and Canada operated as facilitators rather than top-down autocrats. They identified two styles of leadership, designating as democratic those leadership behaviors that were facilitative and as autocratic those behaviors which closely followed the traditional hierarchical model of leadership. Democratic leaders were defined as those who foster participative decisionmaking where subordinates exercise latitude in assuming managerial responsibilities. Autocratic leaders were defined as task-oriented managers who exercise a great deal of authority over making and enforcing policy, supervising employees, and setting the direction for the organization. Using a number of objective questionnaires with established internal validity, Richards et al. (1991) found marked similarities in perceptions by administrators in that they spend much of their time in working with staff, an activity they viewed as critical. The administrators in this study cited management of the organization as requiring a great deal of attention. Generalizing from the results of this study may be difficult, however. Richards et al. (1991) admitted that administrators in schools for the visual and performing arts may be different from administrators in other settings owing to the unique nature of the arts field.

Transformational leadership. Lashway (1995) defined transformational leadership as leadership that inspires others to perform at optimal levels so that vision may be

achieved. According to Liontos (1992), practices used by transformational leaders include visiting classrooms daily, involving everyone in decision making, finding good things that are occurring and recognizing them, surveying the staff often, allowing experimentation, and finding workshops for teachers to attend.

Leithwood (1993) listed the following elements of transformational leadership: (a) identification and articulation of a vision, (b) fostering the acceptance of group goals, (c) establishment of high performance expectations, (d) establishment of appropriate models, (e) establishment of intellectual stimulation, (f) establishment of contingent reward, and (g) the practice of management by exception.

The Leithwood (1993) study used restructuring initiatives, teacher perceived outcomes, and student participation in and identification with school as dependent variables. The degree of variance in types of change being effected by transformational leaders was too small to show the effect of different types of leadership.

In a case study comparison, Keedy (1993) contrasted the leadership styles of four successful secondary school principals as showing various degrees of transformational leadership. According to Keedy (1993), the principals chosen for the study had in common the fact that they had fostered relationships with teachers "empowered by mutual commitment" (p. 2). All four, stated Keedy (1993), were mission grounded, transactional leaders. Despite the fact that results of a case study present problems when attempting to generalize findings, Keedy's (1993) assertion that the actions of the principals he studied were driven by beliefs is interesting in light of the assertion of Leithwood (1993) that practices of transformational leaders are a product of internal processes: past experiences, feelings, beliefs, preferences, and thought processes. According to Leithwood (1993), internal processes are shaped by external influences: "formal training, informal socialization experiences, district policies, staff preferences, the weather, community opinion" (p. 2).

A more widely ranging study relative to transformational leadership was conducted by Silins (1994). This study used a survey given to 291 primary teachers which compared two leadership approaches and the effect of each on specific outcomes, including teacher outcomes, curriculum outcomes, school culture, and student performance. The following leadership behaviors were chosen as indicators of transformational leadership: the quality of being a visionary, individual consideration, collaborative problem solving, goal achievement and ethos. Transactional leadership behaviors were defined for this study as bureaucratic orientation and management-by-exception, behaviors which correlate with laissez faire and dictatorial styles of leadership. In this study it was found that transactional leadership behaviors did not correlate with positive change in the specific outcomes chosen as dependent variables. Transformational leadership behaviors, on the other hand, correlated positively with those specific outcomes. Because of these results, this study was more conclusive than some of the previously mentioned studies.

Laissez faire, democratic, dictatorial, and transactional leadership. Studies which depend on ratings by teachers have tended to show more the effects of leadership style than the Pavan and Entrekin (1991) and the Leithwood (1993) studies. Ogletree and Thomas (1990) compared principal leadership style and teacher evaluation of the principal. Leadership styles included the following four: laissez faire, democratic, dictatorial, and transactional. Laissez faire and dictatorial principals received the highest ratings. In this study, teachers in private schools and preschools rated their principals significantly higher than did teachers in other types of schools.

Research by Gallmeier (1992) appeared to contradict the results of Ogletree and Thomas's (1990) study. In Gallmeier's (1992) work the level of teacher motivation as a function of leadership style (democratic, laissez faire, dictatorial, transactional) was studied. It was found that there was no correlation between leadership style and motivation.

Situational leadership behaviors. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) characterized leadership behavior according to the context of the situation in which it is practiced. They identified two separate categories of leadership behavior: task behavior (which refers to the degree to which leaders direct subordinates) and relationship behavior (which refers to the degree to which leaders interact with subordinates on an interpersonal level). Leadership behaviors practiced in these two areas occur on two separate continua since, given a specific situational context, leadership behavior may be high in task orientation and either high or low in relationship orientation. Likewise, leadership behavior may be low in task orientation and either high or low in relationship orientation, depending on situation. The interaction of these two types of leadership behavior as practiced in the work environment can be categorized in four general areas: high task and low relationship, high task and high relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task.

The third dimension of this leadership model encompasses the effectiveness of leadership behaviors given the situational context in which leadership behaviors are practiced. The situational context depends on factors such as the readiness of subordinates to assume tasks independently, the maturity of subordinates or organization, and the specific situation in which leadership must be practiced. The specific situation may vary, depending on various environmental factors. Environmental factors may include such variables as the stability of the environment. If the organization is undergoing a crisis, a situational context exists in which high task behavior is required, while a stable environment where subordinates may independently practice their job related skills will require different leadership behaviors from the leader (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

The readiness of subordinates to assume independent responsibility has a great deal to do with the behaviors exhibited by the leader (high task and low relationship, high task and high relationship, high relationship and low task, low relationship and low task). Specific leadership behaviors are related to the four task-relationship quadrants as follows: telling, or directing by giving specific instructions and supervision, is a high task and low

relationship behavior; selling, or convincing subordinates of the desirability of certain courses of action, is a high task and high relationship behavior; participating, or facilitating decisions by subordinates, is a high relationship and low task behavior; and delegating, or assigning authority for decision making and action to subordinates, is a low relationship and low task behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). In this model, the level of task-oriented behavior varies with the readiness of subordinates, while the level of relationship-oriented behavior varies with the situational context.

In the Hersey-Blanchard (1988) leadership model, the decision-making style of the leader changes given the readiness of subordinates to assume responsibility and the situational context in which the decision must occur. Decisionmaking behaviors match with specific leadership behavior task-relationship quadrants: authoritative decisionmaking with the high task and low relationship quadrant, consultative decisionmaking with the high task and high relationship quadrant, facilitative decisionmaking with the high relationship and low task quadrant, and delegative decisionmaking with the low relationship and low task quadrant (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Moral and ethical leadership. Some writers propose that the modern definition of leadership be expanded to include moral leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992). Bennis (1991) has chronicled the decay and disintegration of leadership practices based on values in the United States. Ambition, greed, lack of vision, and a lack of commitment to shared values, according to Bennis (1991), have created a vacuum of leadership filled by leaders of limited vision and ability. Additionally, the demands of bureaucracy stifle action which advances vision for improvement. "Routine work drives out nonroutine work and smothers to death all creative planning, all fundamental change" (Bennis, 1991, p. 15).

Bennis (1991) envisions a leadership model which emphasizes vision, the "creation of meaning" (p. 21) for subordinates, leading rather than managing, and "doing the right thing" rather than "doing things right" (p. 18). Leaders should "not think in terms of vic-

In addition to the above, Block (1987) cited vision as the driving force in a situation where all are empowered to improve service.

> The vision of top management and the people above becomes input for the vision created by each lower level manager and employee. All individuals who want to be entrepreneurial and to take ownership for the business have to create their own vision. (p. 115)

Components listed by Block (1987) which should inform the process of creating a vision are the following: the realization that the "choice for greatness is an act of service" (p. 115), the fact that the vision should express "the spiritual and idealistic side of our nature" (p. 116), and the fact that the vision should begin with service to a customer.

Bellingham and Cohen (1990) proposed an ethical leadership model containing the following elements: the development and articulation of vision, values, and norms; the development of people as employees; the fostering of safety; the valuing of diversity; the practice of product development, manufacturing, and marketing consistent with ethics; emphasis on organizational contribution to the community; and emphasis on enhancement of the environment.

Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) have proposed a vision of leadership based on altruism. Because the social environment has changed from an industrial to a postindustrial orientation, they state that a need exists for organizations which meet the needs of a changing society. In a postindustrial world, organizations must become more than "economic machines" (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996, p. 86).

> As human systems, organizations must develop the moral obligation to respond to the needs of consumers, minority groups, and others in their external environments. In other words, organizational structures and philosophies need to shift toward more organic forms with collaborative relations and a sense of purpose that includes the organization's effectiveness as well as the improvement of the quality of life of its members. The individuals' personal values also need to shift from self-centered achievement and independence to altruistic self-actualization and interdependence. (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996, p. 86)

The Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) vision is informed with a strong emphasis on

the spiritual nature of ethical leadership; they cite a list of desirable practices for leadership, virtues such as prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance.

Responding, managing, and initiating. Hord et al. (1984) designated three general types of behavior of leaders who facilitate change in educational organizations. In their study, they found that the change facilitator styles directly impacted degree of change in a school organization. Hall and Hord (1984) established a correlation between a style of leadership they designated initiator and the degree of implementation of changes in curriculum in the schools they studied. This style of leadership requires the commitment of the leader to clear long-range goals. In a later study, Evans and Teddlie (1993) found that the change facilitator styles of principals are correlated with the effectiveness of schools. Their study confirmed "the existence of contextual differences related to principals' leadership styles" (Evans & Teddlie, 1993, p. 9).

In the Hord et al. (1984) study, the interaction between the primary change facilitator (usually the principal) and a secondary facilitator (often a lead teacher) was examined. It was found that secondary facilitators were involved in many more interventions resulting in change when the primary facilitator was an initiator style leader (Hord et al., 1984).

Rutherford (1990) defined the initiator style of leadership as one which depends on the command of information to bring about change. Initiators gather information, use it to analyze the school organization, and then set about improving the school based on data-driven analysis. Quitugua (1990) stated that initiators set goals and are single-minded in achieving the goals they have established. Hall and Hord (1984) defined the initiator style as commitment to long-range goals and the willingness to " 'push' teachers and students to achieve them" (p. 54).

Rutherford (1990) defined the responder style of leadership as one where the leader allows the school to essentially run itself and acts only when the situation demands it. Pavan and Entrekin (1991) identified responders as those who function in a managerial

capacity; responders "keep the school running and allow teachers great professional latitude" (p. 3). Quitugua (1990) stated that responders "are not so particularly goal-oriented; instead they view their teachers as autonomous professionals and their role as one of providing support as teachers request or need it" (p. 3). Hall and Hord (1984) defined the responder as one who allows teachers and others to express opinions. A responder, according to Hall and Hord (1984), will delay decisions until the last minute.

The manager style of leadership, according to Rutherford (1990), falls between the other two styles on a continuum. According to Quitugua (1990), although managers will take part in innovative practices and develop relationships with teachers, they tend to be less goal oriented than initiators. Managers are less focused on long-term goals and tend to lead in a disjointed way. Managers, said Pavan and Entrekin (1991), "provide support to teachers and will become involved if there is a push from the central office" (p. 3). They contrasted managers with initiators who, they said, "have strong ideas about a vision for their school which is described in terms of student benefits and will actively monitor the innovation" (Pavan & Entrekin, 1991, p. 3).

Evans and Teddlie (1993) studied the relationship of change facilitator styles to effective school practices in schools located in different socioeconomic contexts. Differentiating among the three styles of leadership discussed in Quitugua (1990) (responding, managing, and initiating), they found that the most often observed style of leadership in effective schools located in low socioeconomic contexts was the initiator style of leadership. In effective schools in middle socioeconomic contexts, the most often observed style was the manager style. The style of responder was most often observed at ineffective schools. Evans and Teddlie (1993) readily maintained that in most effective schools, styles of leadership used by principals are mixed. Generally, the style of responder is not one of those used by principals in effective schools, even when they practice more than one style: The styles usually interchanged by principals of effective schools are generally those of manager and initiator (Evans and Teddlie, 1993).

Change in Education

Change in the United States.

According to Carrow-Moffett (1993), "the one constant we can rely on is change" (p. 57). Changes in demographics, society, and technology have affected the world profoundly. Gainey (1994) pointed out that changes occur so quickly that it is difficult to react to a change before another change occurs. The United States, says Gainey (1994), has changed significantly in this century from a farming economy to an economy based on providing service, while schools have changed little. Although "the demographics of our communities have changed in terms of the families and the students we serve" (wrote Gainey, 1994), "most schools have managed to maintain the status quo" (p. 27) and in fact "look very much the way they did 100 years ago" (p. 27).

Attempts in the schools to meet the needs of a changing society, according to Gainey (1994), have been ineffective because methods and practices have not changed: Educators attempt to meet new challenges with old methods. Even the best efforts of educators to achieve significant reform have failed. Reform efforts have usually become mired in a bureaucracy resistant to change. Support at the state or federal level has had little effect on reform efforts. Local implementation of innovative programs with support at the state and federal level has been gauged by White (1990) as having an approximate success rate of 20%.

Change in Alabama.

In Alabama, a recent lawsuit on behalf of plaintiff school systems has found that the system of state funding for education is inequitable. The previous governor proposed legislation reforming education in Alabama (Alabama First: A Plan for Excellence Act of 1994).

In 1995, Governor Fob James changed direction from other proposed reform efforts (including those proposed during previous administrations) to a new funding proposal (Preliminary Concept to Implement a Foundation Program for K-12 Education, 1995) and a revamped effort to benchmark the public schools in Alabama through an ini-

tiative to test Grades 3-11 with the Stanford Achievement Test (Education Accountability Plan, 1995). A critical feature of the Fob James plan which makes it different from plans proposed in previous administrations is the emphasis upon the possibility of state takeover of schools and school systems whose students perform below grade level on the Stanford Achievement Test. The Education Accountability Plan (1995) as passed by the Alabama State Legislature, grants the authority to the State Board of Education to create an assistance program for schools or school systems where more than half of the students score below the national norm on a nationally normed achievement test (Education Accountability Plan, 1995). The assistance program consists of a plan for improvement to be developed at the school level. If there is insufficient improvement after a period of 2 years, the State Superintendent is to appoint a team to assist the school in developing and implementing an improvement plan. If after these state intervention measures the State Board of Education determines that there is insufficient evidence of improvement, the State Superintendent is to implement a takeover of the school, including the appointment of a person or team to assume the leadership of the school (Education Accountability Plan, 1995).

Similar measures are in place for school systems where the majority of the students are performing below grade level on the state approved achievement test. The first measure involves the development of a plan for improvement. The last measure involves the assumption of the management of day-to-day affairs of the board of education by the State Superintendent of Education. This focus on standardized testing as the major measure of accountability departs from the more comprehensive accountability plans developed during the Hunt and Folsom administrations (Alabama State Department of Education, 1991; Alabama First: A Plan for Academic Excellence Act of 1994).

Additionally, a demographic shift from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban population has presented educators with new challenges from demographic, economic, and social perspectives (SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1993).

The creation of new, affluent suburbs with heavy tax bases, as well as the increase in populations in large urban centers, creates a situation where locales with ability to raise funds become the "haves" among school systems, while those (primarily rural) where the population has fallen and local industries have relocated become the "have-nots."

Resistance to change. Despite a national call for changes in education which meet the needs of a changing world, writers in the field of education often discuss the difficulty of effecting change in the school setting (Margolis, 1991). Margolis (1991) listed the following sources of resistance to change which frustrate efforts to update educational practices: (a) formal and informal norms, (b) responsibilities which define roles, (c) lack of opportunity for teacher to influence change, (d) lack of resources, (e) reinforcement practices in the school, (f) reputation of leadership, (g) lack of decentralization of power, (h) lack of clarity of goals, (i) strength of old habits, and (j) contractual agreements. Dietz (1990) added five obstacles to change in education: (a) tactical planning rather than strategic planning, (b) isolationism among colleagues, (c) giving in to resistance, (d) consolidation of power rather than power sharing, and (e) wandering discussions instead of focused meetings.

Combs (as cited in Margolis 1991) enumerated several principles to eliminate resistance to change, including the following: (a) avoiding imposing solutions, (b) concentration on beliefs and perceptions, (c) emphasizing process and systems thinking, (d) focusing on challenges which both teachers and administrators find critical, and (e) encouraging changes which have potential.

Once change is initiated, it is difficult to institutionalize or make permanent. Eastwood and Louis (1992) wrote that although "most schools devote considerable effort to the early years of a change program [they] pay relatively little attention to the problems of creating lasting change" (p. 212). Stages cited by Eastwood and Louis (1992) which overcome resistance to change and effect institutionalization of change include the follow-

ing: (a) creation of a collaborative environment, (b) focus upon a plan, (c) working together to develop vision, (d) identification of need, (e) development of support system by the administrator, (f) collaborative development of a plan, (g) the building of commitment through staff development, (h) "front burnering" (p. 220), (i) development of assistance programs, (j) a monitoring system, (k) the ensuring that plan is followed, and (l) reestablishment of pressure.

Role of Change Agent/Change Facilitator

Practices influencing change. White (1990) has identified practices which influence successful change in the schools. Among these practices are the following: the identification of need within the organization and examination of the quality of the program being implemented, the assurance that the objectives of the program are clear to teachers, and the analyzing of the complexity of the program. Recommendations made by White (1990) include the following: (a) targeting interventions to individual teachers, as well as to entire programs; (b) the utilization of a diagnostic tool for monitoring the program; (c) the implementation of programs in small steps; (d) the utilization of a broad-based leadership team; (e) the clarification of objectives; (f) the sharing of power among all players; and (g) the creative utilization of time to accomplish objectives.

One model for effecting change in schools is discussed in Hord et al. (1987). This model, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), is based on the concept that the effectiveness of the implementation of change in the school setting depends to a large degree on the ability of leaders to ascertain the concerns of those involved in the change and assist them in comprehending and participating in the process. This concept, critical to the CBAM model, is called the level of concern (LoC). A change facilitator, state the authors, should ascertain LoC and aid those involved in change as they attempt to implement innovations. Specific components of the LoC concept include the following:

1. Change is a process and not an event.

2. Change is accomplished by individuals.

3. Change is a highly personal experience.

4. Change involves developmental growth.

5. Change is best understood in operational terms.

6. The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context. (Hord et al., 1987)

Hord (1989) studied the facilitation of change utilizing a model that categorized the interventions which implement change in eight function classifications. Hall and Hord (as cited in Hall, 1988) define intervention as "an action or event, or set of actions and events, that influences use of an innovation" (p. 51). The following are the function classifications according to Hall and Huling-Austin (as cited in Hord, 1989): 1,000, developing supportive or organizational arrangements and resources; 2,000, training; 3,000, providing consultation and reinforcement; 4,000, monitoring and evaluating; 5,000, external communication; 6,000, dissemination (gaining support); 7,000, impeding (discouraging or interrupting use); and 8,000, expressing and responding to concerns.

Hord et al. (1984) earlier conducted a more comprehensive study in which the intervention behaviors of the principals of nine elementary schools and their colleagues were documented for a period of one year. In this study, which they designated the principal teacher interaction (PTI) study, a prototype of the intervention behavior model cited above was utilized in analyzing the change facilitator styles of principals (initiator, manager, responder) in terms of the types of change interventions in which they (and those within their schools) engaged (Hall, 1988). Among findings of the study were significant relationships between facilitator style and degree of implementation success of curriculum innovations in the classroom. "Teachers in schools with Initiator and Manager style principals had significantly higher degrees of implementation ($r = .76$) than did teachers in schools with principals using the Responder style" (Hord et al., 1984, p. 53). A secondary

finding of this study was the fact that other members of the organization engage in intervention behaviors giving rise to the discovery of secondary change facilitators who influence change in schools through their behaviors (Hall, 1988; Hord et al., 1984).

Skills of change facilitators. Carrow-Moffett (1993) listed skills essential to the leader who effects change within the school environment: "We will need leaders who are able to set directions and facilitate those involved in working cooperatively to meet the challenges of a diverse world" (p. 58). Carrow-Moffett (1993) stated that "leaders must consider not only the rational plan--i.e., the logical sequential way it should work--but also the 'arational' [sic] or human system factors" (p. 58). Change agents, she said, "must first challenge [themselves] to explore and develop [their] awareness of the barriers and enhancers that [they] bring to the change process" (Carrow-Moffett, 1993, p. 58).

Other skills listed by Carrow-Moffett (1993) include the ability to identify a mutual vision, the ability (and willingness) to empower others, the ability to ascertain the values of self and others and to consolidate those values as part of a mutual vision, openness and willingness to examine self, and the ability to resist the impetus to "change-back" once change is initiated. Margolis (1991) asserted that change facilitators must have a clear understanding of the reasons change is difficult: "Only then can proper adjustments to resistance be made to achieve worthwhile goals" (p. 1).

The principal as change facilitator. According to Jwaideh (1984), there is not enough emphasis in educational literature on the critical role of principals in implementing change. "Effective principals," says Jwaideh (1994), "establish clear goals and priorities, achieve a balance between task considerations and interpersonal relationships, serve as role models for school norms, communicate high expectations to teachers, provide support and direction for change, and gain the support of the community and higher administration" (p. 10). Jwaideh (1984) asserts that principals who lead successful change

(1989), female administrators "interact more with teachers and students than men do. They spend more time in the classroom or with teachers in discussions about the academic content of the school than do men and they spend more time outside of school hours with teachers" (p. 172). Lyman et al. (1993) supported this view, citing research supportive of the idea of women as collegial, participative leaders. According to Lyman et al. (1993) female principals serve as effective enablers of change within their schools, perhaps because of their tendency to share decision making.

Concern for people is a key change concept, according to Hord et al. (1987). The effective change facilitator understands colleagues and the fact that they have concerns about change. Any change undertaken without consideration of the concerns of colleagues is likely to lack permanence. Murray and Simmons (1994) explained that the idea of concern for others is a critical part of effective leadership, one more common to women leaders than to leaders who are men:

> Critical components of the new view of a leader's role include elements of "concern for people" or "consideration." This view is indicative of the emerging female leader and may also support the possible advantage she may have in leadership. Elements of preference for a team organizational structure, empathy, collaboration and high performance standards, along with ones of cooperative style described by Logan (1985), portray the feminine leadership model. (Murray and Simmons, 1994, p. 74)

The concept of "emerging female leader" (Murray & Simmons, 1994) represents a paradigm shift that has taken place since 1980. According to Kosnett (as cited in Hill & Ragland, 1995) women entrepreneurs have started half of all businesses in the United States since 1980. Political definitions have changed: The fact that women such as Hillary Clinton are seen as policy makers has changed perceptions of many (Hill & Ragland, 1995) because they represent the shift in focus from women as clerical workers or middle management executives to women as decision makers at the policy level. The fact that this shift is taking place need not cause confusion (Hill and Ragland, 1995): "Most [women] have not used stereotypes from the past. They disregard these stereotypes and

reach positions of importance through competence and valid experiences. Proven success in the past has propelled them into significant positions of authority" (p. 29).

Weiler (1994) discussed the fact that the idea that women administrators spend more time in interaction with teachers than do men is not, in fact, a new concept. Women rural school supervisors in California in the first half of the 20th Century wrote that they saw themselves not only as reformers but as collaborators with teachers. Rural school supervisors emphasized the democratic approach to management in rural schools (Weiler, 1994). State Commissioner of Public Education, Helen Heffernan, "envisioned supervision as a democratic and collaborative process, modeled on her experience working under Superintendent Richmond of Kings County" (Weiler, 1994, p. 38).

Women administrators approach their jobs in ways diametrically opposed to the leadership paradigm of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, according to Wesson and Grady (1994). That paradigm, they stated, viewed leadership as an exercise of control within a very structured hierarchy.

> Two powerful movements in this country seem to have originated at least in part as reactions to this leadership model: first is the current reform movement in education with its emphasis on restructuring schools; second is the paradigm shift in leadership that is characterized by collaboration and consensus building. (Wesson & Grady, 1994, p. 413)

In the Wesson and Grady (1994) study, the researchers studied women superintendents in order to ascertain if their leadership behaviors corresponded with styles commonly called collegial or collaborative. A second variable under study was job satisfaction for female urban superintendents working in highly bureaucratic environments. The study found that these superintedents tended to interact with others in the school and office environment in nontraditional ways. They reported that

> urban superintendents report using collegial-collaborative approaches to their jobs in highly bureaucratic, urban organizations. This study of reported descriptors of the work lives of women urban superintendents indicates that they are defining their leadership styles in ways that are different from the command-and-control,

> hierarchical model. Aburdene and Naisbitt (1992) have indicated that women in corporate American [sic] lead in new and different ways, ways which are non-hierarchical and emphasize collaboration and cooperation. . . .They seem to be operationalizing the terminology found in the leadership research done by Aburdene and Naisbitt. (Wesson & Grady, 1994, p. 423)

Articulating the female approach to leadership, Shakeshaft (1989) listed several components of a female management style:

1. Relationships with others are central to all actions of women administrators.
2. Teaching and learning are the major foci of women administrators.
3. Building community is an essential part of a woman administrator's style.
4. Marginality overlays the daily worklife of women administrators.
5. The line separating the public world from the private is blurred. (pp. 197, 198)

Nicksick, Willower, and Warner (1994) found that female principals tended to want to focus on people-oriented and instruction-centered activities rather than managerial activities. Female principals envisioned their purpose as to work with teachers in improving instruction. Ninety-six percent of the principals studied cited instruction and curriculum as areas they liked. Eighty-four percent stated that they would like to spend more time on these areas. Nicksick et al. (1994) reported that 46% of the principals cited the following as unique qualities of women administrators: caring, nurturing, compassion, warmth and kindness, concern for the whole person, or maternal instincts. Of the respondents, 22% listed sensitivity as a unique quality of women administrators. The research efforts of Lyman et al. (1993) all support the idea of women as collegial, participative leaders. Lyman et al. (1993) cite interview evidence which suggests that women administrators share decision-making with others.

Murray and Simmons (1994) discussed the need for collegial, participative leaders in environments where site-based management is being implemented. Site-based management, where local school personnel assume authority for much of the direction of the local school, can only be successful under a leader who is able to include others in decisions and

work in a collaborative environment. An autocratic leadership approach negates the positive effect that site-based management initiatives have on the overall school program.

Brown and Irby (as cited in Murray and Simmons,1994) state that research shows as most effective the collaborative style favored by women administrators. Among attributes they cite as critical to successful leadership initiatives of the future are caring, intuition, and empathy, qualities that researchers have found more common in women leaders than men leaders. As Regan (as cited in Murray and Simmons, 1994) says:

> The analysis of the implications for feminine leadership in educational administration clearly links the effectiveness of site-based management to collaborative leadership, a concept more familiar to the motivations and behavior of women. Feminine administering (possible for men as well) is an inclusive mode of leadership that requires both teachers and administrators to participate in decision making and conceptually overlaps with the current reform movement of shared decision making and restructuring schools. (p. 75)

Shakeshaft (1989) supports this idea saying that "the female world is very similar to the world of effective schools. Traditional female approaches to schooling look like the prescriptions for administrative behavior in effective schools" (p.199).

A 1990 study of Chapter 1 schools involved in a Philadelphia school improvement program (Pavan and Reid, 1994) found that female principals headed the majority of the schools where the academic performance of the students was higher than expected. Pavan and Reid (1994) assert that it is not the gender of the principal itself which correlates with the high academic achievement of the students, but the predominant leadership styles of the administrators, these being women "who emphasize instructional issues in a supportive climate" (p. 437).

It is exactly this type of leadership which is being emphasized in the Philadelphia schools where written and oral examinatios are administered to elementary principals. These focus on instructional issues rather than on other managerial aspects of the principalship (Pavan and Reid, 1994). What the Pavan and Reid (1994) study confirms and what has served as the focus of the administrative evaluation system of the Philadelphia

schools is the fact "that those principals, predominantly women, who emphasize instructional issues in a supportive climate have more productive schools" (p. 437).

Differences in rural and urban schools. Rural and urban school settings differ, although there is significant disagreement among researchers relative to the nature of differences between the settings, the amount of difference, and the effect of differences on the school program in each setting. Richardson, Neel, and Cline (1989) found rural schools different from urban or suburban schools in several significant (mostly demographic) ways:

> First, rural school districts often have a different clientele than other school districts. Students who attend rural schools often have different source [sic] of motivation than other students. Additionally, their support structure is often different from students in the urban areas. Secondly, rural schools extend the definition of community, often inculcating a more diverse population than other districts. Third, the lack of population often highlights a difficulty in locating and retaining qualified teachers and educational administrators. Fourth, there is also difficulty in providing ongoing staff development for teachers, but particularly for administrators. Fifth, rural school systems must address the issue of recruitment of administrators from outside the local school district. (pp. 5, 6)

Hetrick (1993) found that the diversity among members of rural populations did not extend to the rural school leadership. Hetrick (1993) found a lack in diversity of personality type which marked a profound difference between the amount of diversity in management type among leadership team members in rural and suburban schools. Hetrick (1993) asserted that this lack of diversity resulted from a tendency of rural areas to foster homogeneous points of view: "There is little doubt that the rural community itself has much to do with deterring changes. Most rural communities are homogeneous and usually closed to outsiders, especially those promoting change" (p. 11).

Additionally, Hetrick (1993) proposed this lack as a possible explanation for his assertion that rural school settings rarely generate changes and innovations in teaching methodology and curriculum. These kinds of innovations are usually developed in urban

or suburban areas. Hetrick (1993) analyzed the prevalence of different personality types among the administrative ranks in rural, urban, and suburban schools using the Myer-Briggs Type instrument.

Other researchers found little or no difference in rural and urban educational leaders. In a study of women in the superintendency in rural and urban schools, Wesson and Grady (1993) found little difference in the variables under study: job satisfaction, personal benefits, self-fulfillment, and personal strengths relative to job performance. Wesson and Grady (1993) stated the following:

> The most striking conclusion is that both urban and rural women superintendents have leadership characteristics that are similar, and these leadership characteristics do fit a new leadership paradigm. These women superintendents have been hired to be change agents and consensus builders, and both the urban and rural superintendents are finding a lot of success in their jobs. Data gathered during the interviews indicate that both groups of superintendents describe their job satisfiers, job benefits, and strengths in terms that do indeed fit a new leadership paradigm. (p. 15)

Muse, Thomas, and Newbold (1989) found little difference between figures comparing rural principals and principals nationally for variables of age, gender, amount of education, certification, and amount of experience in the field of coaching. Although their study raised questions relative to the reasons for the overwhelming preponderance of men in the rural principalship, the study itself found little to suggest differences in demographic variables related to principals in rural schools.

One significant finding of the Muse et al. (1989) study is that few administrators in rural schools have worked in the school district where they are presently employed for more than 16 years. Even more significant is the fact that 53% of the respondents to the Muse et al. (1989) study reported that they planned to move to another position in the next 5 years. The researchers postulated that administrators may see the rural principalship as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself. If the rural principalship is viewed as a means to an end, then the ramifications for rural schools may be significant. Because

of this finding, Hannaway and Talbert (1991) stated that they found urban school principals to be somewhat more experienced than rural principals, but that the difference was not substantial. More tellingly, "despite substantial differences in their social, political, and organizational settings, urban, suburban, and rural schools show comparable means on the effective schools variables of interest." (Hannaway and Talbert, 1991, p. 16).

Studies on differences in variables among urban, suburban, and rural schools have appeared somewhat contradictory, perhaps because the variables measured by each have been different. While Hetrick (1993) found a marked difference between suburban and rural schools relative to diversity of personality type among the ranks of the leadership, Muse et al. (1989) found little difference in figures for demographic information relative to rural principals and average figures for principals nationally. Wesson and Grady (1993) found little difference in responses from urban and rural women superintendents relative to job satisfaction and managerial strengths. Most important, Hannaway and Talbert (1991) found little difference on effective schools indicators among urban, suburban, and rural schools. Perhaps the contradictory nature of studies explains the fact that Hannaway and Talbert (1991) called for more study of component variables in effective schools relative to possible differences among urban, suburban, and rural schools, with principal leadership being one of those variables.

Conclusion

Leadership. A review of the literature yields several different ways of characterizing leadership. Hickcox (1992), in a study of effective CEOs, characterized the styles of leadership as autocrat and facilitator. Richards et al. (1991) juxtaposed autocratic and democratic styles of leadership. Other models of leadership discussed in the literature have included transformational leadership (Keedy, 1993; Leithwood, 1993); laissez faire, democratic, dictatorial, and transactional leadership (Ogletree & Thomas, 1990); situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988); and moral and ethical leadership

(Bellingham and Cohen, 1990; Bennis, 1991; Block, 1987; ; Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1992). The critical concept in CBAM concept is the concept of LoC. The concept of LoC involves the idea that during change, those involved in the change undergo stages of concern relative to change. A change facilitator, state Hord et al. (1987), should ascertain LoC and aid those involved in change as they attempt to implement innovations.

Need for change. Vast changes are taking place both nationally and locally. Writers such as Carrow-Moffett (1993) and Gainey (1994) have discussed the need for educational institutions which meet the challenges presented by social, demographic, and economic changes. Meanwhile, writers such as Dietz (1990) and Margolis (1991) have detailed the fact that although the climate is ripe for reform, change is difficult to accomplish.

Change facilitator. It is in this environment that the change facilitator must work to effect innovation in the schools. In Hord et al. (1984), Hall (1988), and Hord (1989) are discussions of research that categorize the styles of leadership in terms of responding, managing, and initiating. A categorization of intervention behaviors which effect change has been developed by these researchers. In a study of principal teacher interaction (PTI), Hord et al. (1984) found that manager and initiator principals engaged in more intervention behaviors than did responder principals.

expenditure in the schools where those principals serve.

4. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the gender of those principals.

5. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the level of education of those principals.

6. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of their principals and the grade levels housed in the schools where the principals serve.

7. There will be no significant relationship between teacher and principal perceptions regarding the predominant change facilitator styles of the principals.

Subjects for the Study

The subjects for this study were a random sample of principals in the public schools in Alabama. The subjects were chosen so that principals from elementary, middle, and high schools in Alabama would be proportionately represented. The schools in which these principals serve were designated urban or rural based upon setting. A questionnaire was administered to teachers in those schools to ascertain teacher perception of predominant change facilitator style of principals who serve in those schools. The teachers who responded to the questionnaire were purposefully chosen to represent the faculty at the school where the subject serves as principal. Teachers chosen were the Alabama Educational Association faculty representatives for each school. A return rate of at least 70% was anticipated.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire to be administered to teachers to ascertain teacher perception of change facilitator style is the CFSQ (Appendix C) developed by Hall & Vandenberge (as cited in Hall & George, 1988). This questionnaire is comprised of 30 questions which solicit teacher perceptions regarding specific leadership behaviors, termed change interventions. The types of change intervention behaviors exhibited by a principal determine the CFS of that principal.

The CFSQ (Appendix C) was also administered to each principal in order to ascertain the perception of principals of their own change facilitator styles. The principals were to respond, as well, to questions on a demographic cover sheet regarding gender of principals, level of education of principals, and grade levels housed in each school (Appendix D).

Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

The CFSQ was developed in 1988 in order to determine the predominant change facilitator styles of educators in leadership positions in schools (Hall, 1988). The CFSQ is a questionnaire with 30 items to which those answering the questionnaire respond regarding their perceptions about the leadership behaviors of a subject. The CFSQ is then scored using the scoring method described by George (personal communication, April 18, 1996). Overall scores indicate a primary change facilitator style for the subject. The change facilitator styles indicated by the scoring of the questionnaire are responder, manager, and initiator. A norming study conducted on a sample of 1,189 CFSQ ratings resulted in a norming scale with high alpha coefficients, the lowest being .76 (George, personal communication, April 18, 1996). A demographic cover sheet accompanied the CFSQ. Principals were to respond to items on this cover sheet in order to ascertain data which will be used in the study. The cover sheet included questions relative to gender, level of education, and grade levels housed in the school where the principal serves.

Data Collection

Before collection of data was begun, expedited review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Use of the University of Alabama at Birmingham was sought (Appendix E) and granted (Appendix F). Following approval of this study by the IRB, the following steps were taken to collect data.

A random sample of 413 principals in the Alabama public schools was selected for this study. The teachers for the study were purposefully selected: For each subject principal, the teacher responding to the CFSQ in the school where the principal serves was the Alabama Educational Association representative for the faculty. A letter requesting participation in the study was sent to each subject (Appendix G). The letter explained to the subject the procedures to be followed in order to participate in the study, including that the faculty member selected to respond to the CFSQ should be the Alabama Educational Association faculty representative for the school in which the principal is assigned. Accompanying the letter was a research packet containing the following:

1. A CFSQ for a teacher in the school where the principal serves (teacher was to have been purposefully selected [Appendix C]);

2. A CFSQ to be administered to the principal (Appendix C);

3. A demographic cover sheet designating the questionnaire to be completed by the principal (Appendix D);

4. Two self-addressed, stamped envelopes.

After 14 days, a letter (Appendix H) was sent to those schools from which there had been no response. At that time, another packet of research instruments was sent. After 30 days, those who had not responded were reminded of the study by telephone.

Data Analysis

The CFSQs were scored using the scoring method described by George (personal communication, April 18, 1996). Using this scoring system, responses of teachers were

tabulated and each questionnaire assigned an overall rating for the principal which designated CFS. The frequency of these overall ratings was examined for each of the following variables and reported by table and in narrative form: (a) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and setting of school (urban or rural), (b) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and per capita income for the community in which the school is located, (c) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and per pupil expenditure for the school, (d) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and gender of the principal, (e) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and the level of education of the principal, (f) teacher perception of the CFS of the principal and the grade levels served by the school, and (g) teacher and principal perception of CFS of the principal. Contingency table analysis using a chi square statistic was conducted to test each hypothesis in order to ascertain whether a relationship existed between the variables under consideration and teacher perception of principal CFS. In cases where the chi square was significant and the null hypothesis rejected, the chi square value was calculated for each cell in the contingency table and compared with the proportion of the critical value applicable to that cell. Those cells having a chi square value greater than the critical value were examined, and relationships between observed and expected frequencies of responses were interpreted.

Missing Data

Two hundred fifty-seven responses were returned for a basic response rate of 62%. In order to be included in the analysis, a survey was to have at least 90% of the items relative to perception of CFS completed. Forty-five responses were incomplete because the teacher CFSQ had not been returned. An additional 5 were incomplete because the teachers completing the CFSQ had not responded to at least 90% or more of items on the questionnaire. A total of 206 responses were accepted for analysis, comprising a 50% rate of usable response. Of those responses, 21 were incomplete

because the principal of the school had not returned the demographic cover sheet. Thus, 21 responses were not included in the analysis of educational level of principal. This represented a usable response rate for this variable of 45%. Additionally, 20 principals did not return completed CFSQ forms. This represented a 45% usable response rate for principal CFSQ, which was analyzed for principal perception of his or her own CFS.

For those surveys with missing responses, which totaled less than 10%, values for the missing responses were predicted using regression analysis. This method was cited by Sutarso (1995) as the preferable method for predicting values for missing data when $n = 60$ or 120 and the percentage of missing data is 10% (p. 76). In this method, each missing value was treated as a dependent variable, and the remaining responses to the survey were treated as independent values and used to predict the missing values. This predicted value was substituted for the missing value and used in contingency table analysis performed relative to each hypothesis under study.

Summary

This chapter contains a discussion of methodology to be used to investigate the predominant CFSs of elementary, middle, and high school principals in public schools in Alabama based on the perceptions of teachers in the schools led by those principals. CFSQs (Hall, 1988) were administered to teachers and principals, scored using the method described by George (personal communication, April 18, 1996), reported in narrative and frequency tables, and analyzed using contingency table analysis, resulting in a chi square statistic. Data for variables in the study came from a variety of sources to include a demographic cover sheet for principals, the Alabama Department of Education Annual Report for 1994 (State Department of Education, 1994), and information from the 1990 United States Census (U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Adminstration: Bureau of the Census, 1990).

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose for conducting this study was to investigate the predominant CFSs of elementary, middle, and high school principals in Alabama based on the perceptions of teachers in the schools led by those principals. The survey used in this study was the CFSQ developed by Hall and Vandenberghe (1987) and discussed in Hall and George (1988).

The three types of CFSs under study were responding, managing, and initiating. Responding has been defined in various ways. Rutherford (1990) defined responding as allowing the school essentially to run itself and acting only when the situation demands it. According to Hall and Hord (1984), a responder will delay decisions until the last minute. Managing is defined as a CFS which, although fostering innovative practices among teachers, tends to be less focused on long-term goals, thus resulting in disjointed leadership (Quitugua, 1990). The initiating style, according to Rutherford (1990), is marked by command of information: information gathering, analysis of information, and the setting of goals for improvement based on data- driven analysis. Hord et al. (1984) found that the CFSs of manager and initiator were most often found in schools where changes are

implemented with the style of initiator fostering change interventions on the part of secondary facilitators.

Research packets were mailed to a sample of public schools in Alabama which included 197 elementary schools, 103 middle schools, and 113 high schools, for a total of 413 Alabama schools. Each packet contained a cover letter explaining the study, a demographic cover sheet to be completed by the principal, and two CFSQs, one each for the

principal and a teacher who was the Alabama Educational Association building representative for the school. Following the initial mailing of the packets, a second packet was mailed to principals at those schools from which there was no response. After 30 days, a follow-up contact was attempted by phone to those schools from which there was still no response.

Some response was received from a total of 257 schools. Of those 257, 46 responses were incomplete because the teacher CFSQ had not been returned. An additional 5 were incomplete because the teachers completing the CFSQ had not responded to at least 90% of items on the questionnaire. A total of 206 responses were accepted for the study, comprising a 50% rate of response, which could be used for analysis. Of those responses, 21 were incomplete because the principal of the school had not returned the demographic cover sheet. Therefore, 21 responses were incomplete for the educational level of principal. This comprised a 45% rate of response, which could be used to analyze the relationship between educational level of the principal and teacher perception of CFS. An additional 20 responses were incomplete because the principal of the school had not returned the CFSQ. This comprised a 45% rate of responses which could be used to analyze the relationship between teacher and principal perception of principal CFS.

Demographic Data

Responses included for analysis in this study were submitted by principals and teachers from 206 public schools in Alabama. One hundred four of these schools were elementary schools (defined as being comprised of any combination of grades K-5), 42 were middle schools (defined as being comprised of any combination of grades 6-8), and 60 were high schools (defined as being comprised of any combination of grades 9-12). Of the elementary schools, 29 were rural schools and 75 were urban schools. The middle school sample was comprised of 11 rural schools and 31 urban schools. The high school

sample was comprised of 23 rural schools and 37 urban schools. Rural schools numbered 63, comprising 31% of the sample, while urban schools numbered 143, comprising 69% of the sample (Table 1).

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Numbers of Schools by Type and Location

	Location		
Type of School	Rural	Urban	Total
Elementary School	29	75	104
Middle School	11	31	42
High School	23	37	60
All Schools	63	143	206

For the purposes of this study, the communities in which the schools were located were differentiated by the economic level for each community. This was measured by gauging the level of per capita income for each community (U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, 1990). The first level of income was where the per capita income for the community was $4,000 or more below the mean per capita income for the state of Alabama. The second level of income was where the mean per capita income for the community was more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 below the mean per capita income for the state. The third level of income was where the mean per capita income was no more than $2,000 above or below the mean per capita income of the state. The fourth level of income was where the per capita income for the community was more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 above the mean per capita income for the

state. The last level of income was where the per capita income for the community was $4,000 or more above the mean per capita income for the state.

Three schools were located in a community with a level of income $4,000 or more below the mean per capita income for the state, comprising 1% of the sample. Schools located in a community with a level of income more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 below the mean per capita income for the state numbered 30, comprising 15% of the sample. Schools located in a community with a level of income no more than $2,000 above or below the mean per capita income of the state numbered 139, comprising 68% of the sample. Schools located in a community with a level of income more than $2,000 but less than $4,000 above the mean per capita income for the state numbered 9, comprising 4% of the sample. Schools located in a community with a level of income $4,000 or more above the mean per capita income for the state numbered 25, comprising 12% of the sample (Table 2).

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Numbers of Schools by Type and Per Capita Income of Community

	Level of Income					
Type of School	$4,000+ Below Mean	>$2,000 <$4,000 Below	Within $2,000 of Mean	>$2,000 <$4,000 Above	$4,000 Above Mean	Total
Elementary School	1	14	68	7	14	104
Middle School	2	7	25	1	7	42
High School	0	9	46	1	4	60
All Schools	3	30	139	9	25	206

communities with above average income. For middle schools, 9, or approximately 5% of the sample, were located in communities with below average per capita income; 25, or 12% of the sample, in communities with average income; and 8, or 4% of the sample, in communities with above average income. For high schools, 9, or approximately 5% of the sample, were located in communities with below average per capita income; 46, or 22%, in communities with average income; and 5, or 2%, in communities with above average income.

The schools included in the study were differentiated by level of economic support within the school system in which they were located (Table 4). The level of economic support was measured by per pupil expenditure (State of Alabama Department of Education, 1994).

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Numbers of Schools by Type and Per Pupil Expenditure for School System

	Per Pupil Expenditure					
	$1,000 Below Mean	$500 $1,000 Below	Within $500 of Mean	.$500 <$1,000 Above	$1,000 Above Mean	Total
Elementary School	0	24	48	26	6	36
Middle School	0	7	29	5	1	97
High School	0	17	35	6	2	73
All Schools	0	48	112	37	9	206

Of the schools participating in the study, none were affiliated with school systems with a per pupil expenditure $1,000 or more below the mean, and 48, or 23%, were from school systems with a per pupil expenditure more than $500 but less than $1,000 below the mean. Schools from school systems with a per pupil expenditure no more than $500 above or below the mean numbered 112, comprising 54% of the sample. Schools from systems with a per pupil expenditure more than $500 but less than $1,000 above the mean numbered 37, or 18% of the sample. Schools from systems with a per pupil expenditure $1,000 or more above the mean numbered 9, comprising 5% of the sample. Due to the small numbers in each level of per pupil expenditure category, the levels of income were regrouped for purposes of analysis (Table 5). The new categories were designated below average (more than $500 below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama), average (no more than $500 above or below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), and above average (more than $500 above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state).

Elementary schools numbered 24 in the below average per pupil expenditure category, while 48 were affiliated with systems with average per pupil expenditure and 32 were affiliated with systems with above average per pupil expenditure. Middle schools numbered 7 in the below average per pupil expenditure category, while 29 were affiliated with systems with average per pupil expenditure and 6 were affiliated with systems with above average per pupil expenditure. High schools numbered 17 in the below average per pupil expenditure category, while 35 were affiliated with systems with average per pupil expenditure and 8 were affiliated with systems with above average per pupil expenditure.

The sample of elementary principals was comprised of 46 male and 58 female principals. Twenty-nine male principals and 13 female principals comprised the middle school sample, while 47 male principals and 13 female principals comprised the high school sample. Male principals numbering 122 comprised 59% of the sample total with female principals comprising 41% of the sample total (Table 6).

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Numbers of Schools by Type and Per Pupil Expenditure for School System When Regrouped for Analysis Purposes

	Per Pupil Expenditure			
Type of School	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Elementary School	24	48	32	104
Middle School	7	29	6	42
High School	17	35	8	60
All Schools	48	112	46	206

Below = More than $500 below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.
Average = No more than $500 above or below the mean.
Above = More than $500 above the mean.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Numbers of Schools by Type of School and Gender of Principal

	Gender of Principal		
Type of School	Male	Female	Total
Elementary School	46	58	104
Middle School	29	13	42
High School	47	13	60
All Schools	122	84	206

Of the principals participating in this study, 75 had attained either a bachelor's or master's degree, comprising 41% of the sample (Table 7). Those attaining an educational specialist degree or AA certification in the state of Alabama numbered 84, comprising 45% of the sample. Those principals attaining a doctorate numbered 26, comprising 14% of the sample. Of the principals in th 206 schools included in the sample, 21 did not submit surveys and cover sheets so that information regarding the educational level of the principal was unavailable for those schools. The sample size remaining for analysis of education level of principal and teacher perception of CFS was 185.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Educational Level of Principals by Type of School

	Level of Education			
Type of School	Bachelor Master	Ed.S. AA	Ed.D. Ph.D.	Total
Elementary School	36	43	14	93
Middle School	15	18	6	39
High School	24	23	6	53
All Schools	75	84	26	185

21 cases missing.

Frequency Distributions of Nondemographic Variables

Of the 206 teachers responding to the CFSQ, 36, or 18%, perceived their principals to predominantly practice the CFS of responder. Those who perceived the principals in their schools to have a predominant CFS of manager numbered 97, comprising 47% of

the sample. The remaining 73 teachers, 35% of the sample, perceived their principals to predominantly practice the CFS of initiator.

Of the 36 teachers who described their principals as responders, 11, or 5% of all teachers in the sample, were teachers in urban schools, while 25, or 12% of all teachers in the sample, were teachers in rural schools. Of the 97 teachers perceiving the principals of their schools to be managers, 30, or 14% of all teachers in the sample, were teachers in urban schools, while 67, or 33% of all teachers in the sample, were teachers in rural schools. Of the 73 teachers who described their principals as initiators, 22, or 11% of all teachers in the sample, were teachers in urban schools, with the remaining 51 teachers, or 25%, of all teachers in the sample, teaching in rural schools (Table 8).

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style by Location

Change Facilitator Style	Location		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Responder	11	25	36
Manager	30	67	97
Initiator	22	51	73

Table 9 represents the frequency distribution of teacher perception of the CFS of the principals of their schools relative to the level of income of the community as measured by per capita income of community. Among teachers who teach school in communities with a below average level of per capita income (more than $2,000 below the mean per capita income for the state), 5, or 2% of the sample, perceive the principals of their schools to be responders, while 19 teachers, or 9%, perceive their principals to practice

the style of manager, with 9 teachers, or 4% of the sample, perceiving their principals to practice the CFS of initiator. Of those teachers who teach in a community with an average level of per capita income (no more than $2,000 above or below the mean per capita income for the state), 28, or 14%, perceive their principals to practice the style of responder, with 60, or 29%, perceiving their principals to be managers and 51, or 25% of the sample, perceiving their principals to be initiators. Of those teachers teaching in communities with an above average level of per capita income (more than $2,000 above the mean per capita income for the state), 3, or 2%, perceived their principals to be responders; 18, or 9%, perceived their principals to practice a primary style of manager; and 13, or 6%, perceived their principals to be initiators.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style by Per Capita Income of Community

	Per Capita Income			
Change Facilitator Style	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Total
Responder	5	28	3	36
Initiator	19	60	18	97
Manager	9	51	13	73

Below = More than $2000 below the mean per capita income for the state of Alabama
Average = No more than $2000 above or below the mean
Above = More than $2000 above the mean

ceived their principals to be initiators. Of those teachers who teach in systems where there is above average support for the schools (more than $500 above the mean per pupil expenditure for the state), 4 teachers, or 2%, described their principals as responders, while 25 teachers; or 12%, perceived the principal to be a manager, with 17 teachers, or 8%, perceiving the primary principal change style to be that of initiator.

The frequency distribution of perceptions of teachers for the CFSs of the principals in the schools in which they teach and the gender of the principal are presented in Table 11. Of the teachers in schools where the principal is male, 29, or 14% of the sample, perceived the primary CFS of the principal to be that of responder, while 54, or 26%, perceived the primary style to be that of manager, with 39, or 19%, describing their principals as inititators. Of those teachers in schools where the principal was female, 7, or 3%, described their principals as responders, with 43, or 21%, perceiving their principals to be managers and 34, or 17%, perceiving their principals to be initiators.

Table 11

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style by Gender of Principal

Change Facilitator Style	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Responder	29	7	3
Manager	54	43	97
Initiator	39	34	73

Table 12 displays the frequency distribution of the perceptions of teachers regarding the CFSs of the principals in their schools and the education level of the principal. In

schools whose principals' educational level was bachelor's or master's degree, 19 teachers, or 10% of the total sample, described their principals to primarily practice the responder CFS, with 29, or 16%, perceiving their principals to practice the style of manager and 27, or 15%, perceiving the principal of the school to be an initiator. Of those teachers who teach in schools where the principal has achieved an educational specialist degree or met requirements for AA certification in the state of Alabama, 11, or 6% of the total sample, perceive their principals to predominantly practice the responder CFS, with 45 teachers, or 24%, describing their principals as managers and 28 teachers, or 15%, describing their principals as initiators.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style by Education Level of Principal

	Education Level of Principal			
Change Facilitator Style	Bachelor Master	Ed.S. AA	Ed.D. Ph.D.	Total
Responder	19	11	3	33
Manager	29	45	14	88
Initiator	27	28	9	64

*21 cases missing.

Of the teachers who serve in schools where the principal has attained a doctoral degree, 3, or 1%, perceived their principals to be responders, while 14, or 8%, perceived their principals to be managers and 9, or 5%, perceived their principals to be initiators. Of the 206 schools selected for the study, 21 were missing the principal's demographic cover

sheet. Because of this fact only 185 cases could be analyzed regarding teacher perception of CFS and level of education of principal.

Table 13 presents a frequency distribution of the teacher perceptions of CFS of principals as it relates to the grade levels included in the schools in which the teachers serve. Of teachers in elementary schools (any combination of Grades K-5), 16, or 7% of the sample, described their principals as responders, while 48, or 23% of the total sample, described their principals as managers, with 40, or 19%, perceiving their principals to be initiators. Among the teachers in middle schools (any combination of Grades 6-8), 7, or 3%, described their principals as responders, while 20, or 10%, described their principals as managers, with 15, or 7%, describing their principals as initiators. Among high school teachers, 13, or 6%, perceived their principals to be responders, while 29, or 14%, perceived their principals to be managers and 18, or 9%, perceived them to be initiators.

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style by Type of School

Change Facilitator Style	Type of School			Total
	Elementary	Middle School	High School	
Responder	16	7	13	36
Manager	48	20	29	97
Initiator	40	15	18	73

Table 14 presents a frequency distribution of the perceptions of teachers regarding the CFSs of their principals as they relate to the perceptions of the principals themselves regarding their own CFSs. Of the 186 principals who completed CFSQs, 33, or 18% of

the sample, perceived themselves as practicing a primary CFS of responder, while 111, or 60%, described themselves as managers, with 42, or 22%, perceiving themselves as initiators. Of the 33 principals perceiving themselves as responders, 13, or 7% of the total sample, worked with teachers who perceived them as responders; 17, or 9%, worked with teachers who perceived them as managers; and 3, or 1%, worked with teachers who perceived them as initiators. Of the 111 principals who perceived themselves as managers, 16, or 9% of the sample, worked with teachers who perceived them as responders; 56, or 30%, worked with teachers who perceived them as managers; and 39, or 21%, worked with teachers who perceived them as initiators. Of the 42 principals who perceived themselves as practicing primarily the initiator style, 5 or 3% of the sample, worked with teachers who perceived them as responders; 14, or 8%, worked with teachers who perceived them as managers; and 23, or 12%, worked with teachers who perceived them

Table 14

Frequency Distribution of Teacher Perception of CFS by Principal Perception of His/Her Own Change Facilitator Style

Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style	Principal Perception of Change Facilitator Style			
	Responder	Manager	Initiator	Total
Responder	13	16	5	34
Manager	17	56	14	87
Initiator	3	39	23	65
All	33	111	42	186

*20 missing cases.

as initiators. Of the 206 schools chosen for study, principals from 20 did not return CFSQs resulting in 20 missing cases for this variable (Hypothesis 7).

Analysis of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Contingency table analysis was performed for the variables in Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers in rural and urban schools regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals (Table 15).

Table 15

Teacher Perception of Principal Change Facilitator Style Relative to Location of School

		Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
Location	Number in Sample	N	%	N	%	N	%
Rural	63	11	17.5	30	47.6	22	34.9
Urban	143	25	17.5	67	46.9	51	35.7
All	206	36	17.5	97	47.1	73	35.4

$\chi^2(2, N = 206) = .012, p = .994$.

For teacher perception of CFS and location, no significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(2, N = 206) = .012, p = .994$, and the null hypothesis was retained. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the perception of teachers of the predominant CFS of their principals and the location of the schools in which they teach.

Hypothesis 2. Contingency table analysis was performed for the variables in Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers

regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per capita income of the community in which the school is located (Table 16). For teacher perception of CFS and per capita income, no significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 4.355$, $p = .360$, and the null hypothesis was retained. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding this variable.

Table 16

Teacher Perception of Principal Change Facilitator Style Relative to Per Capita Income of Community

		Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
Income*	Number in Sample	N	%	N	%	N	%
Below	33	5	15.2	19	57.6	9	27.3
Average	139	28	20.1	60	43.2	51	36.7
Above	34	3	8.8	18	52.9	13	38.1
All	206	36	17.5	97	47.1	73	35.4

$\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 4.355$, $p = .360$.

Below = More than $2,000 below the mean per capita income for the state of Alabama.
Average = No more than $2,000 above or below the mean.
Above = More than $2,000 above the mean.

Hypothesis 3. Contingency table analysis was performed to test Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per pupil expenditure for the systems where those principals serve (Table 17). For teacher perception of CFS and per pupil expenditure, no significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 4.011$, $p = .404$, and the

null hypothesis was retained. There is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the perception of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and system per pupil expenditure.

Table 17

Teacher Perception of Principal change Facilitator Style Relative to Per Pupil Expenditure Expenditure of School System

		Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
Level of Expenditure	Number in Sample	N	%	N	%	N	%
Below	48	9	18.8	24	50.0	15	31.3
Average	112	23	20.5	48	42.9	41	36.6
Above	206	36	17.5	97	47.1	73	35.4

$\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 4.011$, $p = .404$.

Below = More than $500 below the mean per pupil expenditure for the state of Alabama.
Average = No more than $500 above or below the mean.
Above = More than $500 above the mean.

Hypothesis 4. Contingency table analysis was performed to test Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the gender of those principals (Table 18). For teacher perception of CFS and gender of the principal, a significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(2, N = 206) = 8.307 = .016$, and the null hypothesis was rejected. There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the perception of teachers of the predominant CFS of their principals and the gender of those principals. Further examination of the relationship between teacher perception of the CFS suggests

Table 19

Teacher Perception of Principal Change Facilitator Styles Relative to Education Level of Principal

Education Level	Number in Sample	Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor Master	75	19	25.3	29	38.7	27	36.0
Ed.S/AA	84	11	13.1	45	53.6	28	33.3
Ed.D/Ph.D	26	3	11.5	14	53.8	9	34.6
All	185	33	17.8	88	47.6	64	34.6

$\chi^2(4, N = 185) = 6.182, p = .186.$

Note: 21 cases were omitted because principals had not returned demographic cover sheet.

Hypothesis 6. Contingency table analysis was performed for the variables in Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the grade levels housed in the schools where the principals serve (Table 20). For teacher perception of CFS and grade level housed in the schools where the principal serves, no significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 1.690, p = .792$, and the null hypothesis was retained. There is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regarding the perception of teachers of the predominant CFSs of their principals and grade levels housed in the schools where the principals serve.

Table 20

Teacher Perception of Principal Change Facilitator Styles Relative to Grade Levels Housed in School (Type of School)

Principal Perception of Change Facilitator Style	Number in Sample	Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Elementary	104	16	15.4	48	46.2	40	38.5
Middle School	42	7	16.7	20	47.6	15	35.7
High School	60	13	21.7	29	48.3	18	30.0
All	206	36	17.5	97	47.1	73	33.4

$\chi^2(4, N = 206) = 1.690, p = .792.$

Hypothesis 7. Contingency table analysis was performed for the variables in Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant relationship between teacher and principal perception of the CFSs of those principals (Table 21). For teacher perception of CFS and the perception of the principals themselves of their own CFS, a significant relationship was observed, $\chi^2(4, N = 186) = 23.024, p = .0001$, and the null hypothesis was rejected. There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for teacher and principal perceptions regarding the CFSs of the principals. Further examination of the relationship suggests that more teachers perceived their principals to be responders when the principals perceive themselves to be responders than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained. Furthermore, fewer principals were perceived by the teachers in their schools as initiators when the principals themselves perceived their primary CFS to be that of responder than would be expected were the null hypothesis to be retained. In addition,

fewer principals than expected were perceived by teachers in their schools to be managers when they themselves perceived their style to be that of initiator. Finally, more teachers than expected perceived the principals in their schools to be initiators when the principals perceived their CFS to be that of initiator.

Table 21

Teacher Perception of Principal Change Facilitator Style Relative to Principal Perception of His/Her Own Change Facilitator Style

Principal Perception of Change Facilitator Style	Number in Sample	Teacher Perception of Change Facilitator Style					
		Responder		Manager		Initiator	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Responder	33	13**	39.4	17	51.5	3*	9.1
Manager	111	16	14.4	56	50.5	39	35.1
Initiator	42	5	11.9	14*	33.3	23**	54.8
All	186	34	18.3	87	46.8	65	34.9

$\chi^2(4, N = 186) = 23.024, p = .0001$.

* Fewer than expected.
**More than expected.
Note: Twenty cases were omitted because principals had not returned CFSQs.

Summary of Results

For the following hypotheses, contingency table analysis found no significant correlation between the variables under study and thus no reason to reject the null hypothesis:

1. There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers in rural and urban schools regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals.

2. There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per capita income of the community in which the school is located.

3. There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per pupil expenditure for the schools where those principals serve.

5. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the level of education of those principals.

6. There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the grade levels housed in the schools where the principals serve.

Contingency table analysis found a significant correlation in the analysis of Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the gender of those principals., $\chi^2(2, N = 206) = 8.307$, $p = .016$. When cells were examined individually, it was found that the observed value for the perceptions of teachers regarding the CFS of responder was higher for male principals than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained. At the same time, the observed value for the perceptions of teachers regarding the CFS of responder was lower for female principals than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained.

Contingency table analysis found a significant correlation in analysis of Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant relationship between teacher and principal perceptions regarding the predominant CFSs of the principals, $\chi^2(4, N = 186) = 23.024$, $p = .0001$. Further examination of the relationship between these variables found the following:

1. More teachers than expected perceived their principals to be responders when the principals themselves perceived themselves to be responders than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained.

2. Fewer principals were perceived by teachers in their schools to be initiators when the principals perceived themselves to be responders than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained.

3. Fewer principals were perceived by the teachers to be managers when they themselves perceived themselves to be initiators than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained.

4. More teachers perceived the principals in their schools to be initiators when the principals perceived themselves to be initiators than would be expected if the null hypothesis were to be retained.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

During the investigation of leadership styles and implementation of change interventions used by principals in urban and rural public schools in Alabama, seven variables were studied for possible relationships to teacher perception of CFSs of the principals in the schools where they teach. The variables under study were the location of the school (urban or rural), the per capita income of the community in which the school was located, the per pupil expenditure in the system in which the school was located, the gender of the principal, the level of education of the principal, the grade levels housed in the school, and the perceptions of the principals themselves regarding their own CFSs. The 30-question CFSQ, developed by Hall and Vandenberghe (as cited in Hall and George, 1988), was administered to a principal and to a teacher who served as the Alabama Educational Association building representative for the school. The CFSQ was scored using the scoring procedure advanced by George (personal communication, April 18, 1996). Each CFSQ yielded a rating for the principal which corresponded to a primary CFS: Responder, manager, or initiator.

Summary of Results

Location of school and change facilitator style. This study found that there was no reason to reject the null hypothesis for location of school and CFS. There was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers in rural and urban schools regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals. A relationship between the variables of location and teacher perception of CFS was therefore not indicated.

It would be difficult to ascertain whether or not the lack of a finding regarding a relationship between location of school and principal CFS may have been caused by the fact that a larger number of urban schools were studied than rural schools. The number of schools selected for study was dependent on the process used for random selection and on the number of surveys returned for study. It is interesting to note the fact that the population in Alabama is rapidly becoming urban was addressed in a recent report on demographics in Alabama (SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1993). This fact may have implications for generalizing the finding for change facilitator style and location.

Also germane to finding a lack of a relationship between location and CFS is that such a set of results appears to parallel findings in the work of Wesson and Grady (1993), who reported little difference in the variables of job satisfaction, personal benefits, self-fulfillment, and personal strengths related to job performance. Wesson and Grady (1993) found that both urban and rural female superintendents practice similar leadership behaviors. Muse et al. (1989) found little difference in figures comparing rural principals with a national norm group for variables including age, gender, amount of education, certification, and amount of experience in the area of coaching. Most telling of all, Hannaway and Talbert (1991) discussed finding no marked difference on effective school indicators among urban, suburban, and rural schools. This result parallels the results found for Hypothesis 1 in that CFSs have been found to have significant relationships with the degree of implementation of curriculum innovations (Hall, 1988). Hannaway and Talbert (1991) themselves had called for more investigation of possible differences between urban and rural schools, with one variable of concern being the area of principal leadership.

Research exploring relationships between location and leadership practices has recently appeared to indicate that there is little reason to suspect a relationship between leadership practices and location of the school where a school leader practices. The practice of developing leaders who are capable of effecting change should not be limited to

one setting. The need for staff development in the area of change practices would appear to be universal where setting is concerned.

Per capita income and change facilitator style. There was no significant relationship observed between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per capita income of the community in which the school is located. Because of this fact, there was no reason to suspect a relationship between these two variables. Per capita income became a variable of interest because of the results of a recent lawsuit in the state of Alabama which found funding inequities in the educational system. Two governors have proposed reform legislation to address the issue. In 1994, Governor Jim Folsom proposed a comprehensive plan which featured systemic change (Alabama First: A Plan for Excellence Act of 1994). In 1995, Governor Fob James introduced a new funding proposal (Preliminary Concept to Implement a Foundation Program for K-12 Education, 1995), the funding for which is a yearly subject for debate in the legislature.

These inequities do not appear to extend to the practice of leadership and CFSs. Results of this study regarding income and CFS do not necessarily have relevance to the actual funding of educational programs in Alabama. However, the results may have bearing on issues related to training of principals: The results lend no support to the idea that school leaders in more affluent communities are different regarding the change behaviors they practice. Training in the practice of the initiator CFS advanced by Hall (1988) as most efficacious for the implementation of curriculum innovations, should thus be conducted without regard for the affluence of the community where a school leader practices. As in the previous section of this discussion, training of principals in effective change practices should be offered universally.

An interesting result of this study unrelated to CFS was that the number of schools located in communities with per capita income judged average (no more than $2,000

above or below the mean per capita income for the state of Alabama) far exceeded the number in the below average or above average range. Sixty-seven percent of the schools included in this study were located in a community with average per capita income, while 16% were located in communities with below average per capita income and 17% were located in communities with above average income. This result may not necessarily be generalizable to the entire state based on the fact that the number of schools studied, although random, was relatively small. It is possible, however, that the number of systems already funded equitably may be close to two thirds of those in the state so that efforts to make funding equitable in the state may involve a relatively small number of schools. A study of per capita income of community for all school systems in Alabama could ascertain the actual figures for the entire population.

Per pupil expenditure and change facilitator style. For Hypothesis 3, there was no reason to reject the null hypothesis: There will be no significant relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the per pupil expenditure for the school where those principals serve. Based on the results of this study for this variable, there is no reason to suspect that principals in schools differ in the predominant change style they practice depending on the level of economic support for the school system in which they practice. As discussed in the preceding section, funding issues are of paramount concern in the state of Alabama. Reform efforts revolve around the issue of funding inequities among school systems in the state. However, findings for Hypothesis 3 do not indicate that principals in more affluent school systems differ in the change styles they practice from principals in average or less affluent school systems. Based on willingness and ability to practice change, there is no reason to suspect that more or less training in the area of change is indicated for school leaders based upon the level of affluence of the school systems where they serve. Once again, as in the previous section on per capita income and change styles, an interesting result with implications for

funding appeared regarding the numbers of schools in the categories of average, below average, and above average per pupil expenditure: Fifty-four percent of the schools studied were categorized as average, 17% as above average, and 23% as below average.

Based on this result, questions for future study in the area of funding in education in Alabama are indicated:

1. Are the results regarding these two variables generalizable to the entire state?

2. Why is the percentage of schools in the below average range of per pupil expenditure so much higher than the percentage of schools in the below average range for per capita income?

3. Why is the percentage of schools in the average range for per pupil expenditure so much lower than the percentage in the average range for per capita income?

4. Why is there such a disparity in local effort for education and local level of affluence?

Gender of principal and change facilitator style. For Hypothesis 4, the null hypothesis was rejected. Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no significant relationship or difference in the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the gender of those principals. There is, therefore, sufficient evidence to indicate a relationship between the perception of teachers regarding the predominant CFS of their principals and the gender of those principals. Further examination of the relationship between teacher perception of the CFS and gender of principal suggests that teachers perceive more male principals than expected as practicing a primary CFS of responder, while they perceive fewer female principals than expected as responders.

As previously stated, Hall (1988) found that "teachers in schools with Initiator and Manager style principals had significantly higher degrees of implementation ($r = .76$) than did teachers in schools with principals using the Responder style" (p. 53). As early as 1984, Hall and Hord established a correlation between the change style of initiator and

the degree of implementation of changes in curriculum in the schools they studied. Evans and Teddlie (1993) maintained that although change styles in effective schools were often mixed, the two styles observed in effective schools were those of manager and initiator.

The results of this study for Hypothesis 4 would appear to indicate that male principals are perceived as responders in a number that is higher than expected. Female principals are perceived by their teachers as responders in a number that is lower than expected. This finding is important given that those writing in the area of change tend to cite the change style of initiator as more effective in effecting change within schools than that of responder. According to Carrow-Moffett (1993), the skills listed as essential to the leader who effects change within the school environment are those most consistent with the style of initiator. Other writers who have championed change styles with behaviors matching those indicating the style of initiator are Margolis (1991) and Jwaideh (1984).

The findings for Hypothesis 4 would appear to be consistent with the findings of later writers in the area of gender and school leadership. Shakeshaft (1989) stated that profound differences exist in the ways that men and women manage. Female leaders tend more toward interaction with others, spend more time in the classroom, and spend more time away from school with colleagues. These behaviors are critical to effecting change, according to Hord et al. (1987) and Murray and Simmons (1994). Concern for people and consideration of the concerns of colleagues are critical to effecting change and are, in the view of some writers, components "indicative of the emerging female leader and may support the possible advantage she may have in leadership" (Murray & Simmons, 1994, p. 74).

Some components of the female leadership style, according to Shakeshaft (1989), are the following: (a) Relationships with others are central to all actions of women administrators, (b) teaching and learning are the major foci of women administrators, and (c) building community is an essential part of a woman administrator's style. The Shakeshaft Shakeshaft (1989) model of the female administrator includes components of both the

manager and the initiator change styles, styles cited by Hall and Hord (1984), Hall (1988), and Evans and Teddlie (1993) as the most effective styles in effecting change within the school environment. Recent literature on change has emphasized the need for school leaders who practice the CFS of initiator. In light of this fact, the finding that more male principals practice the CFS of responder than expected, while fewer female principals practice the CFS of responder than expected, implies a need for further study in the area of gender and CFSs. Questions for further study include the following:

1. Would these findings be consistent throughout the Southeast and throughout the United States?

2. Are there locale-related cultural issues related to CFS that may explain findings for gender and CFS?

3. Are there grade level-related issues involving gender of principals which are related to the CFSs of principals?

4. Do issues related to child rearing have a relationship to the practice of CFSs by gender?

Level of education of principal and change facilitator style. For Hypothesis 5, there was no reason to reject the null hypothesis: There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the level of education of those principals. The fact that only 26 of the principals who responded to the demographic cover sheet had attained a doctoral degree may have influenced the results. With a larger number of respondents, there may have been different results. Another influence on results may have been the fact that of the subjects accepted for study, 21 either did not return a demographic cover sheet so that information regarding the education level of the principal was missing. Some concern must be expressed regarding the generalizability of these results. However, based on the results

of this study for this variable, there is no reason to suspect that principals in schools differ in the predominant change style they practice depending on the their levels of education.

This is not to say that additional training will not effect changes in the change styles of principals in much the same way that behaviors of the principal have been shown by Hall and Hord (1984), Hall (1988), and Evans and Teddlie (1993) as being effective in effecting change with the school environment. Though level of education has been long thought to increase the effectiveness of professionals in all walks of life, education presently has a notoriously short shelf life. Change is constant in the social, demographic, and technological realms. According to Carrow-Moffett (1993), change is the one constant on which we can rely. Gainey (1994) discussed the fact that changes occur so quickly that it is difficult to develop plans to deal with change. Possible questions for study may involve the relationships among CFS, effectiveness as a leader, degree of implementation of innovations in the school, and the most recent time during which the principal last enrolled in an educational leadership program. Leadership training should be constantly upgraded. Perhaps level of education should be less a variable for study relative to the practice of CFSs and leadership behaviors than the amount of time since the last education/training in the areas of leadership behaviors and change.

Grade level and change facilitator style. For Hypothesis 6, there was no reason to reject the null hypothesis: There will be no significant relationship or difference between the perceptions of teachers regarding the predominant CFSs of their principals and the grade levels housed in the schools where those principals serve. Based on the results of this study for this variable, there is no reason to suspect that there is a correlation between the predominant change styles practiced by principals and the grade levels included in their schools.

Based on the fact that representative samples of elementary, middle, and high schools were randomly selected for this study and that the percentage of total schools

responding in each category of school closely matched the percentage of each type of school in the original sample, there is no reason to suspect the generalizability of the results for grade level and CFS.

The fact that there appears to be no relationship between grade levels housed in a school and the principal CFS is interesting in that the marked difference in ages of children, subject matter taught, teaching methods used, and training of teachers (early childhood, middle level, and high school) would appear to have no relationship to the types of CFSs practiced by the leaders in those schools. Training in the area of effective CFSs will need to focus on educators in all grade levels since practice of effective styles should take place at all levels.

Principal and teacher perception of change facilitator style. For Hypothesis 7, the null hypothesis was rejected: There will be no significant relationship between teacher and principal perceptions regarding the predominant CFSs of the principals. There is, therefore, sufficient evidence to indicate a relationship between the perception of teachers regarding the predominant CFS of their principals and the perceptions of principals themselves. Further examination of the relationship between teacher and principal perception of principal CFSs suggests that there are significant differences between the frequency of teacher and principal perceptions observed in the study and those expected if the null hypothesis was to be retained. The following differences between expected and observed frequency were noted:

1. More agreement than expected was observed between teacher and principal perception when both teacher and principal perceived the principal CFS to be that of responder.

2. Fewer principals than expected were perceived by teachers in their schools to be initiators when the principals perceived themselves to be responders.

3. Fewer principals than expected were perceived by the teachers to be managers when they themselves perceived themselves to be initiators.

4. More agreement than expected was observed between teacher and principal perception when both perceived the principal CFS to be that of initiator.

Findings regarding teacher and principal agreement regarding CFSs are interesting in that they seem to indicate that in many more cases than expected, teachers perceive their principals in the same way that those principals perceive themselves. This finding is particularly marked by the fact that the greatest agreement between teacher and principal is found at the ends of the CFS spectrum: The highest rate of agreement is between teachers and principals who regard principal change style to be that of responder, and between teachers and principals who regard principal change style to be that of initiator. The finding regarding the lower than expected rate for teacher perception of principal as initiator when the principal perceives the change style to be that of responder may be explained by the higher than expected rate of agreement between teachers and principals when both regard the principal CFS to be that of responder. Similarly, the lower than expected rate for teacher perception of principal as manager when the principal perceives the change style to be that of initiator may be explained by the higher than expected rate of teacher and principal agreement when both regard the principal CFS to be that of initiator.

The findings for teacher and principal perceptions regarding principal CFSs would seem to indicate several interesting trends. First, teachers and principals agree in much higher rates than expected regarding the practices of the styles of responder and initiator. Perhaps an analysis of these findings may yield an interpretation that teachers in the public schools of Alabama, particularly those in leadership positions, make the same judgments regarding principal change style as the principals themselves. This would indicate that teacher perception of principal change style (supported as it is in this study by principal perception) may be an accurate indicator of the change climate or potential for change within the school. Conversely, principal perception of the principal CFS, particularly at

the ends of the change style spectrum, may be considered to be valid predictors of change climate and potential for change within the school.

Researchers have long relied on the perceptions of teachers to ascertain the CFSs of school leaders for reasons articulated by Hall and George (1988). Among those reasons were the fact that teachers were in constant contact with administrators in a variety of situations and settings. The perceptions of teachers regarding the CFSs of their principals have been cited as effective indicators of change climate and potential for change within the schools. Hall and Hord (1984) found that the quality and quantity of teacher implementation of new practices were higher in schools where the principal practiced the CFS of initiator. Additionally, Hall (1988) found that there was a significant relationship between teacher perception of facilitator style and degree of implementation success of curriculum innovations in the classroom. Evans and Teddlie (1993) found that teacher perception of CFS was correlated with the effectiveness of schools in both low and middle socioeconomic settings: In effective schools in low socioeconomic settings, the primary change style of principals was that of initiator, while in effective schools located in middle level socioeconomic settings, more principals practiced the CFS of manager.

Since it appears that there is a relationship between teacher and principal perception of the change facilitator style of the principal, particularly at either end of the change spectrum, the perceptions of principals themselves may have considerable validity in indicating change climate and potential for change. These findings may have value for leaders at the system and state level who plan, design, and create staff development opportunities for principals. A simple diagnostic instrument analyzing change styles could be administered to principals and then an evaluation of needs for staff development performed. Presently, staff development for school leaders is often comprised of general sessions offered by professional organizations or by state departments of education. These sessions often address new issues in education, new tools for school leaders, and new

teaching methods. These are valuable subjects for study by school leaders. The findings of this study indicate, however, that another approach could be valuable. In the present climate of reform and change, top levels of leadership could identify specific change styles they wish to see practiced, ascertain which leaders practice less effective styles, and then teach change skills which would enable leaders to change their schools for the better.

Of the 206 research packets used in this study, 20 were incomplete in that they were missing the principal survey. Because of this fact, for 20 subjects, the teacher and principal perceptions could not be analyzed for relationships. Therefore, the subjects for this section of the study number only 186. Should there have been more principals responding, even more pronounced relationships may have been discovered between teacher and principal perceptions of principal CFS. More study is required in this area, however, before generalizing the results of this study.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study have several implications which relate to issues discussed throughout. Among these are those which relate to the training of principals (and perhaps other school-level leaders). Presently, education is undergoing a time of unprecedented change: Demographics, the social landscape, and the realm of technology all offer tremendous challenges for school leaders. At the same time, reform efforts across the United States demand much more from school personnel in terms of student achievement, professional accountability, and innovation to meet challenges.

Writers have emphasized the need for both change in the public schools (Carrow-Moffett, 1993; Gainey, 1994; and White, 1990) and the practices which can effect such change (Hall, 1988; Hall and Hord, 1984; Hord, 1989; Hord et al., 1984; and Hord et al., 1987). Such practices require training of school leaders.

Results for location, per capita income, and per pupil expenditure did not suggest any relationships regarding these variables and teacher perception of principal CFS. If the

need for training in effective change styles exists, that need appears to be universal, cutting across location, levels of community affluence, and community economic support for the schools. Further study should ascertain whether these results can be generalized to the rest of the Southeast and to the remainder of the United States or apply only to Alabama.

There are implications for consideration regarding results of the study not directly related to hypotheses. Specifically interesting are implications relative to school funding in Alabama, an issue discussed earlier. When schools are categorized by per capita income of community, 67% of all schools are categorized as being located in communities with average per capita income, while only 16% are located in communities with below average income and 17% in communities with above average income. When schools are categorized by per pupil expenditure, the number of schools in the average category dropped by 13%, while the number in the below average category increased by 7%. The following questions have implications for those studying funding for education in the state of Alabama:

1. Why is the percentage of schools in this study included in the below average range of per pupil expenditure so much higher than the percentage of schools in the below range for per capita income?

2. Why is the percentage of schools in this study included in the average range for per pupil expenditure so much lower than the percentage for per capita income?

3. Why is there such a disparity among the schools included in this study regarding local effort for education and local level of affluence?

Significant Findings

Gender and change facilitator styles. The findings for gender have implications for those who are effecting reform in the school setting. The fact that more male principals than expected were perceived by teachers to practice the CFS of responder, while fewer

female principals than expected practiced the responder style, has implications for those who are working to effect change at the system and state levels. The work of some researchers indicates that there is a "female style" (Brown & Irby as cited in Murray & Simmons, 1994; Nicksick et al., 1994; Regan as cited in Murray & Simmons, 1994; Shakeshaft, 1989) of leadership and that this style reflects more effective leadership practices than practices which are less collaborative and facilitative approaches to leadership (Pavan & Reid, 1994).

The issue of gender, particularly when it is related to job performance, is potentially controversial. The findings of this study support the idea that there is a "female style" of leadership, a style comprised of practices associated with effective implementation of change in the school setting. Identifying critical elements which comprise this style should be a priority for future researchers. These elements should be included in training of all school leaders. In order to ascertain key elements practiced by effective female leaders, more study is warranted. Among questions for future study are the following:

1. Would these findings be consistent throughout the Southeast and throughout the United States?

2. Are there locale-related cultural issues related to CFS that may explain findings for gender and CFS?

3. Are there grade-level-related issues involving gender of principals which are related to the CFSs of principals?

4. Do issues related to the raising of children have a relationship to the practice of CFSs by gender?

5. What are specific differences in school performance which are related to gender?

Principal and teacher perception of change facilitator styles. The finding of a relationship between teacher and principal perceptions regarding CFS appears to parallel

findings in the work of Quitugua (1990), who found that there was no significant difference in perceptions of teachers and principals regarding the leadership styles of principals. In the Quitugua (1990) study, the principals and teachers tended to perceive principal leadership styles similarly. This held true in different levels of schools (elementary and secondary), although primary leadership styles differed according to grade level of school.

The fact that a relationship was found between teacher and principal perception of principal CFS has implications for those who plan, design, and create staff development opportunities for principals. Because of high rates of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the practice of certain CFSs, the confidence in the validity of a principal's self-perception may be increased.

Staff development for school leaders is often comprised of general sessions which address new issues in education, new tools for school leaders, and new teaching methods. However, this approach to staff development does not address specific needs of school administrators. The findings of this study indicate that a diagnostic-prescriptive approach could be valuable. In the present climate of reform and change, top levels of leadership could identify specific change styles they wish to see practiced, ascertain which leaders practice less effective styles, and then teach change skills which would enable leaders to change their schools for the better. The perceptions of school leaders themselves would have validity regarding diagnosis of needs in this area. Should future studies support the findings in this area, diagnostic tools ascertaining CFS could be a regular component of a system-level or even state-level initiative to foster true, effective change at the site level.

Additional implications exist for those who work in human resources departments in school systems. School leader self-perceptions regarding CFSs could be used in hiring, training, and assigning principals to school settings. Administering a diagnostic tool would provide valuable information to screen potential leaders. School systems would need to identify the specific change style most desired in a school leader, administer a self-diagnosis tool, and rate potential leaders relative to their predominant change prac-

tices. These ratings would comprise one component of a comprehensive search for effective school leaders. Those interviewing potential school leaders could use the diagnostic tool in order to initiate questions which further ascertain potential of the candidate to effect change.

Limitations of the Study

Originally, 413 research packets were sent to elementary, middle, and high schools chosen purposefully to represent the public schools in Alabama. Of those 413 packets, some response was received from 257 schools. Fifty-one of those responses were missing teacher surveys or included teacher surveys with over 10% of the survey items not completed. Those 51 responses could not be used in the study. The final number of useable responses was 206, or 50% of the number originally sent. Of those 206 responses, 20 did not include principal surveys, and 21 did not include data for the education level of the principals.

The missing data for educational level of principal in the research packets accepted for study reduced the number of subjects to a point where the ability to generalize results may be questionable. The level of principal education was an area where no significant correlation between variables was discovered. The responses of additional subjects may have influenced the results to some degree, with accompanying implications for those designing educational programs and training for school administrators. Finally, the fact that 20 principal surveys were missing may have had an effect on the results in the section of the study dealing with teacher and principal perceptions. Some significant findings were discovered related to this variable. More pronounced relationships or even further relationships may have been found with more responses to this survey.

Worthy of discussion is the fact that the teacher respondent to this study was the Alabama Educational Association representative for the school where the subject principal practices. The building representative was chosen to respond to the questionnaire because

of the fact that this teacher represented the other teachers in the school. However, results may depend on the relationship between this school leader and the principal. If there exists a situation where there is a power struggle between the two, the validity of the responses to the survey may be questionable. Future study using the CFSQ should involve more teachers at the individual schools. A protocol would need to be developed to choose a number of representative teachers per school.

Questions for Future Study

An interesting result of this study, although not related to change, was the fact that there existed an apparent disparity between the numbers of schools in the average and below average range when per capita income and per pupil expenditure are compared for communities in which the schools are located. Questions in this area for future study include the following:

1. Why is the percentage of schools in this study included in the below average range of per pupil expenditure higher than the percentage of schools in the below average range for per capita income?

2. Why is the percentage of schools in this study included in the average range for per pupil expenditure lower than that in the average range for per capita income?

3. Why is there a disparity in local effort for education and local level of affluence?

4. Are these differences significant?

Studies in the area of funding which examined these questions would need, first, to ascertain if the findings of this study are generalizable to the population of the state and, second, to ascertain variables which could influence findings in these areas and develop means of measuring them.

The variable of gender was found to have some relationship to teacher perception of principal CFS. Questions for future study in the area of gender and change style include the following:

1. Would findings for gender and CFS be consistent throughout the Southeast and throughout the United States?

2. Are there locale-related cultural issues related to CFS that may explain findings for gender and CFS?

3. Are there grade-level-related issues involving gender of principals that may explain findings regarding gender and CFS?

4. Do issues related to the raising of children have a relationship to the practice of CFSs by gender?

In several areas under study, implications for staff development and training of school leaders were discussed. Future study is indicated in this area. Specifically, questions for study should include the following:

1. Is staff development in the area of leadership and change effective in improving change climate in the school setting?

2. What kinds of staff development are most effective in effecting change in school leadership practices which in turn influence change climate at the local school level?

3. What kinds of personalities are most "coachable" in the area of CFS practices?

Finally, findings regarding the agreement between teachers and principals regarding their perceptions of the principal CFSs of responder and initiator indicate the need for study in the following areas:

1. Can the findings of this study be replicated in other studies?

2. Would results for teachers and principals in the rest of the Southeast and in the remainder of the United States be consistent with the findings in this study?

3. What kind of diagnostic protocol could be devised to use principal perceptions regarding their own CFSs to implement staff development?

Of the three questions, the issue of staff development and training of school leaders is most critical. A high percentage of school leaders still practice the change style of

LIST OF REFERENCES

Alabama First: A Plan for Excellence Act of 1994.

Alabama State Department of Education. (1991). The Alabama performance based accreditation system. Montgomery, AL: State Department of Education.

Anderson, B. L. (1993). The stages of systemic change. Educational Leadership, 51(1), 14-17.

Bellingham, R., & Cohen, B. (1990). Ethical leadership: A competitive edge. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Bennis, W. (1991). Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Block, P. (1987). The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carrow-Moffett, P. A. (1993). Change agent skills: Creating leadership for school renewal. NASSP Bulletin, 77(552), 57-62.

Dietz, M. E. (1990). On the road to change. Instructor, 99(8), 35-37.

Eastwood, K. W., & Louis, K. S. (1992). Restructuring that lasts: Managing the performance dip. Journal of School Leadership, 2, 212-223.

Education Accountability Plan, Al. Code 16-6B-3 (1995).

Evans, L., & Teddlie, C. (1993, April). Principals' change facilitator styles in schools that differ in effectiveness and SES. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 727)

Gainey, D. D. (1994). The American high school and change: An unsettling process. NASSP Bulletin, 78(560), 26-34.

Gallmeier, K. (1992). The effectiveness of principal leadership style on teacher motivation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 591)

Jwaideh, A. R. (1984). The principal as a facilitator of change. Educational Horizons, Fall 1984, 9-15.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). Ethical dimensions of leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keedy, J. L. (1993, April). Studying principal inner realities and their practice: Building the EA knowledge base. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 730)

Lashway, L. (1995). Facilitative leadership. Digest 96. [On-line], April 1995. Available: Netscape.

Leithwood, K. (1993, October). Contributions of transformational leadership to school restructuring. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 061)

Lewis, A. (1993). Leadership styles. (Report No. ISBN-0-87652-187- 2). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 630)

Liontos, L. B. (1992). Transformational leadership. ERIC Digest [On-line], 72. Available: America Online

Lyman, L. L., Eskildsen, L., Frank, J., Nunn, C., O'Day, D., & O'Donnell, S. (1993). Female principals, Change, credibility, and gender. Planning and Changing, 24(1/2), 30-40.

Margolis, H. (1991). Understanding, facing resistance to change. NASSP Bulletin, 75(537), 1-8.

Murray, G., & Simmons, E. S. (1994). Women administrators: Leading the way in site-based management. Equity & Excellence in Education, 27(2), 71-77.

Muse, I., Thomas, G. J., & Newbold, B. (1989, October). Becoming a rural school principal. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Rural Educational Association, Reno, NV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 378)

Nicksick, C. J., Willower, D. J., & Warner, L. S. (1994). Female school principals on their work. Planning and Changing, 25(3/4), 150-160.

Ogletree, E. J., & Thomas, V. (1990). Effect of leadership styles of school administrators on teacher evaluation of their job performances. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 593)

Pavan, B. N., & Entrekin, K. M. (1991, April). Principal facilitator styles and the implementation of instructional support teams. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 138)

Pavan, B. N., & Reid, N. A. (1994). Effective urban elementary schools and their women administrators. Urban Education, 28(4), 425-439.

Preliminary Concept to Implement a Foundation Program for K-12 Education. (1995, March). Proposal presented by the governor of Alabama to Montgomery County Circuit Court Judge Gene Reese, Montgomery, AL.

Quitugua, J. A. (1990). Consistency of principal's leadership styles and teachers' perceptions Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 316)

Richards J. C., Gipe, J. P., & Duffy, C. A. (1991, November). Characteristics of effective school leaders and their context. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 168)

Richardson, M. D., Neel, H. J. & Cline, H. D. (1989, October). Principal selection in rural school districts: A process model. Paper presented at annual conference of the National Rural Education Association, Reno, NV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 377)

Rutherford, W. L. (1990). The principal spectrum runs from initiators to responders. The Executive Educator, 12(5), 22-23.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Silins, H. C. (1994 April). Leadership characteristics that make a difference to schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 086)

SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (1993). Southern crossroads: A demographic look at the Southeast Alabama extract (Tech. Rep. No. RP91002010). Greensboro: University of North Carolina, School of Education.

State of Alabama Department of Education. (1994). Annual report 1994: Statistical and financial data for 1993-94. (Bulletin 1994, No. 2). Montgomery, AL: State Board of Education.

Stephens, E. R., & Turner, W. G. (1988). Leadership for rural schools (Report No. ISBN-0-87652-130-8). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361 147)

Sutarso, T. (1995). A comparison of the robustness of four procedures used for estimating missing data: Listwise deletion, mean substitution, hot-deck, and regression. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration: Bureau of the Census. (1990). Census '90 (Publication No. CPH-5-2). Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Weiler, K. (1994). Women and rural school reform. History of Education Quarterly, 34(1), 25-47.

Wesson, L. H., & Grady, M. L. (1993, March). A comparative analysis of women superintendents in rural and urban settings. Paper presented at the National Conference on Creating the Quality School, Oklahoma City, OK. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 008)

Wesson, L. H., & Grady, M. L. (1994). An analysis of women urban superintendents: A national study. Urban Education, 28(4), 412-423.

White, G. P. (1990). Implementing change in schools; from research to practice. Planning and Changing, 21(4), 147-224.

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES
• EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
• COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

GREELEY, COLORADO 80639
OFFICE (970) 351-2861
FAX (970) 351-2312

October 22, 1996

Tom Hackett
1938 Lavista Road
Alexander City, Alabama 35010

Dear Mr. Hackett:

Thank you for your letter and telephone calls. I am pleased that you are planning to use the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire in your dissertation study. You have my permission to do so.

If you have any questions about data analyses please work with Dr. Archie George. I will be glad to help with data interpretations.

Good luck with completing your study.

Sincerely yours,

Gene E. Hall, Professor

APPENDIX C

CHANGE FACILITATOR STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

CFS-87

School: _____

Date: ____/____/____

CHANGE FACILITATOR STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages is a list of short phrases that describe different activities, goals and emphases that principals and other leaders can have. Studies have shown that different people place different emphases on each of these behaviors and that there is an overall pattern or style that is unique to each.

This questionnaire is a way to estimate the emphasis that is given to different leadership activities. It has been designed to be a way to help leaders analyze what they are doing. There is no right or wrong way, however, there do seem to be some patterns.

In this instance, would you consider the leadership/facilitating activities of your principal.

Note that some of the items in this questionnaire refer to how this person is working in relation to a particular program or innovation. For those items please think about your principal's role with _____.

Also, some of the items are similar to other items. This is done deliberately in a questionnaire of this type. By having similar items, each item can be less complex and it is possible for you to complete the questionnaire in a minimum amount of time.

Having each item rated on a continuum is important too. For most facilitators/leaders most items will apply, what makes the difference is the amount of emphasis or de-emphasis a particular leader gives to each type of activity.

Please read each phrase and use the following scale points to rate the degree of emphasis given to each by your principal.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never or not true	rarely	seldom	sometimes	often	always or very true

		1 Never or not true	2 Rarely	3 Seldom	4 Sometimes	5 Often	6 Always or very true
1.	Is friendly when we talk to him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Knows a lot about teaching and curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	Procedures and rules are clearly spelled out.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Discusses school problems in a productive way.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Seems to be disorganized at times.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Shares many ideas for improving teaching and learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Plans and procedures are introduced at the last moment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	Keeps everyone informed about procedures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	S/he is heavily involved in what is happening with teachers and students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Proposes loosely defined solutions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Is primarily concerned about how teachers feel.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	Asks questions about what teachers are doing in their classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	Has few concrete ideas for improvement.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	Provides guidelines for efficient operation of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	Supports his/her teachers when it really counts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	Allocation of resources is disorganized.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		1 Never or not true	2 Rarely	3 Seldom	4 Sometimes	5 Often	6 Always or very true
17.	Efficient and smooth running of the school is his/her priority.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	Uses many sources to learn more about the program/innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	Being accepted by teachers is very important to him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	S/he sees the connection between the day to day activities and moving toward a long-term goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	Knows very little about programs/and innovations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.	Is skilled at organizing resources and schedules.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	Has an incomplete view about the future of his/her school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	Attending to feelings and perceptions is his/her first priority.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	Explores issues in a loosely structured way.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26.	Chats socially with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	Delays making decisions to the last possible moment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28.	Focuses on issues of limited importance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29.	Takes the lead when problems must be solved.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	Has a clear picture of where the school is going.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC COVER SHEET

School code_____

Demographic Cover Sheet for Principal

Instructions: Please circle the appropriate response for each item. Your responses are confidential.

Grade levels housed in school

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

Gender

Male **Female**

Level of Education

B.A. B.S. M.A. M.S. M.Ed. Ed. S. Ed.D. Ph.D.

Wish to receive a report on study results? YES NO

APPENDIX E

APPLICATION FOR EXPEDITED IRB REVIEW

Attach a specimen or drug release form where applicable and a copy of any questionnaire(s) or consent form to be used. Attach a copy of the completed Expedited Human Subjects Protocol found on pages 7 to 9 in this Guide.

11/10/96	Educational Leadership	Education Building
SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR DATE	DEPARTMENT	BUILDING
	Room 213	934-4892
SIGNATURE OF FACULTY ADVISOR and/or COURSE INSTRUCTOR	ROOM	PHONE
	35294-1250	934-4963
	UAB ZIP	FAX

This space for IRB use only.

Reviewer's comments:

Signature of Reviewer _____ Date _____

EXPEDITED REVIEW: THE HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTOCOL

(PLEASE TYPE)

Title of Project An Investigation of Leadership Styles and Implementation of Change Intervention Used by Principals in Urban and Rural Public Schools in Alabama

A. General Information

1. Investigator

a) Name of Principal Investigator Paul T. Hackett, Jr.
Social Security Number 259-98-1065

Qualifications of Investigator Graduate Student in Educational Leadership

b) List the name, rank, and major departmental appointment of other investigators participating in this project, if any. Provide below the Faculty Advisor/Course Instructor's name and signature for all student research and indicate whether the Faculty member is an Advisor or Course Instructor.

NONE x

OTHERS Faculty Advisor: Boyd Rogan, Ph.D.

c) If medical supervision is necessary, give the name of the physician who will be responsible for supervision.
Name _____ Phone _____

2. If this proposal is part of a grant, please indicate the following:

Name of Grant: _____

Principal Investigator of Grant: _____

3. Source of Funds - State specific name of sponsor and/or funding source.
Governmental Agency or Agencies _____
Foundation(s)/Organizations _____
Corporation(s) _____
Individual(s)(X) Paul T. Hackett, Jr. Internal-UAB Departmental Funds ( ) None ( )

B. Number and Type of Subjects and Controls

1. Number of Subjects and Controls Number of subjects will be based upon the number of elementary, middle, and high school principals in the state of Alabama: proportion number for sample determined by requirements per Krejicie and Morgan (1979) table
2. Type of Subjects and Controls (include age ranges and health status) Principals in elementary, middle, and high schools in Alabama; ages 21-65, health good
3. Populations from which Derived Subjects will be derived from the populations of elementary, middle, and high school principals in the state of Alabama

4. Describe the gender and racial/ethnic composition of the study population, as well as criteria for inclusion or exclusion of any subpopulation. Racial/ethnic population will be representative of that in public school administration in Alabama

5. Location of Study I will conduct the study from my home in Alexander City, AL.

6. None of the following X , or including:

Minors Under 14 years of age		Prisoners		Pregnant Women	
Fetuses		Mentally Retarded			
Abortuses		Mentally Disabled			

If any of the populations above are involved, attach a statement indicating the reasons for using these groups.

7. Will any of the subjects be from the Veteran's Administration Hospital? Yes ____ No X

8. Will any of the subjects be from other hospitals or institutions? Yes ____ No X
Name of Institution(s)
Have other review boards reviewed this project (including departmental review committees who authorize the use of their patient populations)? YES ____ NO X

If yes, provide the name of the review board and the date of approval:

If the study was rejected, give the reasons:

Note: If the protocol is subsequently rejected or disapproved by another review board the IRB must be notified promptly.

9. Will the subject receive payment for participation in the study? No ____ If yes, state amount and procedures for payment.

10. Other than for routine use, does this project involve obtaining biopsy or surgical material, clinical laboratory specimens, body fluids and/or microbiological isolates? YES ____ NO X If yes, has department providing the specimens given approval? YES ____ NO ____ If yes, attach documentation of approval.

C. Duration of Study

Probable duration of entire study Ten months

Total amount of time each subject will be involved One hour

Duration of each phase in which subject will be involved One hour

D. Abstract of the Research Plan (Please Type)

1. Briefly describe the purpose, objectives and methodology of this project in lay language. Do not exceed the space provided.

The purpose of the study will be to ascertain if there are differences in the perceptions of teachers in rural and urban public schools in Alabama regarding change interventions practiced by their principals. The study will also ascertain whether differences exist in the teacher and principal perceptions relative to interventions practiced by those principals. Other variables will be examined for correlation with change intervention behavior: per capita income in community; per pupil expenditure; gender; level of educacion of principal; and grade level of school.

Randomly selected principals will be asked to respond to a questionnaire ascertaining change facilitator style. Teachers will be purposefully selected to respond to the same questionnaire. Questionnaires will be separately returned to the investigator by self-addressed stamped envelopes.

2. Risks and Precautions: List any possible risks - Physical, Psychological, and Social. Describe any special precautions to be taken to avoid these risks.

There is a possible professional risk to responding to the questionnaire. Questionnaires will be returned separately to the investigator. No individual or school will be identified in the study. Should subjects desire a report, overall results only will be reported to the subject by the investigator. All responses will be kept confidential.

3. Confidentiality: Describe the procedures to be used to maintain confidentiality. If subjects will be contacted please describe process and how potential subjects names will be obtained.

Specific information regarding any individual or school will be held in confidence. Responses to questionnaires will be returned separately by principals and teachers. Subjects will be contacted by phone and the study will be explained to them.

4. Explain the process to be used in obtaining informed consent. Attach a copy of the proposed consent form for review, if applicable.

A letter will be sent to subjects asking them to participate in this study. A follow-up phone call will be made. The completion of questionnaires will imply consent to participate in this study.

APPENDIX F

IRB FORM 4 RELATIVE TO EXPEDITED REVIEW

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use

FORM 4: IDENTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OF RESEARCH PROJECTS INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) MUST COMPLETE THIS FORM FOR ALL APPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND TRAINING GRANTS, PROGRAM PROJECT AND CENTER GRANTS, DEMONSTRATION GRANTS, FELLOWSHIPS, TRAINEESHIPS, AWARDS, AND OTHER PROPOSALS WHICH MIGHT INVOLVE THE USE OF HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS INDEPENDENT OF SOURCE OF FUNDING.

THIS FORM DOES NOT APPLY TO APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS LIMITED TO THE SUPPORT OF CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATIONS AND RENOVATIONS, OR RESEARCH RESOURCES.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul T. Hackett, Jr.

PROJECT TITLE: An Investigation of Leadership Styles and Implementation of Change Interventions Used by Principals in Urban and Rural Public Schools in Alabama

_____1. THIS IS A TRAINING GRANT. EACH RESEARCH PROJECT INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS PROPOSED BY TRAINEES MUST RE REVIEWED SEPARATELY BY THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB).

__X__2. THIS APPLICATION INCLUDES RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS. THE IRB HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS APPLICATION ON 12/3/96 IN ACCORDANCE WITH UAB'S ASSURANCE APPROVED BY THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE. THE PROJECT WILL BE SUBJECT TO ANNUAL CONTINUING REVIEW AS PROVIDED IN THAT ASSURANCE.

__X__ THIS PROJECT RECEIVED EXPEDITED REVIEW.

_____ THIS PROJECT RECEIVED FULL BOARD REVIEW.

_____3. THIS APPLICATION MAY INCLUDE RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS. REVIEW IS PENDING BY THE IRB AS PROVIDED BY UAB'S ASSURANCE. COMPLETION OF REVIEW WILL BE CERTIFIED BY ISSUANCE OF ANOTHER FORM 4 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

_____4. EXEMPTION IS APPROVED BASED ON EXEMPTION CATEGORY NUMBER(S) _____

DATE: 12/3/96

Marguerite Kinney

MARGUERITE KINNEY, DSc
VICE CHAIR OF THE
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

The University of Alabama at Birmingham
117CR Administration Building • 701 South 20th Street
Birmingham, Alabama 35294-0111 • (205) 934-3789 • FAX (205) 975-5977

Tom Hackett
1938 Lavista Road
Alexander City, Alabama

Dear Fellow Principal:

You have been selected to participate in a study of change in schools in Alabama. I am conducting this study in partial fulfillment of degree requirements in a graduate program in Educational Administration at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Please assist me in successfully completing this study by having a member of your faculty who is the Alabama Education Association building representative complete the enclosed Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire.

I ask that you also complete the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire marked "PRINCIPAL" as well as the demographic cover sheet.

Please return your questionnaire and cover sheet in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and ask your colleague to return his or her questionnaire by the second self-addressed stamped envelope. All responses to the questionnaire will be strictly confidential. No respondent or school will be identified. I will, if you so indicate, send you a report of study results.

Thank you for helping me with this study.

Sincerely,

Tom Hackett

APPENDIX H

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Tom Hackett
1938 Lavista Road
Alexander City, Alabama

Dear _____:

On _____, I solicited your assistance in completing a study of change in schools in Alabama. I am enclosing another packet of questionnaires.

Please ask a member of your faculty who has been selected as Alabama Education Association building representative complete the enclosed Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire and return it by self-addressed stamped envelope.

I ask that you also complete the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire marked "PRINCIPAL" as well as a demographic cover sheet and return them using the second self-addressed stamped envelope.

All responses to questionnaires and cover sheet will be held in strictest confidence. No respondent or school will be identified. I will, if you so indicate, send you a report of study results.

Thank you for assisting me in completing this study.

Sincerely,

Tom Hackett

GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM
DISSERTATION APPROVAL FORM

Name of Candidate Paul T. Hackett, Jr.

Major Subject Educational Leadership

Title of Dissertation An Investigation of Leadership Styles and Implementation of Change Interventions Used by Principals in Urban and Rural Public Schools in Alabama

Dissertation Committee:

Boyd Rogan, **Chairman**

Director of Graduate Program Boyd Rogan

Dean, UAB Graduate School Joan P. Lorden

Date 1/7/98