A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP THEORY AND PRACTICE BASED ON BUSH'S SIX MODELS OF LEADERSHIP

DIANA E. DURDLE

Memorial University of Newfoundland

A Study of Leadership Theory and Practice Based on Bush's Six Models of Leadership

By

Diana E. Durdle, B.Ed. (P), B. Spec. Ed.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Education

July, 1998

St John's Newfoundland

Abstract

The first purpose of this survey research study is to administer the Brown and Sheppard survey to establish its reliability and whether it is useful in explaining leadership practices in schools. Bush (1995) categorizes each of the six models: formal, collegial, cultural, subjective, political or ambiguity, as either descriptive or normative in nature. Therefore, a second purpose of the study is to determine the validity of these categorizations. A third and final purpose of the research study is to determine which models exist in the schools studied and how consistent the existing models are with the emerging concept of the learning organization. All teachers and administrators currently working in the four schools in this province were asked to complete a sixty-item questionnaire. Sixty-one individuals were surveyed and the response rate was sixty-seven percent. The survey was, indeed, reliable with the removal of five items to increase the reliability of formal and subjective models. The study confirmed that the leadership constructs described by Bush were useful for discussing leadership in schools. The prevailing models of leadership in the schools were as follows: School One, cultural, School Two, formal, School Three, cultural and collegial and School Four, has no descriptive model of leadership practice. The prevailing model of leadership in three schools was categorized as descriptive in this specific study. All models of leadership in School Four were normative; therefore, a descriptive, observable model of leadership did not exist. The disciplines associated with the development of learning organizations: personal mastery, mental models, systems thinking, team learning, and shared vision were investigated in an attempt to discover whether elements of management associated

with organizational learning were present in any of the four schools in the study. The existence of these specific elements of management may provide the necessary framework to achieve the development and maintenance of a learning organization. Leadership for effective, positive change will require leaders with the ability to motivate others to actively participate in culture building and maintenance. The elements of management associated with organizational learning are present in two of the schools in this study.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to extend sincere thanks to several individuals who have provided encouragement, consultation, and support throughout the various stages of preparing and completing this thesis.

Thank you to my co-supervisors, Dr. Jean Brown and Dr. Bruce Sheppard for their guidance and thorough, critical review of this thesis.

Thank you to my husband Reg, for his infinite wisdom, encouragement, patience, and support which made this thesis possible and rewarding.

Thank you to my parents Dianne and James Lahey and my family for their support and faith in my abilities.

Thank you to the educators for taking the time to contribute to my research and making this thesis a reality.

Thank you to Mr. Gerry White for his valuable statistical knowledge, consultation, advice and encouragement while this thesis was compiled and written.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures and Tables

List of Appendices

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

Successful restructuring of the current education system depends on many factors. As the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education (1992) asserts, "competent leadership is critical for any major restructuring to work, but it will need to be developed and nurtured, and steps will have to be taken to identify appropriate models, skills, and potential leaders" (p. 211). The problem is that definitions of "competent leadership" vary, and the past has shown that it is difficult to "identify appropriate models, skills, and potential leaders." Leithwood and Duke (1998) point out that "educational administration scholars have devoted considerable time over this century trying to understand school leadership and leaders" (p. 1). They maintain that much of what has been learned about leadership in schools "has not depended on any clear, agreed upon definitions of the concept, as essential as this would seem at first glance" (p. 2). They argue that the lack of consensus about the precise meaning of leadership reflects its high degree of complexity and that the more complex the concept, the less precise it can be. They conclude, "Whereas simple concepts are typically open to crisp definition, complex concepts are usually defined vaguely" (p. 3).

This vagueness in defining leadership has serious implications for restructuring efforts. How can the recommendations of the Royal Commission be followed if there is

no common understanding of what competent leadership is? The uncertainty surrounding current efforts at reform make definitions very unclear. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the reduction of 27 school boards to 10 means that district boundaries are enlarged and the district office staff has increased responsibilities. The relationship between schools and the district office has changed, as schools are required to become more site-based, working in partnership with school councils. Within such schools, what is likely to be the prevailing model of leadership? Is there any way to measure what the leadership approach is in the school? If the recommendation of the Royal Commission is to be followed, an obvious first step is to find such a measure.

Purpose of the Study

Tony Bush (1995) attempted to define models of leadership in his book, Theories of Educational Management. Brown and Sheppard (1996) used Bush's six models of leadership in order to develop a survey that would measure leadership, as defined by Bush. If reliable, this survey instrument could help schools define the leadership approach being used. Since the survey was in its developmental stage, the first step required that the instrument be tested. Therefore, the first purpose of this study was to administer the Brown and Sheppard survey to four schools to see if it was reliable and; therefore, useful in explaining leadership practices in schools.

Bush created six models of leadership: formal, political, ambiguity, cultural, collegial, and subjective. Then, he categorized them as being either descriptive

(describing current practice) or normative (idealistic and not found in practice). A second purpose of the study was to determine the validity of these categorizations.

The third purpose of this study was (a) to determine which models existed in each school and (b) how consistent the existing models were with the emerging concept of the school as a learning organization?

Research Questions

The research questions, which guided the study, are:

1. How reliable is the survey instrument?
2. Bush's six models are categorized as descriptive or normative. Are these categories accurate?
3. What models of leadership exist in the schools studied? How consistent are these existing models with the current concept of schools as learning organizations?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are commonly used throughout the study:

Leadership: Dwight D. Eisenhower (cited in Bolman & Deal, 1991) defined leadership as "the ability to decide what is to be done and then get others to want to do it" (p. 406). Bush, in defining educational management, quotes Hoyle's (1981) definition: "management is a continuous process through which members of an organization seek to co-ordinate their activities and utilize their resources in order to fulfil the various tasks of

the organization as efficiently as possible" (p. 8). Bush uses educational leadership and educational management synonymously, a practice which will be continued in this thesis.

Formal Models: Assume that organizations are hierarchical systems in which managers pursue agreed upon goals through rational processes. Managers/leaders possess legitimized authority due to their formal positions within the organization and are; therefore, accountable to sponsoring bodies for activity within the institution.

Subjective Models: Assume that individuals within the organization create that organization. Participants are thought to interpret situations in different ways, and these interpretations are influenced by differences in perceptions derived from their personal backgrounds and values. Organizations have different meanings for each individual member and therefore, exist only in the experiences of those members.

Ambiguity Models: Assume that turmoil and unpredictability are pre-eminent features of organizations. Objectives of institutions and their processes are misunderstood and uncertain. Participation in policy-making is fluid as members decide on decisions in which they wish to become involved.

Cultural Models: Assume that beliefs, values and ideology are the crux of the organization. Individuals hold specific ideas and values, which influence their own behaviour and their interpretation of the behaviour of other members. Norms become shared traditions, which are communicated and reinforced by symbols and ritual within the group.

Collegial Models: Assume that policy and decisions in organizations are determined through a process of discussion, which leads to consensus. All members of

the organization share power within the context of an assumption that they have a mutual understanding of the objectives of the organization.

Political Models: Assume that in organizations, policy and decisions emerge through processes of bargaining and negotiation.

Normative Models: Bush (1995) commented that "Theories tend to be normative in that they reflect beliefs about the nature of educational institutions and the behaviour of individuals within them" (p. 21). Theorists express views concerning how schools should be managed rather than describing the organizational structure or managerial aspects of these institutions (Bush, 1995). Essentially normative models are idealistic and promoted rather than found in practice.

Descriptive Models: Bush (1995) commented that descriptive theories or explanatory theories "are based on, or supported by, observation of practice in educational institutions" (p. 22). Descriptive models are based on what exists in practice rather than what ought to be.

Personal Mastery: Senge (1990) described personal mastery as the discipline of relentlessly illuminating and deepening one's personal vision, focusing energies, developing patience, and seeing reality more impartially.

Vision: The following description by Bennis (1984) best describes how the term vision is used in this thesis. Vision is a desired state of affairs, which clarifies the current situation and induces commitment to the future.

Mental Model: A set of well-established generalizations and assumptions, which influences each individual's actions and perspective of his/her surroundings (Senge, 1990).

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will include a review of the current literature related to Bush's six models of leadership: formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity, and cultural. As well, literature focusing on the emerging concept of learning organizations is reviewed.

Bush's Six Models

Bush's work evolved while studying the education system in Great Britain. Bush (1995) devised a theoretical framework of six models of leadership: formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity, and cultural in an attempt to describe administrative practices. Formal models of leadership dominated early stages of theory development in educational management and the remaining five models developed as a response to perceptions of difficulties or weaknesses which appeared inherent in conventional theory (Bush, 1995). A discussion of the six models will describe the main features of each, the implications for leadership, and the limitations concerning each model. The models, although different, provide a comprehensive portrait of the nature of management within educational institutions (Bush, 1995) in most western industrialized countries.

Formal Models

Bush (1995) contends that formal models of leadership are mainly descriptive in nature. Bush (1995) specifies that descriptive models of leadership are explanatory and

observations of practices in schools support their existence. Formal models, therefore, describe the characteristics of a particular theory and are based on what exists in practice. Hoy and Miskel (1996) disagree and argue that formal models are highly normative in that standardization of behavior and expectations are ensured and that this formalization regulates work performance (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). This description of formal models as normative contradicts Bush's (1995) view. Bush (1995) argues that these formal models are so standardized as a part of normal practice that they simply become "the way things work around here." Organizations are systems, which may be open or closed (Bush, 1996; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The official structure of the organization is predominant in formal models of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1996). Formal structure promotes discipline and decision making based on facts rather than emotions or feelings (Hoy & Miskel, 1996) enabling rational managerial decision making logically aimed at achieving predetermined organizational goals (Bush, 1996; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Formal models of leadership rely on rules, hierarchy of authority, technical competence, specialization (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Shafritz & Ott, 1996) and management protocols (Sergiovanni, 1995).

Within the framework of formal models leaders have ultimate knowledge and authority thereby establishing objectives and policies in a top-down manner (Bush, 1995). Leadership within formal models is designated based on formal position within the organization (Bush, 1995). Leadership, which is strictly based on characteristics of formal models, may only perpetuate hierarchy, authority and subordination within organizations.

Bush (1995) describes several limitations of formal models of leadership: formal models stress authority which is exercised as a product of one's official position within the organization and leaders are subsequently accountable for the activities within their organizations. The top-down management which focuses exclusively on official authority ignores professional independence and does not acknowledge conflict; and formal models focus on the organization as an entity and ignore or underestimate the contribution of individuals while placing strict emphasis on accountability (Bush, 1995). A final limitation of formal models of leadership is the assumption of bureaucratic stability which is definitely incompatible with rapid change (Bush, 1995). Such limitations signify that total subscription to formal models will not produce leaders adequately prepared to deal with change.

Bush (1995) describes five components of formal models: structural, systems, bureaucratic, rational, and hierarchical theories, each of which emphasizes various characteristics of formal models of leadership.

Structural

From a structural perspective, organizations exist primarily to accomplish established goals (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Structural theorists propose that in order to accomplish these goals there is a particular one-best-structure (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995). A structure is the outline of the desired pattern of expectations, activities, and, interactions among managers, employees, and customers (Bolman & Deal, 1991). As a result of structure, stability is assumed and must be maintained (Bush, 1995).

Coordination and control are accomplished through formal authority, impersonal rules and specialization of tasks (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995) and are described as integral to organizational turbulence within which individual preferences are constrained by norms of rationality (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995). Problems or instabilities within the organization are viewed as flaws, which can be ameliorated by editing the existing organizational structure (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995).

Systems

Systems theories stress organizational unity and integrity in which all behaviour is part of an interconnected and complex social system (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Scott, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Organizations attempt to maintain their existing form for as long as possible in order to maintain equilibrium or homeostasis (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Bolman and Deal (1991) contend that organizations cannot remain static within changing environments if they want to survive. Organizations must remain dynamic in an attempt to maintain balance. Hierarchical arrangement is utilized as a measure to ensure that organizational stability is maintained (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Systems may be open or closed (Bush, 1995); however, open systems are more susceptible to growth, change and adaptation, and indeed, stable existence (Scott, 1987).

Bureaucratic

Bolman and Deal (1991) describe bureaucratic organizations as patrimonial, in which a single individual possesses unlimited authority by virtue of the position.

Bureaucracies contain hierarchical authority structures through which organizational goals are achieved (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Scott, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Division of labor, specialization, differentiation, values expertise, and career orientation are achieved through formalized rules, regulations, expectations, and specific roles for each individual (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996, Scott, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Impersonal relationships exist which provides for neutral decision making processes (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Bureaucratic theories are also highly rational (Bush, 1995) in nature.

Sergiovanni (1995) comments that "bureaucratic authority has a place in the most progressive of schools" (p. 115). Sergiovanni (1995) makes several assumptions about the bureaucratic organization of schools: teachers are subordinates in hierarchical organization; principals are trustworthy but not necessarily teachers; the goals and interests of teachers and principals may differ, encouraging vigilance on behalf of the principal; hierarchy equals expertise; and external accountability is most effective.

Rational

Rational theorists view organizations as formal instruments designed specifically to achieve organizational goals (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Rational theories are highly normative and leaders usually decide who should be involved in the decision making process (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Bush, 1995). Great emphasis is placed upon the limitations of individual decision-making (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Leaders decide who

should be involved in decisions based on their level of expertise and any amount of valuable information that individuals could possibly bring to bear on the decision. All decisions are directly made and are based upon specific goals (Hoy & Miskel, 1996) and objective, impartial facts (Bush, 1995). Rational theories emphasize rational, purposeful, disciplined behaviour within organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Rules, authority, compliance, regulations, and jurisdiction are also emphasized (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Hierarchical

Hierarchical theories attempt to achieve formal control and coordination vertically through policies, commands, rules, planning, and accountability systems (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995). This arrangement of top-down communication (Bush, 1995) enables managers/supervisors to exercise a stringent level of hierarchically arranged legitimate power used to shape the behaviour of others (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Collegial Models

Bush contends that collegial models of leadership are highly normative (Bush, 1995) in schools; that is, they are idealistic rather than founded in practice. Collegiality refers to the existence of strong levels of collaboration among and between teachers and principals which is characterized by mutual respect, cooperation, shared work values, and conversations concerning the process of teaching and learning emerging from the school's purpose and professional standards (Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995). In other words, schools with high levels of collegiality have strong professional cultures held together

with shared work norms, all of which contribute to extraordinary performance and increased commitment (Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995), while providing opportunities for continuous improvement and career long learning (Fullan, 1991).

Stoll and Fink (1996) describe collegiality as simply: "we're working on this together" (p. 93). Common values held by all members of the organization enable staff members to have a common view and agreement of organizational goals (Bush, 1995). Bush (1995) further comments that cooperation should be expected when all members of an organization share common values. Barth (1990) adds that cooperation may emerge from mutual assistance, sharing, orientation toward the school as a whole, along with being spontaneous, voluntary, unscheduled, unpredictable, and development oriented.

Sergiovanni and Moore (1989) agree that collegial relationships among adults within the school setting are quite low. An examination of the literature on classroom life (Barrett, 1991; Fullan, 1992; Hargreaves, 1994; Levine, 1985; Schlechty, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1995) also lends support to the conclusion that teaching is a solitary occupation which isolates teachers "who are used to being concerned only with their own classroom" (Ainscow & Hopkins, 1992, p. 81). Collegiality; therefore, is seen as necessary if individual teachers are to learn to work more collaboratively with colleagues (Ainscow & Hopkins, 1992), while developing more cohesive, professional relationships within the school (Joyce, 1991) through the scheduling of increased amounts of time outside of classrooms (Hargreaves, 1994). Joyce (1991) argues that a reduction in actual time spent within the classroom can also serve to connect teachers more closely with surrounding neighborhoods. Collegiality and collaboration are seen as necessary

components, ensuring that teachers benefit from experiences and attain personal and professional growth during their teaching careers (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989). Collegiality of this type is facilitated in settings where individuals share a common mission, communicate openly, engage in case conferencing, written commentaries, and modeling specific, desirable behaviors and teaching strategies (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989).

Collegiality has several merits warranting its facilitation and maintenance. Lieberman and Miller (1990) describe schools with strong collaborative cultures: "teachers and administrators frequently observe each other teaching and provide each other with useful evaluations...Teachers and administrators plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together" (cited in Herman & Herman, 1993, p. 85). Little (1981) was an early researcher on norms of collegiality, and subsequent studies have shown that these norms can be developed under certain conditions (cited in Sergiovanni, 1990). Examples of these conditions include expectations of cooperation among teachers, instances when those expectations are clearly communicated by the principal, and when leaders are responsive to the input and needs of professional colleagues (Bush, 1995), enabling them to share and develop professional expertise together (Hargreaves, 1994; Levine, 1985). It is argued that such shared norms of professionalism allow teachers to have a broader view of the teaching role (Levine, 1985) which leads to increased risk-taking and a commitment towards continuous improvement (Hargreaves, 1994). Expressions of collegiality among teachers must be nurtured and

rewarded in order for a model of collegial practice (Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995) and teacher development (Hargreaves, 1994) to emerge.

Decision making processes also have very important implications when discussing collegial models of leadership. Decisions are predominantly reached using consensus, (Caldwell & Wood, 1992) thereby reducing conflict, allowing all members an opportunity to participate and contribute toward policy formation within the organization (Bush, 1995). Herman and Herman (1993) suggest that in order to develop professional climates of collegiality, a philosophical shift towards this model must precede shared decision making. Collaborative processes are seen as providing better, more useful tools for shared decision making which will raise the commitment and performance of all concerned (Dembowski, O'Connell & Osborne, 1996). Such staffs would have a common view of organizational goals (Bush, 1995) and, although decisions are made as close to each teacher's own classroom as possible (Sergiovanni, 1994), learning to solve problems as a team would reduce norms of individuality (Joyce, 1991). This would provide teachers with the ability to make decisions collectively on assessment, curriculum, strategies, (Sergiovanni, 1994) planning, needs assessments, (Levine, 1984) and collaborative processes; therefore, enabling success (Fullan, 1992; Hargreaves, 1989).

Leadership within the collegial model becomes increasingly important when collegiality is seen as a prerequisite to increasing professional climates in schools (Herman & Herman, 1993) in which leaders share strengths (Watkins, 1984). Baldridge et. al. (1978) describe the leader as "first among equals" (p. 45), meaning that leadership

is shared with other individuals within the organization (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). The kind of leadership provided by principals influences the collegial norm structure of the school (Sergiovanni, 1995). Expertise rather than formal position is emphasized (Bush, 1995) enabling the formal leader to lead through example (Hargreaves, 1989) and effectively share leadership (Hargreaves, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1995; Stoll & Fink, 1996). The issue of the principal as sole instructional leader is important in this model (Herman & Herman, 1993), and conflict will inevitably arise if the term "leader" is used interchangeably with "boss," creating few opportunities for teacher empowerment (Fullan, 1991; Herman & Herman, 1993). Schlechty (1990) maintains that the challenge for leaders, within collegial models is to recognize that the structure of schools creates a need for collegial support and that collegiality is a reality of school life. Collegiality is actively pursued by leaders in an attempt to facilitate participative management (Bush, 1995) and to maintain standards of excellence (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989) by showing and modeling respect and understanding while working with lasting cultures of teaching (Hargreaves, 1989). Hargreaves (1994) further comments that "shared decision making and staff consultation are among the process factors which are repeatedly identified as correlating with positive school outcomes in studies of school effectiveness" (p. 186).

Hargreaves (1989) distinguishes between genuine collegiality and what he calls "contrived collegiality," the latter being a bold, creative means of introducing more collaboration in schools. Contrived collegiality, according to Hargreaves (1991):

> is characterized by a set of formal, specific bureaucratic procedures... It can be seen in initiatives such as peer coaching, mentor teaching, joint planning in

> specially provided rooms, formally scheduled meetings and clear job descriptions and training programs for those in consultative roles. (cited in Fullan, 1991, p. 136)

He argues that many characteristics of contrived collegiality exist in the teaching profession. Hargreaves (1994) maintained that if working conditions such as imposed, compulsory attendance where activities are administratively regulated are less effective approaches to developing collaborative cultures. Attempts to develop collaboration among colleagues, using this contrived approach, may serve to increase rather than decrease feelings of isolation and discontent with the decision making and evaluation practices of the organization. Hargreaves (1989) believes that collegial support and partnership can not be mandated and such practices cannot be described as collaborative cultures. True collaboration must be fostered and facilitated (Bush, 1995; Hargreaves, 1989).

Fullan (1992) argues that collaborative cultures are achieved through the extraordinary efforts of individuals. His position is that reform initiatives can only proceed with supportive, collaborative relationships among staff members, allowing them to become their own change agents (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989). Collaboration, cooperation and trust are seen as all-important aspects of group decision making. "Collaboration and collegiality are seen as forming vital bridges between school improvement and teacher development" (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 186). Hargreaves (1989) also contends that collaboration might provide great challenges for leaders who must facilitate rather than control. Collegiality among teachers and principals is characterized

by a mutual respect for one another as individuals with different experiences and contributions to make (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 135). Schools must move towards greater degrees of collaboration as it will be increasingly necessary when dealing with school boards and school councils (Burns & Smith, 1996), and without attention toward mutual respect, improvements will be very difficult to accomplish.

The collegial model of leadership is also seen as having several limitations. Bush (1995) sees the collegial model as too normative, slow, and cumbersome. Hargreaves (1994) shows that educator's underestimate the time required for individuals to make decisions through a process of consensus and that timelines are overly exaggerated. Hargreaves (1994) also points out that often, it is assumed that each individual teacher understands the meaning and importance of collegiality, while this is often not true. (Bush, 1995) also maintains that leaders are loyal to external agencies, as well as teachers, which may create a conflict of accountability.

Political Models

Bush identifies political models as descriptive in nature. Political models assume that in organizations, policy and decisions emerge through processes of bargaining and negotiation (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Various interest groups develop and form alliances, which allow them to compete for scarce organizational resources (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Shafritz & Ott, 1996) by yielding power over other groups and individuals within the organization (Bush, 1995; Calhoun, Meyer & Scott, 1990). Power often shifts between individuals and groups,

depending on the goals and priorities within the organization, where "individuals, interest groups and coalitions have their own purposes and act towards their achievement" (Bush, 1995, p. 76). Complex systems of individuals and coalitions or interest groups within organizations each have their own beliefs, interests, preferences, values, perspectives, and perceptions (Bush, 1995; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). All of these characteristics affect individual, and indeed, group behaviour.

Power extends in all directions (Shafritz & Ott, 1996) and is described as a relationship among people (Bush, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Power is a fundamental concept for understanding behaviour in organizations (Bush, 1995; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). All individuals at all levels of the education system have power (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Gorton & Snowden, 1993) and the potential for teachers and formal leaders to compete for this power (Dunlop & Goldman, 1991) exists. Exercising this power when certain conditions exist is the test of appropriate usage of power (Dunlop & Goldman, 1991). Therefore, power relations exist in every organization, especially schools (Bush, 1995). Hoy & Miskel (1996) contend that a political model is not suitable for schools, arguing eloquently that teaching and learning may become secondary. Bush (1995) counteracts such an argument by arguing that the micro-politics associated with schools allows essential perspectives for discussion and study. Bush would argue that suitability for schools is not the predominant issue, rather, the issue becomes recognizing and dealing with political patterns and activity within the school system.

Two limitations of political models are noteworthy. Political models concentrate on the inevitability of conflict (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Conflict, in political models is

often viewed as a naturally occurring phenomenon in which power accrues to dominant coalitions rather than being the preserve of formal leaders (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995). Unfortunately the language associated with discussions of power, such as domination, manipulation and conflict, focus on politics and underestimates rational processes and the significance of collaboration (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995). Political models while overstating the inevitability of conflict, are overly pessimistic, (Bolman & Deal, 1991) and are concerned, primarily, with the influence of interest groups and their affect on decision-making (Bush, 1995; Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Often win/lose power struggles occur when interests and concerns of various interest groups are of no consequence to one another (Treslan, 1993). Therefore, a lack of emphasis is placed on the significance of the collaborative process (Bolman & Deal, 1996; Bush, 1995).

Describing schools as political organizations encourages an examination of the various interest groups and leadership present. When schools are engaging in restructuring initiatives, such as is the case in Newfoundland and Labrador, resistance to change is to be expected. Constantly resisting change creates negative politics (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991), which may prove counterproductive in school settings. Positive politics; however, focuses on selecting priorities for implementation while examining other potential priorities (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Positive political climates seem much more suitable for school environments.

Bush (1995) concludes that political models provide an accurate description and analysis of behaviour and events in schools. He argues that "the acceptance that

competing interests may lead to conflict, and that differential power ultimately determines the outcome is a persuasive element in the analysis of educational institutions" (p. 90). He maintains that an emphasis on power as a substantial determinant of policy outcomes, for many teachers, is convincing and fits their daily experiences better than any other model of leadership; that the political perspective, with its emphasis on conflict, may provide a valuable counterbalance to the idealism of collegial models. A recurring pattern of discussion with representatives of power blocks to secure a measure of agreement suggests that power may be used positively to bring about improvement (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Covey (1990) maintains that leaders and followers can achieve acceptable outcomes by believing in specific goals; therefore, reconceptualizing leadership (Stoll & Fink, 1996). Glickman (1991) argues that Schools with democratic environments do not collapse under the weight of power struggles among interest groups, but rather, "power is achieved by giving it away rather than struggling for more" (p. 9). McAlindon (1981) contends that there is a tremendous difference between leadership and being in a position of power. Power must be facilitative rather than instrumental, transforming it into power which accomplishes or helps others, emphasizing the accomplishments of individuals rather than what they are doing (Sergiovanni, 1995). Lee (1997) adds that, "leadership, power, and influence are about what you are and what you can do, your capabilities and your character" (p. 14). Bush (1995) conceptualizes that in order "to achieve acceptable outcomes, leaders become mediators who attempt to build coalitions in support of politics" (p. 88).

Subjective Models

> Bush (1995) describes subjective models of leadership as normative:
>
> Subjective models assume that organizations are the creations of the people within them. Participants are thought to interpret situations in different ways and their individual perceptions are derived from their background and values. Organizations have different meanings for each of their members and exist only in the experiences of those members. (p. 93)

Subjective models focus on beliefs and perceptions of individuals within organizations. Therefore, problems are expected and are due to the conflicting beliefs of individuals.

Subjective models are rooted in phenomenology focusing on the meanings individuals place on specific phenomena (Bush, 1995). This view is quite different from the models of leadership previously discussed. Individuals construct his/her own reality on the basis of personal beliefs, values, goals, morals, and experiences which shape the nature of meanings placed on specific events (Bush, 1995). Individuals can understand organizations through their interpretation of events around them (Bush, 1995). Interpretations of events among individuals may vary significantly. Organizations are not things, rather, they are invented social reality (Greenfield, 1975) which may be created and manipulated by people who are responsible for them and change them (Greenfield, 1986).

Greenfield (1975) is critical of the fact that individuals talked about organizations as though they were real; as though distinct from the actions, feelings and purposes of the people within the organization. The structure of subjective models is the emphasis on the

interactions among individuals (Bush, 1995). Greenfield expressed an underlying principle in 1975: "the organization as an entity striving to achieve a single goal or set of goals is resolved into the meaningful actions of individuals. Organizations do not think, act, have goals or make decisions" (p. 84). Organizations exist because individuals work together to create them and they do not recognize them as valid entities outside of what individuals perceive them to be (Bush, 1995). Reasonably, then, solutions cannot be created by changing structures, the beliefs of individuals within the organization must be examined (Greenfield, 1975).

Organizations operating through a subjective model often appear to lack consensus (Greenfield, 1986). Inevitably conflict arises in organizations surrounding perceived goals (Bush, 1995). Administrators bring people and resources together so that the goals of the organization may be met (Greenfield, 1975). Leadership within subjective organizations may present a challenge since leadership is derived from personal qualities rather than formal authority (Bush, 1995) through which administrators accomplish the goals of the organization while representing personal values. This presents leaders with an open invitation to impose their own, personal, constructed reality upon other members within the organization (Bush, 1995). Organizational goals direct activities and goals must be adaptable in order for the organization to survive (Greenfield, 1975). Administration is all about power and powerful individuals (Greenfield, 1975) where unfortunately, goals then, are nothing more than the stated policy of those with power in the organization (Bush, 1995).

Bush (1995) outlines several limitations to subjective models of leadership. Since organizations are not acknowledged as having any implicit reality, they are difficult to systematically analyze (Bush, 1995). He (1995) argues that another serious criticism of subjective models is that they tend to provide few guidelines for administrators, instead focusing on all individuals, to the detriment of administrators. Bush reasoned that subjective models are not ideal as a sole model of leadership within the organization since multiple interpretations and realities within organizations negate the existence of an ultimate reality.

Ambiguity Models

Ambiguity models are identified as descriptive in nature by Bush, who contends that ambiguous circumstances often exist in school settings particularly throughout the implementation of change initiatives. There is an absence of clear goals (Bush, 1995), policies, and long term objectives (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Cohen and March (1974) discuss ambiguity within organizations and state that inconsistency results if organizational goals are unclear or arbitrary and that schools cannot operate effectively without clear, shared goals and objectives. Ambiguity models are structured in a manner in which inconsistent, unclear goals justify practically any behaviour, due to vagueness (Bush, 1995). Furthermore, Bush (1995) comments that members within such organizations may interpret and implement organizational goals in their own particular manner, causing an inconsistent pattern of aims and goals.

Within this model, fragmentation and loose coupling are the norm, which is consistent with organizations whose members have significant amounts of autonomy (Bush, 1995). Ambiguity models tend to exhibit an inconsistent, complex organizational structure in which decisions and policies do not proceed in a top-down fashion (Bush, 1995). Potential decisions may be made by any individual within the organization (Bush, 1995) which may cause difficulties as no clear preference orderings have been established (Scott, 1987). Decisions are often unplanned, problematic, and confusing (Bush, 1995) leading to preoccupations with the possibility of perspective failure (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Bass and Stogdill (1990) comment that focusing attention on failure in this manner inhibits attention toward positive outcomes, especially in the absence of clear policies, goals, and long-term objectives.

Appointed leaders may experience difficulties due to resentment towards those who represent higher authority, especially in instances where subordinates may favor another individual as leader (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). This is consistent with the existence of subgroups (Bush, 1995) within such an organization. The impersonal nature of leadership roles often inhibits leaders from meeting the demands of their role (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Ambiguity of roles occurs when the leadership role is not clearly defined and, unfortunately, deters leaders from fulfilling the expectations of "leader" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Leaders with the ability to tolerate ambiguous circumstances are more comfortable dealing with unstructured problems and uncertainty (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1993). Conversely, Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy (1993) propose that leaders with low levels of tolerance for ambiguity might become quite anxious in similar situations.

Leaders; therefore, within ambiguous settings, act behind the scenes, as catalysts (Bush, 1995) attempting to avoid role ambiguity (Bass & Stogdill, 1990) while remaining professional and unobtrusive (Bush, 1995).

A limitation of ambiguity models is that they fail to elaborate on the structure and hierarchy of the organization while at the same time they limit the acknowledgement and function of formal rules (Bush, 1995). Ambiguity models offer insignificant practical guidance regarding leadership (Bush, 1995) which may present unquestionable difficulties in schools, as they are accountable to concerned stakeholders within the education system.

Cultural Models

Cultural models may be either descriptive or operational and normative (Bush, 1995; Calhoun, Meyer & Scott, 1990; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1995). Bush (1995) contends that cultural models with a descriptive categorization "are based on, or supported by, observation of practice in educational institutions" (p. 22) whereas, cultural models with a normative categorization "reflect beliefs about the nature of educational institutions and the behaviour of individuals within them" (p. 21). Caring communities are; therefore, created through a system of unwritten rules (Renihan, 1992) depicting exactly what is and is not expected of individuals. Cultural models focus on the values, beliefs, (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Herman & Herman, 1993; Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Beckhard, 1996; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Scott, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995) and assumptions (Shafritz & Ott, 1996) shared by

members of the organization. This gives individuals membership in a group much larger than themselves (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Ultimately, culture can be described as a school's constructed reality (Sergiovanni, 1995) which represents the unwritten, feeling part of the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The organization's culture consists of its members assessment of what works and what does not (Hoy & Miskel, 1996) through which collective meaning evolves (Lieberman, 1990) shaping one's very individuality (Calhoun, Meyer & Scott, 1990).

Typically, culture is an expression of symbols, rituals, ceremonies (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Bush, 1995; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Lieberman, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995); or customs, traditions, expectations, and shared meanings which support existing norms and beliefs (Bush, 1995). Behavioral norms reduce uncertainty and anxiety (Bolman & Deal, 1991) since individuals enter the organization possessing unique values, attributes, needs, sentiments and motives which inevitably impacts organizational life (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Those who embody the values and beliefs within the organization often achieve hero/heroine status (Bush, 1995; Hesselbein et al., 1996; Levine, 1984; Lieberman, 1990). School leaders build strong functional cultures which are built and nurtured by leaders and members and emerge deliberately (Sergiovanni, 1995). Culture is unspoken (Covey, 1990) and serves to define unique qualities of organizations (Bush, 1995) through distinguishing one organization from another (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1995).

Morgan (1986) describes the structure of organizations: "organization is always shaped by underlying images and ideas; we organize as we imaginize" (cited in Shafritz

& Ott, 1996, p. 462). This reiterates Sergiovanni's (1995) view of school culture as constructed reality. Cultural models of organization are open systems in constant interaction with their environment (Shafritz & Ott, 1996) which has a profound impact on the formation of the organizations beliefs and values (Bush, 1995).

Bush sees the organizational leader as mainly responsible for developing and sustaining culture, which, Sergiovanni (1995) sees as giving the organization its unique identity over time. Gorton and Snowden (1993) maintain that the leader must be very clear about which ideals and values the school should promote, providing occasions to reward behavior that exemplifies these ideals and values. Leaders; therefore, should have well formulated values and beliefs that symbolize and embody the culture of the organization (Bush, 1995; Levine, 1984). Fullan (1992) points out that developing school culture is a subtle rather than a blatant business, but that leaders must manage and transform the culture of schools in order for them to benefit from improvement or restructuring initiatives. Leaders must begin to think like change agents because the problem is not just how to acquire new concepts and skills but unlearning things no longer useful to the organization (Hesselbein et al., 1996).

Cultural models are not without specific concerns or limitations. These models tend to condone the imposition of a culture, by leaders, on other members within the organization (Bush, 1995; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Hesselbein et al., 1996; Scott, 1987) which can lead to manipulation and control (Bush, 1995) thereby possibly neglecting instruction and achievement. As support for this argument Bush (1995) writes "shared cultures may be simply the shared values of leaders imposed on less powerful

participants" (p. 139). Researchers have found that organizations with strong cultures do not necessarily inherit special claims to success and longevity (Hesselbein et al., 1996). A final limitation to cultural models of leadership is that they may emphasize tribal aspects of contemporary organizations, such as traditional views of organizational reality (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Learning Organizations

In comparing Bush (1995) with other theoretical perspectives, it becomes apparent that there is considerable consensus in the literature that in order for schools to meet current challenges then they must become learning organizations. An inherent component of schools as learning organizations is a leadership approach that somehow moves beyond any one theoretical model but integrates a number of models. The emerging concept of schools as learning organizations may provide a suitable theoretical leadership approach to compare with Bush's six models.

Argyris and Schon (1978) express the view that organizational learning is not the same as individual learning even when the individuals involved in the process of learning belong to an organization. Senge (1990) accepts this view, and defines learning organizations as those organizations where individuals are constantly expanding their capacity to create the results they truly desire and are continually learning how to learn together. Handy (1995) characterizes learning organizations as having the learning habit which is supported by other theorists who conclude that the learning organization is built

on an assumption of competence supported by forgiveness, togetherness, curiosity, and trust.

Learning organizations as proposed by Senge (1990) are based on five disciplines: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking. Each needs to be defined in the context of this study.

Personal Mastery

Personal mastery is the discipline of clarifying and deepening one's personal vision, focusing energy, seeing objective reality, and developing patience and it is the spiritual foundation of the learning organization (Senge, 1990; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994). Lifelong generative learning (Covey, 1991; Covey, Merrill & Merrill, 1994; Fullan, 1993; Isaacson & Bamburg, 1992; O'Neil, 1995; Senge, 1990) enables individuals to have a special purpose accompanying their visions and goals (Senge, 1990). Senge (1990) views organizations learning through individuals learning. Senge contends that if individuals are constantly engaging in activities which deepen their own personal vision and engage in lifelong generative learning that this will enhance personal capabilities and positively affect participation toward successfully fulfilling organizational goals.

Mental Models

Senge (1990) cites Einstein: "Our theories determine what we measure" (p. 175). Mental models are similar to theories, they shape individual actions (Senge, 1990; Senge et. al., 1994). Mental models are deeply ingrained assumptions or generalizations that

influence how people understand and interact within their environments (Senge, 1990). The discipline of mental models could become a powerful new definition of staff development roles in schools (Isaacson & Bamburg, 1992), since the discipline of mental models would force individuals to reexamine the way they do their work. Existing mental models may present problems to organizations, according to Senge (1990), as individuals are not always fully aware of them and failure to recognize or acknowledge them may diminish efforts at systems thinking.

Shared Vision

Senge (1990) defines shared vision as a vision that several individuals are truly committed to as it reflects their own personal vision as well as the collective vision. It evolves through dynamic interaction among organizational members and leaders and is essential for the success of the organization (Fullan, 1993). Shared vision includes a commitment to truth (Isaacson & Bamburg, 1992), is exhilarating, fosters risk taking, establishes an overarching goal, and learning organizations cannot exist without it (Senge, 1990). Senge also maintains that organizations committed to shared vision need to encourage members to develop their own personal visions.

Team Learning

Team learning, as a discipline, views thought as a collective phenomenon (Senge, 1990; Senge et. al., 1994) as well as, an individual phenomenon (Isaacson & Bamburg, 1992). Team learning is the process of developing a team's capability to create the

desired results of members through dialogue and discussion, a process requiring much practice (O'Neil, 1995; Senge, 1990). This sense of unity and wholeness must pervade every aspect of the school's functioning in order to develop a sense of mission (Goodlad, 1979) through collaborative processes (Barrett, 1991).

Systems Thinking

Systems' thinking is the overarching discipline or framework for recognizing interrelationships within complex situations (Senge, 1990; Senge et. al., 1994). Systems thinking is an analytical tool for dealing with complexity (Ryan, 1995) and is the very cornerstone of how learning organizations think about the world (Senge, 1990). Senge describes how people and events in organizations are bound by "invisible fabrics of interrelated actions, which often take years to fully play out their effects on each other" (p. 7). People change "since we are part of that lacework ourselves" (p. 7). Within organizations; therefore, it is necessary to see how endeavors are interconnected:

> Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static "snapshots." It is a set of general principles-distilled over the course of the twentieth century, spanning fields as diverse as the physical and social sciences, engineering, and management. It is also a set of specific tools and techniques. (p. 68)

Bush and Senge: A Comparison

Bush (1995) discusses each of the six models of leadership: formal, political, ambiguity, subjective, cultural, and collegial using four elements of management: goals, leadership, organizational structure and external environment. Each element of Bush's (1995) models relates to the learning organization. A discussion of Bush's models and the concept of the learning organization, using the framework of the four elements of management will follow.

Goals

Goals and their subsequent role in organizational management vary depending on the particular model of leadership selected for discussion. Bush (1995) comments that significant differences in basic assumptions about goals are evident among each of the six models he describes. Formal leaders, institutions or subunits may initiate goals. Goals may be determined as a result of conflict, agreement, consensus, imposition or through a set of common values (Bush, 1995). These goals, in turn, affect decision-making processes. Decisions are based on goals in all of the models Bush (1995) discusses, even though they may have been determined in many different ways. Goals, though determined at different levels and through different processes within the organization, influence decision making processes, and create and dismantle alliances while remaining the focus that propels or endangers an organization.

Senge (1990) also contends that goals are determined at the individual level. He proposes that individuals should receive encouragement toward creating and journeying toward fulfilling personal goals, which enhances their ability to work collectively and;

therefore, to successfully accomplish organizational goals. Similarly goals/visions within the learning organization emerge from all levels of the organization (Senge, 1990). This process of determining goals allows a rich diversity of ideas while enabling individuals of varying levels of expertise an opportunity to contribute to organizational success.

Goals and decision making are linked quite differently within the learning organization. Decisions are based on shared purpose or goals determined by a team of authorities (Senge, 1990), so that the importance of teamwork cannot be overstated. This is similar to Bush's cultural view that decisions are based on the goals of the organization or its subunits. The profound similarity of this relationship is that in a learning organization teams share purpose and authority (Senge, 1990).

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure varies in each of the six models that Bush (1995) describes. Each model's structural characteristics help describe the type of relationships present. The nature of structural organization is a major distinguishing factor among the models discussed.

Bush (1995) characterizes formal models by rigid, hierarchical arrangements, which are largely based on objective reality. This disregard for individuals and increased emphasis on efficiency and outputs separates formal models from other types of organization.

Political and ambiguity models are similar structurally in that conflict may inevitably occur. Political models are characterized by dominant groups or individuals

struggling to promote initiatives of interest to them (Bush, 1995). Conflict is also evident within ambiguity models characterized by problematic structures. Bush (1995) describes ambiguity models as problematic due to the uncertainty of relationships among loosely coupled subunits. Conflict may be inevitable as a result.

Similarities exist among subjective, collegial, cultural models and the learning organization. In the learning organization, vision emerges from all levels of the learning organization through collegial relationships (Senge, 1990). Similarly, Bush's collegial models have a lateral structure which enables all members to rightfully participate in decision making processes (Bush, 1995). Bush's subjective models have a similar structural nature, in that human interaction enables fluid organizational structure which develops through relationships among individuals (Bush, 1995). The emphasis in subjective models is the individual rather than the role they occupy (Bush, 1995). The nature of the structure is also based on relationships. Bush (1995) describes cultural relationships as a physical manifestation of culture in which the values and beliefs of the organization are expressed through patterns of roles and role relationships. Therefore, Bush's four models: subjective, collegial, cultural, and the concept of learning organization are structurally similar due to the emphasis each places on human relationships and interaction. These models also emphasize the value of individuality among relationships.

Links With Environment

Environmental links vary significantly among the models of leadership described in this study. Bush's formal models may be open systems which respond to external

influences or closed systems which are relatively impervious to outside influences (Bush, 1995). His collegial models; however, inadequately describe relationships with the environment, for as Bush explains accountability is rather unclear due to shared decision making, and there is difficulty in locating responsibility for decisions. Bush's political and ambiguity models are described as unstable and unpredictable. Bush's view is that political models regard external bodies as interest groups which may become involved in decision making (Bush, 1995). Signals from external groups may be contradictory or unclear, which contributes to ambiguous decision making processes.

Bush argues that the environment is "a prime source of the meanings placed on events by people within the organization" (p. 145) in subjective models. Similarly, his cultural models regard the external environment as a source of the diverse beliefs and values, which combine to form a culture. The meanings individuals place on events are based on a diverse array of experiences that are influenced by personal values and beliefs.

The environment is very important in the learning organization, for it is a product of how individuals think and interact while observing mutual respect for each other (Senge, 1990). This interaction, mutual respect and individual thought are based on the disciplines of the learning organizations. Individuals are influenced by personal lived experiences that are influenced by personal values and beliefs enabling an expectation of mutual respect. The fifth discipline, systems thinking, emphasizes the interconnectedness of the systems: the organization and its environment.

Leadership

The perceptions of leadership are inevitably a reflection of specific features of different models of management (Bush, 1995). Bush's formal models place leaders or heads at the very apex of the hierarchically arranged organization, the leader being considered the most powerful individual in the organization whose responsibilities include establishing goals and initiating policy. In ambiguity organizations leaders avoid direct involvement in policy formation; however, leaders provide the framework for decision making in both unobtrusive and tactical manners (Bush, 1995). Unfortunately leadership in such ambiguity settings stress unpredictability and uncertainty. According to Bush (1995), political leaders possess an enormous amount of power, which is similar to leadership in formal models, with leaders using significant resources of power and influence on other subgroups to achieve personal goals while engaging themselves as mediators and participants.

Through collegial relations leaders in the collegial model seek to promote the development of consensus, with decisions based on input from many individuals until a common solution is reached. Bush sees the main responsibility of leaders in cultural organizations as sustaining the culture (Bush, 1995). In an attempt to achieve this goal, leaders are influenced by their own personal values, beliefs, and experiences, with their leadership being symbolic.

Similarly leaders within the learning organization are responsible for building and maintaining cultural relations within organization. Leaders enable individuals to master the five disciplines which converge to create the learning organization (Senge, 1990).

Leaders, rather than being recognized as bosses, most powerful or most persuasive, are designers, described as stewards or teachers (Senge, 1990). This provides a very different description of leadership.

Table 1 provides a summary of this comparison of Bush's models and the learning organization.

Summary

Weick (1982) believes that ineffectiveness may exist in schools because they are managed with the wrong theory in mind. The six theoretical models presented here are not suitable as a single all encompassing theory of leadership in which "the validity of each approach may vary with the event, the situation and the participants" (Bush, 1995, p. 148). These models present many positive characteristics and school leaders can benefit from further exposure to each model's ideas.

The review of the literature provides an opportunity to assess views concerning the six models of leadership relative to others writing and researching in that field.

Table 1

Summary of Literature on Educational Administration

Model	Elements of Management					
	Level of Goal Determination	Process of Goal Determination	Relationship Between Goal and Decision Making	Nature of Structure	Links with Environment	Styles of Leadership
Formal	Institutional	Set by leaders	Decisions are based on goals	Objective reality, hierarchical	May be open or closed, leader accountable	Leader establishes goals and initiates policy
Political	Sub-unit	Conflict	Decisions are based on goals of dominant coalitions	Setting for sub-unit conflict	Unstable external bodies: interest groups	Leader is both participant and mediator
Ambiguity	Unclear	Unpredictable	Decisions are related to goals	Problematic	Source of uncertainty	Maybe tactical or unobtrusive
Subjective	Individual	Problematic, may be imposed by a leader	Individuals behave based on personal objectives	Constructed through human interaction	Source of individual meanings	Problematic, possibly perceived as form of control
Collegial	Institutional	Agreement	Decisions are based on agreed goals	Objective reality, lateral	Accountability unclear due to shared decision making	Leaders seeks promotion of consensus
Cultural	Institutional or sub-unit	Through collective values	Decisions based on goals of organization or its sub-units	Physical manifestation of culture	Source of beliefs and values	Symbolic
Learning Organization	Individual or organizational	Emerge from all levels of organization	Decisions are based on shared purpose or goals by a group or team of authorities	Vision emerges from all levels of organization through collegial relationships	Product of how members think and interact while observing mutual respect; interconnectedness	Leader as designer, steward or teacher and is responsible for building the Learning Organization

While the six models: formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity, and cultural appear to capture the categorization as either descriptive or normative they are not always consistent with the description of the models by other theorists.

Bush (1995) categorizes formal models as descriptive, based on observable practices within the organization. Hoy and Miskel (1996); however, describe formal models of leadership as normative, directly contradicting Bush's (1995) categorization. Hoy and Miskel's (1996) categorization of formal models as normative in nature may be due to an emphasis of standardization of behaviour through expectations, which cannot be directly observed and explained. Bush (1995) does not openly advocate formal models as appropriate leadership theories for schools. He categorizes collegial models as highly normative or idealistic rather than founded in practice. Several authors share in Bush's view that collegial models are highly normative by emphasizing the positive characteristics of collegial models for schools. Bush (1995) cites Baldridge who describes the leader as "first among equals" (p. 64) while Bass and Stogdill (1990) contend that this description implies that leadership is shared among individuals within organizations. Bush (1995) comments, further, that collegial models are appropriate for professional staffs with common values, cooperative relationships and where decisions are reached through consensus. These are not contradicted by the review of pertinent literature. Collegial models of leadership are normative in nature and appear appropriate as models of leadership, which would produce favorable effects in schools. The various authors reviewed appear to support Bush's (1995) view that collegial models are, in fact, normative. Bush (1995) categorizes political models as descriptive. A limitation of

political models is that they are inevitably focused on power. Bush (1995) comments that political models provide an accurate description of behaviour and events in schools, thus a categorization of descriptive is given. Hoy and Miskel (1996) comment that political organization is not suitable for schools. Although Bush (1995) recognizes the descriptive value of political models of leadership in school he advocates that recognizing political patterns and dealing with them is important, not whether it is suitable for schools. Bush (1995) does not openly endorse political models of leadership as appropriate for schools. Bush (1995) categorizes subjective models of leadership as normative. Subjective models have a basis in phenomenology (Bush, 1995) and are based on invented reality (Greenfield, 1975). Since subjective models focus on perceptions and beliefs a categorization of normative would be accurate. Bush (1995) and Greenfield (1975) both describe the normative nature of subjective models. Subjective models emphasize the nonexistence of an ultimate reality (Bush, 1995); therefore, it is useful for describing leadership in schools. Bush (1995) categorizes ambiguity models as descriptive. Ambiguity models emphasize an absence of clear goals, (Bush, 1995) policies and long-term objectives (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Although these characteristics may exist during restructuring initiatives they are not favorable characteristics of long-term leadership objectives and goals. The uncertainty of planning and decision making (Bush, 1995) suggests that ambiguity models are inappropriate for leadership within schools, especially with increased responsibilities and accountability. Bush (1995) categorizes cultural models as both descriptive and normative. The literature seems to support Bush's (1995) categorization of normative, with an emphasis on beliefs, traditions, expectations, norms,

and shared meanings (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1990, 1995). The literature also provides support for a descriptive categorization of cultural models. Cultural models have descriptions throughout the literature, which emphasize the observable characteristics of cultural models. Cultural models seem appropriate for leadership in schools due to their descriptive and normative categorizations.

The learning organization probably fits comfortably into a normative categorization. Fullan (1995) comments that "the school is not currently a learning organization. And teaching is not yet a learning profession" (p. 230) thereby providing a challenge for leaders. Leaders must realize, according to Senge (1990) that change requires imagination, perseverance, caring, dialogue, and the willingness to change through the development of new capabilities, skills, and understandings (cited in Hesselbein et al., 1995). Fullan (1993) contends that in order for positive change to occur, cultures have to be affected and Senge (1996) adds that hierarchical arrangement cannot be effective in systematic change efforts. Evans (1993) postulates that leaders whose personal values and aspirations for their schools are coherent, reflective, and consistent are leaders worth following into the uncertainties of change. The disciplines within the learning organization may provide a framework for change and improvement within education.

Within this context, the following questions arise. The reliability of the survey instrument needed to be determined in this study. The survey was designed to measure the extent to which each of the six models of leadership described by Bush exist. Determining and explaining leadership practices in the schools studied depends on the

reliability of the survey; therefore, a reliability analysis was necessary. The survey was, indeed, reliable with the removal of five items to increase the reliability of formal and subjective models. The next question explores whether Bush's (1995) categorization of each leadership model as either descriptive or normative is accurate. Descriptive models can be observed to exist in practice while normative models are described as ideal or models, which ought to exist. A determination of descriptive models allows a discussion of the specific characteristics of leadership practice within a school thereby allowing comparisons of elements of leadership among models. A determination of normative models simply allows the researcher to theorize about leadership characteristics, which ought to exist or would be ideal in a specific school. A descriptive model of leadership enables a discussion of the strength of the leadership in a particular school and whether the administrator is equipped to deal with change effectively. Finally, what specific models of leadership are operating in each school under study and how consistent are the existing models with the current concept of the learning organization? Recent restructuring initiatives in schools in Newfoundland and Labrador have prompted an interest in the type of leadership currently existing in the province's schools and whether the elements of management associated with learning organizations are present. The absence of these elements means that organizational learning is not possible in these school settings. This research question provides an opportunity to profile leadership practices in each school under study. A determination of leadership practices in these schools is necessary in order to discuss the specific characteristics of leadership currently

existing and whether these characteristics are compatible with the concept of the learning organization which may be quite favourable for the facilitation of change initiatives.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research is mainly a qualitative study. However, research question one required the testing of the reliability of an existing Brown and Sheppard (1996) survey instrument (under development), introducing an element of quantitative research. The findings from the survey were used qualitatively, in order to answer research questions two and three. The three specific questions in this research study are: Is the survey reliable? Are Bush's categories of descriptive or normative accurate for the six models of leadership? How consistent are the existing models of leadership with the current concept of the learning organization? This chapter will describe the methodology used.

The Leadership Survey

Brown and Sheppard(1996) had begun preliminary development of a leadership survey (appendix D) when this study began. This study utilized the findings from the leadership survey research methodology, employing a questionnaire (Brown & Sheppard, 1996) which was administered anonymously to each teacher and formal leader within four schools. The total number of questions designed to measure the four constructs of goals and decision making, structure, external environment, and leadership pertaining to the six models of leadership were: formal (13), collegial (8), political (10), ambiguous (10), subjective (8), and cultural (11), for a total of sixty questions. The

questionnaire employed a five-point scale which ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

The questionnaire was personally delivered to four schools and its implementation was explained to the assistant principal or secretary. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a disclosure and consent form, which described all important aspects of the proposed research including: purpose, procedure, researcher, advisors, risks, right of refusal or withdrawal, confidentiality, and agreement to participate, to each subject. A statement of consent and understanding form was also included and signed by each participant. The questionnaire was forwarded to teachers and formal leaders with a three-week timeline for its completion and collection.

A Cronbach reliability analysis, using SPSS was performed and Cronbach alpha levels generated. An item analysis of each construct was conducted to determine if the alpha levels could be raised by the elimination of particular items. In order to determine the validity of Bush's categorization of each model as normative or descriptive, descriptive statistics were generated for both the entire sample and for each school. If the mean score for a particular category indicated that the model existed with an average mean of 3.5, then that model was considered descriptive, at least in these schools. A comparison of the means also aided in determining the degree to which the categorization might be appropriate. In other words, if those models that Bush claimed to be descriptive were more prevalent in the schools studied, that was considered as support for the categorization. A Crosstabs analysis was also generated in order to compare the percentages of response for specific questionnaire items among the schools. These

descriptive statistics qualitatively provided images of leadership models in the schools studied, and allowed comparisons with the six leadership theories described by Bush and the emerging concept of learning organizations, which was summarized in Table 1.

The Sample

The sample consisted of fifty-seven teachers and four principals, currently employed in each of the four schools in one school district in Newfoundland. Thirty-three participants, 54%, were residents of the community while the remaining 46% commuted, daily, from other rural and urban areas. Table 2 and Table 3 provide specific information concerning those teachers surveyed in this study.

Table 2

Summary of Groups of Teachers Surveyed

School	Teachers	Guidance	Spec. Ed.	Principals	Phys. Ed.	Music
1	11	1	2	1	1	1
2	13	1	5	1	1	1
3	7	1	1	1	-	1*
4	7	1	1	1	1*	-

Note. *Music and Physical Education teachers shared between school's 3 and 4.

This sample was chosen as a matter of convenience due to the isolation of the community, relatively small number of individuals teaching in the community, and accessibility to the researcher.

Table 3

Summary of Teachers Surveyed by Gender and Residence

School	Principal	Female	Male	Resident	Commute
1	Male	14	3	12	5
2	Male	8	14	10	12
3	Male	7	4	6	5
4	Male	1	10	5	6

Note. Commute refers to those teachers and principals residing outside of the community in which the four schools were located.

These four schools were part of a large school district consisting of schools in both rural and urban settings. This particular community would be considered a low socio-economic area. Two of the schools deliver K-6 programs while the other two schools deliver programs for grades 7-Level III. Table 4 provides information about these schools.

The rate of return of questionnaires in this study was 67%, which means that a total of 41 teachers responded out of a possible 61. Table 5 shows that 11/41 of the respondents were not residents of the community while 30/41 of the respondents were residents of the community in which the four schools were located. Resident teachers' average fifteen years teaching experience or more while non-resident teachers tend to have less than five years experience. Perhaps, experience has played a role in individuals recognizing and interpreting leadership characteristics and behaviour. It is also

noteworthy that only 1/ 4 principals completed a questionnaire. The non-responding principals expressed various concerns including questions about items on the questionnaire, origin of the survey instrument, purpose of the survey, and actual value of the project. These concerns appear to have prevented the full participation of all of the administrators in this sample.

Table 4

Identifying Information for Four Schools in Study

School	Students	Grades	Setting	Teachers
1	<250	K-6	Rural	17
2	<350	7-Level III	Rural	22
3	<225	K-6	Rural	11
4	<125	7-Level III	Rural	11

Table 5

Summary of Response Rate for Four Schools in Study

School	Principal	Resident	Commute	Female	Male	Total Response
1	No	10	4	12	2	14
2	No	8	5	5	8	13
3	Yes	6	2	6	2	8
4	No	6	0	0	6	6

Ethical Considerations

The Ethics Review Committee considered the proposed research methodology at Memorial University of Newfoundland as did the School Board's Research Review Committee. Questionnaire items were evaluated and the questionnaire was approved for use with participants. There were no ethical anomalies present, since participant's involvement with this study was totally voluntary, questionnaire items were completed anonymously, and participants could withdraw from the study at any point. Therefore, this research was ethically sound.

Limitations

Due to the limited size of the sample, 40 teachers and one administrator in a single community, generalization of the results would be limited. Even though the response rate of 67% was a good rate of return for survey research, the fact that there were thirty-three percent non-respondents introduced the possibility of bias since the respondents may not be representative of the group intended to be surveyed (Wiersma, 1995).

A further limitation in this research study was that the sample identified was a convenience sample rather than randomly selected. The sample which consisted of all teachers and administrators within four schools in a single community was accessible and convenient due to the location and proximity of schools. Finally, the limited sample size, the sampling procedure, and the qualitative approach to the analysis limits generalizability.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The research questions addressed are as follows: How reliable is the Brown and Sheppard (1996) survey instrument? Bush's six models are categorized as descriptive and/or normative. Are these categories valid? How consistent are the existing models of leadership with the concept of schools as learning organizations? To answer research question one, two tables are presented which provide a summary of reliability statistics for all questionnaire items and the summary of reliability statistics with questionnaire items removed to increase reliability of each construct: formal, political, cultural, subjective, ambiguity, and collegial. To answer research question two, four summary tables are presented which provide mean scores for the six models of leadership within each school which enable a determination of whether the leadership models proposed by Bush are accurately categorized as descriptive or normative. To answer research question three one table is presented which contains a summary of categorizations of leadership models.

Research Question One: Reliability Analysis

Before the data could be analyzed, in this study, the reliability of the survey instrument had to be determined. A Cronbach reliability analysis was performed using SPSS. Table 6 provides a summary of the reliability statistics for all of the questionnaire items prior to the removal of five items because two of the constructs were below the .7

level considered acceptable for educational research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). An item analysis was conducted in order to increase the reliability of each construct.

Table 6

Summary of Reliability Statistics for All Questionnaire Items

Model	N	M	SD	Alpha
Formal	13	39.6	6.6	.69
Collegial	8	24.3	8.0	.91
Political	10	27.7	7.7	.86
Ambiguity	10	27.4	6.3	.77
Subjective	8	22.4	4.6	.63
Cultural	11	39.0	6.3	.75

Table 7 provides a summary of the reliability statistics for each revised construct after five items were removed in an attempt to increase the reliability of formal and subjective models of leadership. Three items related to the formal model were removed from the questionnaire in order to increase the reliability of the construct. Two items, pertaining to the subjective model of leadership, were removed in order to increase the reliability of that model. The alpha levels for five of the constructs were above the .7 level considered acceptable for educational research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993); however the subjective model presented unexpected difficulties. The alpha level of the subjective model was raised from .63 to .66 on the Cronbach reliability analysis which approaches

the acceptable level set for this thesis. However, since the instrument is in developmental stages, findings from this study suggest that this construct should be modified to improve reliability. Overall on the basis of the Cronbach reliability analysis the questionnaire was considered to be a reliable measure of the constructs used in this study and; therefore, the questionnaire is useful in answering the research questions posed.

Table 7

Summary of Reliability Statistics for Specific Questionnaire Constructs

Model	N	M	SD	Alpha
Formal	10	30.5	6.3	.78
Collegial	8	24.3	8.0	.91
Political	10	27.7	7.7	.86
Ambiguity	10	27.4	6.3	.77
Subjective	6	16.4	4.3	.66
Cultural	11	39.0	6.3	.75

Note. N = number of questionnaire items; M = mean or average; SD = standard deviation

Research Question Two: Descriptive/Normative

Bush categorizes six models of leadership as either descriptive or normative. In order to determine whether Bush's categorization of models is valid, the mean scores for each of four schools must be examined. A particular model exists in a school, or is descriptive, if the average mean for that specific model is 3.5 or above. A model does not

exist or is considered normative if the average mean is below 3.5. A comparison of Bush's categorizations for each of the six models and the categorizations as determined in this study is then, possible.

School One

The mean scores for School One are presented in Table 8. The formal model categorization, with an average mean of 2.8 is normative in this particular school which contradicts Bush's categorization of the formal model as descriptive. The collegial model, with an average mean of 3.3, is normative in this school which is consistent with Bush. The political model with an average mean of 2.3, also has a normative categorization in this school. Bush categorizes the political model as descriptive; however the findings in School One do not support Bush's categorization. The ambiguity

Table 8

Mean Scores for School One

Model	N	M	Average M	SD
Formal	10	28.4	2.8	6.8
Collegial	8	26.2	3.3	8.4
Political	10	23.0	2.3	8.4
Ambiguity	10	23.2	2.3	7.0
Subjective	6	14.4	2.4	6.3
Cultural	11	40.7	3.7	5.0

Note. The Average M = M/N for each model.

model, with an average mean of 2.3, was found to be normative, as well. This finding is inconsistent with Bush's categorization of ambiguity models as descriptive in nature. The subjective model, with an average mean of 2.4, is also normative and is; therefore consistent with Bush's categorization of the subjective model as normative. The cultural model, with an average mean of 3.7, is descriptive and consistent with Bush's categorization of these models as descriptive or normative. This cultural model is the only model identified as descriptive in this school; therefore, indicating that it is the dominant model. The cultural model can be described and observed as having an influence on the leadership style, which is prevalent in School One.

School Two

The mean scores for School Two are presented in Table 9. The formal model, with an average mean of 3.5, is descriptive and; therefore, is consistent with Bush's

Table 9

Mean Scores for School Two

Model	N	M	Average M	SD
Formal	10	34.6	3.5	4.0
Collegial	8	20.1	2.5	7.8
Political	10	32.7	3.3	4.4
Ambiguity	10	32.8	3.3	4.4
Subjective	6	19.3	3.2	7.5
Cultural	11	37.1	3.4	3.1

categorization. In fact, the formal model is predominant in this school. The collegial model, with an average mean of 2.5, is normative which is consistent with Bush's categorization. The collegial model also has the lowest average mean of all of the models in School Two. This finding is consistent with the prevalence of the formal model of leadership in this school. The political model, with an average mean of 3.3, is also normative and; therefore, counter to Bush's categorization of the political model as descriptive. The ambiguity model, with an average mean of 3.3, is normative in School Two. Bush; however, categorizes the ambiguity model as descriptive. The subjective model, with an average mean of 3.2, is normative in School Two, which is consistent with Bush's categorization. The cultural model, with an average mean of 3.4, is normative. Bush categorizes cultural models as both descriptive and normative; therefore, one would expect the categorization to vary from school to school.

The sole model existing in School Two is formal. The remaining five models are normative; however, the average mean of 3.4 for the cultural model supports the probability that sub-cultures exist in this school as well.

School Three

The mean scores for School Three are presented in Table 10. The formal model, with an average mean of 2.8, is normative in School Three and does not support Bush's categorization of formal models as descriptive. Collegial and cultural models, with an average mean of 3.6, are both descriptive in School Three. The categorization of the cultural model is consistent with Bush; however, the results in this school do not support

his categorization that the collegial model is normative. The political model, with an average mean of 2.6, is normative and is contrary to Bush's descriptive categorization.

Table 10

Mean Scores for School Three

Model	N	M	Average M	SD
Formal	10	28.0	2.8	6.9
Collegial	8	29.1	3.6	6.4
Political	10	25.6	2.6	5.0
Ambiguity	10	27.5	2.8	2.3
Subjective	6	15.5	2.6	5.7
Cultural	11	40.0	3.6	4.0

The ambiguity model, with an average mean of 2.8, is also normative in School Three, contradicting Bush's categorization in this particular school. The subjective model, with an average mean of 2.6, is consistent with Bush's normative categorization.

School Four

The mean scores for School Four are presented in Table 11. The formal model, with an average mean of 3.0, is normative which does not provide support for Bush's descriptive categorization. The collegial model, with an average mean of 3.0, is also normative; however, this categorization supports Bush. The political model, with an

average mean of 3.1, is normative and; therefore, contradictory to Bush's categorization of descriptive. The ambiguity model, with an average mean of 2.6, is normative and again, inconsistent with Bush's categorization of descriptive. The subjective model,

Table 11

Mean Scores for School Four

Model	N	M	Average M	SD
Formal	10	30.2	3.0	5.0
Collegial	8	23.7	3.0	4.9
Political	10	31.3	3.1	7.1
Ambiguity	10	25.5	2.6	4.1
Subjective	6	16.8	1.7	3.6
Cultural	11	37.5	3.4	5.0

with an average mean of 1.7, is normative supporting Bush's categorization. The cultural model, with an average mean of 3.4, is normative as well. No clear model of leadership exists in School Four. All of the models in this school are classified as normative or idealistic.

Summary of Findings for Research Question Two

Table 12 provides a summary of the categorizations of each of the models: formal, collegial, political, ambiguity, subjective, and cultural, in this particular study as

well as Bush's categorizations for each model of leadership.

Table 12

Summary of Categorizations of Leadership Models

Schools/Bush	Models					
	Formal	Collegial	Political	Ambiguity	Subjective	Cultural
School One	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative	Descriptive
School Two	Descriptive	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative
School Three	Normative	Descriptive	Normative	Normative	Normative	Descriptive
School Four	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative	Normative
Bush	Descriptive	Normative	Descriptive	Descriptive	Normative	Nor./Des.

Bush's categorization of the formal model as descriptive was consistent with School Two in which the formal model exists. The categorization of the formal model in Schools One, Three, and Four was inconsistent with Bush's categorization due to the normative nature of the formal model in these particular schools. Bush categorizes the collegial model as normative. The findings in this study support Bush's categorization with the exception of School Three in which the collegial model was descriptive. Bush's (1995) categorization of the collegial model was accurate in three schools which indicated that his categorization was valid but the exception shows that the collegial model could also be descriptive in specific settings. Bush's categorization of political and ambiguity models does not receive support. Bush categorized both political and ambiguity models as descriptive; however, in each of the four schools studied the

categorization was normative. The subjective model, according to Bush, is normative which was supported in all schools in this study. Bush categorizes the cultural model as both descriptive and normative depending on the school in which cultural characteristics of leadership existed. Schools One and Three were descriptive while Schools Two and Four were normative. The equal split in the four schools provided support for Bush's categorization.

Research Question Three: Leadership and the Learning Organization

The third research question is concerned with the existing models of leadership, in each of four schools, and whether these models are consistent with the concept of the learning organization. Table 1 contains a summary of the literature on educational administration, which includes Bush's six models: formal, political, ambiguity, subjective, collegial, and cultural, as well as the learning organization. The learning organization contains certain elements of management that are presented in Table 1. These elements if present in a particular school support the perspective that a learning organization can possibly emerge in that school. Conversely, the absence of elements related to the concept of organizational learning may impede or prevent a particular school from developing as a learning organization. A Crosstabs analysis will aid in discussing the responses to particular questionnaire items by providing percentages of response for each item for each particular school. The elements of management associated with the learning organization will be assessed for each school to determine whether or not specific elements exist. There are six specific elements of management

corresponding to learning organizations, which are summarized in Table 1. These elements are as follows: 1) Goals may be determined individually or organizationally. 2) Goals may emerge from all levels of the organization. 3) A group or team of authorities base decisions on shared purpose or goals. 4) Vision emerges from all levels of the organization through collegial relationships. 5) The organization is a product of how members think and interact while observing mutual respect and emphasizing the importance of interconnectedness. 6) The leader is viewed as designer, steward or teacher and is responsible for building the learning organization.

Table 8 provides mean scores for School One. Research participants from School One describe leadership practices as cultural. As support for this view, 65% of participants agreed that the mission and goals of the school reflect the values of the staff. In the learning organization goals emerge from all levels of the organization. However, the fact that only 57% of respondents felt that the administration enacted school policy in a manner consistent with and sensitive to the values and culture found in the school is significant since 43% felt that the administrator was not sensitive to values and culture when enacting school policy. In School One 79% of respondents were satisfied that the values and beliefs of the school were reflected in the established rules and regulations. Members made pertinent decisions based on shared purpose. More than 85% of the individuals surveyed agreed that the community in which the school was located was essential in determining values and beliefs that were part of the school. A full 100% of teachers agreed that the uniqueness of the school's culture was due to the traditional values in the community. These teachers and the particular culture of the school was

influenced by how members thought, interacted and showed mutual respect for one another. Although values, beliefs and traditions were viewed positively, 43% of respondents expressed disagreement that the principal often stresses that the school should have a set of core values which reflected the proper mission of the school while 22% were undecided. Only 36% believe that the principal was doing well in this area which leads one to wonder why core values were not stressed, if in fact core values existed at all in School One.

Collegial relations were quite positive in School One. Participants agreed that collegial aspects of leadership contributed to the overall leadership characteristics practiced in this school. Responses to collegial items on the questionnaire are above 50% agreement with the exception of only two items. According to 57% of respondents the school as a whole does not have any explicit goals, but administrators and teachers perform their work based on their own professional and personal beliefs and goals. This is consistent with learning organizations in that goals may be determined individually or organizationally. The leader can be characterized as a designer due to the ability to maintain staff and community involvement while accentuating the academic and social character of the school through encouraging and supporting professional and personal goals and beliefs.

Table 9 provides the mean scores for School Two. Formal models are predominant. While 31% of respondents agreed that the goals and mission of the school were set solely by the principal, 31% disagreed and the remainder were undecided. The item on the questionnaire may have been interpreted positively by some teachers and

negatively by others. Forty-two percent of participants agreed that a rigid hierarchy determined an individual's status while 25% remained undecided. Perhaps both findings were due to the two distinct groups of teachers in this school. A group of teachers were residents of the community with fifteen years of experience or more, while a second group commuted daily from other communities and had less than five years teaching experience. Decision-making and policy formation was top down according to 77% of teachers in this school, 69% agreed that policies were formed by the principal and 100% agreed that the principal was the final authority regarding decisions and policy. Agreement concerning the principal as the final authority was above 75% in the three remaining schools. Teachers agreed that they had little input into decisions and policy development.

There was agreement in School Two that collegial aspects of leadership were not prominent. Fifty-four percent disagreed that all staff members worked collaboratively on policy formation and 77% disagreed that all staff participated in meetings and achieved consensus when deriving school policy. According to 54% of respondents there was disagreement that all members cooperated when forming and implementing policy. More than 60% of the teachers disagreed that the principal actively consulted staff regarding participation in decision-making processes and 69% agreed that the principal imposed those policies on staff members. There was a perceived lack of collaborative work ethic in this school.

The staff at School Two, who participated in this study, produced interesting results on the items designed to evaluate the extent of cultural leadership characteristics

within the school. The mission and goals at the school reflected the staff's values according to 38% of respondents while 39% were undecided on this same item. Less than 35% of participants agreed that the administration's values and beliefs defined the vision of the school's mission and 39% were undecided. Sixty-one percent of the participants agreed that the administrator was sensitive to values and culture within the school when enacting policies and only 30% disagreed indicating that this was recognized as occurring in this school. Rituals and ceremonies were willingly accommodated according to 83% of respondents while 84% also agree that the traditional values of the community contributed to the cultural identity of the school. The apparent lack of collaboration, input into decisions and top down organization of this school does not support the existence of the leadership necessary to build and maintain a learning organization.

Table 10 provides mean scores for School Three. Cultural and collegial models, with an average mean of 3.6 are equally prevalent. There was more than 75% agreement that the staff works collaboratively and derives policies through a process of consensus. More than 85% of teachers agreed that the goals and mission of the school reflected the values of staff members and 61% agreed that those values and beliefs of the administration defined the vision of the school's mission. This indicated that the goals and vision of mission were the responsibility of both administration and staff. One hundred percent of the teachers agreed that the administration enacts policies rationally, and is consistent with and sensitive to, the values and culture within the school. Only 50% agreed that the community was essential in determining those values and beliefs that

were part of the school while 88% agreed that traditional values in the community helped shape the uniqueness of the school's culture. These findings reflected the differences in individual values and beliefs impacting upon each individual's interpretation of questionnaire items. Seventy-five percent of teachers noted that the principal expressed his/her views on the desired direction of the school to staff and community and 75% also agreed that the principal stressed a set of core values reflecting the mission of the school. Both of these items reiterated the importance of values to mission and cultural development and maintenance.

Collegial characteristics of leadership are also prominent in School Three. Only 43% of teachers agreed that regardless of a staff member's formal position they could enact policy if deemed most qualified. This percentage may reflect the reluctance of non-administrative staff to become involved in implementing policies within schools rather than lack of opportunities for engaging in leadership practice associated with policy enactment. Decisions were derived by entire staff consensus according to 63% of participants; therefore, teachers agreed that they had input into school decisions. More than 35% of teachers agreed that the principal imposed policies on staff indicating that although decisions involved a process of consensus not all teachers were satisfied with the process or its eventual outcome.

There was very little formal leadership influence in School Three. There was agreement that the principal of this school was highly accountable and that the school's interests are usually represented by the principal at meetings and conferences. Those

characteristics of leadership are essential for the building and maintenance of learning organizations.

Table 11 provides mean scores for School Four. While no single model provided a portrait of the type of leadership practiced in this school cultural leadership was predominant. Half of the participants agreed that the mission and goals of the school reflected the staff's values indicating that half of the staff disagreed that this was occurring. A significant group of 50% were undecided concerning whether or not values and beliefs of the administration had a vision of the school's mission and only 33% agreed with this statement. A large number of participants were unsure about this item and this may indicate a need for more information concerning the specific meaning and importance of vision and its influence upon school mission development. A group of 67% agreed that the school's values and beliefs were reflected in the rules and regulations governing the school. This finding showed that teachers in this school recognized the value of essential elements that shape rule development. A resounding 83% of participants agreed that the school's structure is readily willing to incorporate special events and ceremonies that helped define the specific character of the school. More than 80% of teachers agreed that traditional values of the community helped define the school's unique culture. This was a great strength for School Four since culture was not built by a single influencing individual and his/her ideas and experiences. Culture was built and positively maintained with the combined influence of individuals inside the school as well as the values and beliefs of those in the environment external to the school

itself. More than 80% of participants agreed that the principal articulated his/her views of the desired direction of the school to staff and the community.

There was a mixed review of the extent to which participants agreed or disagreed concerning the items specific to collegial models in School Four. For example, 67% of participants disagreed that all members derived policies collaboratively and that all staff participated in meetings and derived policies through consensus. These teachers are not satisfied that all members developed policies through consensus while engaging in collaborative processes. Certainly this hinders a positive view of collaboration in this school. Given this response it is interesting that 83% of teachers surveyed agreed that the principal should not be held solely responsible for decisions determined collaboratively. Evidently, they believed that accountability should be shared regardless of the process through which decisions were made and the individuals directly involved in making them. Exactly half of the respondents agreed that the principal actively consults teachers who participated in decision making while the other half disagreed. Obviously the staff is divided on this issue, perhaps indicating the existence of two distinct groups of individuals in School Four. A full 100% of the staff members expressed the view that the principal imposed policies on the staff. The collaborative process is severely limited by such perceptions.

Political elements are also evident in School Four. A group of 67% of participants agreed that during policy development meetings certain groups with their own interests and agendas opposed the initiatives of others. A smaller group of 33% were satisfied that the dominant group would not oppose their ideas. Half of the

respondents at School Four also agreed that certain groups were supported by the administration and usually got their way. Fifty percent of the staff members at this school agreed that the administrator did not support their input and concerns. These elements of political leadership did not provide support for shared purpose and decision making, mutual respect or the leader as designer necessary for organizational learning summarized in Table 1.

More formalized elements also influenced the perception of leadership in School Four. While 83% of the teachers agreed that decision-making and policy development were top down, 67% also agreed that the administrator was highly accountable for performance within the school. An interesting split occurred on the item, which stated that the principal formulated most school policies and initiatives. Half of the respondents agreed and half disagreed with this item on the questionnaire. This finding provided evidence to support the idea that some individuals in this school were supported by the principal while the remaining individuals felt as though teacher input was minimal and that others impose ideas upon them. An overwhelming 100% of respondents agreed that the principal had final authority on policy and decisions affecting the school. This view reinforces the top down approach taken by the administrator in this particular school. The teachers at this school agreed that the principal of the school was accountable and 84% also agreed that the administrator represented the interests of the school at conferences and meetings whether the interests actually reflected the values and beliefs of all staff or the group supported by the administration.

Summary of Findings for Research Question Three

In an attempt to provide a leadership profile of each of the four schools in this research study specific elements of the varying models of leadership were selected and discussed. Do these elements provide a positive portrait of the type of characteristics necessary in order for each school to develop and flourish as learning organizations? A school may indeed develop as a learning organization if leadership elements specific to organizational learning, presented in Table 1, can be shown to exist.

The leadership model in School One was predominantly cultural. Goal establishment involved staff as well as administration in this school. Goal determination; therefore, may be individual or organizational. Goals also emerged from different levels within the school. Teachers agreed that the rules and regulations reflected the values and beliefs of the school, and this established shared purpose. Collegiality is expressed positively in this school as individuals respect one another and relationships emerge. It is not evident that vision emerges from all levels of the school but collegial relationships are evident. The administrator is sensitive to the values and culture within the school and could be described as a strong leader or at least an evolving leader, one who recognizes the direction in which the school should be proceeding and one who rationally enacts policies with the input of staff members. The elements of management concerning organizational learning displayed in Table 1 are present in School One.

The predominant model of leadership in School Two is formal. This school is perceived by teachers, as having a rigid hierarchy in which goals and mission are set solely by the principal. Agreement was high among respondents that decision making

was top down and 100% agreed that the principal was the final authority regarding decisions. These staff members are excluded by the administration from decision making and policy development. These specific elements of formal leadership would hinder the development of organizational learning in School Two. Along with these formal elements of leadership in this school, elements of collegial models of leadership are practically non-existent. Staff members agreed that policy formation through collaboration, decision making using consensus and cooperative implementation of policy was not commonly occurring. Collaborative processes are affected by the formal, hierarchical leadership practices in this school.

Teachers at this school agreed that ceremonies and rituals were willingly accommodated, traditional values of the community shaped the identity of the school, and that the community was essential when determining the school's values and beliefs. These cultural elements of leadership emphasize the importance of the school's links with its external environment, specifically the community in which it is located.

The elements of management associated with learning organizations are absent in this school. This school has rigid leadership, some identifiable cultural identity and little or no collaboration. The existing model of leadership in this school is not consistent with the elements conducive to the development of learning organizations.

The predominant models of leadership in School Three are collegial and cultural. Teachers in School Three agreed that policies were derived collaboratively through a process of consensus, and the goals and mission of the school reflected the values of staff members. Many participants, more than half, agreed that the values and beliefs of the

administration defined the vision of the school's mission. The vision of the school's mission is a culmination of values and beliefs of the teachers, administration and the community since the traditional values of the community also help shape the school's unique identity. These core values are reflected in the school's mission statement.

Agreement was established regarding teachers having input into school related decisions. Although teachers were involved in decision making, more than half of participants agreed that policy was, at times, imposed upon the staff at School Three. Formally, teachers agreed that the principal was highly accountable and that he/she represented the interests of the school.

Staff and administration participated in policy development and decision making. As a result of this process one may conclude that goals were developed by those individuals within the school, having input at various levels, and certainly decisions were based on a shared purpose. It can also be concluded that vision emerges from all levels of the organization since collegial, shared decision making exists. The school's mission was derived from the values and beliefs of the staff as well as the traditional values of the community. The agreement regarding the accountability of the principal and his/her ability to represent the interests of the school establish responsible leadership characteristics. All of the elements pertaining to organizational learning, presented in Table 1 are not explicitly present in School Three; however, this school has a number of leadership elements consistent with the learning organization.

School Four as presented in Table 11 did not have a single, dominant existing model of leadership. The six models: formal, political, collegial, subjective, ambiguity,

and cultural were all classified as normative, with respect to this sample with average means less than 3.5. Although a single, clear model of leadership practice was absent in School Four, various leadership characteristics influence the perceived portrait of the administration.

The cultural model was predominant in School Four. Rules and regulations reflected the values and beliefs of the school and special ceremonies and events were readily accommodated and the traditional values of the community contribute to the uniqueness of the school's culture. Agreement on those items accentuated the cultural identity of School Four. Participants also agreed that the unique culture had been accomplished through the recognition of values and beliefs of teachers, administration, and students in the form of ceremonies and rituals and the community surrounding the school through traditional values. The strength of the leadership characteristics necessary in order to build and maintain culture and a learning organization was evident in School Four.

A majority of respondents voiced disagreement that policies were developed collaboratively through a process of consensus indicating that the collaborative process was not commonly utilized in School Four. A further lack of collaborative decision making was evidenced by the 100% agreement that the principal imposed policies rendering collaboration and consensus nonexistent.

Political and formal aspects of leadership also contributed to the leadership characteristics influencing the principal's leadership in School Four. A majority of teachers agreed that dominant interest groups were supported by administration, which

did not enhance the development of this school as learning organization. The formal element of rigid top down arrangement was not conducive to organizational learning. However, a positive formal characteristic was reflected in 100% agreement that the principal represented the interests of the school, emphasizing responsible leadership presented in Table 1 regarding learning organizations.

The external environment is important as reflected in incorporating its traditional values and representation of the school's interests in meetings. The principal articulates to teachers, parents and other concerned stakeholders the direction that he/she feels the school should take. This vision of the school's direction; however, has not been shown as emerging from all levels of the organization through collegial relationships.

This school is quite unique due to its lack of an observable, descriptive model of leadership practice. Leadership experience is lacking and clear subscription to a model of administrative practice is absent. The lack of a perceived, visible collaborative culture and the political influences present in this school hinder it's capability of engaging in the elements of management necessary in order to accept the challenges associated with organizational learning at this time. Substantial modifications to the leadership of School Four must occur in order for it to accept and cope with the challenges of operating as a learning organization.

The four schools in this research study have provided insight into the leadership characteristics influencing leadership practice in each school. School's One and Three were shown to have elements of management associated with the learning organization, as presented in Table 1. The presence of these elements provided evidence that the two

schools could, indeed, adopt the disciplines of the learning organization. Schools Two and Four; however, were exceptions. The elements of management associated with organizational learning were absent. The disciplines of the learning organization could not be adopted due to the lack of responsible leadership necessary for building and maintaining the learning organization.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study

This study had three basic foci. The first purpose of this research study was to determine the reliability of the survey instrument. Bush (1995) in describing his six models of leadership: formal, political, subjective, ambiguity, cultural, and collegial also categorized each model as either normative, descriptive or both which leads to the second purpose, which was to determine if Bush's (1995) categorization of leadership models, was accurate. The third purpose was to determine the models of leadership existing in the four schools and ascertain whether they were consistent with the current concept of schools as learning organizations.

The questionnaire measures the constructs, which Bush (1995) described and is; therefore, useful for assessing leadership in schools. Table 7 provided a summary of the reliability statistics for specific questionnaire constructs and the alpha levels were all above or approaching the .7 level, which indicated that the survey instrument was reliable.

The results of the study revealed that Bush's categorization of leadership models as either descriptive or normative was valid for the formal model which existed in School Two and the cultural model of leadership which existed in Schools One and Three. Bush (1995) described the collegial model as normative. The collegial model was normative in three of the schools but descriptive in School Three. Bush's (1995) categorization of leadership models was valid in three of the schools studied and provided support for his categorization of collegial models as normative. The descriptive nature of the collegial

model in School Three, as summarized in Table 12, provided evidence; however, that the collegial model was not entirely normative, and does exist in some schools.

Table 1 presents a summary of the elements of management for Bush's six models and the learning organization. A Crosstabs analysis provided percentages of responses on specific questionnaire items for each school which were analyzed in an attempt to determine if the elements of management listed for the learning organization, in Table 1, were present in each of the four schools studied. School One displayed characteristics of cultural leadership and School Three's leadership practice was a combination of cultural and collegial leadership. The elements of cultural and collegial leadership in those two schools were compared to the elements of management associated with organizational learning and it was determined that both of these schools contained the necessary elements of management for organizational learning to take place. However, those elements were absent in Schools Two and Four indicating that these schools were not ready to engage in practices conducive to organizational learning as they currently exist.

Conclusion

The result of this study provides insight into the type of leadership present in each school, as perceived by those individuals participating in this research study. The predominance of cultural leadership in Schools One, Three, and Four suggests that a positive orientation towards other people exists (Epp, 1993). Individuals who can bring many frames of reference to bear on an enormously, complex reality (Sergiovanni, 1995) are required in order for leaders to maintain school culture. Leadership that facilitates positive outcomes during restructuring initiatives requires competent leaders capable of

transforming work environments, respecting individuals, maintaining collegial relationships and building a learning environment while emphasizing shared purpose and interconnectedness (Senge, 1990).

Handy (1995) views leaders of the future as people who are open-minded, question themselves and others, search out new ideas, desire truth and improvement, take risks, and welcome criticism. Two of the principals in this research study comfortably utilized cultural leadership models effectively in their schools. The six models of leadership were present, in some form, in the four schools in this study; however, predominantly cultural models existed in School One, formal in School Two, collegial and cultural in School Three and cultural in School Four.

Characteristics of the cultural model of leadership were prevalent in School One. The descriptive categorization of the cultural model was consistent with Bush who categorized the model as both descriptive and normative depending on the setting. All of the elements of management associated with organizational learning, shown in Table 1, were present in that school. The existence of elements of management conducive to building a learning organization enhanced the potential for School One to become involved in the process of organizational learning.

Characteristics of the formal model of leadership were prevalent in School Two. The formal model was descriptive which supported Bush's view that formal leadership was observable. Due to the rigid, hierarchical arrangement associated with formal leadership collegiality was not present. This finding was consistent with Bush's description of the isolation of individuals as a result of specialization and increased productivity. The elements of management pertaining to organizational learning were not

present in School Two, thereby, rendering it unsuitable for adopting the disciplines associated with the learning organization.

Characteristics of cultural and collegial models of leadership were prevalent in School Three. Both cultural and collegial models were found to be descriptive. The categorization of the collegial model as descriptive was contrary to Bush's (1995) view of normative. Bush's normative categorization of the collegial model was supported in the remaining three schools. Bush viewed the collegial model as normative or ideal; however, the research results in School Three showed that a descriptive categorization was also possible in specific circumstances. The elements of management associated with organizational learning were also prominent in School Three; therefore, a foundation for building a learning organization existed.

Characteristics of the cultural model of leadership were prominent in School Four. School Four lacked a descriptive model of leadership. All six models were normative which suggested that a clear, observable model of leadership was absent. Cultural and collegial influences provided some positive leadership characteristics; however, political elements were also evident. The elements of management associated with organizational learning were practically nonexistent in School Four.

This study of four schools, in a single community, has provided information, which described the characteristics of leadership currently influencing leadership practice in those schools. Schools One and Three contained elements of management conducive to the success of learning organizations. However, Schools Two and Four lacked the necessary elements of leadership that would enable acceptance of the disciplines associated with learning organizations. School's One and Three; therefore, are better

equipped to deal with reform initiatives. Modifications to the leadership characteristics must be made in Schools Two and Four in order for successful restructuring to take place.

Kanter (1995) stated that "we are living in a time when mastering change is probably the most important thing that leaders can help their organizations do" (p. 71); therefore, transformation must occur. Leaders who are capable of informed, eclectic usage of theory are, perhaps, also capable of mastering change. Such leaders are able to adapt to the circumstances in which they find themselves, including changing organizational needs. The educational leaders in Schools One and Three are the best equipped to facilitate organizational change according to the result of this particular research study. Future leaders search out competence, lead through serving, and are vulnerable to the skills and talents of others; leadership is an art (DePree, 1989).

Recommendations

The results of this research study prompt several recommendations regarding practice.

1. It is recommended that teachers and administrators have access to professional literature, which describes theories of educational leadership, change theory and change processes. This valuable information will assist teachers in recognizing the specific characteristics of leadership theories influencing leadership in their schools and assist in assessing whether these characteristics are having an impact on the development of learning organizations.
2. It is recommended that staff members receive in-service support in order to become familiar with leadership roles and strategies associated with culture building and maintenance. The need for such professional development support is evident since culture is built and maintained through collegial relationships, which are essential for the development of organizational learning.
3. It is recommended that each staff become familiar with literature and criteria concerning learning organizations since it is touted as a viable model for schools. The disciplines of the learning organization can be implemented successfully within school settings in which all staff members are involved in developing and maintaining cultural awareness as well as constantly evaluating self and organizational development. Familiarity with the elements of leadership associated with organizational learning will enable an investigation of whether or not the elements exist or, indeed, can exist.

4. It is recommended that staff members be given opportunities to explore and initiate leadership. Knowledge of approaches to leadership would provide staff members with sufficient theoretical knowledge in order to feel more comfortable engaging in leadership roles.
5. It is recommended that administrators become aware of the aspects of the theoretical models of leadership, which shape their current leadership practices. Awareness may encourage increased effectiveness and facilitate the development of leadership strategies, and qualities.
6. It is recommended that culture and academic success can be maintained through staff efforts to combine collaborative processes and team building initiatives. All teachers and administrators would be required to engage in reflective practice, which should encompass leadership abilities, teaching styles and strategies, personal development, and moral purpose in order to utilize models of leadership, such as organizational learning, more effectively.
7. It is recommended that further work be completed to strengthen the survey tested in this study in order to assist in determining professional development needs of school administrators.

Implications for Further Research

The present study has provided several opportunities for further research.

1. Follow-up research, with these schools, should be conducted to determine whether or not fluctuations in predominant models occur given that staffs, administration, and designation of schools have changed since this study was implemented.
2. Further research would provide important follow-up data, since two of the schools in this study will amalgamate and the remaining two schools will be redesignated. The impact of the amalgamation or redesignation may positively or negatively impact on leadership and the leaders influence on policy development and decision making. Leadership may or may not be affected in all of the schools depending on the impact of change.
3. Further research should be conducted which investigates the extent to which leadership approaches are affected by change of individual in the role of principal.
4. This research should be replicated in other rural and urban school settings in an attempt to discover current leadership theory and practice guiding educational processes.
5. This research should be extended to a broader sample and should include urban and rural schools to determine the validity of Bush's categorization of descriptive or normative.
6. An experimental study should be conducted including schools that display elements of leadership consistent with learning organizations and those without such elements in order to determine differences in success.

References

Ainscow, M. & Hopkins, D. (1992). Aboard the "moving school". *Educational Leadership*, 50(3), 79-81.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1993). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. London, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G.& Riley, G. L. (1978). *Policy making and effective leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barrett, P. A. (1991). *Doubts and certainties working together to restructure schools. Washington*, D.C.: NEA National Library.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: The Free Press.

Bennis, W. (1984). Transformative power and leadership. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Ed.), *Leadership and organization culture* (pp. 64-71). Urbana: University of Illinois.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brown, J. & Sheppard, B. (1996). *Leadership Survey*. Unpublished questionnaire.

Burns, G. E. & Smith, A. (1996). Fostering an ethos of collaboration. *The Canadian School Executive*, 16(1), 16-23.

Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management*. London: Athenaeum Press Ltd.

Caldwell, S. D., & Wood, F. H. (1992). Breaking ground in restructuring. *Educational Leadership,* 50(1), 41-44.

Calhoun, C., Meyer, M. W. & Scott, W. R. (Ed.). (1990). *Structures of power and constraint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chawla, S. & Renesch, J. (1995). *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrow's workplace.* Portland, Oregon: Productivity Press.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In J. M. Shafritz & S. J. Ott (Ed.), *Classics of organizational theory* (pp. 385-399). New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principled centered leadership*. New York: Fireside.

Covey, S. R., Merrill, A., & Merrill, R. (1994). *First things first.* New York: Fireside.

Dembowski, F. L., O'Connell, R. W., & Osborne, G. (1996). Fostering shared decision making with a collaborative restructuring project. *The Canadian School Executive,* 16(1), 6-9.

DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art.* New York: Dell Publishing.

Dunlop D. M. & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 27(1), 5-29.

Epp, J. R. (1990). Using participation appropriately. The Canadian School Executive, pp. 18-21.

Evans, R. (1993). The human face of reform. *Educational Leadership,* 51(1), 19-23.

Fraenkel, J. & Wallen, N. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* (2nd Ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Fullan, M. G. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership,* 49(5), 19-22.

Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Successful school improvement the implementation perspective and beyond.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Fullan M. G. (1993). *Change forces, probing the depths of educational change.* London: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership,* 50(6), 12-17.

Fullan, M. (1995). The school as a learning organization: Distant dreams. *Theory Into Practice,* 34(4), 230-235.

Fullan, M. G. and Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Glickman, C. (1991). Pretending not to know what we know. *Educational Leadership,* 48(8), 4-10.

Goodlad. J. I. (1979). Can our schools get better? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 342-347.

Gorton, R. A. & Snowden, P. E. (1993). *School leadership and administration.* Madison, Wisconsin: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M.G. Hughes (Ed.), *Administering education* (pp. 71-99). London: Altone Press.

Greenfield, T. B. (1986). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. *Interchange*, 17(2), 57-76.

Handy, C. (1995). Managing the dream. In S. Chawla & J. Renesch (Ed.), *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrows workplace* (pp. 44-55). Portland, Oregon: Productivity Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). Collaborative culture of teaching. *OPSTF News*, 20-23.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). Cultures of teaching a focus for change. *OPSTF News*, 6-10.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Herman, J. J. & Herman, J. L. (1993). *School-based management: Current thinking and practice*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M. & Beckhard, R. (Ed.). (1996). *The leader of the future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (1996). *Educational administration, theory, research, and practice.* (5th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Hoyle, E. (1981). *The process of management, E323 management and the school, block 3, part 1.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. & Curphy, G. (1993). *Leadership, enhancing the lessons of experience.* Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

Isaacson, N. & Bamburg, J. (1992). Can schools become learning organizations? *Educational Leadership*, 50(3), 42-44.

Joyce, B. R. (1991). The doors of school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 59-62.

Kanter, R. (1995). Mastering change. In S. Chawla & J. Renesch (Ed.), *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrows workplace* (pp. 71-83). Portland, Oregon: Productivity Press.

Lee, B. (1997). *The power principle influence with honor.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. (1998). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy, and K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration.* New York: Longman.

Levine, M. (1984). Excellent companies and exemplary schools: Common goals, characteristics. *American Enterprise Institute,* 56-69.

Lieberman, A. (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures creating the future now.* New York: The Falmer Press.

McAlindon, H. (1981). Education for self-actualization. *Training and Development Journal*, 86-91.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. In J. M. Shafritz & S. J. Ott (Ed.), *Classics of organizational theory* (pp. 457-462). New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

O'Neil, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *Educational Leadership,* 52(7), 20-23.

Renihan, F.I. (1992). New ways of educating toward a renewed vision of responsiveness. *Presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Education Association,* 1-14.

Royal Commission of Inquiry into Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education. (1992) *Our children our future.* St. John's, NF: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Ryan, S. (1995). Learning communities: An alternative to the "expert" model. In S. Chawla & J. Renesch (Ed.), *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrows workplace* (pp. 279-291). Portland, Oregon: Productivity Press.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). *Schools for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Scott, W. R. (1987). *Organizations rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline the art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Senge, P. M, Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership how to get extraordinary performance in schools.* Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship a reflective practice perspective.* Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Moore, J. (1989). *Schooling for tomorrow, directing reforms to issues that count.* Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Shafritz, J. M. & Ott, S. J. (1996). *Classics of organization theory.* New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Stoll, L. & Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Treslan, D. L. (1993). Understanding and managing change. *The Canadian School Executive*, 14-18.

Watkins, D. (1984). The good school-what is it really like? *The Canadian School Executive*, 11-12.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 673-676.

Wiersma, W. (1995). Research methods in education an introduction (6th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

Dear Mr. :
I am a graduate student currently involved in research required as partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Education, at Memorial University of Newfoundland. My thesis supervisors are Dr. Jean Brown and Dr. Bruce Sheppard.

My study involves an investigation of six models of leadership: formal models, collegial models, political models, subjective models, ambiguity models, and cultural models categorized by British researcher and author, Tony Bush. My research attempts to determine whether or not Bush's categorization of leadership models is useful for analyzing models of leadership in schools. This research also attempts to determine whether there is a prevailing model of leadership in each school under study.

In order to gather the necessary data required for this study I am requesting that each teacher and administrator at each of the four schools located on _____ complete a questionnaire designed to aid my research. All of the information gathered in the study would be strictly confidential and participation is completely voluntary. Participants may decline response to any item on the questionnaire or opt out at any time without prejudice. A summary of results will be available upon request to all participants, upon completion of the study.

Please be assured that this study meets the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education and Memorial University of Newfoundland. Anonymity will be protected and all records will remain confidential unless written permission for release is obtained.

If you require further information regarding this research please contact me at ddurdle@calvin.stemnet.nf.ca (H) 488-3316, or (W) 488-2871/2872. If during the research, you should need to consult a resource person other than myself, Dr. Patricia Canning, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Research and Development is available (737-3402).

Sincerely,
Diana E. Durdle

APPENDIX B

Dear Mr.

I am a graduate student currently involved in research as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education, at Memorial University of Newfoundland. My thesis supervisors are Dr. Jean Brown and Dr. Bruce Sheppard.

My study involves an investigation of six models of leadership: formal models, collegial models, political models, subjective models, ambiguity models, and cultural models categorized by British researcher and author, Tony Bush. My research attempts to determine whether or not Bush's categorization of leadership models is useful for analyzing models of leadership in schools. This research also attempts to determine whether there is a prevailing model of leadership in each school under study.

I am requesting that each teacher and administrator in your school complete a questionnaire in order to aid the data collection for my research.

All of the information to be gathered in this study would be strictly confidential and participation is completely voluntary. A summary of results will be available upon request to all participants, upon completion of the study.

Please be assured that this study meets the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education and Memorial University of Newfoundland. Anonymity will be protected and all records will remain confidential unless written permission for release is obtained.

If you require further information regarding this research please contact me at ddurdle@calvin.stemnet.nf.ca (H) 488-3316, or (W) 488-2871/2872. If during the research, you should need to consult a resource person other than myself, Dr. Patricia Canning, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Research and Development is available (737-3402).

Sincerely,

_____

Diana E. Durdle

APPENDIX C

Leadership Survey

Read each item carefully and circle the response that best describes your personal experience in regard to the statement. Please answer by circling **Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2), or Strongly Disagree (1).**

	Survey Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1
1.	The goals and mission of the school are set solely by the principal - and teachers are expected to work toward meeting those goals.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	All members of the staff work collaboratively in formulating school policy.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	All the staff participates in meetings, and work toward a consensus on the direction of school policy.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	There is disagreement among various members of the administration and teachers as to what are the schools goals and primary mission.	5	4	3	2	1
5.	The direction of the school is mostly determined by a small clique of staff (administration and staff) who has power to get things done in the school.	5	4	3	2	1
6.	In staff meetings to develop school policy, there are different groups, which often have their own interests in the direction of the school and oppose the initiatives of others.	5	4	3	2	1
7.	In general, the goals of the school are subject to continual change, and consequently, the staff is not fully aware of the specific goals of the school at all times.	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Although the entire staff in this school is professional, there is little unity of purpose in this school.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Any person or group in the school (based on their specific knowledge or expertise) can potentially be responsible for initiating and enacting school policies.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	There is no set procedure to develop school policies on the direction of the school's mission – school goals merely arise as circumstances dictate.	5	4	3	2	1
11.	Individual staff members pursue their own aims and objectives irrespective of the goals held by the school as a whole.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	This school as a whole does not have any explicit goals, but administrators and teachers perform their work based on their own professional and personal beliefs and goals.	5	4	3	2	1
13.	The mission and goals of the school reflect the values of the staff.	5	4	3	2	1

14.	The values and beliefs of the administration have defined a vision of the school's mission.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	The administration enacts school policy in a rational manner, which is consistent with, and sensitive to, the values and culture found in this school.	5	4	3	2	1
16.	In this school, an individual's status is determined by a rigid hierarchy of positions.	5	4	3	2	1
17.	The rules and regulations in this school largely determine people's roles and their actions in the school.	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Decision-making and policy formation flows from the top down.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Given that there may be many rules and regulations in any school, it is evident that in this school all the staff members participate and cooperate in the formation and implementation of school policies.	5	4	3	2	1
20.	There is often dispute over particular aspects of this school's rules and regulations (i.e., timetables, and class lists).	5	4	3	2	1
21.	The particular form of this school's rules and regulations are largely determined by one group of individuals and their particular beliefs.	5	4	3	2	1
22.	The rules and regulations of this school are structured in such a way as to benefit one group of teachers (i.e. senior staff, math teacher's etc.) over the rest of the staff.	5	4	3	2	1
23.	The staff generally ignores the rules and regulations of this school since the rules are not important.	5	4	3	2	1
24.	The administration acknowledges the professionalism of the teachers in this school, and therefore teachers are given free reign to conduct their work as they see professionally fit.	5	4	3	2	1
25.	The rules and regulations of this school are in a constant state of flux.	5	4	3	2	1
26.	The values and beliefs of this school are reflected in the established rules and regulations.	5	4	3	2	1
27.	The maintenance of our unique school rituals and ceremonies is a vital component in shaping how our school is regulated.	5	4	3	2	1
28.	The structure of our school is readily willing (and flexible enough) to accommodate ceremonies and special events (assemblies, rallies, fundraising, sporting events etc.) which help define the character of this school.	5	4	3	2	1
29.	This school has established rigid rules and regulations for staff contact with the community.	5	4	3	2	1
30.	There is a high degree of accountability in this school, as a whole, in regards to following directions from the school board.	5	4	3	2	1

31.	The administration of this school is highly accountable for the level of performance at this school (e.g., examination results, costs etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
32.	Since many decisions in this school are reached through a collaborative process, then I believe that the administration should not be held solely accountable for the events that occur in this school.	5	4	3	2	1
33.	There are many pressures on this school from various groups in the community (parents, business) to enact various policies for school improvement.	5	4	3	2	1
34.	This school is responsive to the demands of various groups in our community, and is willing to meet with them to discuss and work towards addressing their particular demands.	5	4	3	2	1
35.	The teachers in this school who are directly involved in have a different relationship with their students than those that are not involved in the community.	5	4	3	2	1
36.	Staffs who live in the community where the school is located have a different perspective on the needs of the school than those who do not live in the community.	5	4	3	2	1
37.	There are so many different demands for reforms from the administration, the Board, the Department of Education, and the community that it is difficult to know what changes, if any, should be occurring at this school.	5	4	3	2	1
38.	The community in which our school is located is essential in determining the values and beliefs, which are part of our school.	5	4	3	2	1
39.	The traditional values found in our community help to form the uniqueness of our school culture.	5	4	3	2	1
40.	Most of our school policies and initiatives are formulated by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
41.	Our principal has the final authority on any policy decisions made in the school.	5	4	3	2	1
42.	Our school's interests (at conferences, meetings with the community etc.) are usually represented by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
43.	Our principal actively consults with the staffs, who actively participate in the decision-making process.	5	4	3	2	1
44.	Our principal does not impose policies on the staff.	5	4	3	2	1
45.	During staff meetings, decisions are made based on the processes of consensus and consent by the entire staff.	5	4	3	2	1

46.	School policy initiatives are enacted by any staff member who is deemed best qualified to carry it out – regardless of their formal position in the school.	5 4 3 2 1
47.	In our school, certain groups who are supported by the administration usually get their way.	5 4 3 2 1
48.	In our school, the principal often has to settle disputes between various groups of teachers as to appropriate school policy.	5 4 3 2 1
49.	I believe this school can be run effectively with or without any formally designated administrative personnel.	5 4 3 2 1
50.	The principal of this school is unobtrusive and keeps a low profile.	5 4 3 2 1
51.	It is unclear whether our principal's actions affect student outcomes in a positive manner (e.g., examination marks, graduation rates etc.).	5 4 3 2 1
52.	Our principal has enacted such a large number of policies for change in the school that the staff is unclear on which ones may actually be of real importance.	5 4 3 2 1
53.	The principal has well formulated and articulated values and beliefs on the proper direction of this school.	5 4 3 2 1
54.	The principal makes known his/her views on the desired direction of the school to both the staff and the community.	5 4 3 2 1
55.	Our principal often stresses that this school should have a set of core values, which reflect the proper mission of the school.	5 4 3 2 1
		Male ☐ Female ☐

APPENDIX D

Formal Models

Central Features

- Formal models are descriptive and treats organizations as (open / closed) systems.
- Formal models give prominence to the official structure of the organization.
- The official structure is hierarchical.
- Schools are portrayed as goal seeking / goal-oriented organizations.
- Managerial decision-making is rational, logically aimed at achieving the organizations pre-set goals.
- Authority is stressed; it is a product of official position in the organization.
- There is an emphasis on accountability.

Components of Formal Models

Structural Theories

- There is a one-best-structure based on the particular context of the organization.
- Stability is assumed, and needs to be maintained.
- Problems in the organization (instability) can be resolved through better structures; personal preferences are subordinated to organizational rationality.
- Co-ordination and control are accomplished through authority and impersonal rules.

Systems Theories

- Stress the unity and integrity of the organization which, focus on the interaction of all the component parts and the environment.
- Strives for homeostasis and stability.

- Can be open (schools) or closed.

Bureaucratic Theories

- Hierarchical authority structure.
- Emphasises the goal-orientation of the organization.
- Stresses division of labour / differentiation and values expertise.
- Formal rules and regulations govern decisions and behaviour.
- Impersonal relationships and neutrality in decision-making are stressed.
- These theories have rational, meritocratic ideals.

Rational Theories

- Emphasises managerial processes and (individual decision-making).
- Focus is on objective, impartial facts.
- A normative theory of how administrators should make decisions.

Hierarchical Theories

- Stress vertical relationships within the organization and the accountability of individuals to their superiors.
- Communication is top-down.

Goals

- The organization is goal-oriented, and it pursues specific objectives.
- Goals are set directly by the "leaders" and everyone else works toward meeting those goals.
- Personal goals are subordinated to organizational goals.

Organizational Structure

- The organizational structure is an immutable, objective fact.
- Individual behaviour is determined by the individuals position / role in the organizational structure.

External Environment

- Can be a "closed system" which is unresponsive to environmental influences.
- Can be an "open system" which is responsive to a changing environment.

Leadership

- Leadership is ascribed based on formal position within the organization.
- The formal leader sets objectives and policy and the subordinates follow (top-down management).
- The leader has ultimate authority and knowledge.

Limitations Identified

- Schools are not necessarily goal oriented
- Decision-making is rarely a strictly rational process

- There is too much emphasis on the organization (structure) and not enough on the individual (agency) - it espouses a structural determinism
- It focuses on official authority, and a top-down management process which does not acknowledge conflict and ignores professional independence of employees (e.g. teachers)
- It assumes bureaucratic stability - it is incompatible with rapid change

Collegial Models

Central Features

- It is strongly normative in orientation - claimed to be the most effective manner in which to run schools: "It is an idealistic model rather than one that is founded in practice (p. 53).
- It is appropriate for organizations with "professional" staff.
- Assumes a common set of values held by all members of the organization - co-operation and harmony are optimistically expected.
- Decision-making (e.g., as to organizational goals) is made in-group settings wherein all members understand the organizations objectives and all contribute to policy formation in a participative process.
- Decisions are reached via consensus and this nullifies conflict.

Goals

- The staff has commonality in terms of their view on organizational goals.
- The staff is able to agree on the aims and goals of the organization.

Organizational Structure

- The structure is taken as a given, and has a clear meaning for all members of the institution.
- The structure leads to "lateral" decision-making (participative).
- Authority is based more on knowledge/experience than on formal position.

External Environment

- Generally not directly responsive to external influences.
- There is ambiguity as to who is accountable / responsible for decisions.
- Causes conflict of interests in the nominal leaders - they are supposed to be accountable to external forces for decisions reached; yet they are not directly responsible in the formation of the decision.

Leadership

- The leader is "first among equals" in a professional setting; their duties are to negotiate and facilitate the development of consensus and consent among the decision-making group.
- They are responsive to the needs and input from their professional colleagues.
- The creation of formal/informal opportunities for the testing and elaboration of policy initiatives is expected.
- The authority of expertise over formal position is emphasized; thus the leader acts as a facilitator in a participative management process.

Limitations Identified

- The collegial model is too normative - it obscures rather than portrays reality.

- It is a slow and cumbersome process.
- The emphasis on consensus is not always achieved in practice - it ignores conflict.
- It can be negated by the real structural/hierarchical constraints found in the organization.
- Places leaders in a position of dual loyalty accountable to external governing bodies and responsible for collegial decision-making: accountability lessons the impact of collegiality.
- The proper attitude of the staff is vital; therefore if the wrong "attitude" is present then the leader is powerless to enact effective collegiality.
- The proper attitude/support from the administrator is vital also, and the wrong administrator can override the efforts of a collegial staff.

Political Models

Central Features

- It is a descriptive model.
- Focuses on group activity as the basic unit of analysis.
- It is concerned with interests and interest groups.
- Stresses the prevalence of conflict in organizations; groups pursue their own goals which may be different from other groups or even the organizations thus conflict is not only inevitable but also welcome in that it can promote change.
- Organizational goals are unstable, ambiguous and contested.

- Organizations are political arenas in which decisions emerge from a complex process of bargaining and negotiation; thus decisions on policy are subject to conflict and change
- "Power" is a central concept - the individual/group that holds it sets the organisation's goals.

Political Strategies Administrators Use in Education

- Divide and rule is a common strategy.
- Co-optation: involve the opposition in the decision-making process.
- Displacement: use overt policies to mask the real (alternative) purposes of a policy.
- Control information for power.
- Control the agenda of meetings.
- Uses "exchange theory": use rewards / favouritism for appropriate actions.

Goals

- The focus is on sub-unit, or group goals.
- Group conflict means that goals are contested, unstable, and ambiguous.
- Those who have the most political power set organizational goals.

Organizational Structure

- Structure arises from the process of bargaining and negotiation and is subject to change.

- The established structure serves to meet the interests of the most powerful group in the organization.

External Environment

- External influences (interest groups) on internal decision-making are emphasized.
- The organization is an integral component of the larger environment.

Leadership

- Leaders are key participants in the process of bargaining and negotiation: they employ their own power to advance their own values, interests and policy goals
- Strategies used to control the decision-making process in schools include determining the agenda of meetings, controlling the contents of discussion documents, promoting and favouring teachers with the same interests.
- Leaders also need to build coalitions, mediate conflicts and attain concessions and compromise in order to sustain some stability and the long term viability of the organization

Limitations Identified

- It is strictly a descriptive / explanatory theory of organizational life, it does not offer valid prescriptions of what individuals "should" do.
- Focuses too much on power, conflict and manipulation at the group level and undervalue the structure.

- Too much stress on the influence of interest groups on decision-making, and not enough on the institutional level.
- Too much emphasis on conflict; devalues the possibility of professional collaboration /collegiality.
- Difficult to distinguish political behaviour from normal bureaucratic and collegial activities and it is a cynical perspective on these administrative actions.

Subjective Models

Central Features

- Stated to be a normative model.
- Focus on the beliefs / perceptions of individuals within organizations.
- Focus on the meanings placed on phenomena by individuals (basis in phenomenology).
- Organizations are understood through the interpretations people place on external observations of events in an organization.
- There are multiple interpretations and multiple realities in organizations - "there is no ultimate reality about organizations, only a constant state of flux." (p. 96).
- The particular values background and experiences of every individual shapes the nature of the meanings they place on specific events.

- There is a lack of consensus and often conflict in organizations as to the perceived goals and administrators are not neutral / rational - they represent values and also impose them.
- Structure is not a pre-determined, objective fact, people define the structure through their interactions (basis in symbolic interactionism and constructionism) - organizations are social constructions.
- Individual behaviour reflects personal values and goals.
- The organization is not recognised as a valid entity outside of what individuals perceive it to be.

Goals

- The emphasis is on the goals of the individual rather than the objectives of the organization.
- Individuals seek to accomplish their own personal aims within the organization, which may or may not be in consonance with those attributed to the organization.
- Organizational goals are nothing more than the stated policy of those with power in the organization, therefore the notion of the organization having goals is misleading.

Organizational Structure

- Structure does not exist as an objective fact, it is the outcome of the interaction of individuals.
- Structure is a constructed reality - individual's relationships and behaviour form it.
- Structure, in itself, is of little interest in affecting organizational interaction.

External Environment

- Since "organizations" are not considered real, viable entities, the role of environment on the organization is bypassed.
- The environment does, however, have an impact on the individuals which make up the organization, and as such individuals are responsive and accountable to external forces.

Leadership

- Leaders have their own values / beliefs and pursue their own interests.
- Leaders are often able to impose their own phenomenological interpretations on other members of the organization.
- Leadership derives from personal qualities and skills, not from formal authority.

Limitations Identified

- The model is too normative, it is too ideological in its prescriptions (NB: My view is that subjective models are descriptive to a certain extent. Merely because the model is not empirical in nature does not mean that it is not descriptive. By using its own methods (phenomenology, symbolic interaction) it has produced its own valid description of reality. In any case, all the models have very distinctive ideological bases - be it scientism or subjectivity - and to criticise one theory only as being "ideological" is misleading).

- Organizations are not acknowledged as having any implicit reality, and it is consequently very difficult to analyse organizations in any capacity.
- Complete subjectivity is not valid - there are patterns, generalisations and laws to be found in organizational analysis.
- A major criticism is that on its own, subjective models provide few guidelines for administrators. It focuses too much on all individuals in the organization. This is detrimental to a proper emphasis on administrators.

Ambiguity Models

Central Features

- It is a descriptive model.
- It is a prevalent feature of complex organizations such as schools, particularly in times of rapid change (the organization is viewed as chaotic / anarchistic).
- There is a lack of clarity about the goals of the organization. Goals are inconsistent, and so vague that any behaviour is justifiable.
- Organizational members are professional and they interpret and implement the organizational goals in their own particular manner.
- There is no consistent pattern of aims and goals.
- Organizations have problematic technology. The process of attaining desired outcomes is not adequately understood.

- Fragmentation and loose coupling are the norm. Sub-units may have intra-cohesion, but links and unity with other subgroups are problematic.
- Loose coupling is consistent with organizations in which members have a substantial degree of autonomy.
- Organizational structure is complex, inconsistent and policies and decision making are not structured from the top down.
- There is fluid participation in the management of the organization; anyone can potentially move in or out of the decision-making process.
- Signals emanating from the external environment are acknowledged as being ambiguous /contradictory.
- There is unplanned decision –making. "Rather, the lack of agreed goals means that decisions have no clear focus. Problems, solutions and participants interact and choices somehow emerge from the confusion." (Bush, 1995, p. 116).
- Decentralisation is portrayed as an advantage leading to more appropriate decision-making.
- Ambiguity models are analytical / descriptive - claim to mirror reality rather than suggesting how organizations should operate.

Goals

- Goals are problematic in nature (objectives are not clear at any level identified).
- These unclear goals are inadequate guides for behaviour.

- "Ambiguity theorists argue that decision-making represents an opportunity for discovering goals rather than promoting policies based on existing objectives." (Bush, 1995, p. 120)

Organizational Structure

- Structure is also problematic in a loosely coupled organization - it is ambiguous and subject to change.

External Environment

- Also ambiguous, since organizations including schools have to be responsive to the demands of the environment. This is placed in the context of the commodification of education, as a result of education reforms in Britain.

Leadership

- Ambiguity of purpose (organizational goals are unclear).
- Ambiguity of power (administrator's level of "power" is unclear).
- Ambiguity of experience (practice in one circumstance may not be applicable to another context, the administrator cannot learn from past experiences).
- Ambiguity of success means that it is (difficult to measure achievement).
- Strategies for leadership: Participative- involves time, persistence, co-optation of opposing staff into the decision-making process, and overloading the system with ideas and policies in the hope that some will be implemented Concentrate on structural and personal matters - select proper staff to fit into the desired structure.

- Leaders act as catalysts, often operating behind the scenes and by methods of stealth.

Limitations Identified

- Too little of an acknowledgement of the formal rules and regulations in the structure and hierarchy of the organization.
- Is an exaggeration of the degree of uncertainty in any institution.
- Does not appropriately describe stable organizations.
- Offers little practical guidance to leaders except to be unobtrusive.

Cultural Models

Central Features

- Cultural models may be both operational (descriptive) and normative.
- Focus on the values and beliefs of members of organizations; these values underpin individual behaviour within organizations.
- It assumes (or prescribes) the existence of a common / dominant culture in the organization as a result of common values and beliefs.
- Shared norms and meanings are developed leading to behavioural norms and cultural distinctions.
- Culture is typically expressed through symbols, rituals and ceremonies, which are used to support existent beliefs and norms; there are conceptual/verbal, behavioural, and visual/material norms.

- Heroes/heroines exist in the organization that embodies the values and beliefs of the organization (leaders).
- The informal aspects of the organization (values, symbols etc.) are emphasized over the formal aspects.
- Culture serves to define the unique qualities of individual organizations.

Goals

- The culture of the organization is expressed through its goals.
- The culture (values and beliefs) is mutually / reciprocally supportive of organizational goals and purposes in which values support goals, and goals shape values.
- The culture helps to determine a vision for the organization; this is essentially a rational process of forming organizational goals built on a framework of values.

Organizational Structure

- Structure is a physical manifestation of the culture (shared beliefs and values) of the organization; structure is a result of "cultural" construction.
- The roles of individuals and groups are delineated by their role in role in the structure as designed through the culture of the organization.

External Environment

- The values and beliefs of the organization are derived in large part from the effect of the external environment on the staff.

Leadership

- "The leader in the organization has the main responsibility for developing and sustaining its culture" (Bush, 1995, p. 137).
- Leaders have well formulated / articulated values and beliefs, and are expected to symbolise and embody the culture of the organization.
- They have to maintain and uphold the culture.
- "Leaders have the main responsibility for generating and sustaining culture and communicating its core values and beliefs both within the organization and to external stakeholders" (p. 138).

Limitations Identified

- This model condones the imposition of a culture by leaders on other members of the organization; can lead to ideological manipulation and control.
- "Shared cultures may be simply the shared values of leaders imposed on less powerful participants" (p. 139).
- Can be mechanistic/deterministic assuming the leader can determine and impose the proper culture on the organization.

APPENDIX E

Draft of Survey Development, Bush's Six Models: Table of Constructs and Number of Items (J. Brown & B. Sheppard, 1997)

Models	Goals and Decision-Making	Structure	External Environment	Leadership	Total # of Questions
Formal	1	3	3	3	10
Collegial	2	1	1	4	8
Political	3	3	2	2	10
Ambiguous	4	2	1	3	10
Subjective	2	1	2	1	6
Cultural	3	3	2	3	11
# of Questions	16	15	11	18	55

APPENDIX F

Disclosure and Consent Form
Educational Research

To The Teacher and Principal as Research Participant

This consent form requests your participation in a study related to models of leadership. It assures that your participation is completely voluntary and that your responses will be strictly confidential.

Purpose

The purpose of the proposed research is to determine whether or not the categorization of the six models of leadership: formal, political, collegial, structural, cultural and ambiguity, described by Bush are useful for analyzing models of leadership in schools. The data collected in this research study will also be useful in determining whether there is a prevailing model of leadership in the four schools to be studied.

Procedure

Each teacher and administrator will be asked to take 15-20 minutes of their time to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire contains sixty items. The items measure four constructs of goals and decision-making, structure, external environment and leadership, as pertaining to the six models of leadership under study.

Researcher

Diana Durdle, Graduate Student, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland

Thesis Supervisors

Dr. Jean Brown and Dr. Bruce Sheppard, Memorial University of Newfoundland

Risks

There are no physical or psychological risks, or discomforts, inherent in this study.

Right of Refusal or Withdrawal

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline response to any item on the questionnaire or opt out at any time without prejudice. If during the research, you should need to consult a resource person other than myself, Dr. Patricia Canning, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Research and Development is available (737-3402).

Confidentiality

Anonymity of individuals is assured both while the research is in progress and in the final report. The district administration and the school principal have approved the research study and the methodology. Also, please be assured that this study meets the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education and Memorial University of Newfoundland. You are assured that your anonymity will be protected and that all records of your participation in this research will be kept confidential unless your written permission for release is obtained.

Results

The results of this research will be available to you, upon request, after the study is concluded.

Agreement to Participate

If you agree to participate in the study as described above, please indicate your consent by signing the attached form. Please return signed forms to the researcher through your school secretary.

Sincerely,

_____

Diana E. Durdle

APPENDIX G

Statement of Understanding and Consent

I, _____, understand the purpose of the research study outlined above and recognize the request for involvement that is being made of me relative to the described methodology. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice. I understand that the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Director of the School Board District, and the school principal has approved the project. I understand that confidentiality of all information relative to participants, the school and the school district is assured.

Signed_____ Date_____

Please detach and retain lower portion for your own personal records.

Statement of Understanding and Consent

I, _____, understand the purpose of the research study outlined above and recognize the request for involvement that is being made of me relative to the described methodology. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice. I understand that the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Director of the School Board District, and the school principal has approved the project. I understand that confidentiality of all information relative to participants, the school and the school district is assured.

Signed_____ Date_____