

A STUDY OF THE LEADERSHIP APPROACH THAT
FACILITATES ADOPTION OF SCHOOL COUNCILS

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

LORRAINE DEVEREAUX



A Study of the Leadership Approach that Facilitates Adoption of
School Councils.

by

Lorraine Devereaux

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Education

Department of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

1995

St. John's

Newfoundland

- Abstract -

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils. The project was accomplished in two different contexts by utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative research approaches. This study was conducted through the participation of fifteen schools. There were thirteen schools selected from Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada for the quantitative approach to the study. From this participant group, seven schools were involved in the implementation of school councils and six were not involved. In addition, two European schools were selected for the qualitative approach to the study based on a long history of site-based management and a recent more advanced form of site-based management having been introduced there.

This study examines the attitudes of school council members toward power sharing, with particular emphasis on the degree of principal dominance the stakeholders feel should exist. It also highlights the leadership approach that is best suited to successful implementation of school councils in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

The findings show that in the European environment the degree of principal dominance that school council members feel should exist is different than the principals' viewpoint. It appears, from the European case studies, that feelings toward dominance can be affected by leadership approach. The study conducted in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador reveals

that school council members and teachers perceive those principals who are involved in school councils as having a leadership approach that is more highly developed than principals who are not involved. Involved principals are perceived to be more transformational in their leadership approach - more open to change - and therefore more open to adopting this new site-based management theory as their own.

These findings have implications for the continued training of principals who are involved in school council implementation and their school council members. Even more importantly, however, this study highlights the need for training noninvolved potential school council implementers, principals and school council members, who will also, undoubtedly, be charged with the responsibility for effective school council implementation in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Bruce Sheppard, for teaching me the meaning of challenge. Without his continued guidance, support and encouragement, this thesis would not be possible. Special thanks is extended to Dr. Clar Doyle, my committee member, and to Dr. Frank Riggs, who supervised my study abroad, for their significant contributions to my work. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the late Dr. Austin Harte, whose initial professional advice and encouragement stirred my interest in the topic of School Councils.

I wish to recognize with appreciation the cooperation of the school district superintendents, principals, teachers and present and future school council members of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. Due to confidentiality, I cannot name those other participants in my study, however, the support received from those educators in Europe who gave freely of their time and shared their school council experiences with me is deeply appreciated.

Thanks is extended to my husband, Neil and to my children, Neala, Lesley and Marc for their love and tolerance while the thesis was being compiled. Many thanks to Mom and my family for their support. I wish to extend my gratitude and special thanks to my sister-in-law Joan, for her continuous support and encouragement throughout the entire process.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Content.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii

CHAPTER	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Background to the Problem.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	14
2. Review of the Literature.....	15
Bureaucracy.....	16
Site-based Management.....	18
Leadership for Site-based Management.....	20
Summary	28
Research Questions	31
3. Methodology.....	32
Methodological Approach and Sample.....	32
Hypotheses.....	37

CHAPTER	Page
3. Instruments.....	38
4. Presentation and Analysis of Data.....	46
Discussion of Reliability.....	46
Descriptive Statistics.....	47
Presentation and Analysis.....	52
Hypothesis One.....	52
Principal One.....	53
Principal Two.....	69
Hypothesis Two.....	86
Principal One.....	88
Principal Two.....	99
Hypothesis Three.....	117
5. Discussion of Results and Implications.....	120
Discussion.....	120
Summary and Conclusions.....	127
Recommendations.....	130
References.....	133

CHAPTER	Page
Appendices.....	142
Appendix A.....	143
Permission to conduct research.....	144
Appendix B.....	145
Letter to school board superintendents.....	146
Appendix C.....,	148
Disclosure and Consent Form.....	149
Appendix D.....	152
Principal's package.....	153
Teacher's package.....	157
School Council Member's package.....	159
Appendix E.....	161
Follow-up letter sent to principals.....	162
Appendix F.....	163
Permission to use survey instruments.....	164
Appendix G.....	166
Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices - Self.....	167
Principal Interview Schedule adapted from Kouzes and Posner survey instruments.....	171
Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices - Other....	177
Others Interview Schedule adapted from Kouzes and Posner survey instruments.....	181
Appendix H.....	188
Chapman Survey Instrument - Relationships Between Principals and Members of School Councils: An Attitude Scale.....	189
Chapman's Interview Schedule.....	193

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Indices for Leadership Practices Inventory: Self and Others (Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 194)	40
2.	Leadership Practices Inventory Subscales.....	42
3.	Internal Consistency Reliability of Subscales Leadership Practices Inventory: Self and Others.....	48
4.	Internal Consistency Reliability of Subscales Relationships Between Principals and Members of School Councils: An Attitude Scale.....	49

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Overview

A growing awareness of the need for substantial change in the education system currently appears to be the general consensus of many researchers (Barth, 1991; Glickman, 1990; Fullan, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1994). Working under the guise of traditional management theory is no longer adequate to bring about the necessary changes. Escalating technological advances and increased educator accountability have prompted government officials, educators and researchers to look for new ways to enhance the quality of schooling. This, according to Etheridge and Hall (1992), David (1991), Leonard (1991) and Paxton (1992), means moving away from the traditional, hierarchical system of organizational management found in schools today. The contemporary site-based management theory which advocates a shift from centralization to decentralization where decisions affecting the school are made at the local level has been highlighted as the next needed educational reform by researchers such as Herman and Herman (1992), Hill, Bonan and Warner (1992), Midgley and Wood (1993) and Prasch (1990).

To make this transition in management approach, the essential role of the school principal as change agent is widely recognized (Mahon, 1991; Hannay, 1992; Haugley and Rowley, 1991; Keedy and Finch, 1994). As a consequence of the importance attached to the principal's role, training and professional

development for these educators is regarded as an essential prerequisite to facilitating the adoption of site-based management (Bailey, 1991; Peeler, 1991; Tranter, 1992; Thurston, Clift and Schact, 1993).

Realization that a shift in organizational management theory also requires a change in leadership paradigms is of utmost importance for the success of site-based management. The hierarchical authoritarian leadership approach that accompanies traditional organizational management theory does not reflect the realities of today's world. It is out of step with the widely acclaimed site-based management model. Bass, Waldman, Avolio and Bebb (1987), Brown (1994), Kouzes and Posner (1995), Leithwood (1992), and Sheppard (1993), all recognize that the transformational leadership approach is steadily emerging as leadership for change. The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education [The Royal Commission] (1992) maintains that,

each leader must have a sense of purpose and a clear vision of where the system can and should be going. Good leaders and strong leadership can also inspire others to be creative and can help to foster a new working environment built on trust, openness, respect and collaboration. Every effort must be made to ensure that this kind of leadership is distributed throughout the education system. (p. 211)

As the current wave of reform unfolds, school leadership approach could very likely be the contributing factor that will determine the success or demise of site-based management theory.

The Royal Commission (1992) suggests that the present school system of Newfoundland and Labrador, which was conceived for a

vastly different nineteenth century society, needs substantial readjustment. It contends that in Newfoundland and Labrador the widely held traditional, hierarchical views of schooling must be replaced by a collaborative approach. Through site-based management in the form of school councils, all groups who are affected by educational decisions at the school level are encouraged to participate in the process of making them. House (1992) contends this school council model,

mobilizes all resources in the school community, taking advantage of the special knowledge and expertise of administrator, parent, teacher and student, to formulate goals for the school that meet its needs and have the support of all those affected by the decisions. The shared ownership of those goals and decisions leads to shared responsibility for the results. (p. 50)

Although The Royal Commission (1992) admits awareness of the scepticism of many school administrators about the value of school councils, it is also convinced that parents must play a key role in the direction taken by schools. The Steering Committee on School Council Implementation (Steering Committee) (1994) informs that government, "will introduce legislation that will require principals to ensure the establishment and operation of school councils" (p. 9). In order to ensure the success of school council implementation, House (1992) contends that principals must be trained to become advocates for parental involvement. School principals in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador must come to the awareness that,

properly implemented, (the school council model) will bring the wisdom and skills of parents into the school system in a significant way, it will create new relationships between the school and its community, it will result in a new

partnership of co-operation and mutual trust, and it will infuse the community with a new understanding and respect for the educational concerns of teachers. (p. 233)

Statement of the Problem

It is in the context of the above-noted research (The Royal Commission, 1992; House, 1992; Steering Committee, 1994) which underscores the importance of school leadership in the successful implementation of site-based management, that this study is proposed. Given that school councils are to be implemented in schools throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, the general purpose of this study is to focus on leadership needs related to that implementation.

This study is based on an assumption, supported by research, which suggests that without a shift in leadership approach from the traditional paradigm, school councils may be little more than a move from one power base to another (American Association of School Administrators, 1994; Conley and Bacharach, 1990; Fullan, 1993; Nova Scotia Department of Education, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1990; The Royal Commission, 1992). Both The Royal Commission (1992) and the Collins (1995) report on the school council project note concerns relative to the potential dangers of council domination by the principal. The Steering Committee (1994) corroborates these concerns, affirming, "resistance to sharing power is perhaps the greatest barrier to change" (p. 7-8). In order to provide for successful implementation of school councils in the site-based managed environment proposed,

principals and council members must be less tolerant of principal domination. Within this context, the specific purpose of this research is to determine the relationship among the following factors: the principal's leadership approach, the principals' beliefs towards the degree of influence that they should have in school councils, and the beliefs of other council members towards the degree of influence that principals should have in school councils.

Background to the Problem

Rising concern for greater school productivity requires educators and researchers to reflect on the past and probe into the future in search of ways to promote more effective schooling. Guthrie (1986) highlights the contemporary site-based management theory as a viable alternative to bureaucracy and contends it is the next needed educational reform. Herman (1990) describes site-based management as based on the premise that the quality of education, focused at the school level, advocates empowering stakeholders, allowing them to make important decisions related to the operation of their school. This, he believes, will result in quality improvements.

In the literature on site-based management, the terms site-based management, school-based management and school councils are used interchangeably since each refers to management at the local school level. Thus, these terms are used synonymously in this study. Prasch (1990) suggests that school-based management is,

"grassroots restructuring, a bottom-up approach that depends on local adoption of reform ideas" (p. 2). Hoyle (1992) posits that, "site-based management is the process in which the people who must implement the decision make the decision" (p. 81). Principal, teachers and parents now come to the forefront and are given the autonomy through school-based management to affect educational change.

Site-based management which appears to be helping improve the quality of education in many countries of the world involves shifts in the centralization/decentralization continuum. Caldwell, Smilanich, & Spinks (1988) fittingly named these decentralized schools "self-managing".

Caldwell et al. (1988) provide a comprehensive review of site-based management around the world which suggests that it is a commonly accepted avenue for change. They conclude that recent trends in Canada indicate there is increased decentralization in most provinces as well as a trend to school-based planning and participative decision making. The Edmonton Public School District has become a model for development. They have had a decentralized approach to allocation of resources, including school-based planning, for more than a decade.

In England, The Education Act (1980) made statutory provision for elected parent and teacher governors on school governing bodies. This act stated that,

parent governors must be elected by the parents of registered pupils at the school, and, at the time of their election, they must have registered pupils there. Teacher governors must be elected by teachers at the

school, and, at the time of their election, they must be on the teaching staff themselves. In addition, the head teacher is an ex-officio governor unless he or she chooses otherwise. (p. 26)

The Education Reform Act of 1988 introduced and advocated British schools to accept a new freedom which encouraged schools to be completely site-based managed. Davies and Anderson (1992) contend that there is, "nothing so radical as the grant maintained movement in the UK" (p. 4). In addition, recent attention in England and Wales is focused on local management of school finances which incorporates several mechanisms that are designed to increase choice and diversity for parents and students. Ranson and Tomlinson (1986) state that there is a redefinition of traditional balance of autonomy, power and accountability in education.

In Australia, the traditional pattern of centralized control is diminishing. For example, in Victoria, school councils, representative of parents, teachers and secondary school students, have power within government guidelines to determine educational policies and school budgets. There is a shift of staff from central office to regional offices which attempts to provide stronger support and direction to schools in a highly devolved system (Caldwell et al., 1988).

There is also a decentralizing trend evident in several European countries. Care and Lafond (1986) found that in France the Decentralization Act has encouraged more decision making at the school level. According to Ricatti (1986), boards of education in Italy are attempting to, "encourage decentralized

initiative focused on local needs while maintaining a centralized approach to overall policy decision making" (p. 186). Stego (1986) described a decentralization trend in Sweden, while Gielen (1986) reported from The Netherlands that the, "administrative system as a whole is a rare mixture of a rather large degree of decentralization and a similar large degree of strict directives from the state" (p. 254).

A recent report of The Nova Scotia Department of Education (1994) reaffirms that site-based management continues to gain momentum as a change process. This review provides a current update on involvement in site-based management. All European community countries now have school councils with the exception of Portugal and some areas of Germany. These councils often select or assist in selecting the principal. The size and composition of these councils vary. For example, in Spain, Portugal, Greece and Luxembourg, the number of parents is equal to or slightly less than teachers; in France and Italy, there is equal representation of parents and teachers; and in Belgium, Denmark, Ireland and Scotland, parents always form the majority. As cited in a Nova Scotia Department of Education (1994) document, the New Zealand Education Act of 1989 outlined a school governance system based upon an elected board of trustees. This board, because it controls the total school budget and can control personnel, including some salary provisions, seems to have greater power than any other council studied.

In the United States, over forty states have some form of

school council operating or being piloted. In Canada, provinces such as Saskatchewan, Alberta, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and more recently Nova Scotia and Newfoundland have joined the long list of believers in the power of school councils.

Obviously, there is much consensus that site-based management can affect the change vitally needed to refurbish today's educational system. English (1989) contends it promises to, "unlimber school systems from excessive bureaucratic requirements, buck passing to higher levels, promotion systems that drive out new people and new ideas, and accountability systems that breed paperwork instead of improvement" (p. 1). The common thread in all these management developments has been a shifting of power for decision making from a central authority to the local school level. This thread also holds the fabric for the proposed school council model in Newfoundland and Labrador.

A myriad of problems presently confront school systems in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The Royal Commission (1992) admonishes there are several contributing factors that indicate restructuring is required. "Declining enrolments, demands for access to governance from groups not now enfranchised, pressures to increase achievement levels and decreasing financial resources have created new demands for change which cannot be ignored" (p. xv). Given these conditions and recognizing the need for change, The Royal Commission (1992) emphasizes that even though, "there is no greater challenge facing our province than ensuring that our children obtain the skills,

knowledge and abilities essential to survival in a fast changing highly competitive world, the challenge is not insurmountable" (p. xix).

To address the demands for access to educational governance from these groups who requested political rights, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has proposed legislation on the adoption of school councils by each and every school in the province. The school council which advocates decentralized authority over the management of local schools reflects a fundamental change in process from a vertical or 'top down' bureaucratized, authoritarian structure to a more flattened, horizontal one of collaboration and shared decision making.

The Royal Commission (1992) describes this school council model as one that incorporates all groups who are affected by educational decision making, including principal, teachers, parents, community leaders and students. It invites them to actively participate and encourages those closest to schooling to make more of the important choices. Since greater authority attaches itself to the school, The Royal Commission (1992) contends that, "the primary decision maker, the principal, in relation to the school board, becomes a much more influential figure" (p. 204).

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador recognizes that while it has the power to, "establish the basic goals, set standards and provide resources and structures, however in the final analysis the system cannot be changed from the top down"

(Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994a, p. 7). They also maintain that the principles which guide reform of the education system are intended to represent a balance between top-down and bottom-up reforms. Thus, provincial level legislation appears acceptable while more direct local level responsibility is simultaneously assigned through school-based management in the form of school councils. The Newfoundland Department of Education (1990) contends that most Canadian initiatives, "reflect the current philosophy that the individual school is the most promising vehicle for change, and voluntarism is preferable to coercion" (p. 36). A report entitled Adjusting the Course Part 11 acknowledges that the school is the primary unit for implementing change and improving the quality of education (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994a, p. 20). The Royal Commission (1992) points out that recent studies indicate schools flourish when groups that collectively pursue a common cause are given the power to initiate change and face together the complex forces which are influential in teaching and learning (p. 222).

The school principal and staff must be key players in creating an effective school (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994a). Guthrie (1986) identified leadership as a crucial factor in school effectiveness maintaining that, "a school with a weak principal almost never remains effective very long" (p. 306).

With an added awareness of effective school characteristics, along with the changing roles of local as well as district

administrators, our educators forge ahead with school council implementation. They have been forewarned in Adjusting the Course Part 11 however, that, "the quality of education can only be improved if all those responsible can agree on basic principles and work together for the ultimate benefit of our children and our society" (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994a, p. 33).

In Adjusting the Course...An Information Bulletin there is admission that,

a reform program of the magnitude envisaged by the Commission can be expected to affect a number of established interests within the system. It is hoped that, as far as possible, consensus can be achieved among the various major interest groups on the directions to be taken. Short of consensus, it is hoped that various groups will place the broader public interest ahead of their own agendas. (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1993, p. 1)

A subsequent Adjusting the Course Bulletin maintains that since greater responsibility for school operations and the provision of educational leadership will be devolved to the school level, substantial changes in both the functioning and structure of district offices will be required (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994b). The Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (1994) in their report entitled Adjusting the Course: An Analysis contends that,

the line of authority from the school board office to schools and from government to schools via the school board offices must be clean and efficient. Administrative barriers to schools must be removed, and all groups must understand lines of authority as they exist. (p. 2)

The most current government document on school council implementation by The Steering Committee (1994) entitled Working

Together for Educational Excellence has reiterated the concern expressed by both The Newfoundland Department of Education (1993, 1994a) and The Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (1994) over influence and power sharing.

Adopting a collaborative approach to education will entail more than structural changes. A change in the attitudes and expectations of administrators, teachers, parents, students and other community members is required. Those who now have the power to make decisions must recognize that others associated with the system can make important and valuable contributions to the learning environment. Resistance to sharing power is perhaps the greatest barrier to change. (Steering Committee on School Council Implementation, 1994, pp. 7-8)

It is recognized in the document entitled Adjusting the Course Part 11 that,

the term "myth of expertise" has sometimes been used to describe how professionals can isolate themselves from those they serve by their possession of knowledge not available to lay persons. (Newfoundland Department of Education, 1994a, p. 23)

Feelings of parents to approaching principals can range from intimidation to frustration at being unable to influence the system. The Newfoundland Department of Education (1994a) identifies the bureaucratic nature of the system as the cause of this isolation (p. 23).

The Royal Commission (1992) believes that, "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 leadership models, skills and potential leaders" (p. 211). Contemplating the successful implementation of school councils then, what type of leadership is considered competent to take our schools into a successful

site-based management system?

Significance of the Study

This study will identify the appropriate leadership approach required for the successful implementation of school councils. It will highlight the need for training of principals and school council members. It will identify differing views towards the degree of principal dominance that should help facilitate implementation of school councils.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Throughout many areas of the world countless cries are being heard from government officials and society at large for major change in the educational system. Literature has reiterated their call as researchers such as Fullan (1991), Sergiovanni (1994) and Barth (1990) suggest that change is not only necessary but imminent. Thus, it is well known that educators face uncertainty and shoulder a tremendous burden as we see technology steadily advancing and global society becoming increasingly complex (Wentz, 1989). It is little wonder, then that Kanter (1989), in addressing change, comments, "we are perched on a pendulum that is swinging back and forth faster and faster" (p. 13). Vaill (1989) confirms this statement and suggests that current change conditions are like living in a world of, "permanent white water" (p. 2). Fullan (1993) agrees with Senge (1990) that educators need 'a fundamental shift of mind'. He asserts that,

on the one hand, we have the constant and ever expanding presence of educational innovation and reform. On the other hand, however we have an education system which is fundamentally conservative. The way that teachers are trained, the way that schools are organized, the way that the educational hierarchy operates, and the way that education is treated by political decision-makers results in a system that is more likely to retain the status quo than to change. When change is attempted under such circumstances it results in defensiveness, superficiality or at best short-lived pockets of success. (p. 3)

This conservatism may indeed continue to exist.

Bureaucracy

Max Weber's (1947) bureaucracy theory has survived the test of time. With its traditional authoritative leadership trappings, bureaucracy, which promotes efficiency and productivity, continues to undergird organizational management systems. Its goal presently remains the focus as society, government and educators search for ways to obtain a better product from the school system. Silver's (1983) definition of bureaucracy as, "an organization that achieves the epitome of efficiency and rationality while resting on a bedrock of legitimacy" (p. 73) continues to hold credence even today.

Burns and Stalker (1961) introduced two major management systems - mechanistic and organic - that contrast bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic models. Hanson (1991), Bolman and Deal (1991), and Hoy (1994) allow for several functional management theories, highlighting bureaucracy as the traditional management model and suggesting organizations may resist fundamental change. As cited in Hanson (1991), Weber wrote, "bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge" (p. 20). Thus, Max Abbott's (1965) comment that, "the bureaucratic model is the one most administrators adopt" still holds much credibility today as bureaucrats clamber to keep abreast of rules and regulations in an effort to hold their expertise, "over those who have not bothered to learn them" (Knoop, 1992, p. 17). It is fitting then when Knoop (1992) declares, "one way of gaining power is to

become a bureaucrat" (p. 16). Morgan's (1989) claim that people wish to cling to the hierarchical model suggests that bureaucracy holds the promise of stability and security for those who prefer to work under its umbrella.

The traditional authoritarian leadership approach that partners with bureaucracy theory is presented by both French and Raven (1959), and Abbott and Caracheo (1988). It illustrates a bureaucratic view of power which advocates power as domination over others. French and Raven (1959) identify five types of power - reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power. Expert power, like the other traditional power sources encompasses administrator domination over subordinates. It is achieved when another perceives one as being knowledgeable in a particular area.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that leadership theory began with the 'Great Man' theory which saw power being vested in the very few who, through inheritance, became leaders. Next came the 'Big Bang' theory, which shifted belief from, "leaders are born, not made, to leaders are made by the situation, not born" (p. 256). Because these theories were seen to be flawed, Hoy and Miskel (1991) suggest they were replaced by the contingency approach which upholds the notion that circumstances dictate which type of leadership is effective. Sergiovanni (1992) contends that,

the literature in educational administration ... is heavily influenced by the belief that schools are formal organizations. And today's prescriptions for school leadership are based on that assumption. (p. 41)

Taking into account the focus of traditional management and leadership styles, it is not inconceivable that Kanter (1989) would write, "clearly, the bureaucratic pattern must go. But what do we replace it with?" (p. 309).

Site-based Management

According to Hoy & Miskel (1991) the site-based management model is a far cry from the traditional, bureaucratic, pyramid management model where the organization has the right to command and the employees have the duty to obey (p. 78). Conley and Bacharach (1990), stressing that in successful school-site management teachers are considered professionals, contend that,

if districts implement school-site management but site administrators adhere to a bureaucratic mode of management, schools will not develop into the flexible and innovative organizations for which the reform reports clearly call. Only through the participation of all professional colleagues in the school can this type of management truly be successful. (p. 542)

Conley and Bacharach (1990) also maintain that without teacher participation in decision making, "school-site management will be no more successful than any other system of centralized control" (p.542). Glickman (1991) maintains that in most schools,

the leaders think that to empower teachers will lead to anarchy and evil, and most of the teachers think that administrators and supervisors who talk about empowerment are giving paternalistic lip service to listening to their suggestions rather than truly sitting with them as co-equals in real decisions. (p. 9)

Stimson and Applebaum (1988) corroborate Glickman's statement suggesting that, "teachers too often complain that they are powerless - that they are at the end of a pipeline in which they

are told what and when to teach and test, with virtually no input" (p. 314). Consequently site-based management with its promise of shared decision making is fittingly described by English (1989) as, "an excellent antidote to bureaucracy" (p. 3).

Gardner (1990) suggests that,

leaders differ markedly among themselves in how they use their power. Some employ it to create a climate of coercion and intimidation; others employ it simply as a useful supplement to their persuasive gifts, and foster a climate of cooperation and willing support. (p. 57)

Keedy and Finch (1994) contend that, "a rethinking of power, school-site management, and shared governance are inseparable pieces in the school-restructuring formula" (p. 163). Dunlap and Goldman (1990) suggest that in addition to the traditional power Abbott and Caracheo (1988) found in schools, there is 'facilitative power'. They describe facilitative power as, "the ability to help others achieve a set of ends that may be shared, negotiated, or complementary. If dominance is power over someone, facilitative is power manifested through someone" (p. 3). Dunlap and Goldman (1990) maintain that facilitative power, "reduces tight links between power and status, minimizing claims to legitimacy based primarily on either organizational setting or professional expertise" (p. 1). Akenhead (1991) contends that,

the art of enlightened management is the art of getting others into the decision-making act - and then making sure the act goes smoothly. It's called being a facilitator. The facilitator recognizes that when no one answer is the only right way to go, it's best to listen to all viewpoints, analyze the problem from every perspective and use multiple perspectives to resolve an issue. (p. 27)

This facilitative power is similar to site-based management in that it is based on the idea of shared decision making which requires power sharing. Sarason (1972) asserts that a collaborative effort is necessary for the success of site-based management since, "you cannot create the conditions which enable others to change unless those conditions exist for you" (p. xiv). With all this shared decision making and required power sharing that accompanies site-based management, one wonders then what leadership approach is necessary for its success.

Leadership for Site-based Management

"Good managers get things done. Great managers are able to accomplish impressive and monumental tasks. Leaders, on the other hand, tend to alter dramatically the attitudes of their followers who, in turn, through conviction, make significant things happen" (Conger, 1989). Bennis and Nanus (1985) concur with Conger's assessment that there is a difference between management and leadership suggesting, "managers are people who do the things right and leaders are people who do the right thing. The difference may be summarized as activities of vision and judgement - effectiveness versus activities of mastering routines - efficiency" (p. 21). Tichy and Devanna (1986) reiterate that, "managers are dedicated to the maintenance of the existing organization, whereas leaders are often committed to its change" (p. 28). Kouzes and Posner (1995) declare that, "one of the most glaring differences between the leader and the bureaucrat is the

leaders's inclination to encourage risk taking, to encourage others to step out into the unknown rather than play it safe" (p. 66).

Kouzes and Posner (1995) define leadership as, "the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations" (p. 30). DePree (1989) acclaims leadership is, "liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible" (p. 1). Foster's (1989) definition is, "leadership always has one face turned towards change, and change involves the critical assessment of current situations and an awareness of future possibilities" (p. 41). Burns (1978) defined two types of leaders. Transactional leaders are good managers who retain the status quo, accepting and working within the system as it is. Transformational leadership, in contrast, renews. The distinction between transactional and transformational leadership is significant as we examine the modern site-based management theory. Foster (1989) suggests that, "Burns' work has been a significant advance in leadership studies. He has looked at the idea of leadership from a moral and value-driven basis, and has not accepted a view of leadership as simply a managerial tool" (p. 40). Roueche, Baker and Rose (1989) contend that transactional leadership is one of exchange, a positive or negative payoff from the leader to the follower for a task completed or not completed as defined. Once the exchange is completed, there is no further need to interact unless another process of contingent reward is introduced. This leadership

style is structured, concerned only with efficient ideas and what will work, thus using the power of the position to reinforce (p. 24). Bennis and Nanus (1985) maintain that transformative leaders conversely,

assume responsibilities for reshaping organizational practices to adapt to organizational changes. They direct organizational changes that build confidence and empower their employees to seek new ways of doing things. They overcome resistance to change by creating visions of the future that evoke confidence in and mastery of new organizational practices. (p. 18)

Bass (1985) aptly articulates what higher-order changes such as implementation of effective site-based management requires.

Higher-order changes ... may involve large changes in attitudes, beliefs, values and needs. Quantum leaps in performance may be seen such as when a group is roused out of its despair by a new leader who articulates revolutionary new ideas about what may be possible. A new paradigm is introduced. More quantity is no longer enough; quality must improve dramatically. Leaders may help bring about a radical shift in attention. For instance, groups oriented toward traditional beliefs will be shifted so that they come to value modern approaches. (p. 4)

Sheppard (1993) links instructional leadership with transformational leadership, suggesting that, "models of effective leadership behaviours are developed to guide practice in the development of the desired characteristics of Teacher Commitment, Professional Involvement, and Innovativeness" (p. 213). Sergiovanni (1987), states that followers can be motivated to excel, for example, in schools,

... teachers decide to exceed the limits of the traditional work relationship.... In a sense they are drawn to higher levels of performance and commitment. Following Burns the leadership that evokes (such a) performance investment is that which transforms one's needs state from lower to higher by arousing different dimensions of human potential. Ultimately this leadership becomes moral in its tone and

direction enhancing both significance and meaning of work and life for both leader and followers. (pp. 9-10)

Collective action generated by transforming leaders then, encourages commitment, professional involvement and innovativeness, while empowering those who participate in the decision-making process. Brown (1993) recommends that change requires transformational leaders who respect others and provide opportunities for others to grow and be the best that they can be. Tichy and Devanna (1986) suggest that transformational leaders recognize the need for organizational revitalization, create a new vision and institutionalize change.

Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) and Leithwood (1992) also share the belief that transformational leadership is leadership for change. Roberts (1985) acclaims transformational leadership suggesting that it, "facilitates the redefinition of people's mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment" (p. 1024). Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) declare that change, under transformational leadership is, "the enhancement of individual and collective problem-solving capacities of organizational members" (p. 5). In site-based management this ability to involve others in decision making is a desirable leadership characteristic, however, Paxton (1992) asserts that, "only effective leaders secure in their position will share the power of decision making" and, "effective leaders are also team builders, building the web not the hierarchy" (p. 20).

A change in paradigms from authoritarian leadership with

domination power to transformational leadership with facilitative power involves changes in attitudes and beliefs. With transforming leaders Bennis and Nanus (1985) attest that what's important, "is not so much the exercise of power itself as the empowerment of others. Leaders are able to translate intentions into reality by aligning the energies of the organization behind an attractive goal" (pp. 224-225). Kouzes and Posner (1995) refer to transformational leadership as, "leadership that focuses on a committing style" suggesting,

the first essential for enlisting others is to find and to focus on the very best that the culture - group, organizational or national - shares in common and what that means to its members. This communion of purpose, this commemoration of our dreams, helps to bind us together. It reminds us of what it means to be a part of this collective effort. (p. 133)

Barth (1990) contends that with transformational leadership principal/teacher isolation is broken down, "enabling all members of the school community to contribute their strengths and share the power and the satisfaction - as well as the price - of influence" (p. 61). Fullan (1993) suggests that there is one justifiable generic vision, when pressing for change, that is schools working together to press for and support improvements. He also asserts that collaboration is indeed the key to effective schools where children are the beneficiaries. Nicholl (1986), in reference to relationship between leaders and followers believes,

our leaders must allow themselves - and us - to believe that followers are not passive.... They are, instead, the creators of energy. They are the architects of the open moments into which some people must be the first to step. As followers, they are the agents who show their leaders where to walk. They are the ones who validate their leaders

stepping out in a direction that has meaning for all of us.
(p. 34)

The American Association of School Administrators (1994) supports the concept of site-based management. It calls for a shift in principals' attitudes about accepting advice from local school councils and contends that replacement of defensiveness by attentive listening, thoughtful consideration, and professional expertise is of utmost importance. In a discussion paper on restructuring Nova Scotia's education system, it was stressed that,

the success of site-based management appears to be highly correlated to the knowledge and leadership skills of the principal. Implementation plans for site-based management require intensive and sustained management training and professional development programs for principals, especially in the areas of personnel, financial management and budgeting, strategic planning and shared decision-making. (Nova Scotia Department of Education, 1994, p. 37)

Krantz (1990) posits that to survive, organizations have to, "develop the capacity to change, learn, and adapt quickly and decisively" (p. 53). Unless there is a bridge built between traditional methods of organizational management and the proposed site-based management model, unanticipated problems of adjustment will undoubtedly surface. To avoid this situation, some principals will need professional training and development to ensure a smoother transition.

Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that,

change creates feelings of incompetence and insecurity. Training is one way to allay fears, adjust attitudes and increase the probability that needed improvements will succeed. Unless people have the confidence to do what change requires, they will resist the change or even

sabotage it, while awaiting the return of the good old days.
(p. 381)

Change requires new forms of leadership. Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1992) contend that, "for change to result in improvement, schools require expert leadership" (p. 4). Heller, Woodworth, Jacobson and Conway (1990) state that literature cites weak leadership at the building level as one of the major obstacles to implementing school-based management. Wood and Caldwell (1991), Levin (1992), Harrison, Killion, and Mitchell (1989), and Bailey (1991) collectively support the notion that investment in administrative training is a major prerequisite for the success of site-based management.

David (1989) suggests that, "under school based management, professional responsibility replaces bureaucratic regulation" (p. 45). Changing management structures from the centralized bureaucratic model to a more professionalized and decentralized system of site-based management appears to be a unifying concept for positive educational change. Sergiovanni (1994) maintains that, "changing the metaphor for the school from organization to community changes what is true about how schools should be organized and run, about what motivates teachers and students, and about what leadership is, and how it should be practised" (p. 217). Site-based management might be better interpreted then in the context of school as community rather than organization.

Aronstein and Benedictis (1991), Delaney (1994), Lane (1991) and Poplin (1992), researchers on site-based management, tell us that the school principal has a key role to play in the

successful development of school councils. Mahon (1991) contends that in site-based management, "with everyone turning to the principal for guidance and leadership, the principal becomes a powerful force for reform and school improvement" (p. 25). The leadership of the principal, then, appears to be one of the most important factors in the success or demise of an alternative program.

While addressing the site-based management theory Sergiovanni (1990) contends that without carefully developed leadership involving empowerment, enablement and enhancement, the locus of control will be shifted, "from outside the school to the principal's office; creating, in effect, a chain of small dictatorships across the country" (p. 103). In this case one set of problems would be exchanged for another, teachers and parents suggestions about schooling would be of little consequence. It should therefore be realized that one of the most critical factors regarding school council effectiveness is the principal's attitude toward the group. While Rothberg and Pawlas (1993) contend that in site-based management power and control might be the primary source of resistance; Foster (1984), in reference to principals, posits that, "some have turned to the subtle art of persuasion, steering the council in the direction they want it to go" (p. 27). Bochkarev (1992) supports this as he contends that, in Russia, school councils have yet to find their place as they are encountering many difficulties, including the apathy and resistance of school administrators. He claims, "it is bad when

councils ... exist for form's sake ... and therefore do not exert any appreciable positive influence on the teaching-upbringing process" (p. 91).

In order to counteract the possibility of this situation happening with school councils in the Newfoundland and Labrador educational system, professional leadership training for principals may be necessary. As noted previously, the purpose of this study was to determine the relationship among perceived leadership approach and the degree of principal dominance perceived to be acceptable. The findings from this research provide insights that should prove useful to decision makers, and should assist in successful implementation of school councils.

Summary

The general consensus of research on organizational theory is that site-based management in the form of school councils is the most promising management model for today's schools (Herman and Herman, 1992; Hill, Bonan and Warner, 1992; Midgley and Wood, 1993; Prasch, 1990). The literature, however, highlights that a shift from traditional management theory also entails a shift from its accompanying authoritarian leadership approach to a more contemporary transforming leadership approach that corresponds with site-based management (Bass, Waldman, Avolio and Bebb, 1987; Brown, 1994; Kouzes and Posner, 1995; Leithwood, 1992; Sheppard, 1993). Research emphasizes professional development and training

as being necessary prerequisites to principals' adoption of site-based management (Tranter, 1992; Thurston, Clift and Schact, 1993; Tucker-Ladd, Merchant and Thurston, 1992).

Mitchell (1990) claims that in Colorado rather than mandating school councils, "a better approach would have been to involve more administrators in the planning stages, allowing them to raise objections early on and giving them time to grow accustomed to what was to come" (p. 42). McLaughlin (1990) contends that you cannot mandate what matters, because for real change to happen, skills, creative thinking, and committed action are essential ingredients which should not be overlooked. Hannay (1992), Keedy and Finch (1994), and Mahon (1991) contend that school principals are the ones who ultimately hold the success or demise of this venture in their hands. Thus, in order for site-based management to be assimilated by all school principals, it may be necessary for some of them to change their attitudes toward the degree of principal dominance they feel should exist (The Royal Commission, 1992, p. 233). The literature indicates that without a leadership approach that is in opposition to the traditional authoritarian leadership approach, school councils may be functional in name only (Sergiovanni, 1990; Heller, Woodworth, Jacobson and Conway, 1990).

The advent of school councils requires major shifts in power, in not only the structure, but the governance of schools as well. The Newfoundland Department of Education (1994a), Glickman (1991), and Stimson and Applebaum (1988) suggest that

teachers and school council members who are directly involved with the principal in collaborative decision making may not share the opinion of the principal as to the amount of principal dominance that should exist. School principals who have been charged with the responsibility and consequential accountability involved in the shift from centralized to decentralized governance necessitated by the mandated school councils in this province are required to share power. To what degree are they willing to do this?

The primary purpose of this study is to determine the relationship among the following factors: the principal's leadership approach, the principals' beliefs toward the degree of influence that they should have in school councils and the beliefs of school council members towards the degree of dominance that principals should have on the school councils. Those principals in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador who volunteered to pilot the school council model may be more transformational in their leadership approach than those who did not. The principals who are piloting site-based management, by virtue of their involvement and/or training, may appear to be more open to change. It is hoped that through study of leadership approach, with particular emphasis on the degree of dominance principals feel should exist, the research findings of this study will contribute to the successful implementation of school councils. Further, it is hoped that analysis of the data will allow for the identification of the leadership approach that

facilitates the adoption of school councils as it relates to the perceived degree of principal dominance that is appropriate, thus contributing to the building of both organizational management and leadership theory. Also, it is felt that the determination of a suggested leadership approach that may be necessary for the adoption of school councils will prove useful to practitioners as it would lead to realization by government officials that there is a need for administrative training and professional development.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between the school principals' self perception of their leadership approach and their attitudes toward the degree of dominance that should exist?
2. Is there a relationship between the school council members' perception of the principals' leadership approach and school councils' attitudes toward the degree of dominance that should exist?
3. Is there a relationship between others' perceptions of the principals' leadership approach and involvement in school councils?

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Methodological Approach and Sample

This study was conducted such that the investigator, "sought a rapprochement between qualitative and nonqualitative methods, believing ... that such methods can be productively combined" (Eisner, 1992, p. 5).

Both qualitative and quantitative methods can be used in the service of any paradigm, whatever its presuppositions and assumptions may be. The only criteria that ought to constrain choice of methods is their fit to the axiomatic structure of the paradigm selected to guide the inquiry. (Guba, 1992, p. 18)

The study made use of two different research approaches in two different environments. Firstly, a quantitative study was conducted, using mailed questionnaires to principals, teachers and school council members who are involved and noninvolved in the school council implementation pilot project for the 1994-1995 school year in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

Secondly, to expand on the research knowledge on school council implementation available in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, a qualitative research study, using interview and observation in two self-managing schools was conducted in Europe. This particular setting was chosen to further the research because self-management has been common there for several decades. Also, this environment is presently said to have one of the most advanced forms of site-based management. This qualitative research, then, brings significant enhancement to the

study.

The quantitative study was a survey, nonexperimental type of investigation. It was conducted in one province in Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador. The nine schools selected to pilot the school council model proposed for the province of Newfoundland and Labrador in the 1994-1995 school year were invited to participate in this study. Each of these pilot schools was paired with a provincial school which is not presently involved with school council implementation. These noninvolved schools were chosen using the Department of Education Directory (1994-95), and were matched with the pilot schools on such characteristics as school size, number of teachers, locality and religion.

Since this research was conducted in the final school term, 1995, the response process was speeded when permission from superintendents of the schools chosen to be involved in the study was sought through fax transmittal. All superintendents, without exception, gave their approval for the investigator to contact and solicit the principals' support and permission for the questionnaires to be completed in each school. The principal of each school was then sent a package which included a personalized letter requesting the school's participation in the study, an information sheet with a break down of school council members for principals noninvolved in school council implementation, a school-principal demographic data questionnaire to be completed by the principal, a letter of request with a disclosure and

consent form and a Leadership Practices Inventory: Self Questionnaire, as well as a Relationships Between Principals And Members Of School Councils: An Attitude Scale. In addition, for each teacher, a teacher's package, including a covering letter, a letter of request with disclosure and consent form, and a Leadership Practices Inventory: Other, as well as a school council member package for each school council member, including a covering letter, a letter of request with disclosure and consent form, a Leadership Practices Inventory: Other and a Relationships Between Principals And Members Of School Councils: An Attitude Scale; and a stamped self-addressed envelope to facilitate the return of the questionnaires. Principals were requested to distribute the questionnaires and to solicit the support of a teacher or secretary to collect the completed questionnaires since the involvement of the administration in the collection had the potential to influence responses. There was also a personal telephone call placed to each superintendent and each school principal involved in the study at this time; personal contact was made with at least one school staff member, if the principal could not be reached directly. After a waiting period of approximately one month, principals of schools from which no questionnaires had been received were contacted by follow up letter and then by telephone. Principals from 14 out of 18 schools returned completed questionnaires, however one did not include a full set of responses and therefore was not usable. Where response from a school had been minimal, the investigator

made personal follow up contacts with principals, teachers and school council members to request that they intercede on my behalf. This provided for a total sample of 207 responses. There were 47% of usable questionnaires returned. Analysis of schools that chose not to participate revealed no pattern that, potentially, might influence the study findings. Principals who were contacted in follow-up by telephone cited various reasons for not participating. Some of the reasons noted were personal problems unrelated to school and some had difficulties related to the timing of the study, as it was so close to school year end and the great demands on their time.

The qualitative study conducted in Europe, involved the use of two interview schedules that were grounded in the questionnaires already utilized in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. A letter requesting permission to conduct the study was forwarded to the chairperson of the school council and a disclosure and consent form was signed. Permission was also sought, and signed permission was given on a disclosure and consent form by the principals of both schools for the principal's leadership approach to be investigated through interview and observation at each school. Approval was given and written permission obtained for the investigator to interview the senior and junior teacher in each school, as well as one parent school council representative per school. One interviewed teacher from each school was also a teacher representative on school council. Principals completed principal-school

demographic data information sheets. Next, taped interviews were conducted with all but one participant. This nontaped participant felt somewhat uneasy about taping, so this particular method of data collection was dismissed for that individual. All other participants felt quite comfortable with this method, and in addition to taping the interviews, the investigator also wrote responses on the interview schedules. These qualitative studies were conducted over a one month period, approximately two weeks of interview and observation time per school. As well as interview and observation, school policy documents and other school-related materials were presented for the investigator's examination. The investigator was also provided the opportunity to attend both staff and school council meetings. In the analysis, the investigator was informed by these materials and experiences.

Since there was one male and one female principal participant for the qualitative approach to this study, it was necessary for the investigator to take extra precautionary measures to ensure confidentiality. Thus, the study was organized such that one principal was considered male and referred to as Principal One, the other principal was considered female and referred to as Principal Two (the gender may or may not be accurate). Also, all other participants in the study, teachers and school council members, were considered female (again, the gender may or may not be accurate). In addition to preserving confidentiality, this approach to reporting the

qualitative data increases both the clarity and simplicity of the study.

The investigator felt that in order to obtain the clearest possible picture of site-based management and leadership approach, both quantitative and qualitative research methods would be utilized. Thus, while the quantitative feature involves a large population sample thereby providing strength in numbers; the qualitative approach provides insights to the study that come from personal contact. The combination of these two research methods has provided solid insight into the site-based management process, allowing the investigator's study to span noninvolvement in site-based management, involvement in site-based management in the preliminary stages, school board controlled site-based management that has withstood decades, and finally site-based management that boasts complete autonomy. The quantitative and qualitative data have provided the investigator with the capacity to gain insights, through this combination of research methods, that may have been otherwise impossible.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between the leadership approach of school principals, as perceived by themselves, and their attitude toward the degree of dominance that should exist.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between the

leadership approach of the school principal, as perceived by school council members, and the school councils' attitude toward the degree of dominance that should exist.

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive relationship between the potential school council members' perception of the principals' leadership approach and the schools' involvement in the school council project.

Instruments

An extensive review of the global research on school council implementation and the principal's role in that implementation process resulted in a conclusion that the categories of exemplary leadership behaviours delineated in the Kouzes and Posner (1989) Leadership Practices Inventory: Self and the Leadership Practices Inventory: Other, were felt to be the most comprehensive measure of the Leadership Approach That Facilitates Adoption Of School Councils. Kouzes and Posner (1993) contend that, "accurate assessment of leadership is essential for developing individuals' capacities to lead people more effectively (e.g., How successful is one person versus another person in motivating and influencing others?)" (p. 191). They also maintain that, "the ability to measure leadership is important to researchers concerned with the relationship between leadership and other key social-psychological phenomenon (e.g., How does leadership affect levels of organizational commitment or productivity?)" (p. 191). Kouzes and Posner (1993) also suggest that, "the identification of those

factors that might serve to improve leadership capacities is needed" (p. 191). To address these concerns, Kouzes and Posner (1988) maintain that "both qualitative and quantitative analyses were originally used" in the development and validation of the design for the Leadership Practices Inventory (p. 192). The sample for analyses reported in Kouzes and Posner (1993), "consists of more than 36,000 managers and their subordinates involved in both public and private (in-company) management development seminars. For the LPI self there are 5,298 respondents. The sample size for the LPI-Observer is 30,913" (p. 193). The Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Indices for the Leadership Practices Inventory are given in Table 1.

Kouzes and Posner (1993) state that,

a criterion of .001 was adopted throughout the analyses for reporting statistical significance.... Internal reliabilities on the LPI ranged from .80 to .91. Reliabilities for the LPI-Self (between .70 and .85) were somewhat lower than those for LPI-Observer (ranging between .81 and .92).... Test-retest reliability was examined using a convenience sample of 157 MBA students.... Test-retest reliability for the five practices was at the .93 level and above. (pp. 193-194)

Both sample size and reliability figures for the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory, as shown in Table 1, appear to be quite substantial. Thus, this instrument was chosen for this study as a measure for assessing individuals' leadership practices with the hope that it will enhance leadership capacities. In addition, Chapman's (1982) Relationship Between Principals And Members Of School Councils: An Attitude Scale, was chosen to measure the amount of school principal's influence

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations and Reliability Indices

	Mean	Std Dev	LPI (N = 36,226)	LPI Self (N = 5,298)	LPI Observer (N = 30,913)	Test- Retest (N = 157)
Challenging the Process	22.38	4.14	.80	.70	.81	.93
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.44	4.89	.87	.80	.88	.93
Enabling Others to Act	23.90	4.35	.85	.75	.86	.94
Modeling the Way	22.12	4.14	.81	.71	.82	.95
Encouraging the Heart	21.96	5.17	.91	.85	.92	.93

(Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 194).

that principals feel should exist, as well as the amount of principal influence school council members feel should exist. Both instruments used in the quantitative study and the qualitative study have been used in previous studies and have been proven to be reliable and valid means for such research (Aubrey, 1992; Chapman, 1982; Kouzes and Posner, 1989). It was unnecessary to modify the Kouzes and Posner (1989) instruments for the quantitative study, however slight modifications were required for the qualitative study, with solid grounding being maintained in the interview schedule with the quantitative instrument being used.

Kouzes and Posner (1993) reported that,

The LPI was originally developed based upon case study analysis of more than 1,100 managers and their personal best experience as a leader. These written cases were supplemented with in-depth interviews and revealed a pattern of underlying and critical leadership actions and behaviours.... The sample for the analysis reported in this paper consist of ... For the LPI-Self there are 5,298 respondents.... The sample size for the LPI-Observer is 30,913 (pp. 192-193).

Researchers (Stoner-Zemel, 1988; Lipton, 1990; Plowman, 1991; Posner and Brodsky, 1992) have shown how leadership practices, as measured by the LPI, are related to organizational effectiveness, work group vitality, and individual levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Kouzes and Posner, 1993).

The general subscales or categories of leadership practices are listed in Table 2. These five exemplary leadership practices are defined below:

- a. Challenging the Process - Do school principals introduce new programs to their schools, even to the point of risking failure,

Table 2
LPI SUBSCALES

SUBSCALE	TITLE
(a)	Challenging the Process
(b)	Inspiring a Shared Vision
(c)	Enabling Others to Act
(d)	Modeling the Way
(e)	Encouraging the Heart

while attempting to make school improvements? Do they possess the ability to learn from mistakes? Do they challenge themselves and others by participating in and encouraging teacher participation in professional inservice sessions?

b. Inspiring a Shared Vision - Do principals have a vision for their school's future? Do they encourage others to share their vision?

c. Enabling Others to Act - Do principals involve teachers and school council members in planning what happens in the school? Do they use ideas put forth by others?

d. Modeling the Way - Do principals always follow the values they agreed upon with others? Do the teachers and school council members know the principal's beliefs? Do principals behave in a manner that sets an example of exemplary leadership practices for others?

e. Encouraging the Heart - Do principals celebrate with teachers after completion of a successful term/project? Do they openly praise and support teachers and school council members on their accomplishments, thereby fostering a team spirit?

The Kouzes and Posner (1989) exemplary leadership practices are similar to the Transformational leadership practices as outlined by Brown (1994). These are :

- a sense of purpose, a vision, a focus.
- a structure for planning.
- a collaborative decision-making process.

- a shared common culture (p. 47) .

Kouzes and Posner (1995) suggest that, "transformational leaders closely resemble the leaders we describe" in that transformational leaders are, "inspiring others to excel, giving individual consideration to others, and stimulating people to think in new ways" (p. 321) .

The Relationships Between Principals and Members Of School Councils: An Attitude Scale (Chapman, 1982), provides an interview schedule on which items were generated from interviews with principals and school council members - staff, parent, student and community representatives - as well as observations of councils in session and community and auxiliary groups from four schools in inner city suburban and country Victoria. Thirty-nine items considered relevant to the attitude being investigated were selected for trial. These items were administered to a random sample of 274 principals and school council members. An 80.7% response rate was received. The t score was measured for each item and the statements with the largest t values were selected for inclusion in the final questionnaire. These selected items each had a t value of 3.17. The refined scale of 24 items was sent to 372 principals and school council members at 21 randomly selected schools. A response rate of 79.8% was received. The responses were analyzed.

Reliability

The corrected split-half reliability of the scale based on the responses of 297 principal and school council member

responses was found to be .72835. The test-retest reliability was .69314 for a group of 52 principals and council members re-tested after a period of six weeks.

Validity

Item analysis demonstrated that all items discriminated between high and low scorers on the total score (Edwards $t > / 3.17$). Internal consistency, estimated using Kuder Richardson and Cronbach's alpha, yielded a coefficient of .80705. The homogeneity of the scale was not threatened by any item on the scale. (Chapman, 1982, p. 10)

Prior to using this instrument, the researcher conducted tests to ensure it's reliability in the Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, context. A test-retest and internal consistency were conducted with 24 education students at Memorial University of Newfoundland, who were retested after a period of four weeks. It was recognized that by eliminating 7 items, the reliability of the instrument could be raised. Internal consistency testing of the 17 item instrument revealed an alpha of .894. Test-retest of this same instrument revealed an alpha of .782. As a result of this pilot test, these 17 items were used in the present study. Both instruments that were used for this study are found in Appendix G and Appendix H attached.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter will present and discuss the data analysis from both the quantitative and qualitative studies. It begins with reliability data and descriptive statistics for each of the subscales that measure both the dependent and independent variables. Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to analyze the data which were gathered in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Using this method of analysis allowed the researcher to determine if there is a linear relationship between dominance and principal leadership approach, as well as determining if there is a linear relationship between leadership approach and involvement in school councils. This was examined through the F test of linearity to determine if the linear relationship was statistically significant, and through a measure of accounted variance, Multiple R Square. The P Value for this study was set at $<.05$, which is generally accepted for most studies as "a reasonable probability level" (Gay, 1992, p. 432).

Discussion of Reliability

The results of this study verify the reliability of the instruments used. Internal consistency reliability of each of the scales used to measure the dependent and independent variables involved with leadership practices was determined in this study using a sample of respondents ranging from 195 - 202.

The results of the reliability check for Leadership Practices Inventory are provided in Table 3. All factors tested for this instrument have high reliability coefficients ranging from .8412 to .9136. The highest combined alpha .9192 was found to exist in Factor 5: Encouraging the Heart. The next highest combined alpha .8936 was evidenced in Factor 3: Enabling Others to Act. The third highest combined alpha was .8829 for Factor 4: Modeling the Way. Factor 2: Inspiring a Shared Vision was found to have the next highest combined alpha of .8783. The lowest coefficient is .8412, which was part of a combined alpha of .8778 for Factor 1: Challenging the Process. The figures presented in Table 3 show that this instrument has a high reliability level throughout all its factors. Next, internal consistency reliability for each of the scales used to measure the dependent and independent variables for dominance was determined using the school council member sample of 66 participants. The results of the Attitude Scale are provided in Table 4. While two items fall below an alpha of .70, the combined alpha for this instrument is .7204, which meets the minimum standard of .70 set by Frankel and Wallen (1990). Eliminating those two items does not increase the alpha.

Descriptive Statistics

The sample of 207 respondents for the quantitative feature of this study is broken down according to the participants role regarding school council. A total of 13 participants were principals. All other 194 respondents were potential school

Table 3
Internal Consistency Reliability of Subscales
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY: SELF AND OTHERS

SCALE	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT (ALPHA)						COMBINED ALPHA	NUMBER OF CASES
Challenging the Process	B1 .8555	B6 .8666	B11 .8739	B16 .8412	B21 .8504	B26 .8514	.8778	195
Inspiring a Shared Vision	B2 .8503	B7 .8716	B12 .8662	B17 .8488	B22 .8523	B27 .8536	.8783	201
Enabling Others to Act	B3 .8764	B8 .8756	B13 .9048	B18 .8620	B23 .8570	B28 .8686	.8936	202
Modeling the Way	B4 .8607	B9 .8629	B14 .8704	B19 .8695	B24 .8661	B29 .8447	.8829	200
Encouraging the Heart	B5 .9136	B10 .9121	B15 .8990	B20 .8985	B25 .9027	B30 .9011	.9192	197

Table 4
Internal Consistency Reliability of Subscales
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND MEMBERS
OF SCHOOL COUNCILS: AN ATTITUDE SCALE

SCALE	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT	SCALE	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT
C4	.7115	RC16	.7182
C5	.7115	C17	.7076
C6	.7081	C18	.6930
C9	.7197	C19	.7167
C10	.7125	C20	.7025
RC11	.7076	C21	.7132
C12	.7049	C23	.7180
C13	.6752	C24	.7018
RC14	.7092		
COMBINED ALPHA = .7204			
NUMBER OF CASES = 66			

council members.

From the principal sample of 13 participants, 7 were involved in school councils, 6 were not involved. There were 9 male and 4 female principals. From this group, 12 of the principals who participated in the research study had more than 15 years of teaching experience, only 1 had less than 15 years. This person's experience was in the 10-15 year range. As school principal, 2 participants had 1 year of experience, 2 had 2-4 years experience, 4 had 5-9 years, 3 had 10-15 years and 2 had more than 15 years. Of the 13 participating principals, 8 had an educational level of 7 university years, 1 had 8 years of university education, 1 had 9 years of university and there were 3 missing cases. The reported missing cases were those respondents who did not report all required information on the questionnaire provided.

From the potential school council members sample of 194 participants, 133 participants were female, 60 were male and there was 1 missing case. Again, where missing cases were reported in this research study, all required information was not provided by the participant. From this respondent group, 112 participants were involved in school councils while 82 were not involved. Of the sample who responded to the dominance questionnaire, 1 participant was a school council chairperson, 1 was a student representative, 26 were teachers, 9 were community representatives, 13 were parents and 2 were principals. From the potential school council member participant group, 66 teachers

taught grades K-6, 15 taught Grades 7-9, 20 taught grades 10-12, 31 had teaching positions other than those named above. Of those teachers who participated in the study, 5 had 2-4 years of teaching experience, 14 had 5-9 years, 19 had 10-15 years, 93 had more than 15 years experience as a teacher. Of the teacher respondents, 15 had 1 year working with the principal whose leadership approach they helped determine, 75 teachers had 2-4 years, 24 had 5-9 years, 7 had 10-15 years and 9 had more than 15 years of experience teaching with their school's principal.

The qualitative feature of the study was conducted through use of interviews with 8 participants. Participants in this research consisted of 2 principals, 1 male and 1 female, who are presently involved with school councils. Both of these principals had more than 15 years teaching experience as well as more than 15 years of experience as a principal. Of the principal sample used for this aspect of the study, 1 principal had completed 2 university years, the other principal had 3 years of university education. In addition, 2 teachers and 1 parent representative on school council per school were interviewed. Both parent representatives on school council were female. As well as being active teachers in these schools, 1 teacher interviewed per school was also a teacher representative on school council. The senior and junior teachers from each school were interviewed for this study. All 4 teachers were female. From this group, 1 of the teacher participants had more than 15 years teaching experience, 1 teacher had 10-15 years and 2

teachers had 2-4 years of experience as a teacher. Another teacher had more than 15 years working with the principal whose leadership approach she helped determine, 1 had 10-15 years, 1 had 5-9 years and 2 had 2-4 years of experience working with their school principal.

Presentation and Analysis

Hypothesis One

There is a positive relationship between the leadership approach of school principals as perceived by themselves and their attitudes toward the degree of dominance that should exist.

Data were collected from interviews that were grounded in the survey instruments: Leadership Practices Inventory: Self and the Attitude Scale for dominance. Analysis of the data from the two principals involved in school councils in this study appears to indicate that the hypothesis was not supported. Therefore it seems there may not be a significant relationship between the leadership approach of school principals as perceived by themselves and their attitudes toward the degree of dominance that should exist.

To explore both principals' use of dominance within the school council, data gathered through the use of the Chapman (1982) Interview Schedule on The Relationship Between Principal and Members of School Council: An Attitude Scale, are presented and analyzed. For simplicity and clarity, and at the same time to protect confidentiality, one principal shall be considered

male and referred to as Principal One, the second will be considered female and referred to as Principal Two (the gender may or may not be accurate).

Principal One. When questioned on personal beliefs about leadership, Principal One stated that,

it should be enabling. It should be interested in the people that are being led. Interested to the point of caring for them as people as well as them as task achievers. Leadership is about a light touch for heavy purposes. It's about being direct and honest and open; approachable and it's about preparing the ground for people, enabling them to do their work as a backup support and occasionally a defender. There's also an element, of course, in the personality; presence of the leader.

In contradiction to his self-expressed leadership beliefs, the principal expresses sentiments regarding a school council member however, by adding,

I have one area of difficulty here with one school council member who isn't recognizing the difference between governance and management and it isn't that that person wants to take over or is even interfering, it's that they choose to say what should or can be done in order to facilitate whatever needs doing. I just find that irksome. I don't attach any more blame to that person than I do to myself, I just honestly tend to find it irksome when a person says: You can do so and so when I know perfectly well what I can do. That's not the point. What is the policy? I know how to handle it. I mean it's perfectly true that one can listen to advice about other ways of doing things but I find it irksome for the school council to be run through elementary ways of doing things.

When questioned if clashes on school council are over important issues or if disputes are more idiosyncratic, he replies, "I hope they're never based on personalities, though clearly there is personal interaction."

In reference to the principal's zones of tolerance on school

council, Principal One contends that,

if a school council member or school council members began to be involved in the organization and management of everyday tasks, I think that would be a no go area for me.... If the school council chairperson is in many days of the week and is telling the principal what they want him to do, I would find that completely unacceptable.

The two comments presented above suggest that Principal One feels he is entitled to the view that council members have no greater right than other members of the public to view the day-to-day running of the school and that the principal also feels it is inappropriate for members of school council to in any way exercise control over the principal's behaviour.

When questioned upon what issues principals and school council members disagree, Principal One maintains they don't agree,

on things like the difference between governance and management, though I have to say that even in this school, I think I'm clear about it, I'm not at all sure that my school council members are.... So if we were to scrape away the niceties, I think we might get a bit of disagreement there.

This suggests the principal believes it is inappropriate for school council members to seek from the principal explanations about matters pertaining to the day-to-day running of the school.

Principal One states that what he considers unacceptable on school council is, "parent representatives who get some feedback from parents and instead of seeing me beforehand, they bring it up to the school council without any warning, and that can be a problem." This data sample suggests Principal One feels that a member of council should be expected to bring any contentious issue to the notice of the principal prior to raising it in

council and it also suggests that Principal One believes he is entitled to veto discussion on any issue perceived as a threat to his authority.

Principal One emphasizes that, "the agenda is the control mechanism at meetings of the school council." Also regarding teacher input, he declares that, "most initiatives in the school are top down.... The agenda is largely determined by me." In reference to his school, he claims,

we don't have a hierarchical management structure. It's more flattened so that no teacher is managed by another teacher. They're managed by the vice principal and myself. No member of staff, in fact, is managed by any other staff except the vice principal and myself. What happens is we've split our management into two clear and distinct phases - the management of people is done by me and the vice principal and the management of tasks is distributed among various people. I am absolutely clear about it, that professionals should not be managed by other professionals on the same level.

This suggests the principal exercises control over teachers in the school, as well. Regarding the system for determining teacher salaries at this particular school, Principal One elaborates at length,

Theoretically, they could bargain for a part of their salary. There are two elements. Nowadays the angle of increment from the first stage to the last is no longer automatic. Formerly it was. Now, it is to be reviewed every year and it's called an experience point and it's only awarded if the teachers have satisfied the criteria. So the school council will take advice from the principal, but it's for the school council to determine whether or not every teacher gets that experience point and the second thing is there are other areas, like excellence, where you can give another point. Again, the school council, taking advice from the principal and others, would determine whether a person would get that. In practice, few schools use the excellence points because it's very contentious, but all schools have to use the experience points. Theoretically, the teacher could bargain for the other entitlements. They

could say we want the school council to implement the Teachers Payment Issues - a document which says that the school council shall award excellence points. They choose not to do it because of the fact the teachers are against it. They want a more equitable shared system.

These data suggest that the principal has influence in decision making over some very critical areas of a teacher's career. Regarding consultation with teachers, this principal explains that because, "we sometimes make decisions on the hoof" all participants are not involved in decision making. He maintains that because there isn't sufficient time, "the biggest area of mistake is overlooking to tell people or to consult." This suggests the principal feels that in school administration, democratic procedures must sometimes be foregone in the interest of efficiency.

When questioned to what extent the principal is prepared to use his expertise to influence decision making, Principal One responds,

Oh, I think that's something we do as fully and as often as we need. Speaking personally, it isn't I'm so desperate to have my own way so much, but before an issue goes to the school council, it's already been through a consultation process with the staff and therefore it's already got a fairly firm ground, but that isn't to say that if the lay view came up with something that we haven't seen, we wouldn't be sensible about it.

This suggests that the principal believes it is up to him to indicate those issues which are important for council deliberations and that he also believes the principal must establish that the professional rights of principal and staff are not challenged by members of council.

Principal One expresses the belief that, "their experience

and expertise in the field of education" are what he considers to be the bases of the principals' influence on school council. This person adds that, "school councils who do not consult with the principal and the staff are doomed." When asked to what extent he feels the school council would yield to his expertise, the principal explains,

that happens most often. There are exceptions, but where it is educationally related, then they would. An example of where they wouldn't is the new building. There are school council members who know far more about the process of the building going out to tender and all those things than I do. So they take a more leading role in that respect. But they still need me to manage the process.

This suggests that Principal One feels he is justified in preventing any attempts by council members to exercise influence over matters related to the educational program.

Principal One declares that, "most school council members rely on the information they get from the school," adding,

All policy decisions are made by them. They, in the end accept responsibility for that and they approve it. We make the recommendations, but certainly, what we do is the staff prepares it, and I know, that is one of the areas of problem with school council members, in that they feel it's done, it's sewn up, if you like, but on the other hand we haven't seen very much evidence of the school council members being able to make the kind of commitment where they could do these things.... It's a big commitment of time and often requires quite a bit of insight into what's going on.

This suggests that Principal One believes school council should act as a rubber stamp, merely legitimizing the principal's decisions. On the one hand, he contends,

We've got a curriculum committee which consists of staff and school council members, but the staff's attitude toward it, including mine, is that we spend a lot of time explaining the background before we can get decisions.

On the other hand, when questioned if opponents on school council consistently present the same view, he suggests,

People are usually consistent about these matters, but school council members don't really know enough of the background of most of the things they're deciding about for them to take a strong position.

This comment suggests that the principal believes school council members do not possess sufficient information about the school to challenge the recommendations of the principal. The statement directly above it suggests that the principal, due to the amount of time it would take, may not believe he should be prepared to provide information on all issues about which members of the school council wish to be informed.

Principal One, in reference to who on school council most often initiates action, makes proposals for change and/or recommends alternatives claims, "the principal is the vehicle through which that most often happens." He also declares that the school council always approves the alternatives proposed by the principal, adding, "We have that kind of relationship and that kind of accommodation." This suggests that the principal believes members of school council should always support the recommendations of the principal.

In response to the question: What is the division of labour between the principal and the school council, this principal replied, "Well that's the crunch, so to speak, because it's 95% or more to the principal." This school principal doesn't see how school council members can take on that much responsibility, due to lack of resources, such as a meeting place and secretarial

help. These services are available to the school principal, but available to school council members, as the principal puts it, only, "through the courtesy of the management of the school."

This suggests that the principal believes he is the keeper of the necessary resources the school council needs in order to function and that he can provide these resources to school council at his discretion. The principal adds that the balance of power that underlies this division of labour on school council is,

The school council members have recognized that I am prepared to take on the management role in the fullest extent.... I recognize that it can be seen as a block, a stitch up, I recognize that, but it hasn't been challenged. My school council members seem to be happy with the way we operate.

According to the data he presented, Principal One appears to reign in this school, with school council members as well as with teachers.

To analyze this principal's self-perception of his leadership approach, analysis of the data gathered through interview will be explored in terms of the factors provided by Kouzes and Posner, 1989.

Factor One: Challenging the Process - Principal One contends that he challenged the process in this school by introducing innovations that will be forthcoming within the next year. These innovations include a nursery class and an extension to the school building. When questioned if he experiments with new ideas even to the point of risking failure, the principal replies,

I think that's true. There are certain innovations that we

have introduced that have been risky. The greatest risk is not completing them.... The big risk is not finishing them. That's a management task of limiting the number of innovations.

This suggests that Principal One believes he seeks out challenging opportunities that test his skills and abilities. He gives an example of an unfinished risk taken, suggesting,

The work that we do with parents, to get their cooperation and to get them to support in a very practical way the education of the youngsters is something we have introduced in different forms over a number of years and which our experience shows us, after a while, it gets settled on the back burner. Perhaps it simmers but it doesn't do much more than that. It never gets to the point where it's really on the boil. That's always a disappointment, and it's about all the other pressures, in a sense, that unless we keep up the intensity of leading this program, it doesn't ever get to that sort of stage where we can say, Yes, we've really cracked it. We've got there. We got people onboard who know what they're doing. It doesn't happen.

The above comment suggests that, according to this principal, he experiments and takes risks with new approaches to his work even when there is a chance of failure. The principal continues to add that maybe some of the blame for lack of parental support for the school and its programs might be due to the fact that,

Last year we got documentation out for the parents. This was about home and school cooperation, behaviour programs and so on, but if you were to interview parents, in the main, I'm sure they would say, "I don't know what you're referring to". They've maybe forgot about it. We haven't kept up the momentum because pressures for other things has meant that we've taken our eye off it. We know it's there.

The principal claims that if an idea or program experienced failure he, "would have to say, what's next, and get on with it." He calls attention to one area of weakness, stating,

We regularly fail to bring parents in, other than about their own child. They will come to meetings where we are talking to them one to one about their child, but if we have

programs we want parents to come in and understand what's happening with children in terms of curriculum, behaviour or whatever, then it's much more difficult. We live with that failure all the time, in a sense, when we talk about breaking the circle. We don't achieve it except with isolated parents, a small band of people who will support us.

When questioned on professional development, Principal One reports that he attends six to ten professional development inservice sessions each year that are usually one day events. The principal explains that there was one special year, 1991, when he received a secondment for about 40% of the year to do management training with an oil company. Exposure to much interaction with the business community during that particular year was thus made possible. He declares that this training, "had a significant impression on me which has lasted and which has, I think, influenced my management style ever since." He believes he stays up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting the organization. The principal alleges that he encourages professional inservice sessions for teachers, but,

they're not compulsory. We don't even have to consider that, because it would be like saying their pay is compulsory. It is entitlement that they want to take and it is essentially an entitlement.

Regarding professional development inservice for teachers in his school, Principal One states, "they get around three days a year that they can choose for themselves." These chosen sessions are usually related to each teacher's concentrated curricular area in the school.

Principal One contends that he enjoys challenge in his work, insisting,

that's what keeps me going, in a sense. I've been a principal now for twenty years or so and it is important to me that I do have challenge and that I have variety. Otherwise I think the risk would be that I'd be very stale and mechanistic. I hope not.

He also maintains that teachers are challenged,

through his initiative in bringing to them what's going on in the outside world. I pick up, from the conferences that I go to inspiration or ideas or challenging ideas, even ideas that are critical and I bring them back. I pick them out of the press and I reproduce them and I take them, sometimes first to the senior teachers meeting and sometimes to the full staff meeting. We talk about them. It's uncomfortable on occasions, but something sticks, something clings and we build. It's an incremental thing.

This suggests that the principal challenges the way things are done at work and it also suggests that he looks for innovative ways to improve what is done in this organization, as well.

When questioned whether he practices the philosophy "by mistakes we learn" the principal explains,

We have to be prepared to acknowledge, first of all, that we have made a mistake. We have to be courageous enough to say that we will now look at it again and see how we might do it a better way.

This suggests that the principal asks "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected. This principal appears to perceive that he Challenges the Process.

Factor Two: Inspiring a Shared Vision - Principal One declares that he has a vision for this school.

If the perfect vision is that we should become a very distinctive school, and I know exactly what I'd like to be distinctive about. I'd like to be distinctive about music. I'd like this school to offer children, not just in this locality but on a wider locality, the opportunity to have a development in music that is not easy to provide in primary schools anywhere. It could be provided if we could attract a sufficient staff and resources to be able to do it. That seems a possibility, yet it has not become a reality. I

ask myself if I'm not single-minded enough about it or if there are other things we've got to get right first.... I see it as being something that won't happen unless at some stage or other we say we're gonna do it and we're gonna resource it, come hell or high water.

Principal One also affirms that teachers are encouraged to share in this goal, declaring,

We've talked about it and we've also talked about it with the school council. I'm not sure that we're at the stage where I can say to them "This is where we ought to be going" because we're still working through other areas that I'm sure they would consider to be more important at this time. So in a sense, it is a very long, distant vision. A more immediate one is that we are raising the standards of teaching and learning across the curriculum and that we are raising the standards of behaviour, attitude, application - all those things that have been on our agenda for a few years.

This suggests that the principal of this school seems to describe to others the kind of future he would like others involved with the school to create together with him and it also suggests that he appeals to others to share, as their own, his dream for the future. If the principal remains in this school he describes that,

in five years from now the school will have a normal expectation of high standards and achievement. It will have received a school inspection report that will be encouraging.... It will recognize the good work that's going on. It will have achieved a higher level of parental involvement. The school council will understand more of what it should be about and how to achieve its goals and satisfy its responsibilities. The staff will feel better about themselves. They will have more self esteem because they will have overcome the frustrations of the constant change we've been going through over the last five years and will have come to grips with what they are doing and they would be more in control. It will be a bigger school and it will have launched itself into the distinctive role I think we could and should have ... because people will want to send their children here because they will want the kind of opportunity that this school will offer.

This comment suggests that Principal One clearly communicates a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of this organization, that he looks forward and forecasts what he expects the future to be like, that he seems to demonstrate to others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision and that he appears to be contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities.

Principal One feels that he and the teachers share a more immediate common goal for the school as well, suggesting, "I think that if we were to dig deep, it would be that we all want to succeed at a standard of excellence higher than we are currently achieving." He seems to perceive that he Inspires a Shared Vision.

Factor Three: Enabling Others to Act - When questioned if teachers are involved in what happens at the school, Principal One replies, "Yes, very much so. Everything of any significance whatever is discussed with the strategy team and with the full staff, including where relevant, those members of staff who are not teachers. So it's a highly developed process of consultation." This suggests that the principal appears to involve others in planning actions that will be taken.

The principal contends that teachers are allowed to make their own decisions regarding curriculum and classroom planning. He claims,

One of my frustrations is my failure yet to get people to take more decisions. I joke often with them to bring me solutions, not problems. But people want, in a sense, to offload the responsibility for taking decisions. I would

like to see particular teachers taking more decisions. This remark suggests that Principal One may not develop cooperative relationships with the people with whom he works. It seems that if teachers knew the solution to their problems, they would not need to seek out the advice of the school principal because, when asked if ideas put forth by teachers are used, Principal One responds,

I hope so. I think it's true to say that most initiatives are top down and I guess that's about the fact that they are very involved in the day-to-day tasks and it's much more difficult for them to step back and see what's going on in a wider way. So they come from me or they come from other senior members of staff. They come through the strategy team but even there the agenda is largely determined by me.

This comment suggests that Principal One does not give people discretion to make their own decisions and since the agenda is determined by him, the teachers may feel dependent on him to make recommendations on whatever issue that is being discussed. The principal contends that teachers do what is expected of them declaring,

none of us is perfect but I think that my greatest expectation is that they should be fully committed to the job that they're doing and I think that is true about every one of my staff. I would not have been able to say that many years in the past, but I certainly can say that today and that's marvellous and that's, in a sense, what I think is also distinctive about this school and why I don't fear any evaluative review or inspection.

This suggests that even though this principal views the teachers as committed to their job, he may be reluctant to share decision making or power with them.

Principal One declares that ownership for the projects they work on is given to teachers, but contends, however, that

he usually initiates the projects and the teachers work with them and carry them through to completion. This suggests that the principal may not get others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on. Principal One also asserts that because, "we sometimes make decisions on the hoof, all participants are not involved in decision making." He insists that because there isn't sufficient time, "the biggest area of mistake is overlooking to tell people or to consult." This suggests that this principal, by leaving others uninformed, may not create an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects he leads. Principal One seems to perceive that he is not Enabling Others to Act.

Factor Four: Modeling the Way - When questioned on personal beliefs about leadership, Principal One contends that he believes leadership is about being enabling, caring and supportive of followers. He also maintains that the personal integrity of leaders should be high (see page 53, Quotation 1). This suggests that Principal One seems to be clear about his own philosophy of leadership. Regarding his belief about how the school should be run, the principal describes,

A belief that we have is that we should all treat each other in a courteous manner, with respect. Now that means pupil to pupil, teacher to pupil, principal to staff, principal to pupils - all the interactions. I hope that nobody would say of me that I do not treat them with respect and I do not treat them with courtesy. Again, that's not to say that I'm not from time to time challenging or that I avoid conflict if I feel it has to be challenged.

Principal One contends that teachers should know his beliefs about how the school should be managed, declaring that,

it should be, above all, a place where the children can learn well in a stimulating environment. Where they feel secure and to some extent happy. I'm not above challenging them so that at times they do not feel particularly happy. But overall it should be a place where they enjoy being and certainly feel secure.

This suggests that the principal lets others know his beliefs on how to best run the organization he leads.

Principal One believes that he follows the values agreed upon with the teachers of this school, claiming,

I hope so, I mean I think that it's true of all of us that from time to time we maybe revert to some gut feelings. I hope the policy comes out of well thought out consideration of these matters and it should be second nature to anyone.

This comment suggests that Principal One feels he is consistent in practising the values he espouses. He maintains that as part of school planning he, "would expect teachers to know precisely where they're going" at specific times during the school year. This suggests that he makes sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans and establishes milestones for the projects they work on. This principal appears to perceive that he is Modeling the Way.

Factor 5: Encouraging the Heart - Principal One maintains that he celebrates with teachers at the end of a successful project. The principal explains,

That's done in a variety of ways, but certainly I try always to express thanks to people who have successfully brought about a project. I write notes, either general notes to the core which expresses in writing my appreciation and I write to individuals. It surprises them sometimes.... I send a letter to their home saying how much I appreciate what they've done. I went further than that and at the end of a couple of occasions where we had these special weeks, I not only sent a letter but I sent flowers to the teachers. They weren't from me personally, they were from the school

but nevertheless I was the instigator, but they didn't like that. They thought that it was singling out people in a way that was inappropriate and that everyone, in a sense, had a part to play. I think there was also an element too that they felt it was part patronizing, which perhaps it was, but I didn't mean it that way.... They can't stop me writing. This is my style.

The comment above suggests that Principal One appears to ensure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of school projects and he seems to praise people for a job well done. It also suggests that the principal gives members of the team appreciation and support for their contributions and that he finds ways to celebrate accomplishments. He states,

In an ideal world, this is one thing about resources. In an ideal world, I think the principal should be supportive to the extent that they are a very real presence in the school, day by day, lesson by lesson, visiting and encouraging and taking part. In reality, it's a problem of sharing out the time and responding to all the demands such that I personally feel that's an area of frustration for me. I don't have enough time to do that in the kind of way that would be recognized as both purposeful and recognized as being supportive. So what I do, I do as much as I can, but it's not as much as I would like. I have this vision of the principal being a bit like the store manager, in that they should be, at least 50% of the time, they should be on the floor, walking around observing and assisting and interacting. I don't get 50% of my time to do that. With more resources so that more of the work that I do would be delegated elsewhere, I could.

Principal One seems to believe that he practices Encouraging the Heart.

The data presented suggest that Principal One believes he exhibits many of the investigated exemplary leadership practices - Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart. Thus, Principal One perceives that he possesses several of the necessary exemplary leadership

qualities that may accompany site-based management.

Principal Two. The second principal interviewed for this study presents an interesting contrast to Principal One. Data gathered through the use of the Chapman (1982) Interview Schedule on The Relationship Between Principal and Members of School Council: An Attitude Scale, are presented and analyzed. This principal will be referred to as Principal Two, and female (as with Principal One, the gender may or may not be accurate).

Principal Two succinctly summed up personal leadership beliefs as, "the iron fist in the velvet glove". The principal expresses a belief in democracy, where everyone is valued and contends she does not believe in a dictatorship. She states a personal belief about leadership, declaring,

it's got to be democratic. Everyone has to have their ideas listened to, valued, discussed and perhaps adopted. I don't believe in dictatorship in leadership at all. I had a dictator for a principal in my school before I came here. I swore if I ever became principal, I would never be like her. She ruled her staff with a rod of iron and they all resented it. It created a very bad relationship.

However when addressing the principal's influence on school council, Principal Two asserts,

I think most school councils, and I'm speaking for my own, they do listen to the principal. I mean 99.9% of the time the principal has her way. Obviously you (the principal) know what is best for the school because you work in the school. You're on the shop floor. School council members realize this.

This suggests that Principal Two believes that members of school council act as a rubber stamp, merely legitimizing the principal's decisions. In reference to what extent the principal

is prepared to use her expertise to influence decision making, Principal Two declares, "Oh, we'll use it all the time. If it's something you really want, you're obviously going to try to influence the school council to your side."

When questioned about what she considers the bases of the principal's influence on school council to be, Principal Two claims,

the principal's influence on school council members can be quite strong. Obviously the school principal knows the school better than any council member of the school can and the wise school council member will listen to the principal. If they disagree, then you know you can discuss these things or the school council member can come in and see what the principal is talking about, but on the whole, I think school council members listen to the principal because of the very nature of things. You're on the shop floor. You know more about the school than them because you're here every day.

She also emphasizes the factor that most influences relationships between principals and school council members, declaring,

the attitude of the principal toward school council members is an important factor. I think what you have to realize is that they're not really well versed in the mechanics of running a school and I think you need to be patient and help in that way. It's a two way relationship. You know, they support us if they're given lots of information.

The two comments presented above suggest that Principal Two feels school council members do not possess sufficient information about the school to challenge the recommendations of the principal.

In reference to the extent to which she thinks school council members would yield to the principal's professional expertise, Principal Two explains,

it depends on the school council members. I don't think I can give you any answer on that one. I think if it's a reasonable argument and they can see the reasons behind it ... then on the whole, 90 times out of 100, the school council members will yield to the principal's request, but there are times when that doesn't happen.

When asked whether the school council would support her if she did object to something, Principal Two insists, "oh yes, I think so, because we're the ones who've got to put things into practice, aren't we?" This suggests that the principal feels she is entitled to veto discussion on any issue perceived as a threat to her authority. The principal also states that,

normally the school council listens to the principal. They know we know what we're talking about. The school council members are sensible. They listen to the principal and their staff, as long as you can justify what you want.

This comment suggests that the principal believes the school council should always support the recommendations of the principal. Principal Two also declares that on her school council, control is exercised through agenda setting, "quite a bit", but she adds that the agenda at this particular school is set with input from both the principal and school council chairperson.

When questioned about striking a balance between democracy and efficiency in school administration, Principal Two alleges,

that's difficult. There are times when, to be efficient, you've got to make the decisions yourself. But even then, you don't make those decisions until you have the opinions of the school council members. You go away and think about it. Democracy, I think is very, very important in a school. The whole community of the school, whether they're teaching staff, non teaching staff, school council members. You know you need to listen to each other but there comes a time when, yes, you've got to make the decision.

This suggests that the principal appears to believe democratic procedures must sometimes be foregone in the interest of efficiency in school administration. Principal Two believes there are particular characteristics of a school that may effect relationships, suggesting,

obviously if you've got a school that's unfriendly and intolerant, the relationship won't be good. I mean you have to present a friendly front, you know, an interested front. Tolerance, respect and willingness for the school to listen to people. I think this is important as well. Willingness to lend a helping hand.... Obviously if the opposite of these things are true, you haven't got an effective school, have you?

When asked to what extent school council members govern or merely legitimate the policy making function of the principal, Principal Two responds,

I think it's a good balance of both. I think they make their presence known, as they jolly well should. They do have this responsibility to oversee the running of the school and they do legitimize the policy making but I think it's a lot more than that. It's a good balance of the two. They do, they do govern, yes they do.

When questioned about the relationship between the principal and school council members of this school, the principal says, "it's excellent. The school council members are very supportive." She believes this relationship could be further improved, however, declaring,

I would like more school visits on the part of school council members. I would like them to visit the school more often, to see actually what's going on in the school. Everything that we have plus that would be ideal.

When questioned if the principal should seek the support of others or rely on her own influence as an expert, this principal states,

I think you should seek the support of your teacher representative on school council because they represent the staff as well as you do. I think often the teacher representative can put a different slant on things because they're the ones in the classroom. Particularly if its got to do with curriculum or school management.

This suggests that Principal Two appears to believe she must establish that the professional rights of principal and staff are not challenged by members of council, by presenting a united front.

In reference to the division of labour on school council, Principal Two reports,

most school council members don't pay visits to the school. I mean some of them do, but mainly the input they do is at committee meetings and the main school council meetings. So their input is very valuable, but in terms of time, it's not nearly as much as the principal puts in. I mean, we spend a long time preparing the reports for school council.... They have a chance to read them before the meeting. Sometimes they want to question you on it and sometimes they don't.... But on the whole, it isn't an arduous task but it does bear a fair amount of responsibility.... It's all voluntary.

Principal Two alleges that the balance of power that underlies this division is,

They all get the relevant information about the school from the principal's report and the other information that gets fed to them. So they do get the information. What they don't actually see is the work in progress at the school, the children actually working in the school, but then that's difficult, most of them are working people.

This suggests that the principal may feel it is up to her to indicate those issues which are important issues for council deliberations. Principal Two feels however, that, "most of the school council members have influence in different areas" stating,

you have to be elected you see. The school council is broken up into various committees, finance, personnel, curriculum, so those particular school council members have influence in those areas. Finance is a very strong area where school council members have to approve the school budget and they can very much influence how the school spends its money. Curriculum, perhaps not to such an extent because again this is the place where you, the school knows its needs best, but they have to approve the curriculum, of course. Personnel, of course, there they'd have a large part to play because they're outside the school situation. They're advisory.

Principal Two contends that school council,

has the oversee of the running of the whole school, managerial, curriculum, administration. They oversee the lot - appointment of staff - I mean, you name it, they oversee it, one way or another, either through documents or personally by being there at interviews or at meetings. They oversee most things in the school.

Principal Two highlights an area where school council and the principal might disagree, declaring,

the budget can be a bit tricky. Setting the annual budget can be a little tricky because there's a lot of money involved you know. The school council has to set it within the budget limits. I've never known any discrepancy over curriculum documents or anything like that.

When questioned on how the relationship between principals and school council members is affected by the community characteristic of ability to finance education, Principal Two asserts, "We do not have the finances to run the school as it should be run. Corners have to be cut. Economies have to be made where we are playing with the future of our children."

When questioned about who most often initiates action, makes proposals for change, recommends alternatives, this principal contends,

well anybody can make a proposal. It's usually after discussion. You see, something comes up on the agenda, we

discuss it and somebody says, well I propose we do this about it, or the chairperson says: Do you want to make a proposal? They make a proposal and they need a seconder for that. Anyone on school council can make a proposal. Anyone who feels they have gotten to the point where they can make a proposal.... Anything can be voted on. It may not always be accepted. In which case somebody may say: Well, why don't we do it like this or word it like this? Then it will be thrashed out as a whole body.

Principal Two suggests that in the main, council members always approve the alternatives proposed by the principal, stating, "Yes because normally it's been discussed ... but on the whole, yes they do." She contends there is nobody on council who opposes her declaring, "No, no. We treat them with respect and they treat us with respect. It's a two-way relationship." This suggests that she may feel it is inappropriate for school council members to censure the principal or in any way exercise control over her behaviour. When questioned if clashes are over important issues or if they are more idiosyncratic, Principal Two insists, "It's not applicable, is it? We haven't had any clashes", yet she adds,

one school council member isn't happy with the length of the school hours in the junior school. They're one hour and ten minutes short a week, and she has called a meeting for Friday. But it'll be discussed perfectly amicably. There won't be any clash. We shall find common ground and sort it out.

When asked what principal and school council members zones of tolerance are, Principal Two contends,

usually the school council members, you know, they're reasonable beings and we've got to be tolerant of each others feelings. We're all individuals, but the level of tolerance and politeness and respect which is shown at school council meetings is really quite marked. Nobody is rude to anybody else.

According to the data presented, this principal appears to perceive that she makes use of her influence on school council, but insists that school council members use their influence on school council as well. Ultimately, however, the principal appears to believe that school council members should yield to her, based on her experience as principal of this school and her expertise in the field of education.

To analyze this principal's self-perception of her leadership approach, analysis of the data gathered through interview will be explored in terms of the factors provided by Kouzes and Posner (1989).

Factor One: Challenging the Process - Principal Two explains that she has introduced two new programs to the school in the past year, stating, "one is a nursery program and the other is we've changed our handwriting." She maintains that experimentation with new ideas or programs is done, "only after staff consultation and we're pretty sure of our ground when we actually do anything. If we thought it would be a failure I think we would say no." Principal Two could not give any examples of programs where she would take risks declaring, "not off the top of my head, no." This comment suggests that this principal neither seeks out challenging opportunities that test her skills and abilities nor challenges the way they do things in this school.

Principal Two claims that if an idea or program did experience failure, how she would feel about it would,

depend on how badly it affected the children. Obviously if it really did affect children badly we'd obviously have to back track straight away.... Luckily, that's never happened here. Things that we have tried, we have been fairly sure of because it's after a lot of consultation, really looking at what we're doing.

Principal Two, when asked, explains that she attends approximately a dozen one day courses and about ten one day seminars per year as part of her professional development. However, she contends that she does not attend professional development, "as much as I used to because I prefer my staff to go on them." This suggests that she appears to feel others should stay up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting the organization, but it is not necessary that she do likewise. The principal also suggests that she encourages teachers to attend professional development sessions, but none are compulsory. Noncompulsory attendance at professional inservice sessions, "depends very much on the needs of the school." The principal maintains that she enjoys challenge in her work,

to a certain extent, but I tend to want to be safe. I think with years of experience you know the things that will work and the things that won't and obviously things have changed enormously. I mean the whole job changed in the last five years. We've our own budget and the national curriculum. I mean the whole job has completely changed direction, so the whole time it has been a challenge, the last five years. Some of it I've enjoyed; some I haven't.

This principal contends that she,

challenges teachers all the time to strive to do better. Mainly it's done through staff meetings.... At staff meetings we pool our ideas on how we can improve.... Again it's very much a whole staff thing. The vice principal plays a big role in this, by example of good practice.

This suggests that Principal Two seems to challenge the way

teachers do things at work.

When questioned whether this principal practices the philosophy "by mistakes we learn", the reply was,

Not consciously, but I think possibly that is one of the best ways to learn, isn't it? I don't think I do that consciously. No. As I say, I tend to want to stay on the safe side. I don't like trying things that have got an element of failure in them. A strong element of failure.

This suggests that when there is a chance of failure Principal Two seems not to experiment or take risks with new approaches to her work, therefore she cannot ask "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected. Principal Two seems to perceive that she does not Challenge the Process.

Factor Two: Inspiring a Shared Vision - Principal Two declares that her vision for the school is,

to make it the best school possible, really. This is the age that every child should be at their best, should be happy at school and enjoy what they're doing. The staff should work well together. The parents should be happy with what's going on and feel they can approach the school with any problems. It needs to be an all around caring, respectful and confident school. People have to have confidence in us.

She maintains that teachers are encouraged to share in those goals, "It's very much a whole school goal." Teachers share in this goal, "through staff meetings, discussions, by example, they see me at work, see the way I cope with parents. If anybody has problems with parents I help them resolve them. Usually I do it by example." On the one hand, she talks about people having, "confidence in us" while on the other hand, she suggests, "I do it by example." This suggests that the principal seems to want people to have confidence in the school and it is a whole school

goal but she does not display this confidence in teachers, since only she appears to deal with parents.

Regarding future prospects for this school, the principal claims,

it's difficult for me to say because I'm not going to be here. Obviously I want it to move on. I've been here a long time and you know the danger that things will stand still. They've got to move on. Obviously, I hope the person who takes over from me will keep on the good because she must believe in what she's doing. The things that she feels are not right for her and her school, then she must change them. What's right for me may not be right for my successor. Nothing is perfect in this world. There are a lot of things I know that are not perfect. My successor may want to change the whole thing.

This suggests that the principal does not indicate to others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision. The principal won't remain in this school because she will have retired from teaching, however she believes that in the next five years there will be a big change in staff, stating,

I can see almost a complete changeover in staff. Two members will definitely be retired by then. The other three, I think will move on to pastures new, because that's the only way to get promotion and they're both excellent teachers.... So I can see a big changeover in staff in the next five years, almost a complete changeover in staff.

This comment suggests that the principal seems not to have a dream for the future of this school, therefore she cannot appeal to others to share it. It also suggests that she does not clearly communicate a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of this organization and that although this person may look forward and forecast what she expects the future to be like, future prospects, according to her, do not appear to be

very positive. Since this school is a feeder school for a junior school, the principal believes that a common vision which is shared with teachers is to have a, "closer relationship with the junior school".

We've had a meeting ... to try to make the transition from this school to the junior school as smooth as possible for our children and for the staff taking our children over there. There's always been a lot of liaison but we've felt recently it hasn't been quite strong enough. There are areas on which we don't quite meet ... areas on which we could clash, if we don't work on it.

Even here, it seems that Principal Two appears to provide evidence suggesting that she is not contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities. Principal Two appears to perceive that she does not Inspire a Shared Vision.

Factor Three: Enabling Others to Act - Principal Two contends that teachers are involved in planning what happens in the school. This happens,

through regular meetings. The coordinators of various subjects have different areas of responsibility and we plan our staff meetings ... to see how much time they want... to do whatever they want to do, for example, at the moment, science ... one of the teachers has taken on science this year and she's not done it before and so she needs a lot of help.

This suggests that Principal Two involves others in planning the actions they will take. Regarding giving teachers autonomy over managing their classrooms, the principal comments, "Classroom management, we have a policy for. Teachers are diverse, they're all different, but you have to have a common policy, so the ethos is the same." This suggests that the principal does not give people discretion to make their own decisions, and since policy

documents seem to determine action taken at this school, there appears to be no opportunity for innovativeness. However, she maintains that ideas put forth by teachers are used in the school, "if the ideas are good and you feel they're working, you use them because, you see, this is the only way you get the variety in the school." Principal Two believes teachers do what is expected of them, asserting,

I obviously see what's going on in the classrooms and I see their formal planning and from what I see around the school and in the classrooms, they're obviously following that through. The planning is based on our policy ... so then, you see, slipshod work isn't going on.

This remark suggests the principal feels she may not create an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects she leads. Principal Two contends that teachers are given ownership for the projects they work on, stating, "Well, you make sure that the teachers do know their work is valued. I think it's very important. You make sure the staff are valued." She declares that "we do have a common policy on behaviour, all that sort of thing." This suggests that the teachers at this school stick very much to whatever the school policy on each issue dictates, therefore Principal Two appears not to perceive that she Enables Others to Act.

Factor Four: Modeling the Way - Principal Two comments on personal beliefs about leadership, proclaiming that she much prefers democracy over dictatorship, since she believes that dictatorial leadership creates dissension within the school (see page 69, Quotation 1). This suggests that Principal Two seems to

be clear about her own philosophy of leadership. With regard to following the values she agreed upon with the teachers, she declares, "Well, we try. There's nothing perfect in this world, is there? We try." This suggests that the principal may not always be consistent in practising the values she espouses. The principal contends that teachers know her beliefs about how the school should be run stating, "Oh yes, again it's done through whole staff discussions." This suggests that Principal Two lets others know her beliefs on how best to run the organization she leads. The principal states her beliefs about how the school should be managed,

The diversity of the children, every teacher should be aware of every child's weaknesses. They're all, I've never met the average child. They're all very different.... Teachers need to be very much aware, they need to cater to those children's needs, right from the bottom of the scale right to the top. The classrooms should be attractive, well ordered, things stored in the right places, so there's easy access for the children.... The children should be trained to look after their things and there should be a general order and calm around the school. Children know what's expected of them ... know things that are acceptable and are not acceptable. They should be polite, work well with each other, share.... I mean that is how I like to see the school, quiet, well ordered, children happy but not excited.

Principal Two insists she tries to stand by these values of how the school should be run yet adds,

sometimes things happen and you have to, perhaps, turn a blind eye. People are human. Teachers are human. Things do go wrong. Sometimes, you have to curb your tongue and not say what's on the tip of it.

As part of their planning, Principal Two expects teachers to plan different areas of the curriculum for each term, "There is a general plan for everyone, who does what, when, where." This

suggests that Principal Two seems to make sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans and establishes milestones for the projects they work on. This principal appears to perceive that she practices Modeling the Way.

Factor Five: Encouraging the Heart - Principal Two describes how she celebrates with teachers at the end of a successful term, stating, "we always go out for a meal ... or we have a buffet at the classroom.... At the end of a term, we do something as a staff." This suggests that the principal finds ways to celebrate accomplishments and takes time for celebration when project milestones are reached. The principal claims that she openly praises teachers individually and within the group when they have done a good job on a project. This suggests that Principal Two makes sure people are recognized for their contributions to the success of their projects. When questioned on how she would show recognition of peoples' contributions to the school, the explanation provided is, "Well it depends on what it is, really." Principal Two would say to a person who decorates the school, "My goodness, you did a beautiful job, and I would point it out to other members of the staff - Have you seen?" To another who has worked on policy documents, Principal Two might say at a staff meeting, "Well I think that's really good. Thank you for all the work you've put into it." This suggests that Principal Two praises people for a job well done and she gives the members of the team lots of appreciation for their contributions. The principal contends,

obviously you must praise. Again, it shows that you value what they're doing.... It's very, very important you do not take your teachers for granted, because they do put in a lot of extra work, that's not in their job description. They do it because they want to do it, you might say, and I think they value that.

She also explained, "It's very easy to be isolated as a principal." Principal Two explains that she makes herself part of the staff by mixing with them, "I am part of the staff.... I like to hear that we're friends as well as colleagues. It makes a very good atmosphere in the school." Principal Two appears to perceive that she practices Encouraging the Heart.

The data presented suggest that this principal believes she exhibits only two of the investigated exemplary leadership practices - Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart. This suggests that Principal Two seems to perceive herself as being more conservative in areas that require risk taking and therefore perceives herself as being less adaptive to the site-based management process.

After having examined these principals' self-perceptions of their leadership approaches, it appears that Principal One seems to believe that he exhibits more, while Principal Two seems to believe that she utilizes fewer, exemplary leadership practices. Thus, their self-perceptions of their leadership approaches seem to be different. However, both principals, when questioned as to the extent, as principal, they are prepared to use their expertise to influence decision making, insist they would use their influence on the school council. One of the principals contends, "Oh, I think that's something that we do as fully and

as often as we need", while the other principal maintains, "Oh, we'll use it all the time. Fully. If it's something you really want you're obviously going to influence the school council members to your side."

Even though both principals report that they do use their influence on school council, in reference to the extent to which school council members govern or merely legitimate the policy making recommendations of the principal, Principal One comments, "My perspective is that I would welcome a little more involvement. Their perspective might be that I seem to do it all before they can get their hands on it", while Principal Two suggests, "I think it's a good balance of both. I think they make their presence known, as they jolly well should.... They do, they do govern, yes they do." This appears to be somewhat contradictory since it seems that the latter principal described may want to influence others as much as possible, yet simultaneously may see herself as allowing others to act, as well. Principal One, who according to his own statement, appeared to exhibit most dominance, also seemed to be more self-assured that his leadership approach was more exemplary. Principal Two, who seemed to believe she should use her influence on school council, but also felt others on school council could use their influence as well, seemed to feel that she exhibited less exemplary leadership practices. Ultimately, however, both principals, according to their own perceptions, appear to use their influence on school council as much as possible, but

their approaches to leadership are different.

Quantitative data that were collected from responses on the Leadership Practices Inventory: Self and the Attitude Scale for dominance and were analyzed using regression analysis support the interview findings that there appears to be no significant relationship between the leadership approach of school principals as perceived by themselves and their attitudes toward the degree of dominance that should exist. The R Square of .03757 indicates that 3% of principals' attitude toward the degree of dominance that should exist is explained by self-perception of leadership approach. The degrees of freedom were 1, 11, $F = .42938$, $p = .5258$. Although a limited sample size, the accepted level of significance set for this research study of $p < .05$ was not reached. The hypothesis was not supported. This supports the interview data that there appeared not to be a significant relationship between the amount of dominance principals perceive as appropriate in school council and their perception of their own leadership approach.

Hypothesis Two

There is a positive relationship between the leadership approach of the school principal as perceived by school council members and the school councils' attitude toward the degree of dominance that should exist.

Data were collected from responses on the Leadership Practices Inventory : Other and the Attitude Scale for dominance

and were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The R Square of .05071 indicates that 5% of school councils' attitude toward the degree of dominance that should exist is explained by their perception of the principal's leadership approach. The degrees of freedom were 1, 42, $F = 2.24347$, $p = .1417$. This relationship was not significant at the $p < .05$ level. The hypothesis was not supported. Data collected from interviews with school council members involved in school councils support the quantitative data that there was no significant relationship between the school council members' attitude toward dominance and their perception of the principal's leadership approach.

To explore both principals' use of dominance within school council, as perceived by others, data gathered through the use of the Chapman (1982) Interview Schedule on The Relationship Between Principal and Members of School Council: An Attitude Scale, are presented and analyzed. For simplicity and clarity, and at the same time to protect confidentiality, a similar procedure as was used to identify the research participants for Hypothesis One will be applied to describe the research participants who contributed the data that made possible the analysis of Hypothesis Two. Thus, one principal shall be considered male and referred to as Principal One, the other principal will be considered female and referred to as Principal Two (the gender may or may not be accurate). In addition to these precautionary measures, all other participants in the study, teachers and school council members, will be considered female and referred to

as such (the gender may or may not be accurate).

Principal One. A parent representative at this school suggests that the ideal situation between Principal One and school council may not exist in this school because, as a parent school council representative, she feels,

Perhaps she should be given a little more leeway, more contact with parents. At the moment, we are not allowed contact with parents. I feel restricted. Parents feel we parent representatives on school council should be more accessible. We are told things by parents and then we go to the principal and we don't go back to parents.

This data sample suggests that the school council member feels the principal is not entitled to veto discussion on any issue perceived as a threat to his authority and it suggests that this school council member believes her prime responsibility is not to the administration of the school, rather it is to parents, a section of the public this council member was elected to represent. The data sample presented above also suggests that this school council member feels she should not be expected to bring any contentious issue to the notice of the principal prior to raising it in council.

A school council member suggests the principal has almost the full balance of power on the school council stating, "Even if we have something to say, we get knocked down." This suggests that this council member believes the principal is not justified in blocking discussion on any issue that has implications for the day-to-day running of the school. A parent school council member alleges,

Sometimes I think we're just a number. I think that as a parent school council representative, we don't have that much influence.... Decisions are made based on what information we are given by the principal.... The school council has got a wide range of different people and the principal seeks their advice. He doesn't really take it.

This data sample suggests that the council member does not feel it is inappropriate for members of school council to censure Principal One or in any way exercise control over his behaviour. This parent school council representative tells that she is not a voice for other parents on the school council and she is allowed to speak only when asked.

A school council member maintains that on school council "We all have our little pigeon holes.... We just do what the principal tells us all the time." This suggests the school council member believes members of school council act as a rubber stamp, merely legitimizing the principal's decisions. A school council representative feels the principal has, "almost all the power". This person declares the principal would use his expertise to influence decision making 85% of the time, but expresses the belief that the principal should seek support from staff and the school council chairperson and not rely primarily on his influence as an expert. However, she believes, "most definitely" school council members depend on the principal for information about the school and education in general. It appears that this school council member feels dependent on the principal. She contends that Principal One alone sets the agenda for school council meetings and full control is thereby set, stating, "We follow it. We do not go off the agenda." This

data sample suggests this person believes the principal does not have to be prepared to provide information on all issues about which members of school council wish to be informed, since Principal One chooses what information is brought before council.

A parent school council member claims that parent representatives are required to bring the ideas of parents directly to Principal One. The principal then takes them to school council meetings. "The principal always listens. We get through to the principal. He makes sure he gets credit for the ideas." This comment suggests Principal One seems to take the ideas of others and use them as his own. According to one council representative, the principal most often initiates action and makes proposals for change on school council. This school council representative also reports that school council members would yield to the principal's professional expertise to influence decision making, stating, "A lot would depend on that. The principal knows best."

When a school council representative was asked what are the bases upon which decisions are made, she replied they are, "based on what information we are given by the principal." This suggests that this council member believes school council members do not possess sufficient information about the school to challenge the recommendations of the principal. One school council representative believes that management has to be done by the principal because of his qualifications. When asked how you would strike a balance between democracy and

efficiency in school administration, a parent representative suggests,

There's only one person (the principal) that the management can be done by. He is the one with the qualifications We do (bow to the principal's expertise). But we know no different.... Us Moms really can only speak for our children.... We want what's best for our children.

This suggests the school council member feels that members of school council should always support the recommendations of the principal.

The data provided seem to indicate that although school council members may complain about the dominance exerted by Principal One within this school council, the principal's use of his influence over others may be preferred. These data also suggest that council members in this school may not see themselves as valued and contributing members on school council. At this school, a school council member's lack of confidence may have been a product of the amount of principal dominance she was being exposed to.

To analyze others' perception of this principal's leadership approach, analysis of the data gathered through interview will be explored in terms of the factors provided by Kouzes and Posner, 1989.

Factor One: Challenging the Process - When questioned if Principal One has introduced any new programs/ideas to the school this year, a teacher and a school council member suggested that the principal had introduced the "Writers Initiative" which is the teaching of a new style of writing to the children. This

innovation, they added however, is in direct response to the national curriculum. Thus, it was a required change in program. Both teacher and school council member suggest that Principal One experiments with new programs/ideas even to the point of risking failure, yet the school council member is uncertain of what these programs might be. However, the teacher reports some things the principal might try.

In terms of curriculum the principal might try a language study.... French ... that may not be something that's going to stay, but he would certainly like to give it a try. In terms of management, his management style, he has experimented with different groups in the whole time I've been here and I don't believe that he would want to do it again. Sometimes they work better than others.

When asked what this teacher meant when she referred to "different groups" she added,

Having a flat management structure where you don't have any teachers on incentive points or, having a clearly divided hierarchical structure with clear areas of responsibility. I think he is ready to try anything. I think over the time I've worked with this principal he has been exploring management.... He would try anything. I mean, he feels as though a more flattened structure is better, but whether in practice it works ... though he seems to be fitted more easily to a hierarchical structure.

This suggests Principal One would experiment and take risks with new approaches to his work even when there is a chance of failure and that he seems to look for innovative ways to improve the organization. The comment presented above also suggests that Principal One appears to seek out challenging opportunities that test his skills and abilities. Regarding how this principal would feel if a program experienced failure, one interviewed teacher believes the principal would become "upset". A second

interviewed teacher believes Principal One would become "very defensive" suggesting this principal,

does very much like things to be successful and if they're not he is not easy to deal with. I don't think he would find it easy to say I made a mistake. This principal likes success.... I don't think he would find it very easy to admit a failure.... The principal would feel uncomfortable about it. He is much better if things go well.

This suggests that the principal may not ask "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected. When questioned whether the principal attends professional development inservice sessions, one teacher suggests that Principal One has many "out-of-school" commitments but this person wonders where he spends so much time.

I think he certainly attends an awful lot of things out of school and I don't know what they are. We have requested that we are informed about it.... I think it should be outside of school time.... There's so much work to be done.

This suggests the teachers are somewhat unsure whether Principal One stays up-to-date on the most recent developments. Regarding teacher professional development, a teacher maintains that this principal, "allows it, but does not encourage it." The interviewed teachers agreed that no teacher professional inservice sessions were compulsory at this school. One teacher contends, "It's up to us to find our own professional development." This suggests Principal One may not challenge the way things are done in the school. One teacher believes the principal enjoys challenge in his work suggesting he enjoys putting a production or performance together. According to one teacher, Principal One challenges teachers by an expectation of delegating a project. "The principal expects you to do whatever

task he gives." Others appear to perceive that Principal One is not Challenging the Process.

Factor Two: Inspiring a Shared Vision - A teacher believes that the principal's vision is to identify this school as a well performing school, while a school council member maintains she doesn't know the principal's vision, because this person has been at the school for only two years. This school council member also adds that she, "hasn't seen that much development." One teacher who seems to be aware of the principal's vision for the school suggests that teachers are encouraged to share in the principal's vision through meetings, producing documents and training weekends, while another teacher who doesn't know the principal's vision suggests Principal One keeps teachers "up to date" but otherwise there is "no involvement". This teacher contends that this principal does not share a common vision for the school with her. The data presented above suggest that the principal does not share his vision with all other stakeholders at this particular school. Thus it seems, Principal One neither describes the kind of future he would like others and himself to create together, nor appeals to others to share his dream, since, it seems, at least one person does not even know the principal's vision.

One interviewed school council member contends she doesn't know how Principal One feels about future prospects for this school, while a teacher believes the principal feels optimistic about the future. When asked to describe what this school will

be like in five years from now if the present principal remains here, one teacher believes there will be a new nursery, new buildings and new educational trends, however a second interviewed teacher pondered over the question for a long time and finally replied,

I find that very difficult because I can't imagine anything being any different. If he stays here, I think it will be changes that have been put in place in the last number of years. It would be a greatly enhanced school with regard to physical changes.... I worry about the ethos.

This statement suggests that Principal One does not clearly communicate a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of the organization. It also suggests the principal does not show others how their long term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision. One teacher also suggests that since many of the staff are looking for a change and at the end of this year are leaving the school, she sees the school as having few senior teachers and many beginning teachers in the future. The teacher is not quite sure if such a combination will work well together. This suggests the principal of this school does not project to others a contagiously excited and enthusiastic feeling about future possibilities. Principal One, as perceived by others, appears not to Inspire a Shared Vision.

Factor Three: Enabling Others to Act - One interviewed teacher contends that as part of the senior teachers' group they, "discuss things, plan ahead and we report back to the principal." She also adds, however, "we've had to become more structured. Now, we've got everything planned ahead." She declares, "the

principal overrides us ... on occasions, recently." The second interviewed teacher suggests teachers are involved in curriculum decisions, but are not involved in management decisions. One teacher maintains that Principal One allows teachers to make decisions about classroom management, suggesting, "I'm in charge of my classroom." The second teacher contends that the principal sets broad parameters while allowing teachers to make decisions about curriculum and to manage their own classrooms. An interviewed teacher also suggests that teachers' ideas, ranging from behaviour policies to curriculum changes to planning for special events, are utilized by the principal. This suggests Principal One gives people discretion to make their own decisions. A school council member and a teacher believe the principal gives them ownership for the projects they work on but the teacher contends, "the principal has the say so." Since the principal sanctions decisions, these data appear to suggest that others have been given a false sense of empowerment. When questioned if Principal One uses ideas put forth by others, one teacher declares, "Generally as a whole, no. I think the principal would modify ideas.... You know he develops his own ideas, tends to actually think of his own focus first." This principal, as perceived by others, appears not to Enable Others to Act.

Factor Four: Modeling the Way - One interviewed school council member contends she doesn't know the principal's beliefs about leadership, while an interviewed teacher suggests that

Principal One wants to believe he is a facilitator, but,

on occasions, is more autocratic than he would like to be. I don't think he recognizes this in himself. The principal feels he is very approachable, but there are people who have worked with the principal who don't feel that way.

This data sample suggests that this teacher perceives Principal One to be unclear about his philosophy of leadership. When questioned whether the principal always follows the values he agreed upon, one teacher replies "Yes" while a second teacher reiterates that she doesn't really know the principal's values, adding that at one point the principal said class sizes would be kept low, "but this did not happen." This suggests that Principal One is not perceived to be consistent in practising the values he espouses. Again, regarding the principal's beliefs of how the school should be run, a school council member doesn't know the principal's beliefs, while a teacher knows the principal's beliefs, "broadly" suggesting the principal, "delegates jobs to other people.... He is a delegator ... expects you to get on with that job ... and if there are problems, he would like you to go with a solution in mind as well." This suggests that Principal One does not let people know his beliefs on how to best run the organization and that this principal does not spend time and energy on making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on, since others are somewhat uncertain about what these values are. One teacher maintains that the principal expects teachers to make plans and establish where they will be in each subject at

specific times in the school year, while a second teacher contends the principal, "expects it to be done, but not at such and such a date." This suggests Principal One does not make sure the complete work group sets clear goals and establishes milestones for the projects they work on. It appears that others do not perceive that this principal Models the Way.

Factor Five: Encouraging the Heart - When questioned if Principal One is supportive of you and appreciative of your contributions to the school, one teacher responds affirmatively, suggesting that this principal celebrates with teachers at the end of a successful project or term and he acknowledges teachers' hard work. A second teacher, however replies that "I have felt that because the principal is not very supportive of my views, it's difficult, there have been certain constraints on the amount of support." This suggests that Principal One is perceived by others as not being consistent in Encouraging the Heart. Although he appears to take time to celebrate accomplishments and he makes sure some people are recognized for their contributions to the success of projects, people seem to be praised and feel valued only when their ideas are in agreement with the principal. There appears to be a bartering system in place where support is given in exchange for loyalty. When there is conflict, it seems support is constrained. It appears that Principal One is not always seen as Encouraging the Heart.

Data gathered from others' perspective seem to indicate that Principal One does not exhibit the investigated exemplary

leadership practices - Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart. Thus, others appear to believe that this principal's leadership approach as well as his blatant use of dominance on school council members may not be appropriate for site-based management at this school.

Principal Two. This principal will be referred to as Principal Two and female (as with Principal One, the gender may or may not be accurate). Other participants in the study, teachers and school council members will be referred to as female (the gender may or may not be accurate).

To examine the use of dominance by Principal Two within school council, as perceived by others, data gathered through the use of the Chapman (1982) Interview Schedule on The Relationship Between Principal and Members of School Council: An Attitude Scale, are presented and analyzed.

When questioned, in an interview, if the school principal of a second school uses her expertise to influence school council members, a parent school council member suggests,

I really don't think she does. She just has her say as anyone else involved in whatever situation it was we're talking about. The principal just has her say. She doesn't try to lay down any laws. The principal says things as she sees them and then leaves it open.

This school council member describes the relationship between Principal Two and school council as "Very good" and adds that the ideal relationship exists when the principal and school council are,

able to approach each other, you know, if there's a grievance. It's no good if you can't come to the principal about that, in fact, actually in practice we can.... Well I think really as long as they're approachable; they're open to criticism.

When asked what she considers to be the bases of the principal's influence on school council, the parent representative states,

I think the principal would probably just approach the school council and say her thoughts and I think the school council would take note. It would be discussed, but I think they would probably take the principal's side, because we know her so well. We've known her for a long time. We know that she is good and fair, you know, I can't think of any time that she has been unfair, and I think we would have to take that onboard. We know her character to be honest.

This suggests the school council member believes members of school council should always support the recommendations of Principal Two. Regarding influence, this parent school council representative declares that she would be open to the principal's suggestions:

I think on a personal basis we would all be but when we're all together it wouldn't be that straightforward. It would still be discussed. I know there would always be someone there who would say, lets look at the other side. On a personal one-to-one basis we'd perhaps all think oh yes, you know, going on her knowledge and experience, but then there would be someone who would say, let's look at the other side, which I think that's where parents come in and don't always understand what's going on, so they have questions.

This data sample suggests that the council member feels Principal Two seeks out individual support from school council members. Since, it appears this principal may use her influence by seeking out support from school council members on a personal basis thus forming alliances before council meetings,

regardless if one council member wishes to "look at the other side", Principal Two may already have established a quorum of support before something she recommends comes to a vote.

When one school council member was questioned as to what extent she believes council defers to the principal's professional expertise, she replied,

It would very much depend on what the situation was, but I don't think they would yield unquestionably. You know, it would have to be well thought out, well talked out and not necessarily decided in one meeting. You know, they'd obviously think about it very carefully and take their thoughts onboard, but I think it's a fair school council.

This suggests that even though the school council may deliberate over the principal's request, it seems they would not treat Principal Two unfairly or with disrespect by denying her request. Regarding whether the principal would seek support or rely primarily on her influence as an expert, this person claims,

again, it depends on the situation. I mean if there's something going on in the school that wasn't very important, you know, minor, I think she should go and make her own decisions, as she probably would.

This suggests Principal Two may use influence by deciding what matters are important issues for council deliberations. A council member feels the school council has the support of influentials in the community, however she asserts,

if it was something the principal really wanted and school council was against it, I really don't think that would go down too well with the principal. I think, you know, it would be very hard for her to accept something like that, but it's never arisen.

This suggests the school council member believes that Principal Two would be unhappy if the school council did not implement a

proposal made by her. However, the fact that it has never happened may suggest that this school council always approves the principal's requests. When asked what are the bases on which decisions are made on school council this person responds,

We have curriculum meetings and anything, perhaps we're not too keen on, we have discussed.... The general running of the school, employing teachers, every aspect, I think is discussed. The length of the school day is being discussed at the moment. We have an interview panel for employing teachers.... Obviously the principals are involved. The principals go through the application forms and short list them and then the actual interviews follow. It's not just the principal. It could include a parent and has done.... Each person is short listed and is obviously liked by the principal. We've got a list of requirements, so firstly they must all match those requirements so it's fair. There's no discrimination of any kind then.

This suggests Principal Two may have already used her influence in the selection process long before the decision comes before council, yet this action appears to be considered by the council member as nondiscriminatory behaviour.

A school council representative calls attention to the principal's many years of experience and declares the principal, "has got knowledge. She has got expertise and it seems to have worked over the years." A parent school council representative contends that "every aspect of the school is discussed" yet she believes Principal Two would be prepared to use her influence on "anything that came up that was really necessary." This suggests the council member feels that even though everyone contributes to discussion on issues, the principal holds so much credibility with this school council, due to her expertise and experience, that school council members may allow their

suggestions to be overruled by Principal Two. Regarding who sets the agenda for council meetings, this council member replies, "The chairperson alone, as far as I know" and adds, "usually on the agenda there's any other business. I mean, you can contact him if you've got anything to put on the agenda." However, the school council member asserts one person doesn't often oppose the principal, "Not in this school." Thus, it seems that even though the school council member believes the chairperson may set the agenda for school council meetings, she appears to simultaneously view Principal Two as being unopposed in what she wishes to have done at this school.

In reference to whether relations between principal and school council are affected by the leadership/management skills of individuals, a school council member explains,

indirectly they would, because they would bring about a discussion.... They'd make it their business to find out what's going on about this, that and the other and bring it up.... If they were principals, they'd obviously be informed before anyone else and whereas I'm just a parent representative ... They would take charge of bringing it up, making sure that something is discussed. You know, it's brought to everyone's attention.

This suggests the school council member believes that Principal Two, due to her position in the school, is the bearer of the necessary information that is required for school council deliberations and it seems, this information is provided to the school council at the principal's discretion. When questioned how relations on school council are affected by council members' motivation for serving, a school council member responds,

Usually the principal, the teachers and the parent

school council representatives have obviously got their school and their children as motivation. Sometimes perhaps council representatives are just told to be there, you know, whether they would want to or not. That doesn't mean that they do their jobs as a council representative any worse than they would if they wanted to be there but, you know as regards motivation, I myself, I mean I never dreamt of going on a school council. It was really because I helped so much in the school. They asked a parent to come forward. They had a vacancy for a parent representative and nobody came forward and the principal asked me if I would consider ... and I thought, no I can't do that. She said, "You would, you'd do fine, you care about the school, care about the children". So that's what I did. But it still had to be, a letter had to be sent out and I had to be proposed.... So that was all done. So the last time we had three parents We only have four whole school council meetings a year,... so it takes an awful long time for you to get the, I mean, even now, I think, what are they talking about? What do they mean by that? They'll use things like that and I'll think, what do they mean and it takes an awful long time to get the courage to actually say anything, you know, and to think that you can have some say, but you do definitely.

This data sample suggests that Principal Two may use her influence by recommending that a person put herself forward to be nominated as a school council representative.

In reference to the extent school council exercises its representative and policy-making function, a school council member contends,

I think the principal and the staff involved would do up the subject. If there's something we didn't understand, usually some wording will be changed or something, if we thought it wasn't quite right. There are policies on every single aspect of the school.

This suggests that this school council may act as a rubber stamp, merely legitimizing the principal's decisions. It also suggests that, by having the policies already developed and ready for council approval, Principal Two may prevent any attempts by council members to exercise influence over matters related to the

educational program. Regarding the extent to which school council governs or merely legitimates the policy recommendations of the principal, a council representative contends, "Now, sometimes I feel that we sit there and things are debated, but at the end of the day, I don't feel like we've had a great input. You know what I mean. Not all the time." This suggests that even though it seems school council members are allowed to add to discussions on school council, their contributions to the discussion are not always taken into consideration. When asked how one would strike a balance between democracy and efficiency in school management, a parent school council representative replied,

I think with this school, we're not blasé about it. We wouldn't say the principal knows best and leave it at that. It would still be a case of let's talk it out first, but more often than not it would be the way that the principal considers the right way of running the school. I think because she has done it for so many years and successfully. I mean it wouldn't be just accepted, just like that, but even if it was bandied about for quite some time, really it would be found that perhaps yes, the principal is right ... and I think perhaps, again it depends on the personality of the principal, I suppose, but I think you've got to give them some ... what's the word, I mean this principal has been doing it for so many years. She has got a knowledge, has got expertise. It seems to have worked over the years.

This data sample suggests that the school council members feel it is inappropriate for council members to censure Principal Two or in any way exercise control over her behaviour and that the principal is entitled to exercise influence on any issue which is perceived as a threat to her authority.

In reference to what this council member considers to be the

school council members' influence, this person reports,

I think what they do as a school council is they get all the people who know the school well. Obviously the people who work for the school. They get the principal. I think it's bringing together all sides. At least from my point of view. Then, it's parents and it's outside agencies that bring something, some knowledge. We've got a new parent school council representative who's the head of a University Law and so I think it's bringing together all sides, all views, and from my point of view, perhaps from common sense, not necessarily knowing the legal side of things, never been teacher trained, I don't necessarily understand that side but I can put my views there. I think it's accumulating all that knowledge.

When asked what characteristics of the school affect relationships, a council member maintains, "I think we're so fortunate here. We don't have any problems, but I'm sure other schools do though." The two comments presented above suggest that the school council member may feel that the principal of this school is allowing stakeholder input in decision making, however throughout all the previously presented data, the principal's use of her own influence to affect decision making seems apparent. Even though it appears that members of this school council are permitted to voice their opinions, their views seem to be ignored. Thus, this school council may have a false sense of empowerment.

To analyze school council members' perception of this principal's leadership approach, analysis of the data gathered through interview will be explored in terms of the factors provided by Kouzes and Posner, 1989.

Factor One: Challenging the Process - When questioned if Principal Two has introduced any new programs/ideas to the school

this year, one teacher suggests,

the early years class is something which has been her initiative. We didn't get any funding for that at all. So that's taking five-year-old children in during the two terms before they were five ... and that's something she has wanted for a long, long time.... We were told we could have a nursery class, but we wouldn't get any funding for it. So yes, that's an initiative she has.

This suggests the principal seeks out challenging opportunities that test her skills and abilities. This teacher believes Principal Two would try something that's important to her, even to the point of risking failure, declaring,

This (the nursery), for example has been very important to her over a long period of time ... and we possibly might risk failure if our budget is severely cut again next year, and what do you do? Do you shut it again or does the rest of the school.... What do you do?

This suggests the principal experiments and takes risks with new approaches to her work, even when there is a chance of failure. If an idea/program did experience failure, one teacher believes Principal Two would,

feel very upset, I'm sure, and disillusioned. She would share those feelings with the staff. She doesn't hide things. I mean that's nice.... The principal always ends up trying to be positive.... But she does have these feelings of unhappiness and is disillusioned. She tries to make the best of the situation.

A school council member alleges that the principal might, "be prepared to reconsider" if a program experienced failure. Both interviewed teachers agree that Principal Two attends one professional development inservice session each month and that she encourages teachers to attend professional inservice sessions as well, but these sessions are not compulsory. One teacher adds, "Perhaps we've got a certain subject area that needs

developing or perhaps we've got areas we're sort of weak in.... And if someone hasn't been for a while or something, they would be encouraged to go." This suggests that the principal seems to be aware of teachers' professional development and curricular needs. The preceding data suggest Principal Two stays up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting their organization and it suggests she encourages teachers to do likewise.

A school council member contends the principal enjoys challenge in her work, stating,

I don't think she perhaps enjoys. Enjoys is perhaps not the right word but, you know,... she is always there sorting people out. She is very organized and determined to get things done. The principal is like that generally about everything. Quite determined. You know she doesn't let the grass grow under her feet. She does it and deals with it.

This suggests Principal Two challenges the way they do things at work. A teacher also maintains that the principal enjoys challenge stating, "The principal went recently on a self-awareness course" and it challenged her because, "it made her think about the way she led the school." This suggests that Principal Two looks for innovative ways they can improve what is done in the organization. One teacher maintains that the principal challenges her to perform at higher levels, stating,

... science is my area and I've been given that responsibility. I said I'm quite happy to do it but, please, I need support to do it. The principal said, "I'm sure you can do it" and she arranged ... I do get support in my role, but it's a challenge, and one that probably I might not have wanted to have, to be quite honest, but I didn't really have a lot of choice in the matter.

This comment suggests that Principal Two challenges the way they

do things at work. When questioned whether the principal practices the philosophy "by mistakes we learn", one interviewed teacher states,

If something hasn't gone right. We've made a mistake. We look at why it's gone wrong and see if we can change things. Why did it go wrong? Was it lack of planning or lack of resources?

A school council member couldn't give a specific example but contends,

I think it's just the principal's ability to discuss things with you and as a staff we do discuss things and we say this went wrong, oh never mind. We do sort of talk about things a lot.... The principal isn't frightened about saying this went wrong or anything like that.

The preceding two remarks suggest this principal asks "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected. Principal Two is perceived by others as Challenging the Process.

Factor Two: Inspiring a Shared Vision - One teacher believes that Principal Two has a vision for the school and she encourages teachers to share in that vision by "talking to us and asking for our views". This teacher maintains,

Here we believe that every child is a learner and we encourage them to learn to the best of their ability. We do not have failures.... We try to give each child high self-esteem so that they've all done well, according to their own ability.

This teacher adds that, "our vision is that every child is happy and fulfilled, learning at their own pace." A second interviewed teacher believes this principal shares a common vision with the staff, "if the common vision is, sort of maintaining an independence as a primary school, in that sense, I would say yes." This suggests that Principal Two has not shared a clear

common vision with the staff, since the above comments suggest that there appears to have been as many visions put forth by the principal as there are people interviewed. A school council member believes the principal feels, "concerned about the school's future" because this present principal will soon retire. This person feels the principal is concerned about, "being forced into an amalgamation with the junior school. You know for fund cutting, cost cutting." This suggests that Principal Two neither clearly communicates a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of the organization, nor is she contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities. When asked to describe what this school will be like in five years from now, one teacher declares,

that's difficult because our principal won't be here. So as she will retire, it is a very difficult question to answer, in a sense. I don't know. It will depend on the new principal.

This suggests the principal does not look ahead and describe the kind of future she would like to create together with others. It seems that even though this principal will soon retire, she could be promoting group cohesion among the staff and she could, it seems, be fostering in others a commitment to create and develop positive future possibilities for the school. This principal is perceived by others as not Inspiring a Shared Vision.

Factor Three: Enabling Others to Act - Both interviewed teachers agree that Principal Two involves them in planning what happens in the school. One teacher contends, "the staff

discusses curriculum. The principal doesn't dictate anything." One teacher insists, "I'm allowed to manage my classroom however I wish, completely independently, and at the moment I can choose the topics that I do as well.... At the moment it's a complete free choice, with regard to topic taught in a subject area." A second interviewed teacher suggests that the principal involves her in planning what happens "in her curricular areas" and in her own classroom. "I'm free to plan and arrange what goes on in that classroom according to the needs that I see." This suggests that Principal Two gives people discretion to make their own decisions and she develops cooperative relationships with the people with whom she works. One teacher, when asked if the principal uses ideas put forth by her, declares that she is a beginning teacher and her suggestions for improvement have not been extensive. However, she alleges that Principal Two uses "little suggestions" she makes. A second teacher also suggests that the principal uses ideas put forth by her, stating,

if I've been on a course, for instance, and I come back with something we should be doing or could develop, we get encouragement to go ahead and try or something.... Sometimes because of government constraints or financial constraints we have to find a way to implement change ourselves, so the whole staff is involved. We often spend a long time talking about things before we commit anything to paper. Or, for instance, we might trial things and have a discussion at the end of a certain period, whether it's successful or not.

The two interviewed teachers believe they do what the principal expects of them. One teacher explains that, "the principal shows every confidence in my ability." This data sample suggests that Principal Two treats others with dignity and respect. Both

teachers believe this principal gives the teachers ownership for the projects they work on. According to one teacher, the principal,

allows you to decide what you're going to do and then we give her our plans of what we're going to do. Then she comments on them sometimes, or thinks of suggestions that might help at other times. It's my decision what I do.

The second teacher adds, "My name goes on documents. The school council knows, the staff knows and sometimes parents." This suggests that Principal Two gets others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on. A school council member relates an experience this school principal involved her in, proclaiming,

I once helped the principal interview a dinner lady.... She just thought I might like to. Just to see what interviews were like, you know.... It was an experience. I thought it was more nerve wracking than sitting on the other side of the table. We got together before the interview and worked out some questions. She gave me guidance, a lot of guidance on the sorts of things we could perhaps ask her and then asked me if I thought there was anything I would like to ask as a Mom. You know, what I thought I'd like in a dinner lady and we both asked questions, only about three each.

This data sample suggests that Principal Two involves others in decision making situations in the school. This principal, as perceived by others, appears to practice Enabling Others to Act.

Factor Four: Modeling the Way - One teacher contends the principal's beliefs about leadership are that she believes,

in encouraging us to develop our own ideas. She believes in leading from the front. The principal takes an active part in teaching children. She knows the names of most of the children in the school. She is there as a backup. If you have trouble with a child or a parent, the principal will back you.

A second teacher affirms that Principal Two, "does discuss things with us. She is not completely so autonomous. She discusses things. We talk things through." The preceding two comments suggest this principal is clear about her own philosophy of leadership. Both interviewed teachers contend the principal always follows the values she agreed upon with them. A school council member maintains that the principal,

is very fair with people. This principal expects the children to talk through their differences and apologize to each other. She wants them to respect each other and to care about each other. She is like that all the time. The principal values children too and you can notice that all the time.

This suggests that Principal Two is consistent in practising the values she espouses. One interviewed teacher states what she believes are the principal's beliefs about how the school should be run, "It's support, valuing your opinion, valuing the children's opinion." An interviewed teacher contends, "the principal discusses things with us" and, regarding curriculum, the principal is "as one of the staff then, chipping in and talking as everybody else does." This suggests that Principal Two models the way through active participation and thus spends time and energy on making sure that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on. A school council member contends that Principal Two always stands by her values: "The principal has a code that she reiterates to staff, to parents." This suggests the principal lets others know her beliefs on how to best run the organization she leads. When questioned if this principal expects teachers to make plans and establish where they will be

in each project or subject area at specific times in the school year, both interviewed teachers in this school answered, "No". One teacher adds, "Whether or not we do one whole topic or two little topics in a term is our decision." Others perceived that this principal Models the Way.

Factor Five: Encouraging the Heart - Both interviewed teachers contend that Principal Two celebrates with them. One teacher adds, "At the end of each term, we have a little celebration, we do something to mark the end of term. At Christmas we go out for a meal. Sometimes there's a celebration in the staffroom." This suggests that the principal takes time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached. A school council member maintains that the principal would praise her, "Sometimes, at the end of a successful assembly to which parents are invited." This suggests that Principal Two finds ways to celebrate accomplishments. When questioned whether the principal is supportive of you and appreciative of your contributions to the school, one teacher replied, "I would say yes, I mean I was given a double increment for taking on science.... I was financially rewarded for taking on something I was not too keen on doing." This suggests that Principal Two is appreciative of others contributions to the school. A teacher contends, "The principal will support me with parents. Any particular little quirk that you might be concerned about, she will sort it out with you.... There's not hesitation about that." These data suggest that Principal Two is supportive of

her teachers. This principal is perceived by others as Encouraging the Heart.

According to others' perspective, the data presented seem to indicate that Principal Two exhibits several investigated exemplary leadership practices - Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart. Thus, with the exception of Inspiring a Shared Vision, others perceive this principal's leadership behaviour to be exemplary.

In both instances, according to others, these school principals used their influence on school council members. It seems, however that school council members were more willing to accept the influence of Principal Two, who as perceived by others, exhibited more highly developed leadership practices. When using his influence on school council members, Principal One who seemed, according to others perception, not to exhibit these exemplary leadership practices, did not appear to receive the same willingness from the school council members. A school council representative at the school where Principal Two was perceived by others as having more highly developed leadership practices states that their school council would discuss things openly. However, she contends that after the discussion, the school council would agree with the principal's viewpoint on an issue. The school council member suggests this happens because Principal Two has consistently displayed the honourable character traits of fairness, goodness and honesty (see page 100, Quotation

2). A school council member adds that the school council would not automatically support the principal. She contends, however, that even after some deliberation, school council would ultimately yield to the principal's requests. The council member suggests this happens because Principal Two has, as perceived by the school council member, got knowledge and expertise, therefore school council would agree with her judgement (see page 100, Quotation 3). A school council member also declares that Principal Two has successfully run this school for many years (see page 105, Quotation 1). These data suggest that the school council members in this particular school did not support more dominance as a preference, but due to the leadership approach of Principal Two, they were less likely to perceive her behaviour as dominating.

Principal One is perceived by others as having a less highly developed leadership approach. One school council representative expresses her feelings that, since Principal One 'doesn't allow her to interact or discuss issues with parents, she feels "restricted" as a parent representative on school council. This suggests that Principal One controls information exchange among stakeholders. A council member contends that school council members are always expected to sanction whatever Principal One wishes for the school. "We just do what he tells us all the time." Consequently, a school council member suggests that although Principal One seeks the advice of other school council members, "He doesn't really take it". Even though the school

council members in this school felt the principal should use his influence based on his experience and expertise in the field of education, they also perceived Principal One as being overly domineering in his dealings with school council members. Thus, school council members appeared to feel like they were non-contributing or token members on school council, who were there in name only.

The preceding data suggest that, as perceived by others, principals use their influence on school council, regardless of leadership approach. However, as gathered from the limited sample of interview data, it seems that school council members' attitude toward the principal's use of dominance may be affected by the principal's leadership approach.

Hypothesis Three

There is a positive relationship between the potential school council members' perception of the principals' leadership approach and the schools' involvement in the school council project.

While quantitative data were presented throughout this study, qualitative data were utilized in Hypothesis One and Hypothesis Two. Qualitative data were excluded for analysis in Hypothesis Three because they could not be related to noninvolvement since legislated site-based management was part of the European environment studied. Thus, noninvolvement was found only in the investigated Newfoundland and Labrador context.

Multiple regression analysis of the potential school council members' perception of the principals' leadership approach and the schools' involvement in the school council project indicates an R Square of .12396. This indicates that 12% of variance in Leadership Approach perceived by Others is explained by involvement or noninvolvement in school councils. (DF = 1, 190; $F = 26.88482$, $P < .0005$). Variables Involvement and Noninvolvement were coded dichotomously as 1 and 2 respectively. Since the beta weight is $-.35$, $P < .0005$, hypothesis 3 was supported. Perceptions of the principals' leadership approach were more positive for those schools involved with school councils.

The quantitative analysis for this study was informed by data collected from the completed survey questionnaires. The qualitative analysis was informed by interviews as well as experiences in site-based managed settings, such as attendance at school council and staff meetings and the study of school policy documents, such as School Behaviour Policy, Co-Ordinating Policy on Special Needs, Staff Development Plan, and Policy on Contact with Parents.

The investigator examined a complete site-based managed school development plan for 1992 - 1997. This plan included Aims, Outcomes and Priorities for:

1. Curriculum,
2. Organization of Teaching and Learning, and
3. Management:

- (a) Staffing,
- (b) Resources and Environment, and
- (c) Finance.

The investigator was also given access to information on the site-based managed school principal's role. The list of principal duties seems extensive. It includes such duties as formulating school aims; appointment and management of staff; liaison with staff unions; determining, organizing and implementing an appropriate curriculum and reviewing the work and organization of the school. The principal is also responsible for evaluating standards of teaching and learning; supervising and participating in appraisal of teachers at the school; training and development of staff; pupil progress; pastoral care; discipline; relationships with staff, with parents, with other bodies outside the school, with School Council, with the School Board and with other educational establishments. In addition to these duties, the principal is responsible for allocating, controlling and accounting for the financial and material resources of the school; as well as the security and effective supervision of school grounds. The principal is also expected to participate in the teaching of the children at the school to such an extent as may be appropriate, having regard to other duties that accompany the principalship position.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion of Results and Implications

Discussion

As suggested by the Royal Commission Report for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, it is undebatable that our children are indeed our future - our most valuable resource. In order for these children to be properly and adequately prepared for the ever-changing society of today and tomorrow, a shift from traditional management theory with its bureaucratic, hierarchical structure to site-based management in the form of school councils has been highlighted as a viable alternative. It advocates collaboration and cohesiveness for all stakeholders in the education system. Throughout many countries of the world site-based management is increasingly gaining attention as a more effective avenue to increased levels of student performance, while the popularity of traditional management theory dwindles as it increasingly sinks into the background. One principal describes site-based management:

It means more work for the school council and the management of the school.... We are in control of our own destiny and that feels good. There is this element of - there isn't a safety net. There isn't another body we can refer our problems to and say: It's too much for us.

Thus, site-based management gives schools independence while requiring not only shared decision making on the part of all stakeholders but shared responsibility as well. The principal quoted above finds site-based management "stimulating" and "challenging".

There are times when I am really exuberant and excited and there are times when I feel the burden of the responsibility, but you can't have it both ways.

From the interview data gathered in Europe, it might be deduced that in schools where site-based management has been established for a long time it should not be taken for granted that principals' leadership approaches are in alignment with the philosophy of site-based management.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has expressed its intention to change the structure of the present education system in this province. They have shown much interest in school councils as the next needed educational reform. Although changing the structure of the education system is a very good first step, it is just that. This move to site-based management also requires a shift in mindset of all those stakeholders with whom the success of such a project lies. School principals have a major impact on the success of site-based management. Principals can use their power of position and professional expertise on the school council either to control and to influence others to fulfil their personal agendas or principals can use their position, experience and knowledge in the field of education to guide, enlighten and enhance the input of other school council members. Principals' leadership approaches and especially their philosophy on shared decision making now come into play. The difference in leadership approach is illustrated in the following comment by a parent school council member in a school that presently has a school council,

I once helped the principal interview a dinner lady.... The principal gave me ... a lot of guidance on the sorts of things we could perhaps ask her and then asked me if I thought there was anything I would like to ask as a mom. You know, what I thought I'd like in a dinner lady and we both asked questions, only about three each.

This particular principal seems to have provided the real involvement and shared decision making advocated by site-based management to this parent school council representative. The principal empowered the parent council member assuring her that her thoughts and beliefs are important, too. This school council member is more likely than not to feel that she has a valuable contribution to make to the school. By this action, the principal models to the school council member that the input of the school council member in a real decision making situation in the school is valued.

In contrast, a parent school council representative at another school declares,

sometimes I think we're just a number. I think that as a parent school council member, we don't have that much influence.... Decisions are made based on what information we are given by the principal.... The school council has got a wide range of different people and the principal seeks their advice. He doesn't really take it.

In this case, the structural changes are already in place but the shared decision making that accompanies effective site-based management seems to have broken down. Now, the dire need for training principals in power sharing, thereby involving all school stakeholders in the decision-making process, becomes apparent.

The European schools chosen for this research study

practised two different levels of site-based management. One school was completely site-based managed and had severed all school board ties, thus receiving their funds directly from government and having total control over how they were dispersed within the school. The second school remained under school board control and school board representatives continue to have input on school council, since several school board representatives are council members. The principal in the school with the more radical form of site-based management, as perceived by others, exhibited a less highly developed leadership approach than did the principal of the school which remained under school board control, although this latter principal described did not possess all the investigated exemplary leadership practices either. It might be deduced from examination of the interview data that if such practices are universal, these two case studies on The Principal Leadership Approach That Accompanies Effective Site-Based Management in the European Education System have highlighted the fact that involvement in site-based management does not necessarily bring success. It seems that the principal who fought for the optimum level of site-based management for his school appeared to practice a leadership approach that corresponded more with traditional management theory than with site-based management. The principal who remained under school board control appeared to be more open to shared decision making, yet seemed to have some weak leadership practices that needed to be addressed as well. These findings seem to highlight that

unless training in a new leadership approach is provided, site-based management as it was designed with involvement of all stakeholders may not work. It appears that the success of site-based management, then, may not be dependent on involvement alone.

Barriers to site-based management cannot be removed by school principals who do not possess the commitment and ability to promote and facilitate real involvement of stakeholders. If principals are not properly prepared to take on this new management system, the result may be a new governance system that retains the status quo. There could be, however, one distinct difference. This newly found power that rests with the principals may or may not be used in keeping with the philosophy of shared decision making that is embedded in effective site-based management. This study suggests that leaders do not have the innate ability to share decision making. It highlights the fact that many times people are more inclined to 'talk the talk' of representative democracy than they are ready or willing to 'walk the walk' or facilitate a positive atmosphere for consensus decision making within school council. When principals' attitudes toward shared decision making and the philosophy behind site-based management do not jive, the result may well be ineffective site-based management.

The proposed school council model for Newfoundland and Labrador is based on site-based management that is school board controlled. Like the school board controlled model investigated

in Europe, the Newfoundland and Labrador model proposes that school principals be ex-officio members on school council. Since principals serve as ex-officio members, they neither hold the right to vote on school council nor the right to act as school council chairperson. This matter seems to be causing some concern for educators and teacher unions in this province. The results of the interview data gathered in Europe seem to indicate that whether principals are ex-officio or not is somewhat insignificant regarding the amount of influence principals have on school council. It appears that these issues may not need to be a great source of concern, since the interview data, although a limited sample, seem to suggest that principals will have influence on school councils, regardless of these issues.

Site-based management is a new educational concept in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Because it is a pilot project, monies have been allotted to train involved principals and school council members to better accept this new theory. The quantitative data collected for this study suggest that those principals who are involved in piloting the school council project in this province are perceived by others as having a leadership approach that was considered more appropriate in a site-based management environment than those who were not involved. From these results, the investigator suggests that although it is commendable that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is presently providing this training, it is imperative that training continue after the pilot project has

been completed. A recent research study conducted by Collins (1995) on school council implementation in Newfoundland and Labrador reiterates the need for training of school councils in team building and consensus building. Collins (1995) suggests that, "at a minimum, training should be undertaken for new councils and as an ongoing initiative for new members of established councils" (p. 26). This new management system is being put in place for the benefit of the children in this province, however, if we have stakeholders who are not open to shared decision making, site-based management might be accepted in theory but not necessarily in practice.

One veteran principal of a site-based managed school expressed concern over resources, stating,

If the government doesn't recognize it can't expect primary education to lift itself to the standards required without more resources, we're all done for because I'm sure we are now at the stage where we have identified the issues. We know where we want to get to and I'm pretty sure we are aware of how we might do that and having identified all those things, I think we are now acutely aware that it is not feasible to go on and on doing it from our existing resources. We are at busting point and the big risk is that we've got all these plates spinning and we won't be able to keep them all going and, you know, the possible disaster is they'll all crash to the floor, because you get so fatigued and frustrated by the feeling that you are alone and that there's too much to do. Now, that's a cry from the heart of principals and it's a cry from the heart of teachers, everybody, maybe school council members too, but I think those, in a sense are not yet close enough to see what's happening.

The success of site-based management then, is also based on provision of the necessary resources for its success. At the school level, they include both material resources and professional resources in the area of training.

Summary and Conclusions

The range of school council involvement for the participant groups in this study has been extensive. The investigation revealed four distinct levels of site-based management development. Beginning with noninvolved in site-based management and proceeding to totally involved, the study investigated two levels in the Newfoundland and Labrador context: noninvolvement and involvement in the initial stages. The next two stages were studied in the European environment: school board controlled involvement that has withstood decades and completely autonomous site-based management. The data collected to present this overview of principals' leadership approaches in site-based managed environments suggest that the leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils may not result from readiness for or involvement in school councils. As gathered from the European environment, although a limited sample, it appears that, as perceived by others, neither the principal who fought for the optimum in site-based management nor the principal who chose to retain school board controlled site-based management seemed to display a leadership approach or an attitude toward shared decision making that concurs with the site-based management philosophy.

The European case studies suggest that experience in site-based management may not be the determining factor for the success of school councils, since both investigated schools could boast a long history of involvement in site-based management.

One school principal produced a log book that had been kept at the school for school council examination since 1956. This suggests that even though site-based management has been legislated in this part of Europe, thereby involving stakeholders and giving school council members the responsibility to participate and thus the accompanying accountability for decisions that are made; due to the principal's use of influence, school council members, it appears, may be hindered from carrying out this responsibility. Thus, this appears to indicate that legislation or a structural change, in itself, may not guarantee true acceptance of the philosophy that undergirds school councils.

The European interview data suggest that the principal's readiness for site-based management appears not to be the factor that contributes to the effectiveness of site-based management, since the principal who opted for and in fact fought for complete autonomy for his school was perceived by others as having a leadership approach that was least conducive to site-based management. Also, this person's use of influence on school council, instead of empowering school stakeholders, appeared to make these school council members feel powerless.

The research obtained from the Newfoundland and Labrador context, however, suggests that there is a significant difference, as perceived by others, between the leadership approach of those principals involved and those noninvolved in the school council pilot project who were chosen as the study

sample. While this cannot be generalized to all noninvolved principals, it suggests that the involved principals are seen as being more open to change. This is the type of principal leadership approach that is needed for the success of school councils. The difference in others perception of involved principals' as compared to noninvolved principals' leadership approach in Newfoundland and Labrador may have been the result of training. This suggests that noninvolved but potential school council members also need training as they too will be entrusted with the responsibility of successfully implementing school councils in this province.

To avoid the possibility of this new management system not functioning as it was designed, with genuine involvement of all stakeholders, those principals with a more traditional mindset can be aided through training to readjust their thinking. If the current move toward site-based management is to be successful, principals must become committed to clearing a path for parental and community involvement in the school. Principals must become advocates for school council implementation. Inclusion, rather than exclusion, of stakeholders would now take precedence. With this in mind, school principals can now truly challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way and encourage the heart of all stakeholders involved in school council. For successful implementation to occur, both principals and school council members need to come to an awareness of the principals' new

leadership role and the new approach to school management that the shift to school councils entails.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions presented in this study have implications for the need for leadership training of all school principals who are presently or will be entrusted with the effective implementation of site-based management. Principals who lack the ability to facilitate shared decision making, promote collaborative and cooperative working relations with teachers and school council members, generate a collective vision, build consensus and foster group cohesiveness are not equipped with the leadership skills for successful implementation of school councils.

Principals, through training, can and must be given knowledge of the site-based management theory. Their leadership skills must be developed with the hope that they will adopt this new theory as their own. In addition to training in leadership approach, principals need specific training in the appropriate use of influence. They must also be given the opportunity to experience, with guidance, site-based management in practice as well as in theory. Only then will principals be prepared to work with others in the manner effective site-based management requires. This study has implications for training at the university level of present and future leaders. It has implications for the training of educational leaders at

professional development centres. It also highlights the need for further research in the area of leadership approach with particular emphasis on power sharing relationships.

Some other research possibilities that have surfaced in light of this study are:

1. Experimental research with control groups - an experimental group of principals could be given training in exemplary leadership practices while others who are using site-based management would receive no training.
2. An investigation of the leadership perceptions of male and female principals who are implementing site-based management to determine if either female or male principals rate their leadership skills as more appropriate in a site-based management environment.
3. An investigation of others' perceptions of male and female principals who are implementing site-based management to determine if others rate male or female principals' leadership skills as more appropriate in a site-based management environment.
4. An intensive study of schools who are using site-based management to identify other areas that impact on the success of site-based management with emphasis on:
 - a. principal leadership approach when the study is done in schools that have had site-based management for a longer period of time and those who are at their beginning year of piloting the process.

- b. when a female teacher or school council member is rating a male principal.
 - c. when a male teacher or school council member is rating a female principal.
5. An effort to determine the affect that involvement in the site-based management process has on school culture, with emphasis on teacher empowerment and morale.
6. Experimental research with control groups - studies could be conducted in schools that are not site-based managed and those that have been site-based managed for at least five years to determine what effect site-based management has on student achievement.
7. To increase its reliability, this study could be repeated in other provinces and other countries where contextual factors differ.

Although the above suggestions do not cover all the possibilities for further research that have emerged from this study, they do highlight the type of study investigators who are interested in the site-based management process and/or exemplary leadership practices might pursue.

References

- Abbott, M. (1965). Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations. Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn, AL: Auburn University, (pp.40-53).
- Abbott, M. G. & Caracheo, F. (1988). Power, authority, and bureaucracy. In N. Boyan (ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.
- Akenhead, J. E. (1991). Calling The Tune. The Executive Educator. 13(11), 26-28.
- American Association of School Administrators (1994). Local School Councils ... Where we Stand.
- Aronstein, L. & Benedictis, K. (1991). An Interactive Workshop; Encouraging School-Based Management. NASSP Bulletin. 75(537), 67-72.
- Aubrey, J. (1992). The Principal's Leadership Role In Effective Site-Based Management. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, University of Bridgeport.
- Bailey, W. (1991). School-Site Management Applied. Lancaster, Basel:Technometric Publishing Co., Inc.
- Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make the difference. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barth, Roland S. (1991). Restructuring Schools: Some Questions for Teachers and Principals. Phi Delta Kappan. 73(2), 123-128.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B., Waldman, D., Avolio, B. & Bebb M. (1987). Transformational Leadership and the Falling Dominoes Effect. Group & Organizational Studies. Sage Publications, Inc. 12(1), 73-87.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bochkarev, V. (1992). The School Council. Russian Education and Society. 34(7), 89-99.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1991). Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Brown, I. M. J. (1994). Leadership in Secondary Schools. Unpublished Ed.D. Thesis, University of Toronto.
- Brown, J. (1993). Leadership. Emergency Librarian. 20(3), 8-20.
- Burns, T. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1961). The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock.
- Caldwell, B., Smilanich, R., & Spinks, J. (1988). The Canadian Administrator. 27(8), Department of Educational Administration. The University of Alberta.
- Care, C. & Lafond, A. (1986). France. A case study in Hopes, C. (Ed.) The school leader and school improvement. (Technical Report No. 2 of the International School Improvement Project). Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD. Leuven:Acco.
- Chapman, J. (1982). Relationship Between Principals And Members Of School Councils: An Attitude Scale. Australia: Monash University.
- Collins, A. (1995). Enhancing Local Involvement in Education Through Quality Leadership. St. John's: Faculty of Education. Memorial University
- Conger, G. (1989). Transformational Leadership in American Community Colleges. In Shared Vision. The Community College Press. Washington, D.C.
- Conley, S. & Bacharach, S. (1990). From School-Site Management To Participatory School-Site Management. Phi Delta Kappan. 71(7), 539-544.
- David, J. (1989). Synthesis of Research on school-based Management. Educational Leadership. 46(8), 45-53.
- David, J. (1991). What It Takes to Restructure Education. Educational Leadership. (pp.11-15).
- Davies, B. & Anderson, L. (1992). Opting for self-management. Routledge, London.
- Delaney, J. (1994, Spring). Schools Run by Stakeholders. Prism. pp. 23-25.
- DePree, Max. (1989). Leadership Is an Art. New York: Doubleday.

- Dunlap, D. & Goldman, P. (1990). Reform, Restructuring, Site-Based Management, and the New Face of Power in Schools. Presented at the Annual Meetings of the University Council of Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.
- Etheridge, C. & Hall M. (1992). The Impact of School-Based Decision Making: A Case Study. Memphis State University, Memphis. March, 1-21.
- Eisner, E. (1992). Introduction to Special Section on Objectivity, Subjectivity, and Relativism. Curriculum Inquiry 22:1. Blackwell Publishers.
- English, F. (1989). School-Site Management. The Practitioner. The National Association of Secondary School Principals, XVI(2), 1-6.
- Foster, K. (1984). School Partners Or Handy Puppets? Principal. 63(4), 27-31.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a Critical Practice of Leadership. In Critical Perspectives On Educational Leadership. The Falmer Press, East Sussex.
- Frankel, J. & Wallen, N. (1990). How to Design and Evaluate Research. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute For Social Research.
- Fullan, M. (1991). The New meaning of educational change. 2nd. Ed. Toronto: OISE Press & Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Change Forces: Probing The Depth Of Educational Reform. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's Worth Fighting For? Working Together for Your School. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- Gardner, J. (1990). On Leadership. New York: The Free Press.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). Educational Research: Competencies For Analysis And Application. 4th. Ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Gielen, K. (1986). The Netherlands. A case study in Hopes, C. (Ed.) The school leader and school improvement. (Technical Report No. 2 of The International School Improvement Project), Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD. Leuven: Acco.

- Glickman, C. (1990). Pushing School Reform to a New Edge: The Seven Ironies Of School Empowerment. Phi Delta Kappan. 72(1), 68-75.
- Glickman, C. (1991). Pretending Not to Know What We Know. Educational Leadership. 4-9.
- Guba, E. (1992). Relativism. Curriculum Inquiry. 22:1. Blackwell Publishers.
- Guthrie, J. (1986). School-Based Management: The Next Needed Education Reform. Phi Delta Kappan. 68(4), 305-309.
- Hannay, L. (1992). The Principal Plus Program for change. The Canadian School Executive. 11(7), 3-9.
- Hanson, E. M. (1991). Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour - 3rd Edition, Allyn & Bacon.
- Harrison, C., Killion, J. and Mitchell, J. (1989). Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation. Educational Leadership. 3(8), 55-58.
- Haugley, M. & Rowley, R. (1991). Principals as Change Agents. The Canadian Administrator. Department of Educational Administration. University of Alberta. 30(8), 1-9.
- Heller, R., Woodworth, B., Jacobson, S., & Conway, J. (1990). Administrator Opinions on School-Based Management: Results from a National Survey. The Executive Educator. 9-10.
- Herman, J. (1990). School-Based Management: A checklist of things to consider. NASSP Bulletin. 67-70.
- Herman, J. & Herman, J. (1992). Educational Administration: School-Based Management. The Clearing House. 65(5), 261-263.
- Hill, P., Bonan, J. & Warner, K. (1992). Uplifting Education. The American School Board Journal. 179(3), 21-25.
- House, J. (1992). School Councils. In Our Children Our Future, Commissioned Studies, pp. 43-55.
- Hoy, W. (1994). Foundations of educational administration: Traditional and emerging perspectives. Educational Administration Quarterly. 30(2), 178-198.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (1991). Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House.

- Hoyle, J. (1992). Ten Commandments for Successful Site-Based Management. NASSP Bulletin. 76(547), 81.
- Kanter, R. (1989). When giants learn to dance: Mastering the challenge of strategy, management, and careers in the 1990s. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Keedy, L. & Finch, A. (1994). Examining Teacher-Principal Empowerment: An Analysis Of Power. The Journal of Research and Development in Education. 27(3), 162-173.
- Knoop, R. (1992). Power Tactics. Education Canada. 32(1), 15-19.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1989). Leadership Practices Inventory. California: TPG/Learning Systems.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1993). Psychometric Properties Of The Leadership Practices Inventory-Updated. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 53.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1995). The Leadership Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Krantz, J. (1990). Lessons from the field: An essay on the crisis of leadership in contemporary organizations. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 26(1), 49-64.
- Lane, J. (1991). Instructional Leadership and Community: A Perspective on School Based Management. Theory Into Practice. XXX (2).
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The Move Toward Transformational Leadership. Educational Leadership. 8-12.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational Leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. 1(4), 249-280.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, J. (1992). Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools. Washington, D. C.: The Falmer Press.
- Leonard, C. (1991, Fall). A Case for School Governance. Principals In Council. New Brunswick Teachers' Association XX(1).
- Levin, B. (1992). School-based management. The Canadian School Executive. 11(9), 30-32.
- McLaughlin, M. (1990). 'The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited', Educational Researcher. 5, 11-16.

- Mahon, P. (1991). What to do when rhetoric of reform turns into reality. The Executive Educator. 13(1), 25-28.
- Midgley, C. & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond Site-Based Management: Empowering Teachers to Reform Schools. Phi Delta Kappan. 75, 245-252.
- Mitchell, J. (1990). Share the Power. The American School Board Journal. 42-43.
- Morgan, G. (1989). In Creative Organization Theory, A Resourcebook. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.
- Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (1994). Adjusting the Course II: An Analysis. St. John's, NF: Newfoundland Department of Education.
- Newfoundland Department of Education (1990). The student at the centre: Challenge for Excellence. St. John's, NF: Newfoundland Department of Education.
- Newfoundland Department of Education (1993, December). Adjusting the Course...An Information Bulletin from the Royal Commission Implementation Team. St. John's, NF: Newfoundland Department of Education.
- Newfoundland Department of Education (1994a, February). Adjusting the Course Part 11, Improving the Conditions for Learning. St. John's, NF: Department of Education.
- Newfoundland Department of Education (1994b, April). Adjusting the Course...An Information Bulletin from the Royal Commission Implementation Team. St. John's, NF: Newfoundland Department of Education.
- Nicholl, D. (1986). Leadership and Followership. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), Transforming Leadership: From Vision to Results, Alexandria, Va., Miles River Press.
- Nova Scotia Department of Education (1994). Preparing all students for a lifetime of learning. Halifax, NS: Nova Scotia Department of Education.
- Paxton, D. (1992). Delegation means empowerment. FWTAO Newsletter. 11(2), 17-21.
- Peeler, T. (1991, April). PRINCIPALS: Learning to Share. Thrust for Educational Leadership. pp. 24-27.
- Poplin, M. (1992). The Leader's New Role: Looking to the Growth of Teachers. Educational Leadership. (pp. 10-11).

- Prasch, J. (1990). How to organize for school-based management. VA: ASCD Publications.
- Ranson, S. & Tomlinson, J. (1986). Introduction. In S. Ranson & J. Tomlinson (Eds.). The changing government of education. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Ricatti, E. (1986). Italy. A case study in Hopes, C. (Ed.) The school leader and school improvement. (Technical Report No. 2 of the International School Improvement Project). Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD. Leuven: Acco.
- Roberts, N. (1985). Transforming leadership: A process of collective action. Human Relations. 38(11), 1023-1046.
- Rothberg, R. & Pawlas, G. (1993). Leadership for Restructured Schools: What Is Necessary? NASSP Bulletin. 77(553), 70-76.
- Roueche, J., Baker, G. and Rose, R. (1989). Shared Vision. Transformational Leadership In American Community Colleges. The Community College Press. Washington, D.C.
- Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, and Secondary Education. (1992). Our Children, Our Future. St. John's, NF: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.
- Sarason, S. B. (1972). The Creation of Settings. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. (1990). The Fifth Discipline. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1987). Leadership for quality schooling: New Understandings and Practices, paper prepared for the Southwestern Bell Conference, Restructuring Schooling for Quality Education: A New Reform Agenda, Trinity University, Texas, 18-21 August.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-Added Leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Moral Leadership. Getting To The Heart Of School Improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1994). Organizations or Communities? Changing the metaphor changes the theory. Educational Administration Quarterly. 30(2), 214-226.

- Sheppard, L. B. (1993). A Study of the Relationship Among Instructional Leadership Behaviours of the School Principal and Selected School-Level Characteristics. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Silver, P. (1983). Educational Administration, Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research. New York: Harper & Row.
- Steering Committee on School Council Implementation. Royal Commission Implementation Secretariat. (1994) Working Together for Educational Excellence. St. John's, NF: Newfoundland Department of Education.
- Stego, N.E. (1986). Sweden. A case study in Hopes, C. (Ed.). The school leader and school improvement. (Technical Report No. 2 of the International School Improvement Project). Center for Educational Research And Innovation, OECD. Leuven: Acco.
- Stimson, T. & Applebaum, R. (1988). Empowering Teachers: Do Principals Have the Power? Phi Delta Kappan. 70(4), 313-316.
- Thurston, P, Clift, R. & Scacht, M. (1993). Preparing Leaders for Change-Oriented Schools. Phi Delta Kappan. 259-265.
- Tichy, N. & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The Transformational Leader. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tranter, W. (1992). The New Principal. The Executive Educator. 29-31.
- Tucker-Ladd, P., Merchant, B. & Thurston, P. (1992). School Leadership: Encouraging Leaders for Change. Educational Administration Quarterly. 28(3), 397-409.
- Vaill, P. (1989). Managing as a performance art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weber, M. (1947). The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wentz, R. (1989). School Principals: The Emerging Community Heroes As The 1990s Unfold. NASSP Bulletin. 73(518), 41-42.
- Wood, F. & Caldwell, S. (1991). Planning and training to implement site-based management. Journal of Staff Development. 12(3), 25-29.

Appendices

Appendix A

Permission to Conduct Research

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Faculty Committee for Ethical Review of
Research Involving Human Subjects

Certificate of Approval

Investigator: *Ms. Lorraine Devereaux*
Investigator's Workplace: *Faculty of Education, MUN*
Supervisor: *Dr. Bruce Sheppard*
Title of Research: *"A study of the leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils"*
Approval Date: *March 30, 1995*

The Ethics Review Committee has reviewed the protocol and procedures as described in this research proposal and we conclude that they conform to the University's guidelines for research involving human subjects.

✓
Dr. Walter Okshevsky
Chairperson
Ethics Review Committee

Members: Dr. Walter Okshevsky
Dr. Tim Seifert
Dr. Dennis Sharpe
Dr. Amarjit Singh
Dr. Patricia Canning
Stephen Norris

Appendix B

Letter to School District Superintendents

Trepassey, NF.
AOA 4B0
April 06, 1995

Mr. John Doe, Superintendent
Somewhere School Board
NF

Dear Mr. Doe:

My name is Lorraine Devereaux. I am a graduate student studying Educational Leadership at Memorial University of Newfoundland. The purpose of this letter is to seek permission to conduct a thesis research study in a school or in several schools in your school district.

This study is under the direction of Dr. Bruce Sheppard of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland. It has received approval from the Ethics Review Committee of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

The purpose of the study is to determine the leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils. The project will culminate in a thesis entitled The Leadership Approach that Facilitates Adoption of School Councils.

The research procedure will involve use of standardized survey instruments which will take approximately thirty minutes to complete. One survey instrument will attempt to determine leadership practices of principals as seen by themselves and teachers. The other survey instrument will investigate the attitudes of principals towards school council members. These survey instruments will be distributed to principal, teachers and school council members in each school selected.

Matters of leadership practices can be very sensitive, therefore, complete confidentiality will be assured. Each participant will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time or to refrain from answering survey questions which he or she would prefer to omit without incurring prejudice in any form.

A Master's Thesis, as well as research findings, will be available to your office upon request.

Further information concerning this project can be obtained from Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean of Research, Memorial University at 737-3402. Dr. Norris is not directly involved in the study but is available to participants as a resource person.

Yours sincerely,

Lorraine Devereaux

Please complete the following form and return it to the researcher at your earliest convenience.

I _____, give permission to Lorraine Devereaux to conduct a Master's Thesis research within the school/schools in the Somewhere School Board, as outlined in her letter dated April 06, 1995. The school board understands that every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality.

DATE

SIGNATURE

Appendix C

Disclosure and Consent Form Sent to All Research Participants

Principals - Teachers - School Council Members

DISCLOSURE & CONSENT FORM

TO THE RESEARCH PARTICIPANT:

This is a request for your participation in a study of the leadership approach that accompanies adoption of school councils. The research is being conducted in partial fulfilment of a M.Ed in Leadership at Memorial University of Newfoundland. This study is under the direction of Dr. Bruce Sheppard of the Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Purpose:

The purpose of the research is to determine the school principal leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils. It is hoped that participation in this study will highlight the need for professional development in a new leadership approach to ensure successful implementation of school councils in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Procedures:

This study requests your responses to reflective questioning on leadership and attitudes on relationships between principals and school council members. Teachers and principals will be requested to complete a survey instrument on principals' leadership practices. School council members will be requested to complete an attitude-relationship scale on their relationship with the principal. The questionnaires will require approximately 30 minutes to complete and your answers will be simply a selection of a number on a scale of 1 to 5, indicating your level of agreement with each question. Answers will be inserted directly on the questionnaire which will be read at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Researcher:

My name is Lorraine Devereaux. I have been teaching in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador for 21 years. I am currently teaching and working towards completion of a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership at Memorial University in spring semester, 1995.

Risks:

There are no apparent risks inherent in this research activity.

Right of refusal or withdrawal:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate at the outset, or at any time thereafter

without incurring prejudice in any form. Should you participate, you may decline to answer any question on the study questionnaire. Should you have any questions on this study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Research & Development, M. U. N. (737-3402) or the researcher at the number below. Dr. Norris is not directly associated with the study but is available to all participants as a resource person.

Confidentiality:

Participants in research involving people must maintain confidentiality on any information collected in the course of their participation in the study, as an ethical requirement to preserve their anonymity. Anonymity of individuals, the school and the school district is assured, both while the research is in progress and in the final report. In this study, the researcher will require matching of principal, teacher and school council member responses to survey instruments for each school. This will be done by a coding procedure. The study procedures meet the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education, M.U.N. and has the approval of your school board.

Research results:

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

Agreement to participate:

If you agree to participate in this study as described above, please indicate your consent by signing below on both copies of this form. Please retain one copy and return the other to the researcher.

Sincerely yours,

Lorraine Devereaux
Graduate Student
PH: 438-2377

STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING AND CONSENT

I _____ understand the purpose, nature, procedures of the study outlined briefly above and hereunder signify my willingness to voluntarily participate in the study as described.

I further understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and/or refrain from answering any question(s) posed to me on the project's research instruments without incurring prejudice in any form. I understand and agree that all information collected by me, my identity and that of the school board the school and its staff will be maintained confidential.

Date: _____, 1995 Signed: _____

STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING AND CONSENT

I _____ understand the purpose, nature, procedures of the study outlined briefly above and hereunder signify my willingness to voluntarily participate in the study as described.

I further understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and/or refrain from answering any question(s) posed to me on the project's research instruments without incurring prejudice in any form. I understand and agree that all information collected by me, my identity and that of the school board the school and its staff will be maintained confidential.

Date: _____, 1995 Signed: _____

Appendix D

Package Sent To School Principals

Package Sent To Teachers

Package Sent To School Council Members

Trepassey, NF.
AOA 4B0
April 06, 1995

Mr. John Doe, Principal
Somewhere School
NF

Dear Mr. Doe:

My name is Lorraine Devereaux. I am a graduate student studying Educational Leadership at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am presently teaching at Holy Redeemer School, Trepassey.

I am doing a study for my Master's thesis entitled The Leadership Approach that Facilitates Adoption of School Councils. I have recently received approval from your superintendent to contact you to solicit your support, and that of your teachers, for my study. I realize that this is another request in your already hectic schedule. The principal self leadership questionnaire and the principal school council questionnaire should take approximately thirty minutes to complete. Since the data will involve schools throughout the province, and all data will be pooled, comparisons between principals, schools or districts are not intended or of concern for this study. Questionnaires for each school are coded merely so that the demographic data provided by the principal can be matched to teacher and school council member responses in the computer analysis. These codes will in no way be associated with particular schools. You can be assured of the anonymity of all responses.

Questionnaires and instructions for their distribution are enclosed. Should you have questions related to the study, or any of the instruments, please do not hesitate to contact me at the address above or by telephone (709) 438-2377.

As your support is critical to my research, I am hopeful that your response is favourable, and that you will oversee the distribution, collection and mailing of the questionnaires at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Lorraine Devereaux

INSTRUCTIONS

- A. Please have the questionnaires distributed to all teachers and school council members in your school.
- B. If possible, ask for a volunteer from among the teachers or secretarial staff to collect the completed questionnaires since the involvement of the administration in the collection may affect responses. Have this individual collect the questionnaires in a manner that insures anonymity.
- C. Please ensure that both the principal self leadership questionnaire and the principal school council questionnaire are enclosed with those of the teachers and school council members.
- D. Please return the completed questionnaires to me in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope within two weeks, if at all possible.

INFORMATION SHEET

I am requesting the cooperation of those principals who are not presently implementing school councils to choose people from their school and community who would be typical representatives on a school council. These individuals are kindly requested to complete the Leadership Practices Inventory - Other questionnaire as well as the Relationships Between Principals and Members of School Councils Attitude Scale questionnaire.

A school council shall consist of:

- (i). (a) not less than 8 members and not more than 15 members;
- (b) not less than 2 shall be teachers elected by teachers from among teachers and that school;
- (c) not less than 3 shall be parents elected by parents from among parents of students in that school; and
- (d) not less than 2 shall be representatives of members of the community appointed by the council members.
- (ii). In a school where senior high courses are taught, one student who is elected by senior high students who attend that school shall be a member of the school council.
- (iii). In addition to those elected or appointed, the principal of the school is a member by virtue of his or her position.
- (iv). The members of the school council shall elect a chairperson from among its members.

(Taken from Working Together for Educational Excellence, October, 1994).

PRINCIPAL - SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS

A. Years experience as a teacher (including experience as a principal).

___1 ___2-4 ___5-9 ___10-15 ___more than 15

B. Years experience as a principal.

___1 ___2-4 ___5-9 ___10-15 ___more than 15

C. Sex of the principal: ___F ___M

D. The approximate student enrolment of the school: _____

E. The number of teachers: _____

F. The total number of school council members: _____

Teachers _____

Parents _____

Community representatives _____

Student representative _____

Principal _____

G. Grade levels in your school (e.g. K-12): _____

Dear Teacher:

My name is Lorraine Devereaux. I am a graduate student studying Educational Leadership at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am presently teaching at Holy Redeemer School, Trepassey, Newfoundland.

I am doing a study for my Master's thesis entitled The Leadership Approach that Facilitates Adoption of School Councils. In order to obtain the data necessary for this study, I need your assistance. I realize that this is another request in your already hectic schedule, but since the nature of my study requires a large sample size, your response is critical. The completion of this questionnaire should not take more than 30 minutes.

Your particular responses are anonymous. Also, since the data will involve schools throughout the province, and all data will be pooled, comparisons between principals, schools or districts are not intended or of concern for this study. Questionnaires for each school are coded (number in the top right hand corner of the questionnaire represents your school) merely so that the demographic data provided by your principal can be matched to teacher responses in the computer analysis. These codes will in no way be associated with particular schools when the data has been collected. You can be assured of the anonymity of all responses.

AS YOUR ASSISTANCE IS CRITICAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THIS STUDY, PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE. When you have completed the questionnaire you should return it to the collection volunteer who has been provided with a common mailing envelope for your school. THANK YOU for your time and understanding in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Lorraine Devereaux

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

A. Sex: ___F___ ___M___

B. Years experience as a teacher at the end of this year:

___1___ ___2-4___ ___5-9___ ___10-15___ ___more than 15___

C. Years working with this current principal at the end of this year:

___1___ ___2-4___ ___5-9___ ___10-15___ ___more than 15___

D. Grade level you teach:

___K-6___ ___7-9___ ___10-12___ ___Other___

E. Teaching Qualifications (Grade):

___Less than 4___ ___4-6___ ___7___

F. Are you presently a teacher representative on the school council? ___Yes___ ___No___

Dear School Council Member:

My name is Lorraine Devereaux. I am a graduate student studying Educational Leadership at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am presently teaching at Holy Redeemer School, Trepassey, Newfoundland.

I am doing a study for my Master's thesis entitled The Leadership Approach that Facilitates Adoption of School Councils. In order to obtain the data necessary for this study, I need your assistance. I realize that this is another request in your already hectic schedule, but since the nature of my study requires a large sample size, your response is critical. The completion of this questionnaire should not take more than 30 minutes.

Your particular responses are anonymous. Also, since the data will involve schools throughout the province, and all data will be pooled, comparisons between principals, schools or districts are not intended or of concern for this study. Questionnaires for each school are coded (number in the top right hand corner of the questionnaire represents your school) merely so that the demographic data provided by your principal can be matched to teacher responses in the computer analysis. These codes will in no way be associated with particular schools when the data has been collected. You can be assured of the anonymity of all responses.

AS YOUR ASSISTANCE IS CRITICAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THIS STUDY, PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE. When you have completed the questionnaire you should return it to the collection volunteer who has been provided with a common mailing envelope for your school. THANK YOU for your time and understanding in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Lorraine Devereaux

SCHOOL COUNCIL MEMBER DEMOGRAPHICS

A. Sex: ☐ F ☐ M

B. What is your position on the school council?

☐ Chairperson ☐ Student Representative ☐ Teacher

☐ Community Representative ☐ Parent ☐ Principal

C. Level of education completed:

☐ K-8 ☐ 9-12 ☐ Post Secondary

☐ University - Years completed

Appendix E

Follow-Up Letter Sent To School Principals

General Delivery
Trepassey, NF
June 5, 1995

Mr. John Doe, Principal
Somewhere School
Nf.

Dear Mr. Doe:

Approximately one month ago, I sent you a package of questionnaires in anticipation that you and your staff would be able to participate in my study. If you have already returned the completed questionnaires, I would like to express my gratitude. However, if to this point you have been unable to help me out in this regard, I would truly appreciate your assistance.

As previously stated, this study does not relate to specific teachers, principals or districts. The intent is to match the demographic data provided by the principal with the responses of teachers and school council members in a computer analysis.

Your assistance in this matter is of primary importance to me since I MUST have completed returns from a large percentage of schools in order to complete my study.

If you intend to have your school participate in this study, please return the completed questionnaires to me within the next two weeks.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Devereaux

Appendix F

Permission To Use Kouzes Posner Leadership Practices Inventory

Permission To Use Chapman Attitude Scale

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL, INC.
15419 Banyan Lane
Monte Sereno, California 95030
Phone/FAX: 408-354-9170

February 6, 1995

Ms. Lorraine Devereaux
 General Delivery
 Trepassey, Newfoundland
 Canada AOA 4B0

Dear Lorraine:

Thank you for your correspondence (dated January 18) requesting permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your master's thesis. We are pleased to allow you to reproduce the LPI in your research project to the extent outlined in your letter and according to the following three stipulations:

1. That the following copyright notice appear on all copies of the LPI-Self and LPI-Observer: Copyright 1993 by Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission.
2. That we receive copies of all reports, papers, presentations, etc., including your master's thesis itself, which utilize any of the LPI data from this study.
3. That the LPI may not be re-sold or re-packaged in any other programs or workshop settings without express written permission.

If you agree to the terms outlined above, please sign one copy of this letter and return it to the address above. Enclosed is an article providing more technical information about the instrument's psychometric properties.

If we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let us know. Best wishes in your research efforts.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
 Managing Director

I understand and agree to abide by these terms:

Lorraine Devereaux Date: Feb. 1995

The University of Western Australia



Graduate School of Education
Nedlands, Perth, Western Australia 6009
Facsimile (09) 380 1052, (09) 380 1056
Telephone (09) 380 2393 Telex AA92992
Email jchapman@ecel.uwa.edu.au.

1 February 1995

Ms L Devereaux
General Delivery
Trepassey, Nfld
CANADA AOA 4B0

Dear Ms Devereaux

I am pleased to grant you permission to use the Attitude Scale designed to investigate 'Relationships Between Principals and Members of School Councils' and I wish you good luck in your work.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature, likely of Judith Chapman, consisting of a stylized 'C' and 'J'.

Judith Chapman

Appendix G

- Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Self
- Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Other

(Kouzes Posner International Inc., California, U.S.A.)

KOUZES/POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

L P I

James M. Kouzes

Barry Z. Posner

SELF

INSTRUCTIONS

On the next two pages are thirty descriptive statements about various leadership behaviours and activities. Please read each statement carefully, then rate yourself in terms of how frequently you engage in the practice described. Record your responses by drawing a circle around the number that corresponds to the frequency you have selected. You are given five choices:

1. If you RARELY or NEVER do what is described in the statement, circle the number one.
2. If you do what is described ONCE IN A WHILE, circle number two.
3. If you SOMETIMES do what is described, circle number three.
4. If you do what is described FAIRLY OFTEN, circle number four.
5. If you do what is described VERY FREQUENTLY or ALWAYS, circle number five.

In selecting the answer, be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in each behaviour. Do not answer in terms of how you like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behave. For example, the first statement is "I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities." If you believe you do this "once in a while," circle number two. If you believe you seek out challenging opportunities fairly often, circle the number four.

After you have marked answers for all thirty statements, turn to page four and transfer your ratings to the blanks provided.

Copyright 1993 by Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI) SELF

To what extent would you say you engage in the following actions and behaviors? Circle the number that applies to each statement.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. I describe to others the kind of future I would like for us to create together.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. I involve others in planning the actions we will take.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am clear about my own philosophy of leadership..	1	2	3	4	5
5. I take the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached	1	2	3	4	5
6. I stay up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting our organization.....	1	2	3	4	5
7. I appeal to others to share my dream of the future as their own	1	2	3	4	5
8. I treat others with dignity and respect	1	2	3	4	5
9. I make certain that the projects I manage are broken down into manageable chunks	1	2	3	4	5
10. I make sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects	1	2	3	4	5
11. I challenge the way we do things at work	1	2	3	4	5
12. I clearly communicate a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of our organization.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. I give people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. I spend time and energy on making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on	1	2	3	4	5
15. I praise people for a job well done	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
16. I look for innovative ways we can improve what we do in this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. I show others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision	1	2	3	4	5
18. I develop cooperative relationships with the people I work with.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. I let others know my beliefs on how to best run the organization I lead.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. I ask "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected	1	2	3	4	5
22. I look ahead and forecast what I expect the future to be like.....	1	2	3	4	5
23. I create an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects I lead.....	1	2	3	4	5
24. I am consistent in practicing the values I espouse..	1	2	3	4	5
25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.....	1	2	3	4	5
26. I experiment and take risks with new approaches to my work even when there is a chance of failure..	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
28. I get others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on.....	1	2	3	4	5
29. I make sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans, and establishes milestones for the projects they work on.....	1	2	3	4	5
30. I make it a point to tell the rest of the organization about the good work done by my group.....	1	2	3	4	5

TRANSFERRING RATINGS

After you have completed the instrument on pages 2 and 3, transfer your ratings to the blanks below. Please notice that the numbers of the statements are listed horizontally. Make certain that the number you assigned to each statement is transferred to the appropriate blank.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Copyright © 1989 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by TPG/Learning Systems

The Tom Peters Group

555 Hamilton Avenue

Palo Alto, California 94501

(800) 333-8878

and

University Associates, Inc.

8517 Production Avenue

San Diego, California 92121

Telephone (619) 578-5900

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part 1:

1. (a) Have you introduced any new programs/ideas in your school this year?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) If yes, what were these programs/ideas?

- (c) Describe the programs/ideas.

2. (a) Are other schools in this area using these programs?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) What schools are doing this?

3. (a) Do you experiment with new programs/ideas even to the point of risking failure?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) Suggest one or two of these programs/ideas and explain.

4. (a) If an idea or program did experience failure, how would you feel?

- (b) Explain.

5. (a) Do you attend professional development inservice sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Approximately how many each year?

(c) What is the length of these sessions?

1/2 day _____ 1 day _____

1 week _____ other _____

6. (a) Do you encourage your teachers to attend professional development inservice sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Are these professional development inservice sessions compulsory?

Yes _____ No _____

(c) How many compulsory professional development inservice sessions would teachers attend each year?

(d) Describe these sessions.

(e) How many non-compulsory professional development inservice sessions would teachers attend each year?

(f) Describe these sessions.

7. (a) Do you enjoy challenge in your work?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Give me some examples of these challenges.

8. (a) Do you challenge your teachers to perform at higher levels?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How do you do this?

9. (a) Do you practice the philosophy "by mistakes we learn"?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain how you do this.

Part 2:

1. (a) Do you have a vision/goal for your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

2. (a) Do you encourage your teachers to share in your vision/goal?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How do you do this?

3. (a) How do you feel about future prospects for your school?

(b) Describe what you think your school will be like five years from now if you remain here.

4. (a) Do you and your teachers share a common vision/goal for your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) What is this vision/goal?

Part 3:

1. (a) Do you involve your teachers in planning what happens in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

- (c) Do you allow teachers to make decisions about curriculum, classroom management etc...?

Yes _____ No _____

(d) Describe how you do this.

2. (a) Do you use ideas put forth by teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

3. (a) Do your teachers do what you expect of them?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

4. (a) Do you give your teachers ownership for the projects they work on?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How do you do this?

Part 4:

1. (a) What are your beliefs about leadership?

(b) Explain.

2. (a) Do you always follow the values you've agreed upon with your teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How?

3. (a) Do your teachers know your beliefs about how the school should be run?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe your beliefs.

4. (a) Do you always stand by your values of how this school should be run?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

5. (a) As part of your planning, do you expect your teachers to make plans and establish where they will be in each project or subject area at specific times in the school year?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

Part 5:

1. (a) Do you celebrate with your teachers at the end of a successful term or project?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe how you would do this.

2. (a) Do you openly praise your teachers individually and within the group when they have done a good job on a project?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe how you would do this.

3. (a) Are you supportive of your teachers and appreciative of their contributions to the school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

KOUZES/POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

L P I

James M. Kouzes

Barry Z. Posner

OTHER

INSTRUCTIONS

On the next two pages are thirty descriptive statements about various leadership behaviours and activities. Please read each statement carefully, then rate the leader in terms of how frequently he or she engages in the practice described. Record your responses by drawing a circle around the number that corresponds to the frequency you have selected. You are given five choices:

1. If the leader RARELY or NEVER does what is described in the statement, circle the number one.
2. If the leader does what is described ONCE IN A WHILE, circle number two.
3. If he or she SOMETIMES does what is described, circle number three.
4. If he or she does what is described FAIRLY OFTEN, circle number four.
5. If the leader does what is described VERY FREQUENTLY or ALWAYS, circle the number five.

In selecting the answer, be realistic; answer in terms of how the person typically behaves. For example, the first statement is "He or she seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities." If you believe he or she seeks out challenging opportunities "fairly often", circle the number four.

After you have marked answers for all thirty statements, turn to page four and transfer your ratings to the blanks provided.

Copyright 1993 by Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI) OTHER

To what extent would you say this person engages in the following actions and behaviors? Circle the number that applies to each statement.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Rarely	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Frequently
He or she:					
1. seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. describes the kind of future he or she would like for us to create together.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. involves others in planning the actions that will be taken	1	2	3	4	5
4. is clear about his or her own philosophy of leadership	1	2	3	4	5
5. takes the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. stays up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting our organization	1	2	3	4	5
7. appeals to others to share his or her dream of the future as their own.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. treats others with dignity and respect.....	1	2	3	4	5
9. makes certain that the projects he or she manages are broken down into manageable chunks	1	2	3	4	5
10. makes sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects	1	2	3	4	5
11. challenges the way we do things at work.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. clearly communicates a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of our organization.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. gives people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. spends time and energy on making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on	1	2	3	4	5
15. praises people for a job well done.....	1	2	3	4	5

	1 Rarely	2 Once in a While	3 Sometimes	4 Fairly Often	5 Very Frequently
He or she:					
16. Looks for innovative ways we can improve what we do in this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. shows others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision....	1	2	3	4	5
18. develops cooperative relationships with the people he or she works with.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. lets others know his or her beliefs on how to best run the organization he or she leads.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. asks "what can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.....	1	2	3	4	5
22. looks ahead and forecasts what he or she expects the future to be like	1	2	3	4	5
23. creates an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects he or she leads.....	1	2	3	4	5
24. is consistent in practicing the values he or she espouses.....	1	2	3	4	5
25. finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.....	1	2	3	4	5
26. experiments and takes risks with new approaches to his or her work even when there is a chance of failure	1	2	3	4	5
27. is contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities.....	1	2	3	4	5
28. gets others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on.....	1	2	3	4	5
29. makes sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans and establishes milestones for the projects they work on.....	1	2	3	4	5
30. makes it a point to tell the rest of the organization about the good work done by his or her group.....	1	2	3	4	5

TRANSFERRING RATINGS

After you have completed the instrument on pages 2 and 3, transfer your ratings to the blanks below. Please notice that the numbers of the statements are listed horizontally. Make certain that the number you assigned to each statement is transferred to the appropriate blank.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Copyright © 1989 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America

Published by TPG/Learning Systems
The Tom Peters Group
555 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94501
(800) 333-8878

and

University Associates, Inc.
8517 Production Avenue
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone (619) 578-5900

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part 1:

1. (a) Has your principal introduced any new programs/ideas in your school this year?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) If yes, what were these programs/ideas?

(c) Describe the programs/ideas.

2. (a) Are other schools in this area using these programs?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) What schools are doing this?

3. (a) Does your principal experiment with new programs/ideas even to the point of risking failure?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Suggest one or two of these programs/ideas and explain.

4. (a) If an idea or program did experience failure, how would your principal feel?

(b) Explain.

5. (a) Does your principal attend professional development inservice sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) Approximately how many each year?

- (c) What is the length of these sessions?

1/2 day _____ 1 day _____

1 week _____ other _____

6. (a) Does your principal encourage you to attend professional development inservice sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) Are these professional development inservice sessions compulsory?

Yes _____ No _____

- (c) How many compulsory professional development inservice sessions would teachers attend each year?

- (d) Describe these sessions.

- (e) How many noncompulsory professional development inservice sessions would teachers attend each year?

- (f) Describe these sessions.

7. (a) Does your principal enjoy challenge in his/her work?

Yes _____ No _____

- (b) Give me some examples of these challenges.

8. (a) Does your principal challenge you to perform at higher levels?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How does he/she do this?

9. (a) Does your principal practice the philosophy "by mistakes we learn"?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain how he/she does this?

Part 2:

1. (a) Does your principal have a vision/goal for your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

2. (a) Does your principal encourage you to share in his/her vision/goal?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How does he/she do this?

3. (a) How does your principal feel about future prospects for your school?

(b) Describe what you think your school will be like five years from now if your principal remains here?

4. (a) Does your principal share with you a common vision/goal for your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) What is this vision/goal?

Part 3:

1. (a) Does your principal involve teachers in planning what happens in your school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

(c) Does your principal allow you to make decisions about curriculum, classroom management etc...?

Yes _____ No _____

(d) Describe how he/she does this.

2. (a) Does your principal use ideas put forth by you?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

3. (a) Do you do what the principal expects you to do?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

4. (a) Does your principal give you ownership for the projects you work on?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How does he/she do this?

Part 4:

1. (a) What are your principal's beliefs about leadership?

(b) Explain.

2. (a) Does your principal always follow the values he/she agreed upon with you?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) How?

3. (a) Do you know your principal's beliefs about how the school should be run?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe these beliefs.

4. (a) Does your principal always stand by his/her values of how this school should be run?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

5. (a) As part of your planning, does your principal expect you to make plans and establish where you will be in each project or subject area at specific times in the school year?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

Part 5:

1. (a) Does your principal celebrate with you at the end of a successful term or project?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe how he/she would do this.

2. (a) Does your principal openly praise you individually and within the group when you have done a good job on a project?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Describe how he/she would do this.

3. (a) Is your principal supportive of you and appreciative of your contributions to the school?

Yes _____ No _____

(b) Explain.

Appendix H
Relationships Between Principals
and Members of School Councils: An Attitude Scale
(Chapman, Judith D., University of Western Australia, Australia)

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND MEMBERS OF SCHOOL
COUNCILS: AN ATTITUDE SCALE

This questionnaire contains 24 statements concerning the nature of relationships between principals and school council members.

There are no correct responses to these statements. We are interested only in your honest opinion. We hope that you will indicate your personal opinion, regardless of whether you think other people might agree or disagree with you.

Please complete the form independently. Your responses will remain confidential and no person or school will be named in the report of the study. Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling your responses at the right of the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Members of school council should always support the recommendations of the principal.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. A member of council should be expected to bring any contentious issue to the notice of the principal prior to raising it in council.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. School council members do not possess sufficient information about the school to challenge the recommendations of the principal.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. The principal is entitled to veto discussion on any issue perceived as a threat to his/her authority.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. The principal is justified in trying to ensure that the people nominated to school councils are those with whom he/she believes he/she can work most effectively.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. The school council should not make a decision which the principal is known to be unhappy about implementing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. In school administration democratic procedures must sometimes be foregone in the interest of efficiency.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Members of council should never act as a rubber stamp, merely legitimizing the principal's decisions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. School council members' prime responsibility is to the administration of the school rather than any section of the public.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. The principal is entitled to the view that council members have no greater right than other members of the public to view the day-to-day running of the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. Council members are justified in demanding that the principal conform to their expectations about the keeping of accounts.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. The chairman of council should not put to a vote a proposal which the principal is known to oppose.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. The principal is justified in blocking discussion on any issue that has implications for the day-to-day running of the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. The principal should be prepared to provide information on all issues about which members of the school council wish to be informed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. School council members are justified in creating informal alliances to be used in limiting the power of the principal on the council.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. It is appropriate for council members to seek from the principal explanations about matters pertaining to the day-to-day running of the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. The principal is the school council member's most reliable source of information about the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. The principal must establish that the professional rights of principal and staff are not to be challenged by members of council.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. It is up to the principal to indicate those issues which are important issues for council deliberations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. The principal is justified in insisting on unlimited control over funds necessary for the day-to-day running of the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21. It is inappropriate for members of school council to censure the principal or in any way exercise control over his/her behaviour.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22. The most important role of council is as a support for the principal in his/her dealings with politicians and Education Department officials.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23. The principal is justified in preventing any attempts by council members to exercise influence over matters related to the educational program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24. The principal is entitled to exercise influence on any issue which is perceived as a threat to his/her authority.	SA	A	U	D	SD

PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL COUNCIL MEMBER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Describe the existing nature of the relationship between the principal and school council members of your school.
2. Describe what you consider would be the ideal relationship.
3. What factors do you believe influence relationships between principals and school council members?
4. What do you consider to be the bases of the principal's influence on school council members?
5. To what extent do you think council members would yield to the principal's professional expertise?
6. To what extent is the principal prepared to use his/her expertise to influence decision making?
7. Should the principal seek out support or should he/she rely primarily on his/her influence as an expert?
8. Do council members find themselves dependent upon the principal for advice and information about the school and education in general?

9. What do you consider to be the bases of school council members' influence?
10. Who on council has the support of powerful people in the community? How does this affect the relationship between principal and council?
11. What sorts of decisions are made by your council?
12. What are the bases upon which decisions are made?
13. What are the areas of
 - (a) common interest?
 - (b) separate interest?
 - (c) non interest?
14. Upon what issues do principals and school council members tend to
 - (a) agree?
 - (b) disagree?
15. On what issues would either principals or school council members be prepared to exercise their influence?

16. What is the division of labour between council members and the principal?
17. What is the balance of power that underlies this division?
18. Who sets the agenda? (solely or primarily)
To what extent is control exercised through agenda setting?
19. Who most often initiates action, makes proposals for change, recommends alternatives?
20. In the main, do school council members always approve the alternatives proposed by the principal?
21. Does one person or group on council often oppose the principal?
22. Are clashes over important issues or are the disputes more idiosyncratic, based on personalities?
23. Do opponents consistently present the same views?
24. What are council members' and principals' zones of tolerance?

25. Describe incidents in which the behaviour of either principal or council members was such that it was responsible for particularly good or bad effects on council action or the school program.

26. How is the relationship between principals and school council members affected by community characteristics such as:

Size:

Socio-economic status:

Educational expectations:

The community's ability to finance education:

Politics:

Degree of stability in the community:

The community's history of school-community relations:

27. How are relations affected by such personal characteristics as:

The socio-economic status of principal or school council member (occupation, income, education):

The prestige of individuals:

The sex of individuals:

The leadership/management skills of individuals:

Council members' motivation for serving:

28. What characteristics of the school affect relationships?
29. To what extent does the school council exercise its representative and policy-making function?
30. To what extent do school council members govern or merely legitimate the policy recommendations of the principal?
31. How do you strike a balance between democracy and efficiency in school administration?



