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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which Iowa secondary school principals and teacher building representatives support a model for cooperative action in the administration of the state's secondary schools. In addition differences in the perceptions of those principals and teachers are examined and the extent to which practices in the schools reflect cooperative practices is determined.

The population for the study included all secondary teachers in Iowa identified by their local education associations as the building representative and the principals of the schools where the building representatives were employed. Data were gathered using a survey instrument developed by the researcher. Questions in the instrument were extracted from assumptions about successful schools and key characteristics in six areas of schooling, both of which were originally identified in Ventures in Good Schooling jointly published in 1986 by the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The two groups were asked to respond on a five-point Likert scale to the desirability of eight assumptions which underlie cooperative action. Summaries by group using mean difference scores (correlated t-test) established the beliefs reported by the two groups. Both groups also responded to 30 practices, which were divided into six areas of schooling, in terms of the desirability and degree of implementation in their schools of each practice. Mean difference scores were computed for each of the six categories and were examined by single-sample (within groups) t-tests.
Results disclosed an unexpected and important level of agreement between the two groups. Using a scale of 1-5, both principals and teachers assigned a value greater than 4.3 to the desirability of cooperative action. Both groups assigned an even higher overall agreement value (4.48) with the underlying assumptions about successful schools. Of the six specific areas investigated, the two most notable were student achievement and behavior—where principals and teachers assigned the highest values of desirability (4.56 and 4.51 respectively)—and the area of supervision, evaluation, and personnel, where principals and teachers expressed high, and remarkably similar, levels of support for cooperative action (4.32 and 4.33 respectively).

These results indicate that there exists a remarkable level of agreement between teachers and principals about the desirability of teacher involvement in the cooperative and collaborative management of the school. Further indications are that teachers and principals are poised to accept joint responsibility.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A substantial amount of educational literature has recently focused on effective schools, improving school climate, and leadership effectiveness. References are made to the relative importance of the principal's position and the responsibility of the principal to make decisions which will influence the lives of students, teachers, other employees, parents, and patrons of the school attendance area. The principalship has been characterized as the most powerful position in the American school by virtue of the degree of visibility evidenced on the school campus and in the attendance area. Regardless of the principal's leadership style or behaviors, the principal is the individual in the school who is most responsible for the school climate and outcomes of productivity and satisfaction of students and staff (Kelly, 1980).

At the same time, study groups such as the Carnegie Task Force of 1984 (cited in the National Association of Secondary School Principal's and Burger King Corporation's In Honor of Excellence, 1985) point to the need to change the role of the teacher in the direction of greater responsibility and involvement in institutional decision-making in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Still other research responds to this issue of teacher empowerment by noting that successful leaders (including principals) have a capitalistic view of power. That is, one invests it to increase it, and the more one distributes power among others the more one gets in return. This view of power is complex, however, and does
not equate power with status or prestige. Rather, it is the capacity to influence, to ensure the outcomes one wishes, and to prevent those one prefers to avoid. For it is not just power over people and events that counts, but rather power over accomplishment and achievement of organizational purposes. In order to increase control over the latter, the principal needs to surrender or delegate control over the former. Teachers need to be empowered to act and be given the necessary responsibility that releases their potential and makes their actions and decisions count (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Some principals may fear the thought of teacher empowerment and the loss of their own power. However, Erlandson and Bifano (1987) indicate that giving teachers greater responsibility, particularly for the development and implementation of educational strategies, can enhance the principal's power by expanding the available resources to all phases of the instructional program.

This conception of "influential power" is not the power over people and things associated with dominance, control, and hierarchy, but rather the "power to" concept of leadership. It is the power to do something, to accomplish something, and to help others accomplish something that they think is important. In "power to" far less emphasis is given to what people are doing and far more emphasis is given to what they are accomplishing (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Further research about the dual roles the effective principal must assume as instructional leader and manager suggests that the principal deliberately share these functions with others as a more realistic alternative to assuming both duties. The effectiveness and
practicality of such a recommendation rests on the concept of team leadership. Because secondary schools are not as tightly coupled as their business counterparts, nor as able to generate consensus concerning common goals and careful product evaluation, shared leadership is more compatible with the organizational structure of schools than is leadership focused on one person.

Pursuing this relationship between school organization and leadership, it should be recognized that the typical decentralized secondary school is more loosely coupled than its elementary counterpart. This decentralization is the result of three factors: first, there is less consensus among administrators and teachers about school goals, due to the size of the secondary faculty and diversity of academic backgrounds; second, the departmentalized structure and more specialized nature of the curriculum reinforce the autonomy of the classroom teacher; third, the secondary principal works with teachers who perceive themselves as subject-matter specialists, and therefore, the secondary principal has less "expert power" than that which is ascribed to the elementary principal. In such loosely coupled organizations, composed of several self-directing units, a decentralized team approach to leadership will probably be more effective (Glatthorn & Newberg, 1984).

Of course, there must first be consensus about what the instructional leadership functions are in the school. Principals and teachers need to identify the most critical instructional functions, then the teachers in the program who are perceived as leaders need to be assigned responsibility for them. Once this is accomplished, the
principal collaborates with these leaders and legitimizes their activities.

Baxter (1986) suggests that principals could increase their effectiveness by knowing staff personalities. Good principals have the ability to assess the strengths and weaknesses of staff members and make appropriate appointments in order to get things done. The key ingredient here is a basic understanding of people. The research is also clear that teachers are best involved in areas related to their expertise. However, a note of caution is expressed in that not all teachers are equally desirous or capable of significant participation in principal-teacher cooperative action, nor are they prepared to assume such a collegial relationship (Belasco & Alutto, 1972; Erlandson & Bifano, 1987).

The degree of staff participation needed is still one of the most difficult questions for a principal to answer. Certainly participation alone is not a panacea that will eliminate conflict and disagreement and solve all management problems. Most people are not just waiting to participate; nor will participation just happen without acquired leadership skills to guide people in the participation process (Larsen, 1988).

Ultimately, what seems to be missing are agreements among principals and teachers about teacher involvement in the decision-making process.

In 1985, the National Education Association (NEA) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) appointed a committee to develop a joint statement about the roles of principals
and teachers in the operation of the school. In the preface to the final report, the committee asserted that "teachers and principals must accept joint responsibility for designing a collaborative school, a school in which the professional autonomy of teachers and the managerial autonomy of principals are harmonized" (Ventures, 1986, p. 1).

As a result of their efforts and research, the committee was able to identify some basic assumptions about successful schools. These assumptions were not only supported by the research but also validated and verified by experiences of principals and teachers. The assumptions as described in Ventures (1986) were:

1. The improvement of education depends on decisions and actions at the school site.
2. The quality of education depends on the cooperative, joint efforts of teachers and principals.
3. The staff of a good school develops and utilizes shared goals and high expectations for instructional outcomes.
4. The instructional practices of good schools are rooted in validated, applicable research.
5. The personnel of good schools are fully prepared, certified, high quality professionals.
6. The teachers and principals of good schools perform their responsibilities in a manner consistent with the highest standards of professionalism.
7. The management of good schools reflects practices that motivate and encourage staff members to sustain and improve their professional skills.
8. The personnel and resources as well as the flexibility and independence of good schools are fully utilized to meet the unique needs of their students.
9. In good schools, teachers and principals assume the responsibility for improving the educational experiences of all students and display initiative and make full use of their knowledge, experience, and authority.
10. In good schools, the channels of communication are open and clear, and the professional staff members have ample opportunity to exchange ideas and insights.
11. Good schools recognize and take into full account the family and community factors affecting student performance. (pp. 14-15)
The major outcome of this project based on these assumptions was the identification of key characteristics that appeared to generate the possibility for effective cooperation within each of six specific areas in the secondary school. The two associations acknowledged that their members would continue to view certain issues with differing perspectives. However, they asserted that the successful development of a collegial relationship between principals and teachers depends not only on the focus of their common interests and perspectives, but also upon an acknowledgment of their differences.

Areas of School Life

The six areas of school life that the committee used in developing a framework for action were:

1. Purpose and Goals of the School
2. School Organization and Climate
3. Classroom Instruction
4. Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development
5. Student Achievement and Behavior
6. Family and Community Relationships

In each of these areas, the committee developed a list of "key characteristics that appear to generate effective cooperative action" (Ventures, 1986, p. 5). Certain of these "characteristics" were behaviors, practices, or attitudes that pertained only to the principal. Others identified teachers as the primary source of behaviors, practices, or attitudes. Still other practices, which were of particular interest to the researcher, were those which appeared to create the best opportunities for cooperative principal-teacher relationships.
action. These latter practices are significant in that they touch each of the six broad areas of school life identified above. For the purpose of this research, the author adapted the six areas of school life.

School Goals and Purposes

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include defining cooperatively the goals and purposes of the school, cooperatively collecting data about students, and cooperatively developing strategies for implementing and evaluating school programs. (Items 1, 2, 7, and 8 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A.)

School Organization and Climate

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include cooperatively developing policies concerning the general operation of the school, working together to recruit and provide for the professional development and retention of staff, cooperatively developing and maintaining order in the school, and recognizing student achievement. These activities include, but are not limited to, creating an atmosphere where students are well disciplined and hold a high degree of respect for, and understanding of, themselves and others. (Items 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 30 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A.)

Classroom Instruction

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include cooperatively developing activities involving instructional effectiveness as the highest priority in the school, those related to
development of instructional improvement and program implementation plans, identifying resources necessary to meet instructional objectives, and accurately assessing and effectively recognizing academic achievement as it relates to instructional goals and total program effectiveness. (Items 3, 4, 5, 6, and 19 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A).

Supervision-Evaluation-Personnel

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include cooperatively developing criteria and strategies for evaluation of personnel, reviewing summative written evaluations, reviewing administrative performance, and developing ways to recognize the accomplishments of teachers and principals while also acknowledging their service and contributions to the community. (Items 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A.)

Student Achievement and Behavior

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include cooperatively designing instructional programs, policies, and procedures that encourage participation in learning and classroom attendance in general; maintenance of an orderly and safe environment while accommodating individual learning styles; incorporating fair and accurate grading procedures; promoting personal responsibility and maturity; and developing a set of activities to ensure that expectations and rules are communicated to students and community in the clearest and most concise way possible. (Items 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A.)
**Family and Community Relationships**

Practices identified in this area as "indicators of success" include cooperatively encouraging families to provide good learning conditions, identifying and using community resources while providing public recognition for them, promoting positive working relationships with the media, and developing plans that encourage families to discuss progress reports and other school communiques with the professional staff. (Items 26, 27, 28, and 29 on the questionnaire address this area. See Appendix A.)

**Purpose of the Study**

Task forces, committees, theorists, and reformers may all posit a general cooperative relationship between the principal and teachers, as did the NEA and NASSP joint committee when it developed a functions and activities framework for effective school administration. Further, the relationship the joint committee articulated was one which envisioned the principal and teachers working together in carrying out many of the administrative functions, working together in a manner that might be characterized as cooperative principal-teacher action.

However, several questions might be asked about those relationships, not the least of which is, how do secondary school principals and teachers not directly associated with an activity such as the NEA-NASSP joint committee project view the ideas proposed? Or stated another way, how widely held are the assumptions about cooperative principal-teacher action in the administration of secondary schools? More specifically, how do secondary school
principals and teachers in Iowa view the involvement of teachers in carrying out administrative functions in schools?

The purpose of this study is (a) to assess the extent to which secondary school principals and teachers support a model for cooperative action in the administration of secondary schools, (b) to examine the differences in the perceptions they hold, and (c) to determine the extent to which practices in their own schools reflect this model. To that end, the writer questioned building representatives and their principals throughout Iowa about their views on principal-teacher cooperative actions in schools. Specifically, five basic questions guided the inquiry:

1. To what extent is there agreement in Iowa between building representatives and their principals on the basic assumptions about successful schools as defined in the Ventures study?

2. What are the perceptions of high school principals in Iowa relative to the desirability and degree of implementation of principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships?

3. What are the perceptions of building representatives in Iowa relative to the desirability and degree of implementation of principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships?

4. What are the perceptions of building representatives in Iowa relative to the desirability and degree of implementation of principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships?

5. What are the perceptions of building representatives in Iowa relative to the desirability and degree of implementation of principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships?
development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships?

4. Are there differences between how building representatives and their principals view the desirability of teacher–principal cooperation in the aforementioned areas and the degree to which they believe such cooperative undertakings are implemented in their respective schools?

5. How do the opinions of these principals and building representatives in Iowa compare when district enrollment and geographic location are taken into account?

Research Hypotheses

1. There is no difference in the level of agreement of building representatives and their principals in regard to the basic assumptions about successful schools as defined in the Ventures study.

2. There are no differences in the perceptions of Iowa high school principals regarding the desirability of principal–teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within the school. Differences in perception are examined in each of the following areas: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships.

3. There are no differences in the perceptions of building representatives regarding the desirability of principal–teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within the school. Differences in perception are examined in each of the
following areas: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships.

4. There are no differences in the perceptions of Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the desirability of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships.

5. There are no differences in the perceptions of Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the actual implementation of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools related to: purposes and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation, and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships.

Assumptions

For the purposes of this study the following assumptions are made:

1. The Likert responses represent continuous data; the numbers selected indicate approximations of respondents' positions to the respective items.

2. The Local Education Association's (LEA) building representative is a teacher-leader.
3. The responses are accurate reflections of the beliefs of the respondents.

Limitations

The following limitations are recognized in this study:

1. The study is restricted to Iowa secondary schools.

2. The generalizability of the results of the study to other schools is limited by data analysis procedures involving paired responses and by voluntary response to the survey.

Definition of Terms

Area Education Agency (AEA)—An intermediate service unit providing special education, media, and other educational services to local school districts and acting as a regional link between the Department of Education and local districts.

Building Representative—A teacher either elected or appointed by the local education association to represent all teachers of a specific secondary school building or organizational group.

Cooperative Action—Undertakings through which teachers and principals demonstrate a willingness to work together in a mutually supportive way.

Local Education Association (LEA)—A local extension of the state and national teacher organizations.

Principal—The building administrator in those secondary schools organized as a single unit of (6)7-12, 8-12, 9-12, or 10-12 which have a local education association building representative on staff.
School (or) site-based management (SBM)—A structure which is designed to place the locus of program control at the school site, rather than at the central office.

Secondary—Schools with either a (6)7-12, 8-12, 9-12, or 10-12 organizational structure, as listed in the Iowa Educational Directory (Department of Education, 1987-1988).

Teacher—A term used interchangeably with the term building representative.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Much of the literature like that cited by Honig (1985), Huddle (1987), and the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) (cited in Strategies For Excellence, 1987) indicates that the traditional, rule-oriented school organization is unlikely to survive without major changes.

These changes to be effective must reflect the values of the people who deliver the services. Bennis (1969) predicted the future of organizations would depend on a shift of emphasis "... from the individual level to cooperative group effort, from delegate authority to shared responsibility, from centralized to decentralized authority, from obedience to confidence, from antagonistic arbitration to problem-solving" (p. 33).

Michael Timpane, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, cited In Honor of Excellence (NASSP and Burger King Corporation, 1985), explained at the symposium for outstanding teachers and principals, sponsored by the Burger King Corporation, that the Education Excellence movement has advanced in stages. He believes that this movement now needs the involvement of teachers and principals.

Timpane identified the first stage as the period of reform proposals and studies. As examples he cited reports such as A Nation at Risk (National Commission of Excellence in Education Task Force, 1983), John Goodlad's A Place Called School (1984), and Ernest Boyer's High School (1983) which gave a detailed picture of schools, called...
for major changes in the public schools, and made recommendations for their improvement. The years following these reform proposals and studies have been the years of legislative response, the second stage. This legislation has often included increased academic requirements for the high school diploma, increased teaching salaries, competency testing for new and/or experienced teachers, and re-emphasis on "basic" subjects, among others.

According to Timpane, educational reform has now reached the third stage, the implementation phase. In many ways this stage is the most difficult because it involves change—changing conditions, changing behaviors, and changing attitudes and perceptions. This stage most directly involves practitioners, but little groundwork has been laid for their participation.

The message sent by the various education reports seemed to be the same, and very clear. Tucker and Mandel (1986), and the recent Carnegie Task Force on the Teaching Profession, cited in In Honor of Excellence, (NASSP and Burger King Corporation, 1985) pointed directly to the need to "change the practitioner's roles in the direction of greater responsibility and involvement in instructional decision-making in order to effectively improve the quality of teaching and learning" (p. 2).

Researchers such as Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982), Briggs (1986), and Huling-Austin, Stiegelbauer, and Muscella (1985), have asserted that education reformers need to recognize that a bottom-up strategy is necessary for effective change to take place. Since much of the reform agenda will have to be implemented by school-based
practitioners, teachers and principals should be involved in the process. The teachers' and administrators' views on how this implementation should occur will have a critical bearing on the final outcome of such efforts.

The school-effectiveness research and the school studies placed responsibility for sustained innovations in educational quality at the school level; the district level was viewed as important for support of school-level reform efforts (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Purkey & Smith, 1985; Sizer, 1984).

This chapter consists of four major sections. First is a review of the literature concerning leadership and effecting change in schools. Specifically, empowerment and the role of principals are examined, as well as their relationship to power and influence. The section concludes with a review of participatory management concepts related to leadership and power sharing.

The second section of the chapter focuses on managerial structures and examples of empowerment in action. This review discusses two specific participatory structures: school-based management and distributive management. The final part of this section deals with the issues and terminology of shared leadership, collegiality, and collaboration as they relate to these management structures.

The third section is devoted to arguments and counter-arguments to the concepts associated with participatory management. This section discusses the range of thought from fears of empowering teachers too much, resulting in deterioration of middle management, to the opportunities that collaboration and collegiality present.
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The fourth and final section focuses on empowerment and the extent of decision making. Also discussed is the terminology related to increased participation between teachers and principals. The concepts of shared decision making and participatory decision making are specifically dealt with in this section of the review.

**Leadership and Effecting Change In Schools**

The research on effective schools and the research on the effective high school principal both focus on one central quality. That quality is principal leadership. Because effective schools are partly the result of the activities of effective principals, these "leadership" activities and management practices have been both scrutinized and chronicled at some length in the professional literature and research (Ubben & Hughes, 1987).

**Empowerment and the Principal's Role**

Although there is general agreement on the importance of the role the principal plays in effective schools, some questions still remain. The current school reform debate focuses a substantial amount of attention on the concept of leadership. This debate has generated specific questions. How can the principal be a more effective leader? What kind of leadership works in getting schools to improve? How can the principal be more effective in getting teachers to teach better? What is the proper leadership role? What role should teachers play in the leadership process? How can leadership make schools better places for teaching and learning?

These questions are centered around the precise nature of the leadership of the principal. "The questions generated focus on four
generally agreed upon areas: high expectations, orderly climate, frequent evaluation, and strong leadership" (Ubben & Hughes, 1987, p. 4).

Although authors such as Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) have devoted entire books to effective principal leadership, what the research does not seem to be clear on are the specific leadership behaviors and styles that principals demonstrate to create effective schools. Both Lipham (1983) and Ubben and Hughes (1987), in their synthesis and critique related to the effect of administrative and supervisory behavior on student learning, were struck by the relationship between teacher behavior and administrator behavior. Hughes concluded: "There is little question that administrator and supervisory practice and organizational structure impinge mightily on the outcomes of the school. It is known and generally, observable; it is the particulars that are still troublesome" (Ubben & Hughes, 1987, p. 4).

Leadership has been defined as "the process of persuasion by which a leader or leadership group induces followers to act in a manner that enhances the leader's purposes or shared purposes" (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989, p. 213). How this leadership is conceived and practiced apparently makes the difference.

A common mistake made by administrators who seek to improve schools is to equate leadership with authority or power. Authority is the means by which one obtains compliance even if it is given grudgingly. As John Gardner (1986) pointed out, those who comply grudgingly become subordinates rather than followers. The performance
of subordinates is typically marginal, sometimes satisfactory, but rarely extraordinary. Gardner continued to say that quality schooling will not be achieved by teachers and principals who view themselves as subordinates. Instead, it is necessary to encourage and develop followers who have the capacity for continued performance beyond expectations. Followers then are those driven from within while subordinates are pushed from the outside.

Traditionally, the study of leadership has dwelt on issues of leadership style, levels of decision making (and consequences of variations of these on teacher satisfaction, compliance, and performance), and school effectiveness. Which style is better: autocratic or democratic, task or relationship, directive or participatory (Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989)?

James McGregor Burns (1978) developed a language system and set of concepts for sorting and understanding traditional leadership. For Burns, leadership was exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilized resources to arouse and satisfy the motives of followers. To this end, he identified transactional leadership and transformative leadership; the former focuses on basic, largely extrinsic motives and needs, while the latter focused on higher-order, more intrinsic needs.

Many experts believe that transactional leadership has run its course. They maintain that it is based on a limited view of human potential, an inadequate view of how the world works, and an outdated conception of the field of management theory and practice (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1986; Sergiovanni & Moore, 1989).
Examples of concepts associated with transactional leadership are the development of management skills designed to engineer work behaviors; using assorted leadership styles; and applying the principles of contingency, exchange, and path-goal theory.

Examples of concepts associated with transformational leadership are empowerment and symbolic leadership. In transformative leadership, administrators and teachers unite in pursuit of higher-level goals that are common to both, regardless of their special interests and goals. Transformative leadership yields levels of performance that are beyond normal expectations. Motivation is the explanation, and the basic principle of motivation theory is that people invest themselves in work in order to obtain desired returns or rewards.

Other writing has focused on leadership and the principal by discussing particular characteristics for good leadership or desirable traits individuals who are effective leaders possess. Fuhr (1989) said that effective leaders know where they want their organization to go and set a time for reaching those goals. He believed that the primary mission for every school administrator, and in particular principals, was establishing a vision and mapping out plans. Other research as well pointed to the importance of this "vision." Bennis (1969) considered vision to be a key concept, aligned with purpose. He said that leadership required "the capacity to create and communicate a compelling vision of a desired state of affairs, a vision . . . that clarifies the current situation and induces commitment to the future" (p. 3).
While examining the particular behaviors for principals to exhibit, the theorists go far beyond simple stressing a vision. One of the most important threads that ties vision and leadership together is communication. John Gardner (1989) said, "If you had to name a single, all-purpose instrument of leadership it would be communication" (p. 73).

Gardner likened the workplace to the learning laboratory and said the potential leader must have an excellent command of writing and speaking as well as listening skills to better be able to know how other workers feel about their jobs, how they regard those above them in the hierarchy, what motivates them, and what lifts their morale and what lowers it.

Writers like Fuhr (1989) and First and Carr (1986) also emphasized the importance of communication to the leadership of the principal. Fuhr included communication in what he called the four Cs of good leadership practice. First, however, he believed it was important for principals to have honesty and integrity as ingredients of their character. Character development helped keep the vision of the school clear and on course. Second, successful leaders also cared and desired to help others. Fuhr explained that principal caring is not enough and that his/her attitude needed to be extended to students, teachers, parents, and any others associated with the school community. A third C, explained Fuhr, was courage. Courageous decision making brought about peace of mind, but when it was lacking the vision began to fade. Courage provided leadership that propelled the school district toward the vision of tomorrow. Courageous
decisions are not always popular, but they keep the vision clear and the school on course. The fourth and final C Fuhr revealed that principals need is communication. He, like Gardner, contended that for a principal to be an effective leader, he/she needed to be an effective communicator. Expectations, goals, purposes, and philosophies all must be communicated to the entire school population. The more people know and feel involved in the vision, the more they are willing to invest their resources in the product of education. Communicating will also keep the vision clear and the school district on course.

Blank's (1987) study analyzing the leadership of principals in 32 urban high schools across the country serves as an excellent summary for the current literature on leadership. Blank's findings in the review suggested that:

The role of the principal as a leader is critical in creating school conditions that lead to higher student academic performance—conditions such as setting high standards and goals, planning and coordinating with staff, having an orientation toward innovation, frequent monitoring of staff and student performance, and involving parents and the community. (p. 69)

Blank also concluded that the research on the role of principals as instructional leaders has been inconclusive. For example, the effects of principal leadership may be influenced by a number of factors. Blank's studies found that "the principals of effective schools have different leadership styles and that principal leadership differed according to the school context and organization" (p. 71).

(The organization of the school district, among these other factors, may also affect the role of the principal as leader. In his study of high schools Boyer (1983) found that leadership by principals
and school autonomy characterized most effective schools. However, he observed that there is also now a strong counter-trend toward centralization of decision making and greater requirements for school reporting and accountability, which tend to decrease the opportunities for leadership by principals.)

The recent emphasis on "principal as leader" may have added a new dimension to the traditional distinction between dual roles of the principal as educator and the principal as administrator. Against the perspectives of the current movements on reform, the concept of the principal as the source of educational leadership, and of the school as the relevant level of organization for change, may signify an important shift. This development of the concept of principal as leader may describe a new set of expectations for school principals. The concept of principal as leader also implies a redefinition of the relationship between principals and teachers, the school and the school district.

Power, Influence, and Empowerment

As a review of effective leadership unfolds, dimensions of organizational change and the impact of leadership upon student outcomes also emerge. In relation to these two dimensions, theorists make some particularly interesting comments.

Claussen (1985), in addressing the first dimension, equated "leader" with "change facilitator" in the role of the principal. He examined the question of what "makes principals more effective and efficient change agents" (p. 6). Although it is characteristic of humans to resist change, Claussen identified communication,
involvement, and encouragement/support as three important factors that can mitigate this impulse.

Claussen believed that, of those three, involvement was probably the most important. He agreed with other writers, Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) and Gardner (1989), who said that the difference between average and high performing principals is that effective principals are proactive.

Although the role of the principal as change facilitator is becoming more clearly understood, few principals are trained or prepared to direct the change process. One need is to create a school environment conducive to the introduction of change. "These concerns, however, are not static, and each principal must be prepared to deal with these challenges in a manner that best suits him or her as an individual" (Claussen, 1985, p. 57).

Brandt (1987), in addressing the second dimension, interviewed Richard Andrews as he researched the role of the principal's leadership and student outcomes. In his summary Andrews referred to what other research points to as of utmost concern to teachers and principals:

Frankly, I never anticipated that we would find such a powerful relationship between leadership of the principal and student outcomes. After all, the principal is one step removed from the direct instruction process. But what we found is that the teacher's perception of their work environment is so important, the power of the principal's leadership so pervasive, that it has a measurable impact on student learning. (p. 16)

The term "power" seems to be contradictory to the suggestions in the research for increased involvement and participation, particularly in the dimensions of change and student outcomes. What many teachers
fear is the power the principal has over them. On the other hand, some principals are fearful of empowering teachers too much and losing their own power (Blank, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1987).

To avoid the negative connotations often associated with the term "power," the terms influence and power have often been used synonymously by writers. Pichler (1974) discussed influence and power this way:

Influence is the ability of an individual to affect the thoughts, emotions, and/or actions of one or more persons, based on personal resources as well as the authority of one's office. Hence, the influence of school principals consists of the legitimate power of their office and the power resulting from their personal qualities and characteristics. (p. 401)

"Influence" is usually the term chosen over "power" because, as Gunn and Holdaway (1986) explained, influence is an ability which may be increased. It is a skill which may be worked on and practiced in order to improve effectiveness. Power, on the other hand, may not be an ability or skill at all, but rather a characteristic of position. It may be necessary to distinguish between leaders and power holders. By definition, "leaders always have a measure of power. But many power holders have no trace of leadership" (Gardner, 1988, p. 47).

Sergiovanni (1987) explained that successful leaders know the difference between "power over" and "power to." There is a link between leadership and power, and indeed leadership is a special form of power, power to influence (p. 341).

Sergiovanni (1987) indicated further that principals need not and should not fear the implications associated with the concept of empowerment. In fact, highly successful leaders actually have a view of leadership by empowerment. These leaders have learned the great
secret of leadership, power investment: The more you distribute power (influence) among others, the more you get in return. "Teachers need to be empowered to act and be given the necessary responsibility that releases their potential and makes their actions and decisions count" (p. 341). He also emphasized later that empowerment without purpose is not appropriate. The two go hand-in-hand. Sergiovanni (1987) said, "when directed and enriched by purposing and fueled by empowerment, principals and teachers respond with increased motivation and commitment to work" (p. 220). He continued, "empowerment and efficacy are closely connected ideas. When teachers and principals are empowered, their sense of control increases, as does the belief that they can make a difference" (p. 221).

This theme was also elaborated by Erlandson and Bifano (1987). They explained that, seen one way, the concept of teacher empowerment seemed to rob the principalship of its central responsibilities of management of the school and instructional leadership. However, more carefully read, they believed the research indicated that "greater responsibility in the hands of the teachers for the shape and delivery of educational strategies can, in effect, extend the principal's power by bringing expanded resources to the planning, implementation, and monitoring of instructional programs" (p. 31).

Hodges (1986) cautioned, however, that "increased training will be needed for both teachers and principals to make efficient and productive use of limited resources, as well as specific areas of finance, budget, curriculum content, and methodology" (p. 23).
Empowerment and Participatory Management

Although the term "empowerment" is relatively new on the educational scene, the antecedents have been around for some time. Goodlad (1984) maintained that "the school must be largely self-directing. The people within it must develop a capacity for effecting renewal and establishing the mechanisms for doing this" (p. 31).

Teacher empowerment has its implicit roots in the literature on teacher dissatisfaction, autonomy, professionalization, and shared decision making. For instance, Bacharach, Bueer, and Shedd (1986) noted that working conditions such as limited participation in decision making and limited communication with administrators concerning important issues, were prime demotivators for teachers. McLaughlin, Pfeifer, Swanson-Owens, and Yee (1986) discovered that "the conditions under which teachers work are often set up in such a way as to deny teachers a sense of efficacy, success, and self-worth" (p. 423). Among the factors they identified as conditions of the work environment that contributed to teacher frustration and disillusionment were: lack of teacher input into decisions that directly affect their work, administrative decisions that undermine teacher professional judgment and expertise, absence of the opportunity for collegial exchange to examine new and alternative practices, and lack of recognition for accomplishments.

Participation in decisions of educational substance, that is, those decisions that directly affect the teaching-learning process, has been cited by teachers as a dimension of their professional
environment in which they desire the greater participation. However, these areas are exactly where they experience the greatest deprivation (Johnston & Germinario, 1985; Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978).

The considerable amount of research and informed opinion, exemplified by Pauline Gough (1987) as she interviewed William Glasser on improving schools and shared decision making in schools, builds a strong case that a more professional, autonomous role for teachers could also enhance the effectiveness of the public schools. Rutherford (1985) in his 5-year study of the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals concluded that more effective principals share with faculty a commonality of school goals and expectations.

Alutto and Belasco (1972) in their study of 454 teachers concluded that "... teachers would like to see a control structure instituted which encourages greater participation by subordinates ... " (p. 124). From their review of the literature three themes emerged:

1. Increasing participation of organizational members will increase the probability that change will occur and increase the effectiveness of change (ownership syndrome).

2. Shared decision making enhances administrative control by extending its influence over a wider range of decisional issues.

3. Increased decision making leads to greater job satisfaction and work achievement on the part of educational members.

Shared decision making in schools does not, however, mean indiscriminant involvement of teachers in all decisions. The general
nature of their profession suggests that they be involved in those decisions most related to their expertise. Bridges (1967) concluded that shared decision making must also fall outside the teachers' "zone of indifference" if it is to be effective. The teachers' degree of participation in decision making should increase as the consequences of their decisions for them increases.

Johnston and Germinario (1985) also supported that general concept by suggesting that "a teacher is interested in participating if he or she is capable of contributing to the decision and if the decision is personally relevant..." Their study also concurred with that of Alutto and Belasco (1972), which noted that teachers are not homogeneous in their desire or ability for participation.

Research like that of Lawler (1985), Mitchell-Wise (1978), Robinson (1976), Scarr (1982), and Tubbs and Beane, (1982) on teacher empowerment seems to hold two major pieces of advice for the principal: Structure the school organization in such a way that hierarchical differences are diminished and teachers have professional autonomy and genuine collegial involvement in decisions, and proceed with caution, since not all teachers are prepared to assume such a collegial relationship.

There appears to be little dispute over the fact that the most effective principals are those whose teachers have ownership in the mission of the school and a vital interest in its effective implementation. But at the same time, there are concerns which suggest that involvement is not a panacea.
Evidence shows that teachers can become saturated with decisional involvement and, as noted earlier, not all decisions are appropriate for their involvement. Furthermore, not all teachers are equally desirous or capable of significant participation in decision making. The principal must be aware of these subtleties and incorporate them into attempts to build a collegial structure (Erlandson & Bifano, 1987).

It is apparent, in summary, that some type of relationship among leadership, power, and participatory management exists for the principal. It seems essential that this relationship be understood by principals, and by teachers, in order to promote effective schools and learning. It is to this relationship that the authors of Ventures turned their attention.

Kanter's (1981) work in this area is perhaps the most useful of that which is available. It clarifies many of the relationships between power-sharing and effective leadership, and serves as a summary of much that has been touched previously in this chapter. She posited that "increasing the power attached to a wide variety of organizational positions can enhance the productive capacity of the organization" (p. 219).

In her analysis of leadership for the 1980s and beyond, Kanter (1981) identified eight specific new demands of leadership which set the context for the emergence of empowerment and power-sharing as central themes:

1. There is a need to have a more flexible image of the leader, characterized by images of strength that go beyond physical
appearance. These images need to encompass a wider range of people with talents from the mainstream as well as all levels of the organization.

2. Leaders need to be integrators who can handle fragmented constituencies and internal conflict of organizations.

3. For all those who have some stake in an organization's existence the leader must be able to satisfy "multiple stake holders" if a sense of ownership is to develop and the organization is to continue to prosper.

4. Leaders must give followers a greater voice. The attitudinal changes in society continue to move away from authoritarianism and toward democratic internal procedures.

5. Flatter, more responsive systems need to be designed so that information can spread widely and decisions be made at the lowest possible level. Top-down processes are too unwieldy, subject to too many information distortions, and remove a role from the people best able to make the decision.

6. The model for the single leader may be declining in favor of shared leadership. In fact, it may be important to ensure that a much larger number of members of the organization are capable of taking on pieces of the leadership role.

7. Leaders will need to know how to gather data from multiple sources and analyze them before acting. Simple answers do not fit complex environments. More communication channels will need to be established, and leaders will need to ensure that there is a constant flow of information in all sectors of the institution.
8. A change in the role of leaders from ordering to inspiring is necessary. Leaders will create the environment, or design the structure that enables people to discover their skills and talents. Thus, the role will be one of enabling, rather than controlling.

Behind many of these demands is the question of power: knowing what it is and how it can be generated for more people. Kanter (1981) explained that people need power, just as they need opportunity, not only because their expectations are growing and they demand it, but also because it is an ingredient in effective participation in the system.

The question concerning power, of course, is how much and where it should reside. Some social scientists have argued that teachers have too much power in that they have total control over their classrooms, with little check from higher authority. Kanter (1981) argued the problem is just the opposite: too little power. "An emphasis on forms, procedures, and paperwork always reduces the power of people subject to such demands" (p. 222). She believed that power (or the feeling that one has power) tends to create effective leadership in which people operate with more flexibility, give more freedom, emphasize more development for the people below them, and focus on results rather than procedures. Under such circumstances, the powerful seem to deserve more power--more voice in decisions and more recognition. With powerlessness, the cycle is the opposite. Powerlessness breeds a variety of ineffective behaviors that encourage more resistance from the people around and further exaggerates the perception of low power.
Kanter (1981) noted, however, that not all the factors contributing to powerlessness are in the hands of the educational manager, or specifically the principal. Some of them stem from groups surrounding schools, such as school boards, parent groups, unions, professional organizations, and government regulators, each with demands on the system. However, it is still possible to suggest options for expanding power. Problem solving task forces and decision making teams can expand opportunity and also increase power, in that they can "involve more people in discretionary, problem solving activities that net them visibility and recognition even if nothing changes in their job situation" (p. 222).

Despite the virtues of power sharing discussed thus far, Kanter (1981) believed some cautionary notes are in order. She explained that organizations should not move to more participatory forms without being aware of eight central tensions which surround participation: (a) authoritarian leadership where employees are expected to return gratitude for democracy imposed; (b) principals who experience a limited amount of power already are even more resistant and fearful of management approaches which further reduce it; (c) determining the level of involvement and what decisions should be made democratically is difficult, as well as being a time consuming process (also the extra time workers need to invest may not always be worth it, as noted also by Alutto & Belasco, 1972; Bridges, 1967; Johnston & Germinario, 1985); (d) all teachers are not equally interested in or adequately prepared to exercise power and share decision making; (e) simply identifying a team and giving lip service to the team concept does not
guarantee democratic procedures or mutual support; (f) organizations that stress participation and cooperation can find it difficult to eliminate troublesome and/or ineffective people; (g) when something new is tried expectations are aroused with the thought of expanded power and opportunities, and frustration can dominate the organization if the expectations are not fulfilled; (h) organizational systems with increased participation are often thought to be a panacea for all the ills of a school. Experiences from those who have tried show that results even within the same organization can be mixed.

While the previously mentioned cautions must not be ignored, Thomas and Edgemon (1984) believed that these tensions can be dealt with and that there needs to be a renewal of participatory management in schools. The contentions they make are valid, they believed, "because school management is a process that involves the efforts of both administrators and teachers. A continuing task must focus on its participatory nature, giving attention to the complementary tasks to be performed by all segments of the professional staff" (p. 49).

Managerial Structures

There are a number of management structures designed to provide this renewal of the participatory management system in schools. School-based management, distributive management, and ideas related to collaboration and collegiality derived from the mastery in learning project all hold potential for participation and the positive effects of "empowerment."

Examples of Empowerment in Action

School-based management. From the literature on leadership, empowerment, participation, and participatory management, a process
has emerged that involves the individuals responsible for implementing decisions in actually helping make those decisions. This process, called school-based management (SBM), (English, 1988; O'Neil, 1989) has as its major objective school improvement, based on the belief that better decisions will be made if control over decisions is placed as close to the action as possible. "Individuals closest to the educational process will be most aware of the students' needs and, therefore, will make the best decisions" (Clune & White, 1988, p. 13). The SBM programs also aim to increase involvement of school staff, parents, and the community (to create a sense of school ownership).

These views regarding SBM were elaborated by members of the AASA/NAESP/NASSP School-Based Management Task Force (1988). They concluded that the two most fundamental beliefs of SBM are: "those most closely affected by decisions ought to play a significant role in making those decisions; and educational reform efforts will be most effective and long-lasting when carried out by people who feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process" (p. 6). It is apparent that these same beliefs are reflected in Ventures (1986), the focus of this paper.

This same task force indicated that a growing number of school districts have adopted school-based management as a way to improve instruction for all students. Members identified six advantages to school-based management.

1. It formally recognizes the expertise and competence of those who work in individual schools to make decisions to improve learning.
2. It gives teachers and other staff members increased input into decisions.

3. It shifts the emphasis in staff development so the teachers are more directly involved in determining what they need.

4. The process focuses accountability for decisions (the superintendent or principal will have ultimate responsibility for any decision).

5. It brings both financial and instructional resources in line with the instructional goals developed in each school and helps provide better services and programs to students.

6. It nurtures and stimulates new leaders at all levels, and increases both the quantity and the quality of communication, which is more likely to be informal.

The ideas and concepts which the research on SBM brings forth also suggest its relationships to issues previously identified in this chapter. An issue of particular significance is the role of the principal and how teacher empowerment affects it. This issue is brought most sharply into focus in the SBM structure.

Clune and White (1988) agreed that the role of the principal changes greatly as a result of SBM. With Blank (1987), Erlandson and Bifano (1987), Kanter (1981), Sergiovanni (1987), and Weischadle (1980), they also believed that the principal is the key figure in fostering shared governance within the school. In fact, they contended that the difference between a successful and unsuccessful SBM program is often related to the leadership qualities of the principal. With most decisions involving a group decision making
process rather than the principal making decisions unilaterally, the principal encourages responsibility and commitment by exchanging information and ideas. Clune and White (1988) believed "a talented principal in a SBM system will find a balance between order and freedom" (p. 20).

Today school-based management is typically discussed in terms of "empowering" teachers. Certainly one of the most important advantages of this process is its ability to take full advantage of the expertise of all staff. In spite of the problems cited earlier by Geisert (1988), Hodges (1986), and Gunn and Holdaway (1986), school-based management can both empower and enable teachers. They are empowered through shared decision making, and they are enabled because the decisions are more likely to support what they are trying to accomplish in the classroom. SBM should not, however, blur the lines of authority and responsibility. It should lead to the empowerment of teachers, not just the further empowerment of teacher unions.

Through SBM teachers should acquire more autonomy and more freedom to act. At the same time Kremer (1982) explained that schools need to develop a strategy for implementing a school management team. In School-Based Management (AASA, NAESP, NASSP, 1988) Peters and Waterman described the importance of shared values and the kind of autonomy they envisioned:

A set of shared values and rules about discipline, details, and execution can provide the framework in which practical autonomy takes place routinely. . . . Too much overbearing discipline of the wrong kind will kill autonomy. But the more rigid discipline, the discipline based on a small number of shared values . . . in fact, induces practical autonomy and experimentations throughout the organization. (p. 8)
Distributive management. From 1981 to 1983 Thomas and Edgemon (1984) headed a major project in Fairfax County, Virginia, called the Distributed Management of Instructional Environments (DMIE) Project. This project, like SBM, concentrated on the participatory nature of school management and reflected a genuine attempt to empower teachers. The key activities of the project developed from six steps. The first step involved the principal's forming a renewal team. The most effective DMIE teams were those with principals willing to work cooperatively for the improvement of management in the school and those with teachers who recognized the high positive correlation of effective management with effective instruction. The second step was that teams reviewed concepts associated with participatory management in schools. The members of the renewal team needed to talk effectively about school management among themselves and with the rest of the professional staff in their school. A third step involved the renewal team preparing a management profile of its school. This step had a two-fold purpose: One, as the team worked on this task, all members could reach a common level of awareness about the school's management structures and processes, and second, the resulting profile presented a graphic portrayal of the current realities in the school. Step four in this renewal team approach involved surveys of staff perceptions of the management structures and processes in its school. This task had three purposes: First, the entire staff needed to feel involved in the renewal program. Second, the renewal team needed the data gathered, since staff perceptions were just as much a part of the
current reality as were the management structures and processes themselves. Finally, the survey enabled the team to identify any misperceptions the staff might have. Clarification of these misperceptions constituted gain, regardless of any other activity. In step five the team analyzed the data generated by the management profile and by the staff survey. This analysis permitted the renewal team to identify four categories of information. They were able to identify which structures and processes were sound and should be retained, those that needed modification, those that needed to be dropped, and those that needed to be added. In the final stage, step six, the team developed a renewal plan. The document was an action-oriented blueprint, giving guidance to immediate and longer-range activities.

This six-step process for development of a team renewal plan is just one more response to the participatory management emphasis in our schools today. Although there is a variety of ways in which participation may be increased, it should be pursued as an alternative to traditional management structures and processes. Thomas and Edgemon (1984) summarized by saying, "a participative approach, such as the use of administrators and teachers on renewal teams, is particularly appropriate, given the 'de-facto' distribution of management behaviors in a school" (p. 55).

**Collegiality and collaboration.** Sergiovanni and Moore (1989) discussed leadership in terms of leadership density. They explained that "every employee a manager" is a common goal among highly
successful leaders, because they recognize the importance of leadership density and its relationship to organizational effectiveness. "Leadership density means the extent to which leadership roles are shared and leadership broadly exercised" (p. 221). They explained that when leadership density is practiced, the leader is still in charge, but in a different way. Principals are not solo performers, but lead members of collegial teams.

McClure (1988) explained that "The Mastery in Learning Project," a 5-year, school-based improvement effort, allowed teachers and administrators to explore the benefits of this form of collegiality. The project was NEA's response to the national outcry for school improvement. The 26 participating schools reflected the demographic and organizational diversity of schools throughout the nation.

The faculties of these 26 schools developed an improvement plan which included a self-examination of current and future roles, leadership styles, and application of research to enhance the members' decision-making and problem solving skills.

As these schools worked through this process over 2 years, they identified and actually experienced nine distinct stages in the development of collegiality:

1. The staff established the desirability to undergo change and determined the sincerity of such desire.

2. The faculty felt elated that they would be treated as professionals and given the opportunity, authority, and resources needed to improve teaching and learning.
3. The faculty committed their energies to solving the school-wide problems they identified and established an organizational structure to support that work.

4. When teachers discovered that no one from outside the school was going to provide solutions, they became dispirited.

5. This was a critical stage where they almost began again. Twenty to 50% remained active workers. Their determination led to ownership of the project and internalization of its goals.

6. The staff acted on a few simple, straightforward ideas with immediate visible results. Those recaptured the interest of faculty members in the work and created a sense of accomplishment.

7. At this stage Mastery In Learning called for an expansion of the decision-making process: When analyzing problems, faculties examined available options before adopting solutions.

8. Together the staff selected and introduced pilot efforts, assessed their outcomes, and modified them to achieve more desired outcomes.

9. Here the staff moved from fragmented efforts to comprehensive school reform. The faculty's readiness for this stage was signaled by increased attention to coordination of their efforts and great interest in making separate activities mutually supporting.

The results of this project disclosed that in many of the Mastery In Learning schools faculty now viewed leadership as a shared responsibility that was based on competence as much as role. Perhaps most important these faculty members began to see their roles differently. They were becoming more collegial; better able to share...
ideas, to solve problems together, and to contribute to the knowledge base. "Isolation has been replaced by professional collaboration—to the benefit of students, teachers, and the profession" (McClure, 1988, p. 62).

Though research has described the features of schools where collaboration exists, collaboration is clearly not something that can be imposed on faculties. It is clear that collaboration depends on the voluntary efforts of educators to improve their schools and their own skills through teamwork. And while some educators will affirm the characteristics mentioned above as desirable in any school, others may respond negatively to the very idea of collaboration.

**Empowerment: Arguments and Counter Arguments**

The whole idea of participatory management, school-based management, empowerment, and collegiality is not without skeptics like Geisert (1988), Imig (1986), and Mahlinger (1986). Geisert, perhaps the most prominent among them, was wary that the administration of public education is in danger of being "overthrown by a seductive new movement" (p. 56). This movement, he contended, supports the expansion of teacher empowerment. He saw this movement gaining momentum and said that educators who should know better are climbing aboard a dangerous band wagon.

Geisert (1988) believed that the recommendations of the Carnegie Task Force as reported by Tucker and Mandel (1986) called for complete elimination of middle management and would render the school district administrators and board members powerless to control or manage school programs. He believed the reports called for increased professional
autonomy through having teachers control the management and instructional programs of the school.

Geisert (1988) argued that, although the Carnegie report contended that management by teachers was de facto in form, decentralization would increase bureaucratic regulation in school, just the opposite of what is often claimed. Increasing the number of decision makers in schools, he contended, would create a need for additional procedures and policies, thus increasing the bureaucratic obstacles to school improvement.

In his conclusions Geisert explained:

Proposals that replace administrators with committees not only run counter to effective schools research, they could create a nightmare of mismanagement in our schools. Successful reform of the teaching profession cannot be found in union-wrapped 'all or nothing' deals like that proposed by the Carnegie Foundation. (p. 59)

However, most researchers agree with Prasch (1984) and Marburger (1989) and do not follow Geisert's "all or nothing" interpretation of the concepts involving increased participation in the management of our schools. They see the concept of teacher empowerment, and its manifestation in school-based management, as a partnership. Marburger said that "we are now listening to what industry has been saying: that decentralization makes sense" (p. 3). Principals will definitely have to undergo in-service training to implement such approaches to management. Since this practice involves a distribution and redivision of authority, principals will find themselves sharing this authority with councils, teams, committees, and teachers. Some principals wonder how to do this and also meet the demands for
accountability. Marburger's comments at a recent ASCD conference on site-based management summed up that concern this way, "If I'm there at the crash landing, I want to be there at the take off" (p. 3).

In response to concerns of this nature, Smith (1987) noted that some observers feel collaboration means just a lot of talking that takes teachers away from their tasks. "While it is true that participative decision making and collegiality require a certain investment of time, these interactions are valuable in themselves, but contribute to something of even greater value: quality education" (p. 5). Whether such interactions prove valuable depends, as Rosenholtz (IP) and Little (1982) explained, upon the content of those interactions.

All three argued that collaborative schools do not require school administrators to abdicate their authority. Actually, a collaborative school requires a higher caliber of leadership than does a bureaucratic school. However, principals must be willing to share authority. Principals of collaborative schools have found in Smiths' (1987) words, that "power shared is power gained: Teacher respect for them grows" (p. 6). Nor do collaborative schools reduce teachers' accountability. Some observers fear that efforts to give teachers more say in decisions may backfire, when they invoke "professionalism" to avoid doing what administrators want them to. But, in fact, collaboration gives added strength to concerns for accountability by building consensus about school improvement.

Sergiovanni and Moore (1989) suggested that the least common form of relationship among adults in schools is one that is collegial,
cooperative, and interdependent. He pointed out that collegiality is not the same as congeniality, and one takes risks when one encourages others to share knowledge and talk openly about the work that they do as educators. However, he believes, as do Marburger (1989), Smith (1987), Rosenholtz (IP), and Little (1982), that the results of teamwork and collaboration provide a climate and a structure that encourage teachers to work successfully together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth.

To some degree, this paper is an attempt to determine how these arguments and counter-arguments play out in Iowa Secondary Schools.

Empowerment: The Extent of Decision Making?

The Ventures (1986) authors, writing about empowerment and participatory management, argued that teachers must be significantly involved in making decisions if participatory management is going to work. But they did not mean that faculty will be involved in making all decisions. As one task force member observed, "You just can't vote on every issue." They also acknowledged that not everyone wants shared decision making. They believed, however, that shared decision making taps the problem-solving ability of principals and teachers, thus energizing their competencies as professionals. What needs to be examined and clarified are the nature of these shared decisions and the areas in which they should occur.

Unfortunately, as Dixon (1984) pointed out, participatory management or shared decision making carries the unfortunate connotation of a simplistic approach; that is, just involve employees
more than in the past. Dixon, however, identified four major elements in any effective participatory management system: They are an information system that provides timely feedback about organizational performance, systematic representation at all levels, alignment around a vision that is shared by all, and the organizational leader's (principal) belief in the creativity and responsibility of employees. She visualized the information system as one which required the group responsible for the decisions to take ownership in making them. Second, feedback regarding the decision must be provided in a timely manner, and third, the information regarding the decision must be made visible to all employees. In discussing representation, Dixon visualized a systematic process that allows employees at all levels an opportunity to share in the decision-making process. Regardless of the type of groups organized to participate in this joint effort, she believed it is important that all levels of the organization be represented. Just as the democratic process functions even when not all citizens actively participate in elections and local government, so participative management can function even though not every employee participates.

Again, relating this decision-making process to the terminology of power and empowerment, true representation occurs only when the groups involved have the power to act upon their decisions. However, once again, this empowerment does not mean that managers allow groups to make all the decisions. Other writers (Lynch, 1978; Sampson, 1978; Snyder, 1978; Sousa, 1982) in addition to those cited earlier
have expressed similar opinions about this aspect of shared decision making.

Hayes and Garner (1977) found that while Likert and his colleagues at the Institute of Social Research demonstrated that increased decision making participation improves the productive capacity of an organization, that does not automatically mean that the group will be held legally responsible for its actions. They noted that decision making without responsibility can be a pleasant, even exhilarating experience. But education is unlikely to make the gains it must make if participation in decision making is simply a game from which teachers can walk away when they are tired of playing.

Walter and Glenn (1986) pointed out that an important factor that influences teachers' willingness to be involved in decision making is the level and type of decisions required. Teachers have not been trained to perceive themselves as leaders and decision makers within organizations. The way many schools are organized into isolated, self-centered units limits teachers' involvement in decision making. Hewitson (1978) explained that one in four teachers is dissatisfied with his/her job. Shreeve's (1984) research supported Hewitson, and suggested that to reduce this dissatisfaction, numerous changes in decision-making practices are necessary.

In his Canadian study, Hewitson (1978) reported that increased decision-making authority led teachers to greater identification with program goals, more ego involvement, greater motivation, and increased job satisfaction. In this same study Hewitson remarked that without destroying the benefits of centralized decision making, school
districts can return control of important classroom decisions to teachers. He specifically identified four areas: selecting the goals for instructional program, selecting instructional materials and determining the best applications of the materials for students, determining how instructional time is to be used, and sharing in the selection of staff development topics that best meet teachers' individual needs.

Belasco and Alutto (1972) also reflected the relationships between decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. They indicated decisional participation may be measured through a discrepancy approach which compares current with preferred levels of participation. This approach isolates three "states of decisional participation—decisional deprivation (participation in fewer decisions than preferred), decisional equilibrium (participation in as many decisions as desired), and decisional saturation (participation in more decisions than desired)" (p. 46). This study demonstrated that "the desire for increased participation in organizational decision making is not equally and widely distributed throughout the population" (p. 46). The results continued to bear out as well the "centrality" of the relationship between distributive justice and satisfaction levels. The key finding was that teachers with lower satisfaction levels participated in fewer decisions than they desired.

In their conclusions Belasco and Alutto (1972) highlighted the necessity for a management strategy which recognizes that a similar decisional participation approach will have a varying impact on satisfaction levels in different strata of the teaching population.
"It becomes necessary then to identify those substrata within the teaching group which are particularly deprived, then design a participatory management program which meets the needs of those particular teachers" (p. 56).

Bridges (1967) described the conditions conducive for effective participation in terms of a "zone of indifference" within which an administrator's decision will be accepted unquestionably; for the administrator to seek involvement within this zone is to court resentment, ill will, and opposition. Bridges, reflecting the earlier work of Barnard and Chase, suggested two axioms: First, as the principal involves teachers in making decisions located in their zone of indifference, participation will be less effective. Second, as the principal involves teachers in making decisions clearly located outside their zone of indifference, participation will be more effective.

The problem for the principal then clearly becomes one of differentiating the decisions that fall within the teachers' zone of indifference from those which do not.

Tannenbaum (1950) was one of the early writers who analyzed decision making in a manner which contributes to the differentiation Bridges emphasized. He noted that decision making involves a conscious selection of one alternative from among a group of two or more alternatives. In reaching decisions, teachers and principals typically will: (a) define the problem, (b) identify a number of action alternatives relevant to the problem, (c) predict the
consequences related to each alternative being considered, and (d)
exercise a choice from among the alternatives.

The role the teacher plays in this conception of the
decision-making process, either recommending or determining, depends
upon the teacher's zone of indifference and the area of freedom
granted to principals by their superiors. Both Tannenbaum (1950) and
Bridges (1967) insisted that, regardless of the procedures principals
choose to implement in the decision-making process, it is important
they make quite clear to the teachers the boundaries of their
authority and the area of freedom in which they can operate.

In extending this emphasis Garten and Valentine (1989) argued
that faculty members should participate in the identification and rank
ordering of their needs, particularly in the area of staff
development. They indicated that faculty participation could take
many different forms, "but each school must find a legitimate way to
involve faculty members if the staff development efforts are to lead
to school improvement" (p. 3).

While Wood (1984) expressed concern that for many teachers
participatory decision making results in frustration rather than
fulfillment, she nonetheless identified several ways to enhance the
probability of effective participation. She explained that
participatory decision making is a collaborative approach in which
superordinates and subordinates work together as equals in an attempt
to identify, analyze, and solve problems that face the organization.
Wood did sound two concluding cautions: First, she warned that
participatory management is neither the best decision-making practice
to identify, analyze, and solve problems that face the organization. Wood did sound two concluding cautions: First, she warned that participatory management is neither the best decision-making practice nor a panacea for the ills of the organization; it is only one of many approaches. Second, Wood noted that it is incorrect to judge the strategy ineffective if it has not been fully implemented. In other words, as Wood put it, "if the processes and structures adopted in a group facilitate pseudo-participation rather than active participation, the positive results of participatory decision making cannot be expected to occur" (p. 63).

Dixon (1984) and Snyder (1978) also visualized the positive potential of a strategy which empowers teachers to act. Dixon explained that true representation occurs only when groups have the power to act upon their own decisions. However, she qualified the power issue, as have others, by explaining that empowerment does not mean that managers allow groups to make all the decisions. Snyder emphasized the importance of minimizing the perceived differences between administrators and teachers and to determine common goals.

How all of these issues can be best dealt with and prepared for has concerned other writers. Brightman (1984), and Clune and White (1988) strongly suggested that principals and teachers will have to be trained in the decisional sciences. They believed in-service training programs ought to focus on improving the ability of administrators and teachers to recognize and understand their roles to most effectively implement a participatory decision-making strategy. Hodges (1986) and
Schlapkohl (1987) also emphasized what they termed the "how to" of implementation and the importance of teacher preparation.

Clearly most implementation suggestions represent a substantial departure from the way power has been traditionally shared between principals and teachers. These proposals alter the relationships between these parties. Consistent with authors cited earlier, Heller and Lundquist (1984), Lipham (1983), and Maidment (1986) also concluded that essentially traditional relationships between principals and teachers will have to give way to collaborative efforts to solve educational issues at the school site level if effective shared decision making is to exist. This will likely be more trying than would staying with the traditional relationships. It may also be worth the effort.

To date, the most significant major effort to spell out the requisites of this "new approach" was made in 1986 when the National Education Association and National Association of Secondary School Principals appointed a committee to develop a joint statement about the roles of principals and teachers in the operation of the school. This committee asserted that "teachers and principals must accept joint responsibility for designing a collaborative school, a school in which the professional autonomy of teachers and the managerial autonomy of principals are harmonized" (Ventures, 1986, p. 1).

Because of its scope and the unusual alliance of educators involved in its development, the major outcome of this project is particularly significant. This committee identified key characteristics that appear to generate possibilities for effective
cooperation. These characteristics were within each of six specific areas in secondary schools:

1. Purpose and Goals of the School
2. School Organization and Climate
3. Classroom Instruction
4. Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development
5. Student Achievement and Behavior

Certain behaviors, practices, and/or attitudes were reflected in the characteristics described. Some were specific to the principal, others were primarily concerned with the teacher, but most important, many others were those which appeared to provide the best opportunities for cooperative principal-teacher action. This committee focused on two primary tasks:

1. Reviewing the relationship between effective schools and teacher/principal cooperation.
2. Defining the major areas of school life that could benefit from cooperative action.

Committee members "sought to develop a practical tool that would help principals and teachers examine their responsibilities to create a quality instructional program at the school site" (Ventures, 1986, p. 4). Their work provided both the focus and impetus for this study.

Summary of Review

This chapter reviewed the current emphasis on school effectiveness and the importance of the various school reform reports and research. These concerns began with messages sent by the Carnegie
Task Force calling for a change in the practitioner's role in the
direction of greater responsibility and involvement in order to
improve the quality of teaching and learning.

A review of the current literature regarding leadership was then
presented, in particular the new dimensions of the changing roles and
expectations of the principal. This review continued with an
examination of the relationship(s) between leadership and such
concepts as power, influence, and empowerment. Many writers
recognized the importance of the role of the principal and supported
efforts to expand his/her power sharing activities and participatory
management structures. These supporters also emphasized that these
participatory structures will necessitate new sets of expectations and
definitions of the relationships between teachers and principals and
schools and school districts. Teachers and principals will also
require training and in-service to better understand their relative
positions in order to maximize these new relationships.

The review of the literature revealed two practical examples of
specific management structures. Studies of various high schools which
had implemented a School Based Management approach and another study
related to the Distributive Management of Instructional Environments
Project (DMIE) were included. In addition to examining these two
formal management structures, the review also probed the network of
shared leadership, collegiality, and collaboration reported in the
Mastery in Learning Project and how each of these aspects related to
the various management structures and to each other. Although no
single structure was identified as "best," there is substantial
support for the principle that for shared leadership, collegiality, and positive collaboration to occur, a specifically organized structure needs to be established with all members understanding their relative positions and responsibilities within the organization.

The review then focused on the arguments and counter-arguments related to the concept of participatory management. Although there are those skeptics who fear increased participation by teachers will eliminate middle management completely, the conclusion of most writers is that participatory management systems offer the greatest opportunities to develop a true partnership between teachers and principals resulting in optimum school effectiveness.

A general review of "decision making" and the particular relationship it has to the earlier mentioned dimensions of increased participation was also included. Three particular concepts were discussed in this section of the chapter, namely, shared decision making, collaboration, and participatory decision making. From that discussion it may be concluded that, because the school principal is bombarded daily with decisions which necessitate the best decisions possible, involving those most closely associated with the decision outcome will best guarantee the highest quality decision.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

As noted in the previous chapters, education has recently been in a state of increasing change. In the last 5 years this change has been accelerated particularly by public criticism and various "reform" reports.

In response to this criticism, it has been suggested that a different leadership and managerial style, as well as a different state of relations between principals and teachers, be developed. These relations have been discussed in the literature in such terms as empowerment, collegiality, collaboration, shared leadership, shared decision-making, and participatory management, among others.

Indeed, substantial research has been done emphasizing the importance and potential effectiveness of increased participation by teachers in the management of secondary schools. However, the optimum amount and type of participation remains the most difficult issue for the principal. What the research suggests is missing is consensus among principals and teachers about the specifics of teacher involvement in the decision-making process.

In 1986 the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Education Association (NEA) jointly published Ventures, which presented the opinions of task force members concerning the key characteristics which appeared to have potential for promoting effective cooperation within each of six specific areas of the secondary school:
1. Purpose and Goals of the School

2. School Organization and Climate

3. Classroom Instruction

4. Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development

5. Student Achievement and Behavior

6. Family and Community Relationships

This study attempted to determine how widely held were those assumptions which underlie the characteristics identified in Ventures. The study also sought to assess the extent to which secondary principals and teachers in Iowa support a model for cooperative action in the administration of the secondary school.

Population

Because the Ventures study was a joint effort of the NEA and NASSP and included results from secondary principals and teacher leaders, the researcher sought a similar population for this study.

The specific population identified for this survey included two distinct sub-groups. First, all secondary teachers in Iowa identified by the local education associations as the building representative of the secondary school were identified. Although the researcher recognized that building representatives may not automatically qualify as "teacher leaders" it was felt that they, among all other staff members, could best reflect the attitudes and beliefs of the instructional staffs in their particular schools. Second, the population included the secondary principals of all the schools where these building representatives were employed.
The secondary schools selected for this study included all 402 in Iowa identified by the 1987-88 Department of Education Iowa Educational Directory as having (6)7-12, 8-12, 9-12, or 10-12 organizations.

Instrumentation

The three-section instrument used in this study was developed by the researcher. The instrument was designed for both principals and building representatives. The preliminary section was used to secure information related to secondary schools, including the type of district organization and enrollment. (See Appendix A.)

Part A of the instrument, the second section, consisted of eight items to which respondents were asked to indicate their levels of agreement or disagreement. They were to circle their responses based on a five-point Likert scale, indicating the level of their agreement or disagreement with each item. The eight items were extracted from 11 items identified in the Ventures study as "basic assumptions" about successful schools, and were those that specifically related to principal-teacher cooperation opportunities. Although most seemed obvious in their appeal, the researcher sought to establish a baseline level of agreement by Iowa principals and teachers on these basic assumptions and beliefs.

Part B of the instrument, the third section, consisted of 30 items. These items addressed practices which the researcher adapted from the 84 "Key Characteristics" identified in Ventures. The 30 items were those that made reference to cooperative principal-teacher action. Items were grouped in the same six broad areas of school life.
identified in Ventures: four items in Goals and Purposes, six in Organization and Climate, five in Classroom Instruction, six in Student Achievement and Behavior, five in Supervision-Evaluation-Personnel, and four in Family and Community Relations.

Each principal and teacher was asked to respond to identical, but separate, questionnaires. They were asked to indicate first how desirable they felt each practice was, using a 1-5 Likert scale, and then, for the same item, the degree of implementation of that practice in their school, again using a 1-5 implementation scale.

Each instrument was identified as reflecting either a principal (P) or teacher (T) response, and both instruments were numbered so responses could be paired for each school.

This instrument was field tested in July 1988 with 26 subjects representing both respondent groups. Minor editorial changes were subsequently made in the instrument as a result of the field test.

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected using the previously described instrument. Cover letters, one to the principal, the other to the teacher, were attached to their respective questionnaires. Each cover letter briefly described the reason for, and purpose of, the study and gave the necessary instructions for completing and returning the instrument. Pre-addressed, stamped return envelopes were placed in the same envelope. This complete packet was then mailed to the principal. The principal's cover letter included not only directions for completing the instrument, but also requested him/her to distribute the teacher cover letter, questionnaire, and return
envelope to the building representative. Each respondent was told that all data would be paired, so it was imperative that both surveys be returned if the school was to be included in the study. (See Appendices B and C.)

The first packets were mailed to schools on January 30, 1989, with a request that the completed instruments be returned no later than February 15, 1989.

A second mailing was made to 103 schools from which no response had been received. This second mailing consisted of a letter to the principal indicating that a completed pair of questionnaires had not yet been received. This letter was sent on February 20, 1989 with a request that a response be made no later than Friday, March 3, 1989. (See Appendix D.)

For the purpose of discussion the location of each responding school relative to its Area Education Agency (AEA) affiliation was obtained by the author using the 1987-88 Department of Education Iowa Educational Directory. Although these data were not collected directly from the instrument, they were used in the analysis phase to place schools in one of five statewide geographic locations for purposes of examining response patterns for different geographic locations, specifically, Northeast (AEAs 1,2,7), Northwest (AEAs 3, 4, 12), Southwest (AEAs 13, 14), Southeast (AEAs 9, 10, 15, 16), and Central (AEAs 5,6,11).

Analyses of Data

Data were generated from the opinions of building representatives and their principals about two aspects of cooperative action: The
first asked for responses on a five-point Likert scale related to the desirability of eight assumptions which underlay cooperative action. Summaries by group using mean difference scores (correlated t-test) established the beliefs reported by the two groups.

The second set of data focused on 30 practices which appeared to provide opportunities for cooperative teacher-principal action. The 30 items were divided into six sub-categories:

1. Purpose and Goals of the School
2. School Organization and Climate
3. Classroom Instruction
4. Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development
5. Student Achievement and Behavior
6. Family and Community Relationships

Separate mean difference scores were generated for each of the six categories for what the group believed was the desirability of each activity and for the degree of implementation of each activity in its schools.

Data were reported in mean difference scores for each pair. Mean difference scores were computed for each of the six categories. The following comparisons were used to analyze four different types of respondent perception relationships: principal desirability vs. principal implementation, teacher desirability vs. teacher implementation, principal desirability vs. teacher desirability, principal implementation vs. teacher implementation. Difference score means were examined by single-sample (within groups) t-tests.
Though group differences may be observed on individual items, they were not subjected to statistical analysis due to concerns related to the normality of the distribution of responses at the item level. Individual items were grouped according to the six general areas and the same set of mean difference and t-test statistics applied on the basis of these groupings.

All data gathered were analyzed using matched pairs. Since matching creates responses based on the same set of situational circumstances, any instruments returned without a corresponding match were excluded from data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

This study was designed to assess the extent to which Iowa secondary teachers and principals support a model for cooperative faculty-administrative action in school operations. A questionnaire was developed using the Ventures document as a framework to design questions that appeared to offer the greatest opportunity for cooperative action within the 6 areas described in Ventures. Comparisons were made between the perspectives of principals and teachers related to the desirability and implementation of certain practices. Response patterns associated with enrollment and geographic considerations were also examined.

In the first section of this chapter a description of the total sample is presented. The second section includes the five hypotheses which were tested and the resultant data. The final section summarizes the results of the study.

Sample

The 402 schools selected for this study represented all secondary schools in Iowa organized, according to the grade levels encompassed, in one of four ways: (6)7-12, 8-12, 9-12, or 10-12.

The initial mailing of the survey produced 245 pairs of teacher-principal responses, a return rate of 60.9%. A follow-up mailing secured another 10 pairs, making the final data pool 255 pairs, a final return rate of 63.4%. (One additional pair of surveys was discarded because one instrument was returned incomplete. An additional 49 surveys were received for which the paired survey was missing.)
These 255 schools represented four categories, based on building enrollment. Category I was the smallest enrollment group representing those 87 schools with an enrollment of less than 200. Category II included 114 schools with enrollments ranging from 200-499. Category III included 20 schools with enrollments ranging from 500-799 students. Category IV, the largest schools, contained 33 schools whose enrollments exceeded 799. One pair of data could not be used for enrollment analysis as it was incomplete.

The sample also represented five geographic categories, based on the area education agency affiliation of each school (see Appendix E). Category I, the Northeast section, included 58 of 77 (75%) of the schools in AEA's 1, 2, and 7. Category II, the Northwest section, included 40 of 63 (63%) of the schools in AEA's 3, 4, and 12. The Southwest section, Category III, contained 33 of 51 (65%) of the schools in AEA's 13 and 14. AEA's 9, 10, 15, and 16 composed the Southeast section, Category IV, with 54 of 99 (55%) of the schools responding. The Central section, Category V, included AEA's 5, 6, and 11. It contained the largest number of schools responding with 68 of 112 (61%), the fourth highest return percentage. This total of 253 did not include two pairs of responses that lacked the data necessary for geographic analysis (see Table 1).

**Analyses of Data**

Five specific hypotheses were tested statistically. A Type I error probability of .01 was established as the criterion for rejection of each hypothesis. Results relative to each hypothesis are presented in this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Returned</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Rate</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data utilized in testing hypotheses 2 through 5 were generated from the responses of principals and/or building representatives (teachers) to 30 items regarding the desirability and/or implementation of cooperative action activities. Appendix G shows the frequency of responses to each of the 30 items. The 30 items were grouped into the 6 specific categories defined in Ventures, namely, Goals and Purposes; Organization and Climate; Classroom Instruction; Student Achievement and Behavior; Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel; and Family and Community Relations. (These areas are elaborated on pages 7-9). The findings in each category were subjected to statistical analysis.

**Hypothesis 1**

**Null Hypothesis 1:** There is no difference in the level of agreement of Iowa high school building representatives and their principals in regard to the basic assumptions about successful schools as defined in the Ventures study.

The data pertinent to the testing of this hypothesis included the levels of agreement expressed by building representatives and
principals with the eight assumptions about successful schools described in the Ventures document. A high level of agreement was observed between the two groups in all eight questions, with responses most commonly recorded in options 4 and 5 on the Likert scale, agree and strongly agree respectively (see Appendix F).

Table 2 summarizes the findings for the two groups on each of the eight questions. The relatively high degree of agreement between principals and teachers can be seen in Figure 1, which compares the responses of the two groups.

Table 2
Mean Responses by Principals and Teachers to Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pr Mean</th>
<th>Tch Mean</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1107</td>
<td>4.1028</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6299</td>
<td>4.4646</td>
<td>.1654</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7677</td>
<td>4.6142</td>
<td>.1535</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7520</td>
<td>4.6063</td>
<td>.1457</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3548</td>
<td>4.1976</td>
<td>.1573</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7283</td>
<td>4.6024</td>
<td>.1260</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6957</td>
<td>4.5534</td>
<td>.1423</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8063</td>
<td>4.7312</td>
<td>.0751</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.6064</td>
<td>4.4834</td>
<td>.1230</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall results generated a t value of 3.34, at 253 degrees of freedom, thus yielding a Type I error probability of less than .01 (p < .001). Consequently, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.
Hypothesis 2

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within participating schools.

Table 3 presents the findings relevant to Hypothesis 2. For principals, the mean difference between desirability and implementation ranged from .6331 to .9163. All differences were positive, indicating in every case that desirability ratings exceeded those for implementation. (These differences are graphically...
represented in Figure 2.) The $t$ values for the six areas ranged from 17.1 to 22.36; degrees of freedom ranged from 250 in one instance to 251 in the other five (the exceptional case caused by item omission on the part of the respondent). Type I error probabilities were less than .001 in each of the six areas. Thus Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Table 3

Principal Response Means on Desirability and Implementation in the Six Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Principal Desir.</th>
<th>Principal Imple.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4970</td>
<td>3.7971</td>
<td>.6999</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4011</td>
<td>3.7679</td>
<td>.6331</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4835</td>
<td>3.5673</td>
<td>.9163</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5646</td>
<td>3.9129</td>
<td>.6517</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3162</td>
<td>3.5298</td>
<td>.7864</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3581</td>
<td>3.5023</td>
<td>.8558</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes  
Area 2 = Organization and Climate  
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction  
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior  
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel  
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations
Figure 2. Mean responses by principals for desirability and implementation in the six areas.

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes  
Area 2 = Organization and Climate  
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction  
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior  
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel  
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations

Hypothesis 3

Null Hypothesis 3: There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school building representatives regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within their schools.
Table 4 presents the statistics generated in testing Hypothesis 3. For building representatives the mean differences between desirability and implementation ratings ranged from -1.2338 to 1.4277. In five of the six areas the differences were positive, indicating that desirability means exceeded implementation means. The lone exception was in the area of Family and Community Relations, where the negative difference indicated that the current levels of implementation perceived by building representatives exceeded their desirability ratings. (These differences are graphically represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Teacher Desir.</th>
<th>Teacher Imple.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4573</td>
<td>3.2417</td>
<td>1.2156</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
<td>3.1799</td>
<td>1.2368</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4468</td>
<td>3.0191</td>
<td>1.4277</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5060</td>
<td>3.5021</td>
<td>1.0039</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3310</td>
<td>3.0704</td>
<td>1.2605</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0351</td>
<td>4.2688</td>
<td>1.2338</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations
in Figure 3.) The $t$ values for the six areas ranged from -22.57 to 26.21, at 251 degrees of freedom, yielding error probabilities of less than .001 in each of the six areas. Thus Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

**Figure 3.** Teacher response means of desirability and implementation in the six areas.

![Bar Chart]

**Note.** Area 1 = Goals and Purposes  
Area 2 = Organization and Climate  
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction  
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior  
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel  
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations
Hypothesis 4

Null Hypothesis 4: There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the desirability of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

Table 5 presents the statistics generated in testing Hypothesis 4. The mean differences between building representatives and their principals on the question of desirability ranged from -.0197 to 1.3194 in the six areas identified. In four of the six areas, the differences were positive, indicating that, in each of these four

Table 5
Principal and Teacher Response Means on Desirability in the Six Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Principal Mean</th>
<th>Teacher Mean</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4990</td>
<td>4.4570</td>
<td>.0420</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>&lt;.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3996</td>
<td>4.4193</td>
<td>-.0197</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>&lt;.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4834</td>
<td>4.4472</td>
<td>.0362</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>&lt;.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5637</td>
<td>4.5047</td>
<td>.0591</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>&lt;.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3171</td>
<td>4.3328</td>
<td>-.0157</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>&lt;.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3566</td>
<td>3.0372</td>
<td>1.3194</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes  
Area 2 = Organization and Climate  
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction  
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior  
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel  
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations
areas, principals expressed higher levels of support for the desirability of cooperative action than did teachers. However in the area of Organization and Climate and in the area of Supervision, Evaluation and Personnel, the differences were negative. In these two instances teachers expressed greater support for cooperative action than did principals. (Figure 4 depicts the response differences in these six areas.)

Figure 4. Principal and teacher response means on desirability in the six areas.

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations
The differences between the desirability ratings expressed by principals and building representatives generated $t$ values ranging from $-0.53$ to $22.51$. In five of the six areas statistical analyses were based on 249 degrees of freedom. In the exceptional instance, there were 250 degrees of freedom. (Again this difference resulted from item omissions on the part of the respondents.) Only in the case of Family and Community Relations was the error probability less than .01 ($p < .001$). In the other 5 areas none of the differences proved significant at the .01 level; error probabilities in those five areas ranged from .111 to .722. However, Hypothesis 4 was rejected on the basis of the lone significant difference, which dealt with the area of Family and Community Relationships.

**Hypothesis 5**

Null Hypothesis 5: There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the actual implementation of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

Table 6 shows the statistics generated in testing Hypothesis 5. In the six areas identified the mean differences between building representatives and principals on the issue of implementation ranged from $-0.7586$ to $.5847$. In five of the six areas, the differences were positive, suggesting that in each of these five areas principals perceived higher levels of cooperative action being implemented in their buildings than teachers did. Only in the case of Family and Community Relations did building representatives indicate a higher level of implementation was in place. (Figure 5 displays the differences in responses in these six areas.)
Table 6

Principal and Teacher Response Means on Implementation in the Six Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Principal Mean</th>
<th>Teacher Mean</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8017</td>
<td>3.2447</td>
<td>.5570</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7671</td>
<td>3.1824</td>
<td>.5847</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5730</td>
<td>3.0198</td>
<td>.5533</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9188</td>
<td>3.5014</td>
<td>.4175</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5398</td>
<td>3.0746</td>
<td>.4652</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5103</td>
<td>4.2688</td>
<td>-.7586</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>-12.90</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations

The contrast in perceptions regarding implementation in the six areas yielded t values ranging from -12.9 to 11.89. In four of the six areas, statistical analyses were based on 253 degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom in the other two areas were 251 and 252. (Again these differences may be attributed to item omissions on the part of the respondents.) All differences were significant at the .01 level (p < .001). Thus Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Data generated from the four enrollment categories and from the five geographic regions were also analyzed. Responses from principals
Figure 5. Principal and teacher response means on implementation in the six areas.

Note. Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community Relations

and building representatives concerning the desirability and implementation of practices in each of the six areas, namely, goals and purposes; organization and climate; classroom instruction; student achievement and behavior; supervision, evaluation, and personnel; and family and community relations, were recorded across geographic regions and enrollment categories. Response frequencies are reported in Appendix H.
With but few exceptions response patterns were remarkably consistent, demonstrating little variance attributed to geographic location or school size. The figures which follow the tables in Appendix H dramatize the similarity of group responses.

Summary of Results

Paired response data from building representatives and their principals in each of the 255 Iowa secondary schools which participated in the study were analyzed. These paired responses represented a return rate of 63.4% (255 of a possible 402 schools).

Comparisons were made with regard to basic assumptions about effective schools, about the desirability of cooperative principal-teacher actions in school operations, and current implementation levels of these actions.

Five hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no difference in the level of agreement of Iowa high school building representatives and their principals in regard to the basic assumptions about successful schools as defined in the Ventures study.

2. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within the school.

3. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school building representatives regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within the school.
4. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the desirability of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

5. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the actual implementation of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

In each case the null hypothesis was rejected.

As indicated, Hypothesis 1 was directed toward the examination of differences between building representatives and principals in the levels of support they gave to the eight assumptions about cooperative teacher-principal action in successful schools espoused in the Venture document. The response patterns for building representatives and principals regarding the support of these assumptions about successful schools were very similar (see Figure 1). But, based on their questionnaire responses, principals were found to be more supportive than building representatives at the .01 level (t = 3.34 at 253 df, p < .001). As a result, Hypothesis 1 was rejected even though the overall mean difference between the ratings of the two groups was only .1230 on a five-point scale (the actual means were 4.6064 for principals vs. 4.4834 for teacher leaders).

Six areas of principal-teacher cooperation were examined from the standpoints of their desirability and the status of their implementation within respondents' schools in testing Hypotheses 2 and 3: The six areas were, goals and purposes; organization and climate;
classroom instruction; student achievement and behavior; supervision, evaluation, and personnel; and family and community relations.

Both principals and building representatives indicated that differences existed between the desirability of certain cooperative actions and the degrees to which they had been implemented in their schools. These disparities were found to be significant at the .01 level in all six response areas for principals ($p < .001$ for each area); in all areas, the mean differences were positive, thus indicating the levels of desirability exceeded the levels of implementation. Significant differences ($p < .001$) also were elicited in all six cases involving comparisons of building representatives' responses related to desirability and implementation.

Positive differences favoring desirability over implementation were found in five of the six. The lone negative difference was found in the area of Family and Community Relations, where teacher ratings indicated that the level of implementation exceeded the desirability of cooperative action. Due to these findings, both Hypotheses 2 and 3 were rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4 focused on the examination of differences between the cooperative action desirability ratings of principals and building representatives in the six aforementioned areas. Higher mean desirability ratings were observed for principals in four of the six areas. Only in Organization and Climate and in Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel were higher mean desirability ratings generated by the responses of building representatives, but neither difference proved significant at the .01 level.
The only area in which the resulting difference was found to be significant was in the area of Family and Community Relationships, where principals rated the desirability of cooperative action higher than did building representatives; actual means based on the five-point scale utilized were 4.3566 for principals vs. 3.0372 for building representatives (mean difference = 1.3194, t = 22.51 at 250 df, p < .001). Hypothesis 4 was rejected on the basis of this lone significant difference.

Hypothesis 5 called for a similar evaluation of the differences in implementation ratings registered by principals and building representatives. In five of the six areas, principals' mean implementation ratings exceeded those of building representatives; all 5 differences proved to be significant at the .01 level (t values ranged from 8.44 to 11.89 at either 252 or 253 degrees of freedom, p < .001 in every instance). Only in the case of Family and Community Relations were building representatives' mean implementation ratings higher than those registered by principals; the mean rating for principals was 3.5103 vs. 4.2688 for building representatives. This difference also proved significant at the .01 level (mean differences = -0.7586, t = -12.90 at 251 df, p < .001). Hypothesis 5 was rejected on the basis of having one or more (actually six) differences achieve significance at the .01 level.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were threefold:

1. To assess the extent to which Iowa secondary school principals and teachers support a model for cooperative action in the administration of secondary schools.

2. To examine differences in the perceptions of principals and building representatives regarding aspects of that model.

3. To determine the extent to which practices in their own schools reflect this model.

Data for this assessment were gathered using a survey instrument developed by the author. Questions were extracted from a list of characteristics in Ventures, a publication developed jointly by the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. These questions, in the author's judgment, provided the best opportunities for principal/teacher cooperative action. These questions were grouped into the six general areas of school life identified in Ventures. The areas included:

1. Purpose and Goals of the School
2. School Organization and Climate
3. Classroom Instruction
4. Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel Development
5. Student Achievement and Behavior
6. Family and Community Relationships

Data comparisons were made on the basis of matched pairs by school. Mean difference scores were used to examine the opinions
reported by the paired principals and teachers concerning aspects of cooperative actions. The perceptual differences examined were: principal desirability vs. principal implementation; teacher desirability vs. teacher implementation; principal desirability vs. teacher desirability; and principal implementation vs. teacher implementation. Separate mean difference scores were examined by single-sample (within groups) t-tests. Although group differences on individual items were examined, they were not subjected to statistical analysis. Individual items were grouped according to the six areas previously mentioned, mean difference scores were generated and subjected to statistical analysis.

Hypotheses

Five null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no difference in the level of agreement of Iowa high school building representatives and their principals in regard to the basic assumptions about successful schools as defined in the Ventures study.

2. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within their schools.

3. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected building representatives regarding the desirability of principal-teacher cooperation and the degree to which it is implemented within their schools.
4. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the desirability of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

5. There are no differences in the perceptions of selected Iowa high school principals and building representatives regarding the actual implementation of specific principal-teacher cooperative actions in their schools.

Discussion

The survey developed for this study was designed to assess the extent to which selected high school principals and teachers in Iowa support a model for cooperative action. The extent of agreement was unexpected and important. When given the options which ranged from 1 to 5, both building representatives and principals essentially assigned a value greater than 4.3 to the desirability of cooperative action in five of the six areas investigated (see Table 5).

With media attention so often directed to the assorted disagreements between administrators and teachers, and when collective negotiations periodically dramatize these differences, this level of agreement between principals and unionized building representatives for supporting cooperative action in school operations simply could not have been anticipated.

Similar patterns of support appeared for the assumptions which underlie cooperative action. Both principals and building representatives assigned overall values greater than 4.48 on a scale of 1 to 5 to their agreement with the underlying assumptions (see Table 2).
In examining the agreements, two areas seem particularly notable. The first of these, Student Achievement and Behavior, received the highest level of support from both groups. The importance of this agreement rests in the fact that this is the area where cooperative action is probably most desirable. In the final analysis student achievement and behavior are what schools are supposed to be about. Considerable research has focused on standardized test scores, outcomes based education and teacher accountability, all of which are intended to determine how well schools are performing and whether students are learning. The astonishing level of agreement about the desirability of cooperative action in the area of student achievement and behavior found in this study suggests strong support for cooperative efforts by principals and teachers to this end.

The second area, Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel, actually had the closest level of agreement between principals and teachers, with mean values of 4.32 and 4.33 respectively on the 1 to 5 scale. In a time of collective bargaining, master contracts and the issue of teacher evaluation for retention and/or improvement of instruction, this level of agreement is of particular importance. Principals and teachers should be gratified by these levels of agreement and the implications for a truly cooperative venture they suggest in an area that has typically been characterized by adversarial posturing. Perhaps not only the extent of the agreement, but also the high rating of its desirability, is an indication that a system of dealing with supervision, evaluation, and personnel can cooperatively be developed in secondary schools.
The three areas of Goals and Purposes, Organization and Climate, and Classroom Instruction again produced an extremely high level of agreement about desirability. With desirability ratings of no less than 4.4 and differences of no more than .03, the shared views of principals and teachers in these areas is evident.

The relationships among these areas and their importance to effective schooling is well documented and researched. The importance and significance of this remarkable level of agreement should be obvious. If principals and teachers espouse virtually the same high levels of desirability and are in agreement about the value of cooperative actions in the development of School Goals and Purposes, Organization and Climate, and Classroom Instruction, the institution itself, and more importantly the students themselves, may well be destined for improved performance.

In the area of exception, Family and Community Relations, a distinct break in the pattern of agreement was evident. Though the support levels expressed in this area by teachers and principals (3.04 and 4.36 respectively) were both on the positive side of neutral, principals clearly held a substantially more positive view of the area's desirability than did teachers. It is interesting to speculate about the possible explanation for this comparatively large difference: The fact that teachers still desire cooperative action opportunities, but appear less enthusiastic than principals, could be a result of their uncertainty about the kinds of cooperative actions to be implemented with families and community resources. Teachers may appreciate support from these sources, but may also be wary of
"meddling" in the guise of cooperation. Principals, on the other hand, by the nature of their position and their public relations role and training, may not be as fearful of this "meddling," but may be quicker to accept at face value the usefulness of family and community involvement.

Yet another explanation may be that teachers desire the principal to serve as a buffer between the community and themselves in times of unpleasantness, or it could in fact reflect their wishes to take care of those issues with parents more on their own without administrative intervention.

Ultimately of course, the recognition of the desirability of family and community involvement by both groups is important. Because the two groups agree on the desirability of cooperative action in this area, the likelihood that teachers and principals can discuss the reasons for their differences is increased, and that, too, seems important.

With but one exception, both groups believe there is a lower level of implementation of cooperative actions in their buildings than they desire. In nearly every case teachers believe a greater disparity in implementation exists than do principals. (The exception is the area of Family and Community Relations where teachers believe a higher degree of implementation is in place than they desire, a fact that is perhaps predictable given the modest support for the concept expressed by teachers, as discussed earlier).

The importance of the overall disparity between lower levels of implementation and higher levels of desirability is that it indirectly
discloses the belief, again held by both groups, that it is important to continue to work toward developing and implementing more cooperative action opportunities than are now in place.

In this study, hypotheses were created to permit a statistical examination of any differences which existed both within and between the two respondent groups in the areas addressed in the study. Such an examination may be helpful in the development and implementation of cooperative action opportunities.

**Basic Assumptions of the Venture Study**

Analyses of the extent of agreement on the basic assumptions described in Ventures clearly suggested that there were high levels of agreement between teachers and principals. As noted earlier, frequency distributions showed the majority of responses from both groups to be in either category 4 or 5 on a five-point Likert scale, and comparisons of means to be markedly similar. The overall results yielded a t value of 3.34 and error probability of less than .01. Therefore, based on the statistics, Hypothesis I was rejected, which indicates that teachers and principals do differ in their beliefs about the basic assumptions about successful schools.

However, that conclusion is blunted upon closer examination of the actual mean differences. For the eight assumptions these differences ranged from .0079 to .1654, .1230 overall. These extremely small differences, when coupled with the near-congruent pattern of mean responses and the frequency of responses in options 4 and 5, diminish the practical significance of the findings.
For principals and teachers to develop a truly effective cooperative network it appears essential that they first function from a common set of assumptions. These assumptions can then form the foundation for creating a statement of beliefs. These beliefs provide a basis for the formation of a mission statement and, in turn, the basis for short- and long-term planning for effective schooling. For all practical purposes a common core of assumptions appears to be in place.

**Principal Desirability vs. Implementation**

This portion of the study compared the desirability level of cooperative action to the implementation level, as perceived only by the principals.

The purpose of this analysis was to assess the state of agreement or disagreement within the principal group. Essentially the study sought to establish how closely their perceptions of "what is" approximates their views of "what should be."

The results first showed that, for principals, the mean differences between desirability and implementation for the various item groupings ranged from .6331 to .9163. The t values ranged from 17.1 to 22.36, yielding probability values of less than .01 in each case. The statistical hypothesis was rejected, thus indicating a significant difference between what principals desire in cooperative actions and how they perceive them to be actually implemented. The differences in mean comparisons which appeared all showed a positive value, which reflects that in every case the desirability level exceeded the level of implementation.
This is not particularly surprising since desires generally reflect aspirations. In turn these aspirations generally exceed current practices. Further analysis, in which the 30 questions were placed into the six specific areas of school life described in Ventures, disclosed that results stayed consistent across all six general areas. Significant differences appeared, with the desirability level exceeding perceived implementation, in each of the six areas.

Further examination of the mean differences makes it possible to determine which areas show the greatest disparity between "what is" and "what should be." The largest disparity is in the area of Classroom Instruction, which signals to principals where they may wish to prioritize their efforts to increase cooperative actions.

**Teacher Desirability vs. Implementation**

This section also compared the desirability and implementation ratings of cooperative action, but in this case using only responses from teachers.

The purpose of this section was to establish teacher perceptions relative to the desirability and implementation of the listed cooperative actions, again a contrast of "what is" with "what should be."

Results in this section indicate, as was true of principals, that significant differences exist between teachers' perceptions of the desirability of certain cooperative actions and the degree to which they are implemented in their schools. For building representatives, the mean differences between desirability and implementation ratings ranged from -1.2338 to 1.4277. The $t$ values ranged from -22.57 to
26.21 (p < .001 in every instance), which caused the rejection of the statistical hypothesis. In five of the six areas the mean difference scores were positive, which reflected that teachers perceived significantly higher levels of desirability than implementation. The lone exception was in the area of Family and Community Relations, where the negative difference indicated a higher degree of implementation than teachers believed desirable, a point of comment earlier in this chapter.

As was the case for principals, the higher degree of desirability than implementation is perhaps not surprising. As before, the area of greatest difference, Classroom Instruction, should identify a priority area for greater cooperative action initiatives. Fortuitously, this is also the one indirectly identified by principals as a priority area, thus enhancing the likelihood that both groups will turn their attention to it.

**Principals vs. Teachers Regarding Desirability**

Once the respective positions of each of the groups were established, comparisons between groups were possible. In this particular analysis the desirability levels expressed by principals were compared with those expressed by teachers. The purpose of the comparison was to recognize any areas of agreement from which a cooperative plan could operate, as well as to understand where differences lay. This area of the study generated much of the basic data which permitted the assessment of agreement between the two groups, as discussed earlier in the chapter.
The results in this section showed that teachers and principals were in remarkable agreement concerning the desirability of principal/teacher cooperative actions. The mean differences of building representatives and principals ranged from -.0197 to 1.3194. In four of the six areas the values were positive, indicating that in each of these four areas principals expressed a slightly higher level of support for the desirability of cooperative action than did teachers.

However, in the area of Organization and Climate and in the area of Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel the differences were negative. This indicated that in these two areas teachers showed more support for cooperative actions than did principals.

The support that teachers expressed for cooperative endeavors in the area of Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel is particularly interesting. It may indicate that teachers are eager to take part in such programs as TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement), peer evaluation procedures, and other practices which increase the significance of their roles in this area. It may also be an indication that teachers desire greater involvement in the selection and assignment of staff. It may suggest the willingness of experienced teachers to play a role in the mentoring process. In any event, principals should closely examine the possibilities that these findings suggest. They may suggest initiatives by principals that hold promise for taking advantage of the apparent softening of adversarial positions which have so often characterized practices in this area.
The $t$ values resulting from these differences in desirability expressed by principals and building representatives ranged from $-0.53$ to $22.51$. In five of the six areas error probabilities ranged from $0.111$ to $0.722$, which failed to achieve significance at the $.01$ level. Only in the area of Family and Community Relations was the error probability less than $.01$. However, based on this lone significant difference, Hypothesis 4 was rejected.

It is important, however, not to let the statistical treatment mask the essence of the findings. In five of the six areas examined, the results showed that teachers and principals in general were in agreement with the desirability of cooperative actions in their schools. This should tell the two groups that they share a readiness to enter into cooperative working relationships in most of the areas described in the Ventures document. With the fact of this shared desire established, each group should proceed with some confidence into the mutual development of an effective school mission statement, one which emphasizes the importance of cooperative teacher-principal initiatives.

Principal vs. Teachers On Implementation

This area of the study focused on the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding the actual implementation of the cooperative actions described. Results showed that the mean difference between building representatives' and principals' perceptions of actual implementation ranged from $-0.7586$ to $0.5847$. In five of the six areas the differences were positive, which indicated that in these five areas principals perceived that a higher level of implementation
existed than did teachers. As noted earlier, only in the area of Family and Community Relations did teachers indicate they believed a higher level of implementation was in place. The perceptions regarding implementation resulted in t values ranging from -12.9 to 11.89. All differences were significant at the .01 level, which required that statistical Hypothesis 5 be rejected.

It is, of course, difficult to determine what accounts for the differences in the levels of implementation perceived by each group. It seems probable, however, that a substantial part of the difference in perceptions may be traceable simply to what is visible to each group.

Given the relative isolation of teachers, that group simply may not be aware of certain practices underway in the school. Principals, on the other hand, with an opportunity to see school practices from a different perspective, may be more aware of cooperative endeavors in the building.

The implications of that situation suggest that principals need to communicate to teachers (and perhaps to others), on a regular basis, those developments in the school which are manifestations of cooperative actions. In fact, "communication" should involve more than simply informing; ideally it should include creating opportunities for observation and interaction with those involved in such cooperative practices.

**Enrollment**

Observations were made in this area to determine if school size, based on enrollment, had any effect on the views of principals and
teachers. Enrollments were broken down into four distinct categories. The categories include: (a) schools with less than 200 students; (b) those between 200-499, (c) those between 500-799, and (d) those whose enrollment exceeded 799. This particular breakdown resulted in returned questionnaire pairs of 87, 114, 20, and 33 respectively.

The overall response patterns indicated a high degree of similarity (see Appendix H). Although the responses by principals and teachers relative to enrollment categories were surprisingly consistent, slight differences were observed.

Principals' responses in the areas of desirability and implementation reflected a pattern where the favorability of cooperative actions increased with the size of the school. That is, larger schools showed a slightly higher mean than did smaller schools. Teachers also demonstrated a similar pattern of responses regarding desirability and implementation according to enrollment. Although the area of desirability showed slight irregularities in the response patterns, the overall observations reflected higher degrees of cooperative action acceptance in the larger schools. Even as the mean fluctuated, the pattern was consistent in all four enrollment categories.

These response patterns showed the overall consistency in the perceptions of both teachers and principals regarding cooperative actions throughout the four enrollment categories. It lends some generalization to the findings, in that agreement about the desirability of that action is not affected appreciably by district enrollment.
It is possible that the slightly higher degree of apparent acceptance by larger schools is the result of the more formal communication structure in larger schools. Smaller schools, because of their intrinsic intimacy, are more likely to assume communication is taking place when in fact it may not be. Although obviously it is not the formality of a communication system that makes cooperative principal-teacher actions work, that system may make the two groups aware of actions that are being undertaken by the institutions. Without some kind of communication network, a dangerous assumption that communication channels exist, when in fact they do not, could easily be made.

Geographic Location

Discussion in this section focuses on whether principals and teachers located in different geographic locations in Iowa have differing perceptions regarding desirability and implementation. Schools were broken down into five geographic locations based on the AEAs to which they were assigned. The areas were, Northeast, Northwest, Southwest, Southeast, and Central. This particular breakdown resulted in region numbers of 58, 40, 33, 54, and 68 respectively.

The results, when examined on the basis of geographic location, revealed unusually uniform perceptions (see Appendix H). In all six areas the five locations showed negligible differences. When the observations were broken down into the desirability and implementation areas for principals and teachers the results were essentially the same. It thus becomes difficult to make any kind of statement about differences based on geographic location.
It appears that importance can be placed on the consistency of the responses by principals and teachers regardless of their geographic location, as was the case when responses were examined on the basis of school size. These two respondent groups apparently are operating from the same base of acceptance of the potential of cooperative action; apparently the economic and cultural differences which typically are explained by geographic location and school size do not exert profound influences upon these perceptions.

Conclusions

This study was designed to determine the extent to which Iowa secondary school building representatives and principals support a model for cooperative action. Specifically they were asked to respond about their beliefs concerning certain basic assumptions underlying successful schools, and about the desirability and perceived implementation of specific cooperative actions. Based on the paired data collected from surveys returned from 255 school districts, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The overall perceptions of principals and building representatives showed an unexpectedly high level of agreement. Both groups indicated desirability rates of greater than 4.3 (on a scale of 1 to 5) in five of the six areas, as described in Ventures.

2. Principals and teachers expressed surprising levels of agreement on the basic assumptions about successful schools, as described in Ventures. The overall ratings of both groups exceeded 4.48 (on a scale of 1 to 5) which seems particularly notable.
3. The area of Student Achievement and Behavior received the highest level of support for cooperative action from both groups. On a scale of 1 to 5, principals and teachers assigned values of 4.56 and 4.51 respectively. Not only are these support levels extremely high, but they occur in the area where it is arguably most desirable to have agreement. These levels indicate that tremendous promise exists for the development of cooperative action opportunities in this area, and the success of students may well be enhanced by such action.

4. Of particular interest are the results in the area of Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel. Principals and teachers in this area again reflected high levels of agreement; however, most interesting is the remarkable similarity in their perceptions. This area attracted support levels of 4.32 by principals and 4.33 by teachers, again on a 1 to 5 scale. Indications may be that teachers are eager to take part in programs such as TESA, peer evaluation and the mentoring process. It may also reflect their desire to become more involved in the selection and assignment of staff. Perhaps most important, these findings may also indicate to both groups the unique opportunity they now have to cooperatively develop procedures and instruments for the purpose of improving instruction and, in the process, diminish the adversarial postures which have typically characterized this supervisory/evaluative relationship.

5. When the desirability of cooperative action is compared to its degree of implementation in their buildings, in five of the six areas teachers believe greater disparity exists in implementation than do principals. Both groups indicate higher rates of desirability than
implementation, though levels of implementation always appear on the positive side of neutral, with the lowest level being 3.02. Since both principals and teachers reflect the belief that the desirability of cooperative action exceeds its level of implementation, there appears to be great promise for the collaborative development of cooperative action opportunities in the immediate future.

6. Of the statistically significant differences noted in the study, by far the most serious appears to be in the area of Family and Community Relations. While principals and teachers both support its desirability, the levels of support vary dramatically. Principals are far more supportive of cooperation in this area, while teachers, unlike principals, believe the implementation of cooperation in this area exceeds substantially the level of desirability.

7. Patterns of responses by principals and teachers were remarkably consistent in all areas when observations were made based on enrollment and geographic location.

Recommendations

Based on this study the following recommendations are made regarding the study, development, and implementation of a cooperative action plan for successful schooling:

1. While principals and teachers in Iowa showed unexpectedly high levels of agreement from both the assumptions and the specifics of cooperative action, they should acquaint themselves with each others' beliefs about successful schools. While it would be desirable to have total consensus, it is not requisite to the development of a successful cooperative plan. Knowledge of each others' position is,
however, imperative; recognition of similarities as well as any differences is essential. That is particularly true in the area of Family and Community Relations. Creating opportunities within the school setting where attitudes and perceptions can be shared and information of the type presented in this study can be reviewed and discussed is an important beginning.

2. Principals and teachers should appreciate the similarities which exist in their mutual perceptions of the desirability of cooperative actions and the importance of their implementation. The fact that both groups have a significantly greater desire for such action than they perceive is now implemented indicates the potential for the development of cooperative planning.

The promise for success suggested by the general agreement between principals and teachers on the issue of desirability seems to minimize the fact that principals perceived a higher rate of implementation in their buildings than did teachers. Additional cooperative planning should be vigorously pursued, in light of both groups' favoring an increase of such action beyond their perceptions regarding current levels of implementation. Through the development of cooperative plans, these perceptions should actually improve as the lines of communication between the two groups improve and levels of trust increase.

However teachers and principals should pay particular attention during these developmental stages to the area of family and community involvement. The results of this assessment indicate a pronounced difference in perceptions within this area. Teachers actually
perceived greater implementation of such actions than they desired. A breakdown of the particular roles and involvement families and the community should play in the school would perhaps be beneficial. The involvement of a group of community representatives could perhaps provide valuable insights in this area, as well as help build necessary and appropriate community support.

3. Principals and teachers should seize the opportunity that their high level of agreement in the area of Student Achievement and Behavior implicitly presents. Development of cooperative actions in this area could do much to improve the effectiveness of schools and, at the same time, provide an opportunity for a collaborative response to public concerns related to the schools.

4. The possibilities offered by the near exact levels of agreement between principals and teachers in the area of Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel should not be ignored. A golden opportunity exists for both groups to cooperatively develop policies and procedures which could not only improve instruction but, in the process, also open communication lines in an area of great sensitivity, where acrimony and suspicion have been common.

5. Principals in particular should examine (or reexamine) the existing systems which now provide opportunities for cooperative action, those under consideration, and others which appear to provide the greatest potential for cooperation. The ultimate goal of this process is to assess whether what is now being accomplished in the area of cooperative action is consistent with its potential. The fact that teachers indicate a perception of substantially lower degrees of
Implementation in their schools than do principals lends a sense of immediacy to this examination. Teachers can benefit from, as well as aid in, this assessment by examining what specifics generated their perceptions. Principals and teachers can then share these insights in order to develop the most accurate and relevant balance between (a) their perceptions of exactly what it is they are doing in the area of cooperative principal-teacher actions, and (b) what they hope to achieve from such actions in all six areas, including the troublesome area of family and community involvement.

6. Principals of larger schools tend to be somewhat more supportive of cooperative action plans than do principals of smaller schools. These small school principals should examine their positions to determine whether they are fearful of such cooperation, or whether they feel that the lines of communication are already conducive to effective cooperative arrangement traceable to the small size of their schools.

If principals of these smaller schools believe that, because of their size, they have less need for a formal cooperative principal-teacher plan, they should then evaluate the discrepancy apparent in the implementation portion of the data, which reflects a higher perception of implementation in larger schools than in smaller schools.

Principals and teachers should be cautioned not to assume that smaller size minimizes the need for more formal cooperative planning. At the same time, larger schools should not assume that they are so large that a truly effective cooperative action plan would simply be
an impossible and unnecessary task to develop and implement. The additional personnel and potential resources available to schools of larger size should make this type of management system even more attractive.

7. Both principals and teachers should feel assured and emboldened since their supportive attitudes toward cooperative action appear consistently and clearly reflected within their responding groups. No major differences were observed within the State of Iowa, regardless of the respondent's geographic location or size of school. This reflects the general agreement between the two groups (and within the groups) with the concepts associated with principal-teacher cooperative actions. It appears important, however, for each school district to tailor a plan which suits its own philosophies and goals. The feeling of collegiality which shared perceptions present should provide an excellent foundation from which to build a comprehensive cooperative plan.

8. Handling the uncertainty and confusion associated with the redefinition of roles and responsibilities in a cooperative framework requires special skills. Many of these skills can be learned through training and staff development activities. School districts need to actively pursue these types of activities. If they do not, this transition could be very difficult, if not impossible. Such activities could further be enhanced by the formation of a staff development committee for inservice, a faculty senate, and support teams for students and faculty.
In addition to the above recommendations, the researcher recommends the following topics for further study:

1. A similar assessment of the perceptions of teachers and principals at other levels of the school organization, such as middle schools or junior highs, and elementary schools, should be undertaken.

2. The development of a method to implement cooperative school management plans which incorporates criteria for assessing the effectiveness of those plans should be studied.

3. The development of a model framework (more specific than Ventures) from which schools can develop and implement their own plans for cooperative principal-teacher actions should be initiated.

4. An examination is needed of specific staff development programs which emphasize opportunities for teachers and principals to focus on special areas of concern, which the changing roles and responsibilities associated with cooperative school-based management plans generate.

5. In addition, the significance of the negative mean difference between principals and teachers regarding implementation in the area of Family and Community Relations should be more intensively examined to identify significant problems in the perceptions of both groups, particularly on the part of teachers.
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APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Selected Iowa Principals and Teachers Respond To A Model for Cooperative Action

PART A

The conceptual basis for cooperative action has been established in Ventures. The following items are reported from that publication.

PART A

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by placing a circle around the appropriate response at the right.

Agree Disagree
1. The improvement of education depends primarily on decisions and actions at the school site. 5 4 3 2 1
2. The quality of education depends largely on the cooperative, joint efforts of teachers and principals. 5 4 3 2 1
3. The staff of a good school develops and utilizes shared goals and high expectations for instructional outcomes. 5 4 3 2 1
4. The management of good schools reflects practices that motivate and encourage staff members to sustain and improve their professional skills. 5 4 3 2 1
5. The personnel and resources as well as the feasibility and independence of good schools are fully utilized to meet the unique needs of their students. 5 4 3 2 1
6. In good schools, teachers and principals assume the responsibility for improving the educational experiences of all students. 5 4 3 2 1
7. In good schools, teachers and principals display Initiative by making full use of their knowledge, experience, and authority. 5 4 3 2 1
8. In good schools, the channels of communication are open and clear. The professional staff members have ample opportunity to exchange ideas and insights. 5 4 3 2 1

PART B

Please respond to the following items by indicating first how desirable you believe the practice is (Circle your response in the left-hand column.) Then in the right-hand column circle your response to indicate the degree of implementation of that practice in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRABILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Agree Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The principal encourages faculty to participate in identifying the purposes, priorities and goals of the school. 5 4 3 2 1
2. The principal and teachers gather information about the school and effective educational practices to plan appropriate educational programs. 5 4 3 2 1
3. The principal and teachers collaborate to develop a school-wide plan for instructional improvement. 5 4 3 2 1
4. The principal and teachers develop and implement systems to evaluate program effectiveness. 5 4 3 2 1
5. The principal often involves the faculty in the decision-making process before decisions are finalized. 5 4 3 2 1
6. The principal and teachers develop strategies to implement decisions and evaluate results. 5 4 3 2 1
7. The principal seeks teacher input in identifying staffing needs and in selection of new staff. 5 4 3 2 1
8. The principal and teachers jointly develop methods for recognizing student achievement. 5 4 3 2 1

(Appendix A Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRABILITY IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicable</strong> <strong>Innovative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong> <strong>Low</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The principal and teachers cooperatively develop strategies to maintain order and discipline and support one another in discipline matters.

13. The principal and teachers cooperatively create and monitor an orderly, safe environment.

14. Both principals and teachers develop faculty meeting agendas and identify topics for discussion.

15. The principal and teachers work together to establish in-service programs and other professional development activities.

16. The principal and teachers jointly develop faculty meeting agendas and identify topics for discussion.

17. The principal seeks formal feedback from teachers about administrative performance.

18. The principal and teacher jointly review the teacher’s annual evaluation report.

19. Teachers participate in the budget process by identifying the resources necessary to reach the instructional objectives and are then provided with information about the operating budget.

20. Principals and teachers cooperatively develop procedures to recognize professional accomplishments, length of service and community contributions.

21. The principal and teachers encourage classroom attendance through well designed instructional programs, and established policies and procedures.

22. The principal and teachers encourage participation in learning through well designed instructional programs, and established policies and procedures.

23. The principal and teachers work together to define and enforce fair and accurate grading policies.

24. Together the principal and teachers foster student self-reliance and self-discipline by providing appropriate opportunities for them to assume responsibility.

25. The principal and teachers work together to communicate clear and concise summaries of rules and expectations.

26. The principal and teachers work together to identify and use community resources.

27. The principal and teachers work together to provide good learning conditions in the home.

28. The principal and teachers work together to encourage families to provide good learning conditions in the home.

29. The principal and teachers work together to maintain positive working relationships with the media.

30. The principal is generally visible and available to faculty and students, both formally and informally.

Thank you for taking the time necessary to complete this questionnaire.

Respectfully,

Steve Nicholson
January 30, 1989

Dear Teacher:

        Principals and teachers are bound by their shared dedication to the ideal of excellence in every school. Achieving this has never been easy. The National Education Association and National Association of Secondary School Principals share the conviction that present circumstances demand a renewed sense of interdependence among all educators, particularly between teachers and principals. In 1985 NASSP and NEA leaders appointed a committee to develop a practical tool to help principals and teachers examine their roles and responsibilities to create a quality instructional program; Ventures in Good Schooling was the result.

        As part of my doctoral program in school administration at the University of Northern Iowa, I am investigating the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of secondary principals and teacher representatives in Iowa relative to cooperative action and collaboration.

        High school teachers in Iowa who are the designated building representative for their local education association and the principal from their school have been selected to participate. Your building principal has been asked to distribute to you this cover letter, a questionnaire, and return envelope.

        The same type of questionnaire will be used by you and your principal. Only group findings will be reported and no attempts will be made to compare principal and teacher responses from a single school. Questionnaires must be paired by school for data analysis, however, and have been numbered for this purpose. You may be assured that the anonymity of your responses will be protected completely and absolutely.

        If the findings are to have the desired impact, it is important that a good response be achieved. Please take the small amount of time required to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. Please do so by no later than February 15th.

        Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Stephen R. Nicholson
APPENDIX C

January 30, 1989

Dear Principal:

Principals and teachers are bound by their shared dedication to the ideal of excellence in every school. Achieving this has never been easy. The National Education Association and National Association of Secondary School Principals share the conviction that present circumstances demand a renewed sense of interdependence among all educators, particularly between teachers and principals. In 1985 NASSP and NEA leaders appointed a committee to develop a practical tool to help principals and teachers examine their roles and responsibilities to create a quality instructional program; Ventures In Good Schooling was the result.

As part of my doctoral program in school administration at the University of Northern Iowa, I am investigating the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of secondary principals and teacher representatives in Iowa relative to cooperative action and collaboration. Dr. James Albrecht serves as my advisor in this project.

High school teachers in Iowa who are the designated building representative for their local education association and the principals from their schools have been selected to participate.

Enclosed you will find a cover letter and questionnaire for your teacher representative and a questionnaire for you. Would you please distribute the teacher cover letter, questionnaire, and return envelope to your high school building representative?

The same type of questionnaire will be used by you and your teacher. Only group findings will be reported, and no attempts will be made to compare principal and teacher responses from a single school. Questionnaires must be paired by school for data analysis, however, and have been numbered for this purpose. You may be assured that the anonymity of your responses will be protected completely and absolutely.

If the findings are to have the desired impact, it is important that a good response be achieved. Please take the small amount of time required to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. Please do so by no later than February 15th.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Stephen R. Nicholson
7 Liberty Drive  
Osage, IA 50461  
February 20, 1969

Dear Principal:

I am writing this note because I have not yet received a completed pair of questionnaires from you and your building representative.

As I mentioned in the first mailing, the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of selected teacher representatives and principals such as yourself provide an excellent insight into the role of cooperative action and collaboration in Iowa High Schools.

I certainly would like to include your high school in the study and would be very appreciative if you would take the small amount of time necessary to complete and return the questionnaire. Would you also encourage your teacher representative to do the same? Please do so no later than Friday, March 3rd. Again you may be assured that the anonymity of your responses will be protected completely and absolutely.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Stephen R. Nicholson
APPENDIX E

AEA MAP

Area Education Agencies
APPENDIX F

PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS FREQUENCY
RESPONSE TO PART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses</th>
<th>Disagree 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPENDIX G

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES FOR PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
QUESTIONS 1–30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix G Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 0 2 11 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 11 11 43 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 88 97 123 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 151 141 76 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 0 0 2 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 0 2 22 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 22 26 91 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 125 115 115 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 105 109 23 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 0 1 3 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 0 19 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 21 22 72 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 102 101 115 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 128 128 44 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 2 3 27 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 8 44 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 60 53 73 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 94 83 70 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 85 105 38 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 3 16 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 21 22 71 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 110 96 110 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 120 131 54 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 0 0 2 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 3 10 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 4 3 51 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 74 78 111 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 172 168 80 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix G Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 16</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 19</td>
<td>0 13 42 94 103</td>
<td>3 10 28 102 109</td>
<td>29 53 69 61 43</td>
<td>74 51 54 51 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20</td>
<td>3 12 61 107 68</td>
<td>1 12 56 104 79</td>
<td>30 70 82 48 25</td>
<td>69 57 76 41 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21</td>
<td>0 0 10 82 159</td>
<td>0 1 12 83 156</td>
<td>3 11 74 109 57</td>
<td>7 27 85 96 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22</td>
<td>0 1 11 81 158</td>
<td>0 2 13 96 141</td>
<td>0 10 57 123 63</td>
<td>7 25 99 95 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 23</td>
<td>0 5 17 97 132</td>
<td>1 4 21 107 119</td>
<td>3 20 63 110 57</td>
<td>23 26 88 89 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 24</td>
<td>0 2 9 105 135</td>
<td>0 0 17 98 136</td>
<td>0 13 66 126 50</td>
<td>9 37 79 97 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix G Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal Desirability</th>
<th>Teacher Desirability</th>
<th>Principal Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 26</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

MEAN RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS ON DESIRABILITY OF THE SIX AREAS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>4.3953</td>
<td>4.4799</td>
<td>4.6875</td>
<td>4.7045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>4.3043</td>
<td>4.3894</td>
<td>4.6000</td>
<td>4.5727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>4.3814</td>
<td>4.4783</td>
<td>4.6400</td>
<td>4.6727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>4.5136</td>
<td>4.5451</td>
<td>4.5750</td>
<td>4.7576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>4.2093</td>
<td>4.2910</td>
<td>4.5100</td>
<td>4.5636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>4.2297</td>
<td>4.3761</td>
<td>4.4625</td>
<td>4.5682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community
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# Mean Responses of Principals on Implementation of the Six Areas by Enrollment Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>3.6762</td>
<td>3.7898</td>
<td>3.9375</td>
<td>4.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>3.6092</td>
<td>3.7931</td>
<td>3.8100</td>
<td>4.0677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>3.4523</td>
<td>3.5561</td>
<td>3.6700</td>
<td>3.8909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3.8718</td>
<td>3.8749</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>4.1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>3.3529</td>
<td>3.5439</td>
<td>3.7800</td>
<td>3.8727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>3.4448</td>
<td>3.4381</td>
<td>3.4792</td>
<td>3.9015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes  
Area 2 = Organization and Climate  
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction  
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior  
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel  
Area 6 = Family and Community
### Mean Responses of Teachers on Desirability of the Six Areas by Enrollment Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4.3498</td>
<td>4.4904</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>4.5985</td>
<td>4.3417</td>
<td>4.1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.3004</td>
<td>4.4617</td>
<td>4.5062</td>
<td>4.6111</td>
<td>4.5221</td>
<td>4.4035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4.2837</td>
<td>4.5062</td>
<td>4.5400</td>
<td>4.6121</td>
<td>4.4500</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4.4225</td>
<td>4.5221</td>
<td>4.4500</td>
<td>4.7020</td>
<td>4.4727</td>
<td>3.6125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]

- **Area 1**: Goals and Purposes
- **Area 2**: Organization and Climate
- **Area 3**: Classroom Instruction
- **Area 4**: Student Achievement and Behavior
- **Area 5**: Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
- **Area 6**: Family and Community
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MEAN RESPONSES OF TEACHERS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SIX AREAS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>3.0680</td>
<td>3.1888</td>
<td>3.6625</td>
<td>3.6490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>3.0766</td>
<td>3.0906</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>3.5253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>2.7996</td>
<td>2.9776</td>
<td>3.4800</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3.3571</td>
<td>3.4557</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
<td>3.8990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>2.8908</td>
<td>3.0254</td>
<td>3.4600</td>
<td>3.4955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>4.1860</td>
<td>4.2721</td>
<td>4.2125</td>
<td>4.5076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community
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MEAN RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS ON DESIRABILITY
OF THE SIX AREAS BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>5.5474</td>
<td>4.4562</td>
<td>4.4531</td>
<td>4.5472</td>
<td>4.4522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>4.4684</td>
<td>3.3458</td>
<td>4.3802</td>
<td>4.4403</td>
<td>4.3539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>4.5638</td>
<td>4.3800</td>
<td>4.4531</td>
<td>4.5255</td>
<td>4.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>4.6609</td>
<td>4.5417</td>
<td>4.4687</td>
<td>4.5346</td>
<td>4.5578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>4.4172</td>
<td>4.2033</td>
<td>4.2859</td>
<td>4.3132</td>
<td>4.3059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>4.5733</td>
<td>4.1750</td>
<td>4.2656</td>
<td>4.3255</td>
<td>4.3419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community
### Mean Responses of Principals on Implementation of the Six Areas by Geographic Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>3.7888</td>
<td>3.7938</td>
<td>3.6919</td>
<td>3.8538</td>
<td>3.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>3.7126</td>
<td>3.7321</td>
<td>3.6869</td>
<td>3.8889</td>
<td>3.7779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>3.5888</td>
<td>3.6200</td>
<td>3.4182</td>
<td>3.6370</td>
<td>3.5353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3.8017</td>
<td>4.0392</td>
<td>3.9409</td>
<td>3.9099</td>
<td>3.9260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>3.5328</td>
<td>3.3850</td>
<td>3.5273</td>
<td>3.5296</td>
<td>3.6265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>3.4713</td>
<td>3.4875</td>
<td>3.5260</td>
<td>3.5509</td>
<td>4.4304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community
MEAN RESPONSES OF TEACHERS ON DESIRABILITY OF THE SIX AREAS BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>4.5661</td>
<td>4.4187</td>
<td>4.4597</td>
<td>4.5231</td>
<td>4.3260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>4.4583</td>
<td>4.3495</td>
<td>4.4660</td>
<td>4.3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>4.5517</td>
<td>4.5050</td>
<td>4.4194</td>
<td>4.5037</td>
<td>4.2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>4.6523</td>
<td>4.4833</td>
<td>4.4086</td>
<td>4.5525</td>
<td>4.3946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>4.4448</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>4.3484</td>
<td>4.3370</td>
<td>4.1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>3.0690</td>
<td>3.0208</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>3.1435</td>
<td>2.9963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 1 = Goals and Purposes
Area 2 = Organization and Climate
Area 3 = Classroom Instruction
Area 4 = Student Achievement and Behavior
Area 5 = Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
Area 6 = Family and Community
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### Mean Responses of Teachers on Implementation of the Six Areas by Geographic Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>3.1954</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
<td>3.1439</td>
<td>3.4043</td>
<td>3.2831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>3.1126</td>
<td>3.0983</td>
<td>3.1061</td>
<td>3.3642</td>
<td>3.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>2.9940</td>
<td>2.9842</td>
<td>2.7273</td>
<td>3.2778</td>
<td>3.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3.4296</td>
<td>3.3417</td>
<td>3.2929</td>
<td>3.7685</td>
<td>3.5358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>3.0224</td>
<td>2.8837</td>
<td>3.1030</td>
<td>3.2685</td>
<td>3.0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>4.3065</td>
<td>4.2639</td>
<td>4.0919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart:**

- **Area 1**: Goals and Purposes
- **Area 2**: Organization and Climate
- **Area 3**: Classroom Instruction
- **Area 4**: Student Achievement and Behavior
- **Area 5**: Supervision, Evaluation, and Personnel
- **Area 6**: Family and Community
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Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.