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ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study. The two purposes of this study were to: (1) analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior, and (2) investigate the differences between the manner in which the principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Procedures. Principals at 231 public elementary schools within a sixty mile radius of Terre Haute, Indiana were included in the original sample. These principals were surveyed to determine their instructional leadership behaviors. The principals who responded to the survey were then asked to have ten teachers fill out a school climate inventory. The data from both instruments were tabulated and used to determine relationships between principals' instructional leadership behaviors and teacher perception of climate. On-site, structured interviews were conducted with three teachers and the principal in four of the elementary schools with more positive climate elementary schools with less positive climates and principals of schools climates conduct school operations.

Findings. Statistical analyses include descriptive statistics, Stepwise...
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Findings. Statistical analysis of the data included descriptive statistics, Stepwise regression, Independent
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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The latter part of the twentieth century has seen a great deal of research on the differences between "more effective" and "less effective" educational environments. Research has provided results showing evidence that the greatest differences in effectiveness were found at the individual school level. Researchers also began to analyze the differences between those schools defined as more effective and those schools defined as less effective. Strong instructional leadership was a consistent characteristic of the more effective schools. Another imperative factor that emerged from the effective schools research was the necessity for a school climate which is safe, orderly, and appropriate for learning to take place. Edmonds (1981) isolated five characteristics which he called correlates of effective schools. He found two of the most important correlates to be (1) the leadership of the school, and (2) the climate of the school. Other researchers have also investigated the relationship between these two characteristics.

Keefe, Kelley, and Miller (1985) state that:
in order for a school to be both productive and satisfying, a number of elements must be present. Two, however, emerge as essential: (1) a positive school learning climate and (2) a principal who supports the establishment and maintenance of this climate. (pp. 70-71)

Brookover (1979) suggests that schools are thought to be dynamic social systems made up of interrelated factors. This mix of interconnected characteristics is unique to each school and provides each with a definite personality or climate (Halpin and Croft, 1963). A school’s effectiveness is determined by a school’s culture resulting in a distinct climate composed of attitudes, behaviors, and organizational structure.

Howard, Howell, and Brainard (1987, pp. 6-7) state that “at least eight factors contribute to a school’s climate and determine its quality.” There should be evidence of:

1. Continuous Academic and Social Growth
2. Respect
3. Trust
4. High Morale
5. Cohesiveness
6. Opportunities for Input
7. School Renewal
8. Caring

The principal’s leadership style is an important factor which influences both effectiveness as an instructional leader and the climate of the school. In their analysis of eight case studies, Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) conclude
that the characteristics of instructional leaders include:

1. A propensity to set clear goals and to have these goals serve as a continuous source of motivation.
2. A high degree of self-confidence and openness to others.
3. A tolerance for ambiguity.
4. A tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems.
5. An analytic perspective.
6. The ability to be in charge of their jobs. (p. 37)

In understanding how the effective instructional leader functions, research has moved beyond examination of how a principal behaves to an understanding of what the principal can do to facilitate appropriate instruction and a positive learning climate. Duckworth (1983) found during research that staff meetings, staff development activities, and observation of and consultation with individual teachers provide opportunities for the principal to encourage and recognize good work and show a commitment to improve below standard teaching.

Six administrative and supervisory support functions were identified by Gersten and Carnine (1981). These functions are essential to instructional improvement, but can be performed by the principal or someone else in the organization trained to fulfill the support role. The support functions include:

1. Implement programs of known effectiveness of active involvement in curricular improvement
2. Monitor student performance
3. Monitor teacher performance
4. Provide concrete technical assistance to teachers (inservice, programs, coaching)
5. Demonstrate visible commitment to programs for instructional improvement
6. Provide emotional support and incentives for teachers. (p. 21)

Statement of the Problem

Studies (Krug, 1989; Krug, Ahadi, & Scott, 1991, Maehr & Ames, 1988; Maehr, Braskamp, & Ames, 1988) have focused on five dimensions of instructional leadership which provide a useful taxonomy within which much of what instructional leaders do can be described. Included in these dimensions are (1) defining mission, (2) managing curriculum and instruction, (3) supervising teaching, (4) monitoring student progress, and (5) promoting instructional climate. This research indicates that the impact of instructional leadership cannot be fully understood by ignoring the context in which it occurs. The school’s climate is an important piece of instructional leadership.

Literature reveals that a positive climate includes an emphasis on academics, an ambience of caring, a motivating curriculum, a professional collegiality, and a closeness to parents and community (Witcher, 1993). Current school literature supports the use of school climate measures as predictors of school effectiveness. These measurement instruments often involve the input of teachers as to the appropriateness of the climates of their schools.
Instructional leadership research indicates the importance of the role the principal plays in school effectiveness. Researchers have concluded that the principal is the decisive element in the effectiveness of a school (Walker, 1990). Numerous instruments have been developed to assess the effectiveness of the principal as instructional leader. Many of these instruments include a self-assessment form for principals and a survey instrument to determine teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness.

In light of research to date, it would be beneficial to know if there is a relationship between teacher perception of school climate and principal instructional leadership behavior. Are there significant instructional leadership behaviors which best predict a positive school climate? Is there a significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between schools with more positive climates and schools with less positive climates?

Though these links have been explored previously, enhancing the knowledge base by on-site investigation is needed. Smith and Andrews (1989) believed that their research in strong instructional leadership and school climates that promote achievement needed to be extended by concentrating on the daily activities of those principals that appeared to be strong instructional leaders. Wimpelberg, Teddie, and Stringfield (1989) note that future research on principals must address more than general characteristics of behavior or attitudes. They suggest that specific job tasks of the principal's role be identified and time allocations for these tasks be investigated. Andrews,
Basom, & Basom (1991) stated that:

We must move beyond simplified notions of supervision as the formal pre-conference, observation, post-conference process. Instead, we must think of the act of supervision as the sum of the personal interactions between and among teachers and the principal that lead to the improvement of instruction. (p. 100)

These research findings support the need for further on-site study. This investigation includes determining the differences in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Purpose of the Study

The two purposes of the study were to: (1) analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior and; (2) investigate the differences between the manner in which the principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Research Questions

Is there a relationship between teacher perception of school climate and principal instructional leadership behavior? Is there a significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between schools with more positive climates and schools with less positive climates?
Are there significant instructional leadership behaviors which best predict a positive school climate?

**Null Hypotheses**

*Ho1:* There is no significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior.

*Ho2:* There is no significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between the elementary schools with more positive climates and elementary schools with less positive climates.

*Ho3:* There is no linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate.

Qualitative data was collected and analyzed with appropriate statistical procedures to accept or reject each null hypothesis.

**Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis**

The overall research question that guided the collection of qualitative data in the interview and observation was: Are there differences based upon on-site, structured interviews of principals and teachers, in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates (1) conduct school operations, and (2) implement change?
Definition of Terms

Climate. The collective personality of a school or enterprise, the atmosphere as characterized by the social and professional interactions of the individuals in the school (Norton, 1984).

Elementary School. For the purposes of this study, an elementary school encompasses grades kindergarten through five or kindergarten through six.

Domains of Meaning. Salient, grounded categories of meaning that evolve during the beginning analysis of data in a qualitative study (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T). An inventory that assesses five dimensions of instructional leadership behavior: Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, and Promotes Instructional Climate. A 108 item survey used to assess instructional leadership behavior, job satisfaction and commitment, and school culture or climate from the teachers' perspective (Maehr, Braskamp, & Ames, 1988).

Instructional Leadership Inventory. An inventory of 100 self-report items that focus on five broad categories of instructional leadership: Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, and Promotes Instructional Climate. The instrument is designed to assess instructional leadership behaviors. This inventory is completed by principals (Maehr & Ames, 1988).

Principal. For the purposes of this study, a principal is defined as the administrative head of an elementary school.
**Teacher.** For the purposes of this study, a teacher is defined as a certificated professional employee of an elementary school.

**Delimitations**

Delimitations of the study exist in the following manner:

1. The time frame established during which data were collected is the 1995-96 academic year.
2. Approximately 231 schools were included in the original cluster sample.

**Limitations**

Generalizations from the study are limited to the degree that:

1. The schools located in the population of this study are representative of schools in Indiana.
2. The number included in the sample was limited to the schools that respond to the survey instruments.
3. The survey instruments used were normed on Illinois participants.

**Summary and Organization of the Study**

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter One has provided an introduction for the study, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, null hypotheses, and a definition of related terms.

Chapter Two presents a review of the related literature. It is subdivided into an introduction and research on
instructional leadership behaviors, school climate, and qualitative research. Chapter Three presents information about the population sample and the instruments used. Chapter Four presents findings to answer the hypotheses and interview questions posed in Chapter One. Chapter Five presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and a discussion of the implications of those findings.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature examines related research conducted to date on the variables of the present study. There are two major areas of research. The first is concerned with previous findings related to instructional leadership behavior. This review examines the critical importance of the principal's instructional leadership role in the development and maintenance of an effective school. It also discusses the leadership behaviors that parallel the identification of effective principals.

The second area of study is an examination of school climate. Within this review, climate is defined and characteristics of positive climates are identified. The principal's role in climate is discussed and current research is presented to support the importance of the administrator's role in promoting positive school climate. A third area presented in this chapter includes a brief overview of current literature addressing qualitative research.
**Instructional Leadership Research**

Effective schools researchers consistently share the belief that one of the major key elements in an effective school is an effective principal. Edmonds (1981) stated that the "principal has to be the person the instructional personnel look to for the instructional leadership in the system. If they do not, the implications for the school are considerably negative" (p. 26). Edmonds added that the principal must perform several key duties including visiting the classes, systematically observing, and systematically responding to the observations.

In 1971, Weber listed "strong leadership from the principal" as a characteristic of "successful" schools. In 1975, Lezotte, Edmonds, and Ratner also identified "the principal as an instructional leader" as one "characteristic of an effective school" (cited in Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985, p. 3).

Niece (1983) found three major themes in his qualitative research on effective instructional leaders. He stated that effective instructional leaders "are people oriented and interactional" (p. 16). These principals did not let themselves become secluded and isolated from the day to day operations of the school. They provided regular interaction with all school populations and remained visible and accessible.

Secondly, he stated that effective instructional leaders "function within a network of other principals" (p. 16). The principals made sure they had a network of peers to keep in close contact with on both a formal and informal level.
These networks were on local, state, and nationwide levels.

His final theme was found in the commonality of administrative practitioners having had a major influence on developing these effective instructional leaders. These mentors guided the principals and were highly praised during Niece’s interviews.

Andrews and Soder (1987), identified the effective instructional leader as a principal performing at high levels in four areas: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence in the school. Stronge (1993) further extends these levels by discussing the importance of unifying the management responsibilities of the principal with instructional leadership duties. These two combined create the primary role of the principal being that of “educational leadership.” He believes that this combination provides a much healthier paradigm for understanding the principalship. This unified view draws a rational relationship between managerial efficiency and instructionally effective schools.

Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983) supported this theory in their efforts to relate the principal’s educational leadership role with Edmonds’ (1979) five correlates of effective schools: (1) strong administrative leadership, (2) climate of high expectation, (3) orderly, instructionally oriented environment, (4) emphasis on basic skills instruction, (5) monitoring student progress. They narrowed the five correlates to three general dimensions of principals’ behavior: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a
positive learning environment. Their research suggested that these dimensions be used to categorize the specific behaviors of principals as their performance related to school effectiveness. This categorization resulted in a realization that virtually all principal behaviors, including basic managerial duties, are related to school effectiveness.

In 1994, Colon used an iceberg as a visual model for the framework of the instructional leader. The iceberg's tip represented the principal's observable behavior, the things that others see the principal do. The massive submerged portion of the iceberg represented all of the things that created the observable behavior. He emphasized the fact that the instructional leader will have a submerged portion that is created by the mixing of facts, theories, attitudes, and vision. This submerged mass then becomes essential to the proper development of a knowledge base, philosophy, and vision. Colon believes that these three elements will mold and modify the instructional leader's observable behavior.

In 1989, Smith and Andrews identified four areas of strategic interaction conducted by instructional leaders that promote increases in student achievement. The first area was identified as that of a resource provider. The teachers in the schools are its greatest resource and they must be acknowledged for exemplary teaching and encouraged to share with others. The principal must know the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers and show genuine concern for their health, welfare, and professional growth. This caring approach creates a faculty willing to take risks and approach change. The second area identified was that of an
instructional resource. This is based upon the clinical supervision of teachers. The principal identifies good teaching and provides feedback to teachers that promotes professional growth. The third interaction area identifies the principal as a communicator. The principal must communicate to the staff essential beliefs (1) all children can learn and experience success; (2) success builds upon success; (3) schools can enhance student success; and (4) learner outcomes must be clearly defined to guide instructional programs and decisions (Andrews, Soder, and Jocoby, 1986).

The final area is visible presence. The authors stated that:

To create a visible presence in day-to-day activities, principals must model behaviors consistent with the school's vision; live and breathe their beliefs in education; organize resources to accomplish building and district goals; informally drop in on classrooms; make staff development activities a priority; and, most of all, help people do the right things and reinforce those activities. (p. 100)

Northern and Bailey (1991) identified seven characteristics that are essential for successful instructional leadership (1) visionary leaders, (2) strategic planners, (3) change agents, (4) communicators, (5) role models, (6) nurturers, (7) disturbers. (pp. 25-27) They also wrote that principals must have numerous philosophies that become a belief system. These principals must believe in the innate goodness of people, involve staff in shared decision
making, help establish long term staff goals, make evaluation an opportunity for teachers to set personal goals, and model lifetime learning for staff. (p. 27)

Krug (1992) discusses that fact that recent research has identified a five-factor taxonomy to address the commonalities of principal’s instructional leadership behaviors (Krug, 1989; Krug, Ahadi, & Scott, 1991; Maehr & Ames, 1988; Maehr, Braskamp, & Ames, 1988). The first area identified is Defining Mission. The school’s chief executive must help frame school goals and purposes and clearly communicate these to teachers, students, and parents. Clear mission is especially important during times when schools are restructuring to meet the changing needs of students and the communities they serve.

The second area identified is Managing Curriculum and Instruction. Principals must provide teachers with resources and information that will enable them to plan their classes effectively. Principals must also be aware of the special needs of each instructional area and actively support curriculum development.

Supervising Teaching is the third area Krug includes in his taxonomy. This includes the traditional performance evaluation, but also includes staff development. He stresses that, “the effective instructional leader is prospective rather than retrospective regarding staff and is focused on what can be, not what was” (p. 433).

The fourth area is Monitoring Student Progress. Instructional leaders must be aware of the variety of effective ways in which student progress can be assessed.
They must also enable teachers and students to use assessment results to improve while helping parents understand how to interpret and understand assessment results in a supportive fashion.

The final taxonomy area is Promoting Instructional Climate. Principals must learn that creating an exciting and reinforcing learning environment will provide the conditions under which students and teachers will want to do what needs to be done. The school's atmosphere must be supportive and provide a shared sense of purpose. It is within this climate that the energy of students and teachers will be filtered in productive directions.

Foriska (1994) discusses instructional leadership as "critical to the development and maintenance of an effective school" (p. 33). The author emphasizes that instructional leaders must influence others to employ the most appropriate instructional practices coupled with their best knowledge of the subject matter. The focus must always be on student learning and principals must readily supply teachers with resources and incentives to keep their focus on students. Principals must keep teachers informed about educational tools and developments in the field of effective teaching. Instructional leaders must also be available to teachers for the critiquing of these tools and teaching practices and help them determine applicability to the classroom. Ongoing discussions enhance teacher growth, promote dialogue exchange with peers, and encourage continued development of innovative ideas.

In 1989, Ralph Tyler discussed the importance of the
principal's leadership in promoting student learning. His findings reported that schools with substantial improvements in students' learning accomplished this by cooperative efforts of teachers, parents, and other interested community members. Schools worked together with these involved parties to identify and develop solutions for significant educational problems. This team approach to problem-solving requires a shared understanding and commitment to mission. The principal must make sure all parties are well grounded in the school's purpose and goals. The principal must then help the team focus on the significant problems as identified by the teachers.

After the problem is identified, a solution must be developed. There is rarely only one solution to most educational problems. The team needs to look at all possible solutions and choose the one which presents itself as the most effective and feasible. The team must then implement this solution and answer the following questions:

1. What present school practices will need to be changed?
2. What changes in the curriculum are necessary?
3. What new teaching procedures will need to be used?
4. How will participating teachers gain the skills required to employ these teaching procedures successfully?
5. What new instructional materials are needed and how can they be obtained or constructed?
6. What changes are required in the daily and weekly school schedule?

These questions require deliberative thought and an
appropriate schedule for implementation. The team should not expect too much too soon and they should make the schedule realistic. Transforming people’s beliefs and skills takes time and patience. Effective problem-solving is one of the primary tasks of today’s administrator.

Duke (1982) identified six key factors necessary to achieve an effective instructional program: (1) competent teachers, (2) adequate time for direct instruction, (3) an orderly learning environment, (4) adequate instructional resources, (5) communication of high expectations, (6) continuous monitoring of progress (p. 3). Duke also identified four directly related leadership functions and two indirectly related functions that are associated with the achievement of instructional effectiveness. The four direct functions included: (1) staff development, (2) instructional support, (3) resource acquisition and allocation, (4) quality control. The indirect functions were coordination and troubleshooting.

Duke suggested that effective leadership has no single skill or set of skills considered appropriate for all schools. Effective leadership is situational and principals should strive to acquire many leadership skills to apply to different circumstances. This assumption implied that leadership functions that promote instructional effectiveness can be learned.

Duke found that acquiring a competent teaching staff is integral to a school’s instructional effectiveness. The principal must play a key role in recruitment, inservice education, and staff motivation. Capable, skilled, and
energetic teachers must be selected and made aware that their talents will be appreciated. After a robust faculty has been hired, it must be maintained and nurtured with ongoing staff development designed by teachers. The staff must be treated as professionals and encouraged to take leadership positions. If a school does not have proficient teachers, the instructional effectiveness of a school is doomed.

To enable recognition of effective principals, Duke organized questions for each of the six key functions of an effective principal.

**Staff Development:**

1. Does the principal possess a plan for recruiting the best possible teachers?
2. Is the staff encouraged to participate in inservice activities?
3. Does a plan exist for the regular offering of inservice opportunities?
4. Do staff members participate in decision making regarding inservice?
5. In what way does the principal encourage teacher leadership?
6. How does the principal respond when a teacher is having trouble meeting instructional objectives?

**Instructional Support:**

1. What does the principal do to minimize the time teachers spend on paperwork, record keeping, and classroom management?
2. What does the principal do to minimize classroom interruptions?
3. Does the principal encourage teachers to clarify their classroom management goals and to develop classroom management plans?
4. What does the principal do to minimize student absenteeism?
5. Are noninstructional activities carefully scheduled so as not to interfere with classroom instruction?
6. Are regular efforts made to keep teachers, students, and parents aware of school rules and policies?
7. Are school rules reviewed regularly and are unnecessary rules eliminated?

Resource Acquisition and Allocation:
1. Are resources allocated on the basis of staff input?
2. Are efforts made to ensure that resources are allocated fairly within each classroom as well as among classes?
3. Does the principal participate in the development of the school and district budget?
4. Does the principal maintain close contact with his superiors?
5. How does the school's operating budget for materials compare with other local schools' budgets?
6. What does the principal do to generate additional sources of revenue?
7. Do teachers have the materials they need to initiate orderly learning on the first day of school?

Quality Control:
1. Does the school possess clear goals and objectives?
2. What does the principal do to see that the staff is
aware of school goals and objectives?
3. What does the principal do to see that goals and objectives are being achieved?
4. What does the principal do to communicate high expectations to staff and students?
5. Does the staff have high and consistent expectations of the principal and are these communicated clearly?
6. What does the principal do to recognize staff and student achievement?
7. Does the principal regularly visit classrooms and meet with teachers?
8. What occurs when a particular student is not achieving according to expectations? (i.e., Is the first reaction to assess teaching or to find reasons why the student cannot learn?)
9. Do evaluation plans include provisions for assessing unintended negative outcomes?

Coordination:
1. Does the principal regularly review the operations of each department?
2. What do the principal and staff do to minimize duplication among subunits of the school?
3. What does the principal do to see that staff members are aware of each other's activities and plans?
4. Does the principal delegate authority to his assistants and chairpersons to improve coordination?
5. What does the principal do to encourage schoolwide, systematic planning? Is time for planning made available to staff members?
Troubleshooting:

1. What does the principal do to encourage staff members to anticipate problems before they arise?
2. Do contingency plans exist for each department and class?
3. Upon what sources of information does the principal rely for accurate feedback on staff, student, and community morale?
4. Are efforts made to obtain data from as close to the source of problems as possible?
5. What does the principal do to ensure advance warning of any changes in district policy?
6. What mechanisms exist for handling problems once they arise?
7. Are staff members trained in conflict resolution strategies?
8. To what extent does the principal actively involve staff in problem solving? (pp. 9-10)

These questions are based upon the belief that principals take specific actions in order to increase instructional effectiveness. They provide guidelines for administrator actions.

Strong instructional leadership was evidenced by Dwyer, (1984) after he and his colleagues interviewed and shadowed 42 peer nominated successful instructional leaders. It was determined that principals are the integral key in shaping effective instructional organizations. These leaders have strong belief systems, find leadership opportunities in the varied demands of their jobs, are able to move organizations
within bureaucratic constraints, and know that growth is a step by step process that does not happen quickly.

**School Climate**

Keefe, Kelley, and Miller (1985) state that: in order for a school to be both productive and satisfying, a number of elements must be present. Two, however, emerge as essential: (1) a positive school learning climate and (2) a principal who supports the establishment and maintenance of this climate. (pp. 70-71)

They define school climate as: "the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members" (p. 74). Three assumptions stem from the understanding of this definition: (1) school environment quality is a longitudinal concern, (2) shared perception and consensus about what is and what is not important is an essential descriptor of climate, (3) the primary concern of the school must be the students. (p. 74-75)

The authors indicate that climate assessment should utilize the following kinds of questions:

1. Are parents, students, and school personnel in high agreement about the mission of the school? About the social behaviors expected in the school? About the academic behaviors expected in the school?

2. Do the teachers and administrators believe that virtually all students are capable of mastering the instructional objectives of their grade level?
3. Do the teachers accept responsibility for ensuring that virtually all students master these grade level objectives? Is the staff committed to carrying out this responsibility, regardless of the racial or socioeconomic makeup of the school?

4. Is the physical environment attractive? Safe? Convenient? Accessible?

5. Does the formal organization protect the rights and safety of individuals? Is it efficient? Are its regulations and procedures perceived to be fair?

6. Do students receive individual attention if that is a goal of the school?

7. Are the rights of students respected?

8. Are the administrators and teachers committed to equity - assuring that students of various ethnic and income groups perform at comparable levels - and excellence - that the highest possible individual and group outcomes are achieved?

9. Are administrators and staff members seen as enthusiastic, caring, and concerned?

10. Are staff members perceived as knowledgeable and skilled in the execution of their professional duties? Is their performance viewed by peers, patrons, and students as competent?

11. Is the community supportive? Do the professional employees feel the community understands and supports their efforts?

12. Who feels a sense of ownership for the school in that community? Do students, professional educators,
and parents agree about who actually "owns" the school? (p. 75)

Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1985) state:
school climate may be one of the most important ingredients of a successful instructional program. Without a climate that creates a harmonious and well functioning school, a high degree of academic achievement is difficult, if not downright impossible to obtain. (p. 15)

In 1988, Sweeney wrote: "a winning school climate provides the very foundation for a sound educational program. When the climate is right, people are inspired to do their best. Teachers and students do what needs to be done to stimulate learning. Achievement generally rises" (p. 1).

Climate is a reflection of organizational structure and gives a school its own unique personality. School climate can determine the success or failure of a school. A positive climate promotes and breeds a successful outlook and atmosphere. Effective schools create and maintain climates that are comfortable, pleasant, and orderly. They consistently promote high expectations of staff and students (Stronge & Jones, 1991).

Winter and Sweeney (1994) discuss the fact that there are many useful ways to measure school climate, but little has been learned about how to develop a climate that is positive. After the authors interviewed 32 teachers about climate, a common strand emerged. The teachers felt that the principal played the most important role in fashioning a school's climate. The teachers felt that the support a
principal provided was a key to the climate of school. The interviews led to the identification of five types of administrative support that affect school climate: recognizing achievement, backing up teachers, encouraging teachers, caring, and administering school rules fairly. This support, caring, and recognition, will promote a sense of pride that will lead to a more positive climate. Teachers surrounded by this environment will give the most of their time and talents.

Further emphasizing the importance of the principal's role in climate, Kelley (1980) stated the principal is responsible for a school's climate and the teacher is responsible for the climate in the classroom. Kelley affirmed that principals and teachers must be:

1. Aware of the conditions and events that influence personal attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.
2. Alert to the conditions and events that influence professional attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.
3. Aware of the expectations of others and know whether or not those expectations are understood.
4. Aware of the responses to conditions or events that cannot be controlled but must be coped with.
5. Able to plan, initiate, and implement events or changes that influence conditions which can be controlled.
6. Able to formulate long-range plans for maintenance and improvement of conditions and events which influence the quality of outcomes attained by students. (p. 33)

In 1989, Adams and Bailey discussed the importance of
principals taking care of their teachers. This care involved supporting teacher preferences, promoting feelings of self-efficacy, and focusing on the well-being of teachers through enhanced working conditions. The way teachers feel about themselves is a direct result of the leadership patterns and styles of principals. Through their leadership, principals should provide a belief in people, job and role diversity, high expectations, positive reinforcement, and celebrations of good performance. Teachers who feel good about themselves will become inspired to teach and deliver instruction at an exceptionally high level. Principals who take the time necessary to make sure that teachers understand their worth will find that classroom instruction will improve as teachers' self-efficacy improves.

To further demonstrate the power of teacher self-worth, Purkey (1983) found that research lends evidence that when teachers understand, accept, and like themselves, they have a much greater capacity to understand, accept, and like their students. Further research indicates that principals who demonstrate positive self-worth will act positively. They show a high regard for their employees as human beings and make continuous attempts to build the self-esteem of their staff members (Beck & Hillmar, 1987).

Sweeney (1992) indicates that survey research conducted in more than 600 schools across the country, using the School Improvement Inventory, provides a great deal of valuable information about school climate. The research findings support the fact that most schools tend to have a positive climate, but vast differences appear between the most and
least positive climates. According to Sweeney, the size of school, community type, and level of attendance make a difference in a school's individual climate. Suburban schools are found to have more positive climates than rural schools. Urban schools usually have the least positive climates and elementary schools have more positive climates than secondary schools. Schools with significant discipline problems as perceived by teachers tend to have less positive climates. The ratings of principal effectiveness in learning environment management, instructional leadership, and human resource management are highly correlated with climate measures. The principal behavior most highly associated with a positive climate was human resource management.

Sweeney further indicates that principals must enable and guide staff members to identify key beliefs and values that should guide the school. The principal must also promote a student centered school while providing feedback and rewards to students and staff. A sense of family must be fostered within the school and the importance of parents and community should be well established. Finally, the principal must provide open communication lines, promote pride through achievement, and develop a high level of trust with students and staff.

In reference to implementing change, Stevens (1990) concludes that the proper climate is necessary for successful school reformation. The first steps taken by the staff and principal must be non-threatening. The use of informal discussion with key staff members or school improvement teams with building representatives could be a possible first step.
Long term improvement is possible through staff commitment. The staff must be made aware of current research in the area of reform and understand how this supports the implementation of change within the school. This exposure to research should be ongoing and coupled with continuing dialogue on improvement issues. Staff members should be sent to timely workshops and conferences that pertain to the reform area. Successful change must also include stability in leadership and a realistic timeline for the school improvement project.

In the book *Handbook for Conducting School Climate Improvement Projects*, (1987) Howard, Howell, and Brainard identified eight indicators of school climate. The identified list includes:

1. **Respect.** Each member of the school must be treated with respect and see themselves as persons of worth. An atmosphere of mutual respect prevails.
2. **Caring.** Individuals in the school should feel that people are concerned about them and interested in their well-being.
3. **High morale.** School members feel good about what is happening, are willing to perform assigned tasks, and are confident, cheerful, and self-disciplined.
4. **Opportunities for input.** Everyone in the school should be given the opportunity to contribute ideas and know they have been considered.
5. **Continuous academic and social growth.** Both students and faculty strive to develop their skills and knowledge. The professional staff holds high expectations for students.
6. **School renewal.** The school is self-renewing; it is growing, developing, and changing.

7. **Cohesion.** School members should feel a sense of belonging to the school. This will result in school spirit or esprit de corps.

8. **Trust.** Individuals within the school must have confidence that others can be counted on to do what they say they will do. Integrity is an essential characteristic of school members. (p. 7)

The authors discuss the fact that their extensive experience with climate improvement leads them to believe that “nothing of substance improves until the school’s climate does” (p. 50). People’s feelings about their school can encourage or impede change. As a school’s climate improves there will be less discipline problems, better attendance, improved achievement, dropout decline, more respect for and help to others, and a collective responsibility for the well-being of the school.

**Qualitative Research**

Eisner and Peshkin (1990) discuss the current trend demonstrating acceptance of qualitative research. They state, “the judgment that qualitative research is either beyond the pale or substandard no longer generally holds with overwhelming force” (p. 3). There is increasing dialogue between qualitative and quantitative researchers versus the traditional debate format. Leading research journals are encouraging submissions of manuscripts pertaining to qualitative research, book publishers have found an increased
market for qualitative literature, federal agencies are using more qualitative approaches to research, institutions are regularly offering qualitative methodology courses, and departments of education have begun to advertise new faculty appointments that specify competence in teaching qualitative research. These trends offer evidence that qualitative research is formulating for itself a place of prominence in the established field of inquiry.

In 1988, Sherman and Webb analyzed the work of leading qualitative researchers and developed six characteristics of qualitative research. Their list is as follows:

1. Events can be understood adequately only if they are seen in context. Therefore, a qualitative researcher immerses her/himself in the setting.
2. The contexts of inquiry are not contrived; they are natural. Nothing is predefined or taken for granted.
3. Qualitative researchers want those who are studied to speak for themselves, to provide their perspectives in words and other actions. Therefore, qualitative research is an interactive process in which the persons studied teach the researcher about their lives.
4. Qualitative researchers attend to the experience as a whole, not as separate variables. The aim of qualitative research is to understand experience as unified.
5. Qualitative methods are appropriate to the above statements. There is no one general method.
6. For many qualitative researchers, the process entails appraisal about what was studied. (pp. 5-8)
The relationship between qualitative and quantitative research was addressed by Lancy (1993). He believes that there is increasing evidence of agreement and understanding between the two fields of inquiry. He indicates that many studies are currently using qualitative data to complement quantitative data and that qualitative and quantitative methods may be combined in a single study. Lancy also noted that it has become extremely common for qualitative researchers to utilize various quantitative techniques. Patton (1990) describes using qualitative research as, essentially, the "natural history" stage of a quantitative study. This stage allows the identification and investigation of variables in the study.

Lancy (1990) also discusses the qualitative method of triangulation. This consists of printed material and other artifacts are combined with observation and interview records. The printed material and other artifacts become the qualitative researcher's most effective defense against the charge of being subjective. Multiple data sources allow the researcher to fill in gaps that would occur if they only relied on one source.

Summary

The review of related literature and research is divided into three sections. The first discussed the literature on instructional leadership. This section began with information on the influence and common characteristics of the instructional leader. It further discussed the instructional leaders role in promoting student learning and
implementing change.

The second section of the chapter examined school climate. This section examined the role of the principal in impacting school climate and common characteristics of schools with positive climates.

The third section of the chapter addressed qualitative research. This section supplied evidence of current acceptance of qualitative research, characteristics of qualitative inquiry, and discussion of combining qualitative and quantitative research methods.

The research is clear about the importance of a strong instructional leader, the need for a positive school climate, and the current acceptance of qualitative research in the field of inquiry. This study seeks to determine relationships between instructional leadership and school climate. A primary purpose of this study was to examine the differences between the principals of schools with less positive climates and the principals of schools with more positive climates.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

The two purposes of the study were to: (1) analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior and; (2) investigate the differences between the manner in which the principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Overall, the design involved the following basic procedures:

1. Approximately 231 public elementary schools located in 13 counties within a northern and eastern sixty mile radius of Terre Haute, Indiana were included in the original cluster sample.

2. Teacher perception of school climate data was collected in each of the identified elementary schools using the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T), developed by MetriTech, Inc. (Maehr, Braskamp, & Ames, 1988).

3. Principal instructional leadership behavior data was collected from each of the principals of the identified
elementary schools using the Instructional Leadership Inventory, developed by MetriTech, Inc. (Maehr & Ames, 1988).

4. On-site, structured interviews were conducted with a group of three teachers and with the principal in four of the elementary schools with more positive climates and four of the elementary schools with less positive climates. A half day was spent at each site observing the principal and the school environment. The interviews and observations were used to identify the differences in the manner in which principals of schools with positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Null Hypotheses

There were three null hypotheses in this study. The null hypotheses were:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between the elementary schools with more positive climates and elementary schools with less positive climates.

Ho3: There is no linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate.

Quantitative data was collected and analyzed with appropriate statistical procedures to accept or reject each null hypothesis.
Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

The overall research question that guided the collection of qualitative data in the interview and observation was: Are there differences based upon on-site, structured interviews of principals and teachers, in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates (1) conduct school operations, and (2) implement change?

Data Sources

Approximately 231 elementary schools in Indiana were included in the original cluster sample. A sixty mile radius from Terre Haute, Indiana was drawn starting due east and going north. The area included is a quarter pie shaped region with Terre Haute being the southwest point. Any counties in which part of the county was in this region were included in the sample. All schools with grade configurations of kindergarten through five or kindergarten through six within these thirteen counties were included. The schools within these counties represented urban, suburban, small town, and rural communities.

Data Collection Process

The Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI) was sent to the principals of the schools identified in the sample. Those principals not returning the survey after the first mailing were provided a follow-up letter and an additional copy of the survey to complete. The schools in which the principal returned the ILI were then sent ten copies of the
Instructional Climate Inventory. The principals were instructed to give the surveys to the secretary with the provided letter of process explanation. The secretary's letter instructed him or her to use an alphabetical listing of teachers and starting with the first teacher, give the Instructional Climate Inventory to every other teacher until ten teachers were selected. If the school had less than twenty teachers, the secretary was to give any remaining forms to teachers who did not receive one starting with the second teacher on the alphabetical list until all instruments had been distributed. The secretary was then to distribute, collect, and return the information to the researcher in a stamped envelope provided by the researcher.

The results from each of the schools on both instruments were tabulated. Schools that returned both surveys were ranked on the basis of teacher perception of school climate (Instructional Climate Inventory). Schools that received high ratings, falling into the top third of ratings, on this climate measure were considered schools with more positive climates. Schools that received low ratings, falling into the lower third of ratings, on this climate measure were considered schools with less positive climates. As a result of the instrument, the top third of the participating schools were considered schools with a more positive climate. The lower third of the participating schools were considered schools with a less positive climate.

On-site, structured interviews and observations were conducted at four schools with more positive climate ratings and at four schools with less positive climate ratings. The
principal was involved in a structured interview (Appendix B) lasting approximately one hour. Three teachers also participated in a structured group interview (Appendix B) lasting approximately one hour. Both the principal and the group of teachers were asked the same questions and the interviews were recorded.

The researcher also spent time observing the principal and the school environment. This provided the opportunity for field observations and collection of artifacts. These artifacts included items like school handbooks, minutes from meetings, and school memoranda. The field observations included a tour of the school, observation in classrooms, and perceptions gathered as the researcher informally became acquainted with the school facility and environment. The interviews, field observations, and artifacts enabled the data gathered to be triangulated for research purposes. The data collected was analyzed and categorized into domains of meaning. Those domains were: Climate Responsibility, Change, Staff Development, Communication, and Daily Routine. The researcher searched for themes that clarified relationships among the domains. These relationships helped further identify how the principals of the schools visited conducted school operations and implemented change.

**Instrumentation**

**Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI)**

The Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI) was used with the elementary principals identified in this study to
obtain self-reports of instructional leadership behaviors. This instrument consists of 100 short, multiple-choice statements and questions. Completion of this instrument yielded eight scores. Five scores represented major dimensions of instructional leadership: Define Mission, Manage Curriculum, Supervise Teaching, Monitor Student Progress, and Promote Instructional Climate. The remaining three scales assessed administrator perceptions of their work context: Staff, School, and Community.

According to the documentation from Metritech (1988), to enable validity and reliability to be tested, the Instructional Leadership Inventory was given to 242 administrators in the state of Illinois. This sampling plan incorporated an approximately proportional number of administrators at the elementary and secondary school levels as was found in the state. These administrators also completed the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS: Hallinger, 1984). Coefficient alpha indexes of internal consistency were determined for the eight scales: Defines Mission, Manages Instruction, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, Promotes Instructional Climate, Staff, School, and Community.

Instrument reliability was described as follows: Values for the remaining scales range from .74 for the Manages Instruction scale to .89 for the Staff scale. These generally high values suggest that the Instructional Leadership Inventory is sufficiently reliable to justify its use on an individual basis (MetriTech, 1988, p. 7).

Evidence is also provided determining the validity of
the instrument. Instructional leadership was assessed by both the Instructional Leadership Inventory and the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). PIMRS consists of ten subscales: Frame the School goals, Communicate the School Goals, Supervise and Evaluate Instruction, Coordinate the Curriculum, Monitor Student Progress, Protect Instructional Time, Maintain High Visibility, Provide Incentives for Teachers, Promote Professional Development, and Provide Incentives for Learning. Correlations were then run between subscales of the PIMRS and the ILI.

Validity was evidenced as follows: Correlations between the two instruments are substantial, indicating excellent convergence between them. In order to further test the degree of convergence between the two scales, a regression of the ten PIMRS scales on each of the five Instructional Leadership Inventory scales was performed. Multiple Rs, range from .34 to .90, with associated Rs squared ranging from .12 to .81. Once again the results provide strong evidence for the convergence of the two measures.

Up to this point the validity of the ILI has been approached from the perspective of its relationship with other self-report scales. An even more important aspect of validity is the extent to which self reports on the ILI correspond to external assessments of instructional leadership behavior.

For this purpose a pilot study was conducted in which 8 superintendents were asked to provide PIMRS rating on each of 38 principals. Each principal completed the ILI. The use of
the two instruments precluded the charge that significant correlations between the two sets of ratings might arise artifactually from common measurement scales. A number of correlations between the ILI scales and the superintendent item ratings were found to be statistically significant in this pilot study (MetriTech, 1988, pp. 8-9).

**Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T)**

The Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T) is comprised of 108 short, multiple-choice statements and questions. Norms are based upon data collected from 515 teachers. Approximately 33% of this sample was drawn from elementary schools, 14% from junior high (or middle) schools, and 53% from high schools. Because of significant differences on several of the scales across type of schools, norms have been separately calculated for elementary, junior high, and high school.

Reliability of the instrument was calculated by use of the coefficient alpha index of internal consistency for the twelve scales of the instrument: Define Mission, Manage Instruction, Supervise Teaching, Monitor Student Progress, Promote Instructional Climate, Accomplishment, Recognition, Power, Affiliation, Satisfaction, Strength, and Commitment. The values for the scales in the present test development study ranged from .79 for the Strength of Culture and Satisfaction scales to .92 for the Accomplishment scale. These high values indicate that the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T) is reliable and could be used on an individual basis (MetriTech, 1988, p.8).
The Instructional Climate Inventory contains scales adapted from a previously validated and extensively researched instrument (Braskamp and Maehr, 1985) for measuring climate factors. The School Climate Inventories conform to theoretical expectations and identify reliable differences in various aspects of school climates (Krug, 1989).

Selection of Sites for Interviews

The results from each of the schools on both instruments were tabulated. Schools that return both surveys were ranked on the basis of teacher perception of school climate as measured by the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T). Schools that received high ratings on this climate measure were considered schools with more positive climates. Schools that received low ratings on this climate measure were considered schools with less positive climates. On-site, structured interviews were conducted at four of the schools with more positive climate ratings and four of the schools with less positive climate ratings.

Structured Interviews

The principals from each of the eight schools selected for on-site, structured interviews were contacted and visitation dates and times were established. The teacher groups were selected based upon their accessibility to the interviewer at a specified time of day. While not a random process, this method made feasible the use of the interview methodology in this study.
The principal was involved in a structured interview (Appendix B) lasting approximately one hour. Three teachers also participated in a structured group interview (Appendix B) lasting approximately one hour. Both the principal and the group of teachers were asked the same questions and the interviews were recorded.

The researcher also spent time observing the principal and the school environment. This provided the opportunity for field observations and collection of artifacts.

**Statistical Analyses**

The first hypothesis, "there is no significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior" was tested using the Pearson product moment correlation.

The second hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between the elementary schools with more positive climates and elementary schools with less positive climates" was tested using Independent Sample T Tests on each subscale of the survey instruments.

The third hypothesis "there is no linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate" was tested using a Stepwise regression with the five subscales of the instructional leadership instrument.

The information gathered from the structured interviews of the principals and teachers at the schools with more
positive and less positive climates regarding "the manner in which principals in these schools (1) conduct school operations, and (2) facilitate change" is presented in Chapter Four.

Summary

In this chapter, the following design components were presented and described: the research methods; the interview question and hypotheses; the data sources, including the population and sample; and the instrumentation used. One main purpose of this study was to analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior. The second main purpose was to identify differences in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The two purposes of this study were to: (1) analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior and; (2) investigate the differences between the manner in which the principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Overall, the design involved the following basic procedures:

1. Approximately 231 public elementary schools located in 13 counties with a northern and eastern sixty mile radius of Terre Haute, Indiana were included in the original cluster sample.

2. Principal instructional leadership behavior data was collected from each of the principals of the identified elementary schools using the Instructional Leadership Inventory, developed by MetriTech, Inc. (Maehr & Ames, 1988).

3. Teacher perception of school climate data was collected in each of the identified elementary schools using
the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T), developed by MetriTech, Inc. (Maehr, Braskamp, & Ames, 1988).

4. On-site, structured interviews were conducted with a group of three teachers and with the principal in four of the elementary schools with more positive climates and four of the elementary schools with less positive climates based on analysis of data collected. Time was spent at each site observing the principal and the school environment. The interviews and observations were used to identify the differences in the manner in which principals of more positive and less positive school climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Statistical analysis of the data included descriptive statistics regarding the mean, standard deviation, frequency, and standard error. Pearson product moment correlation, Independent two-tailed t-test, and Stepwise regression were used to test the null hypotheses and the level of significance was set at .05. The statistical procedures were all performed using the SPSS computer program.

This chapter provides the findings which resulted from the statistical analysis and on-site interviews described in Chapter 3. Two sections are contained in this chapter. The first section presents the findings of the study related to the statistical analysis of the three hypothesis of the study. The second section presents the findings of the on-site interviews of teachers and principals of the more positive and less positive elementary schools.
Hypothesis Testing

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between the elementary schools with more positive climates and elementary schools with less positive climates.

Ho3: There is no linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate.

The first hypothesis was, "there is no significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior." The following rules were used in the interpretation of the magnitude of the correlation coefficient (Cohen, 1988): Correlation coefficients ranging from .10 to .49 were considered a medium relationship, and over .50 were considered a large relationship between variables. Significant correlations existed between seven of the teacher climate subscales and two instructional leadership behavior subscales (Table 1).

The results showed a significant positive relationship between the principals' perceptions of Supervising Teaching and the teachers' perceptions of Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, Promotes Instructional Climate, Accomplishment, and
Recognition. There was also a significant positive relationship between principals' perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate and teachers' perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate. All of these correlations can be considered medium correlations. Eight correlations

Table 1

Hypothesis One: Correlation Between Teacher Perception of School Climate and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Climate Subscale</th>
<th>Defines Mission</th>
<th>Manages Curric.</th>
<th>Supervises Teaching</th>
<th>Monitors Progress</th>
<th>Promotes Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines Mission</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages Curriculum</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors Progress</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Climate</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### Pearson Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Climate Subscale</th>
<th>Defines Mission</th>
<th>Manages Curric.</th>
<th>Supervises Teaching</th>
<th>Monitors Progress</th>
<th>Promotes Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Commitment</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Strength/Clim.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Accomplishment 3</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Recognition</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Power</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Affiliation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01

Effect size for r:
- small: .10
- medium: .30
- large: .50 (Cohen, 1988, p.83)

were found. Therefore, null hypothesis one was rejected. A significant relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of school climate and principal instructional leadership behaviors.

The second hypothesis was, "there is no significant difference in principal instructional leadership behavior between the elementary schools with more positive climates and elementary schools with less positive climates."

Independent Sample t-tests were used to compare the two
Table 2

Results of Testing Ho2: Relationship Between Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviors Between Elementary Schools With More Positive Climates (N=15) and Elementary Schools With Less Positive Climates (N=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defines Mission</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manages Curriculum</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervises Teaching</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitors Student Progress</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>53.93</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotes Instructional Climate</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
groups and locate significant relationships. The results of these tests are displayed in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the means of the schools with the more positive climates in the areas of Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching and Promotes Instructional Climate were higher than the schools with the more negative climates. The mean of the more negative schools in the area of Monitors Student Progress was higher than the mean of the more positive schools. The $t$ value for each of these descriptors indicates no significant differences between the principals’ perception of their instructional leadership behaviors in the more positive and less positive schools. Based upon lack of significant differences, null hypothesis 2 was not rejected. There were no significant differences found between the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with more positive climates and the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with less positive climate. It is of importance to note that this is based upon the principals’ perceptions.

The next series of tables describes the results of null hypothesis 3. The third hypothesis was “there is no linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate.” Stepwise Regression was used to determine relationships between principal instructional leadership behaviors and teacher perception of school climate.
Table 3

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship between Teacher Climate Perception - Defines Mission and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behavior - Supervises Teaching (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R Square = .19 for Step 1

**p< .01

A significant relationship was found between teacher climate subscale defining mission and the instructional leadership behavior of supervising teaching (Table 3). Having a principal who spent time promoting teaching skills, observing classes, and encouraging staff made it significantly more likely the teachers perceived the school as having a climate supportive of school goals, purposes, and mission.

A significant relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of Manages Curriculum and the instructional leadership behavior of supervising teaching (Table 4). Having a principal who spent time working on teaching skills with teachers, observing classes, and encouraging staff to try their best made it significantly more likely the school had a climate where the teachers perceived the principals as productive curriculum managers.
Table 4

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Manages Curriculum and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviors - Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors Student Progress</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R-Square = .12 for Step 1; R-Square change = .08 for Step 2

*p<.05, **p<.01

A significant relationship was found between the teachers climate subscale Manages Curriculum and two instructional leadership behaviors; Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (Table 4). In order to be strong in the area of Managing Curriculum, a principal must promote and supervise the teaching occurring in the classroom. A negative relationship was found between a principal who stresses to teachers the importance of achieving top test scores and a principal perceived as being a positive manager of school curriculum.

A significant relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of Supervises Teaching and the instructional
Table 5

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Supervises Teaching and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviors - Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors Student Progress</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** R-Square = .16 for Step 1;
R-Square change = .11 for Step 2
*p<.05, **p<.01

leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching (Table 5). In schools where there is a strong teacher perception of principal's supervision of teaching, principals are more likely to rate themselves positively in the area of supervising teaching.

In Step 2, a significant relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of Supervises Teaching and the principal instructional leadership behaviors of Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (Table 5). The relationship is positive with the area of Supervises Teaching and negative in the area of Monitors Student Progress.

A significant positive relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of Monitors Student Progress and
Table 6

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Monitors Student Progress and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behavior - Supervises Teaching (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R-Square = .16 for Step 1;

**p<.01

the instructional leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching (Table 6). Schools with leaders who describe themselves as spending time working on teaching skills with teachers are more likely to have a positive perception from their teachers as to how they monitor student progress.

Step 1 found a significant relationship between teacher climate subscale of Promotes Instructional Climate and the principal instructional leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching (Table 7). Principals who describe themselves as coaching and counseling their teachers in a supportive manner are more likely to have teachers perceive them as promoting instructional climate.

In Step 2, a significant relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of climate and the principal instructional leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (Table 7). Supervises Teaching had
Table 7

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Promotes Instructional Climate and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviors - Supervises Teaching and Monitors Student Progress (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors Student Progress</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R-Square = .16 for Step 1; R-Square change = .10 for Step 2

*p<.05, **p<.01

A significant positive relationship, while Monitors Student Progress had a significant negative relationship. Principals who perceived themselves as someone who supervises teachers and who do not stress to their teachers the importance of achieving top test scores are more likely to have a faculty that feels they are innovative and praised for their good work.

A significant relationship was found between the teacher climate subscale of Accomplishment and the principal instructional leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching (Table 8). Principals who describe themselves as someone who
Table 8
Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Accomplishment and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behavior - Supervises Teaching (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R-Square = .10 for Step 1; *p<.05

spends time working on teaching skills with teachers is more likely to have teachers that perceive the school as supportive of teachers who are creative and try new ideas.

In Step 1, there was a significant positive relationship between the teacher climate subscale of Recognition and principal instructional leadership behavior of Supervises Teaching (Table 9). Principals who describe themselves as observing classes and encouraging staff to try their best are more likely to have teachers that perceive the school climate as valuing and rewarding good efforts.

In Step 2 there was a relationship between the teacher climate subscale of Recognition and the principal instructional leadership behaviors of Manages Curriculum and Supervises Teaching (Table 9). The relationship between teacher perception of recognition and the principal’s perception of their management of curriculum was negative. This indicates that principals who perceive themselves as
making sure the lesson plans fit with stated instructional objectives and ensuring a good fit between curriculum objectives and achievement testing have teachers who don’t perceive the climate as one that values and rewards efforts. The relationship between teacher perception of recognition and the principal’s perception of their supervision of teaching was positive. This indicates that principals who perceive themselves as leaders who observe classes and model effective teaching techniques for staff are more likely to have teachers that feel valued and reinforced for their efforts.

There was a significant relationship between teacher

Table 9

Results of Testing Ho3: Results of Regression Analysis Predicting the Relationship Between Teacher Climate Perception - Recognition and Elementary Principal Instructional Leadership Behaviors - Supervises Teaching and Manages Curriculum (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervises Teaching</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages Curriculum</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R-Square = .10 for Step 1; R-Square change = .08 for Step 2
*p<.05, **p<.01
perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behaviors. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 is rejected. There is a linear composite of elementary principal instructional leadership behavior which explains a significant amount of the variance for teacher perception of school climate. Supervision of Teaching, Monitoring Student Progress, and Management of Curriculum all had significant relationships with the dependent variables (Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, Promotes Instructional Climate, Accomplishment, and Recognition) used during the regression analysis.

Analysis of On-Site Structured Interviews

On-site interviews were conducted in order to gather data for the interview question, “Are there differences, based upon on-site, structured interviews of principals and teachers, in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates (1) conduct school operations, and (2) implement change?” Using the data compiled from the Instructional Climate Inventory, the upper third of the responding schools were considered schools with a more positive climate and the lower third considered less positive. The more positive third and the less positive third were considered two “outlier” groups (Table 10). Eight schools were selected, based on teacher perception of climate, for on-site interviews. These sites included four
### Table 10

**Descriptive Data of Teacher Perception of School Climate from Responding Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.36*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.35*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.33*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.25*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1/3 (upper 1/3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1/3 (middle 1/3)**

(table continues)
schools from the more positive outlier groups and four schools from the less positive outlier group. Within each group, other factors such as location, type of school (urban, suburban, small town, rural), and school size were given consideration in the selection of schools to be visited in order to provide a balanced representation.

Principals at each of the schools were then contacted for an interview and to set up an interview with a group of three to five teachers. The interviewer selected an hour of the day to conduct the teacher interview and visited with the teachers who were available during this conference period.

This method made feasible the use of the interview methodology in this study. Another hour long interview occurred with the building principal. Both the principal and group of teachers were asked the same interview questions.
(Appendix B) and all interviews were recorded. To prevent participant identification, all principals were referred to in this section with masculine pronouns.

**More Positive School #1**

The school M1 was one of the schools with a "more positive" climate. The school was located in a small town of approximately 9,000. The principal had been principal of the school for the past two years and the school population was approximately 300 students.

The principal and the teacher's group at M1 responded very similarly to the questions. Both indicated that the climate was positive, cooperative, and focused on the needs of the children. Both also indicated that the principal was responsible for the climate and set the tone for the building. Change was described by the principal and the teachers as that of teacher empowerment. The teachers felt involved in major decisions, but still had a great desire for him to make some changes on his own. Most of the major changes were addressed at faculty meetings in which the principal types up a narrative about the issue prior to the meeting and distributes it to the staff. The issue is then discussed at the staff meeting with everyone having the same prior information. Both groups preferred this approach and felt satisfied with the process. Instructional change occurred through district committees and informal networking after staff members attended conferences. Many times faculty made presentations at staff meetings concerning curriculum innovations or ideas.

The school had a yearly theme or goal, usually focusing
on issues that were included in the School Improvement Plan, as a part of Indiana’s Performance Based Accreditation which was completed in 1992. Building-wide staff development had been minimal the past few years because the corporation had cut the funds for staff development completely. The teachers worked on individual professional goals based upon their needs, strengths, and desire for new knowledge.

The principal and teachers agreed that he was very visible and spent time in classrooms. His tone (both verbally and nonverbally) was always a positive one. Both groups saw him as a role model for the children and faculty. They felt it important that he be in the lunchroom chatting with both students and teachers. Both groups indicated that he does not accept inappropriate student behavior and handles children sternly, yet with dignity. There had been “only one incident of a student throwing a punch” the entire year. The principal indicated that “much time is spent maintaining a safe building.”

Communication was handled both formally and informally. The principal’s door was “always open” for personal and professional advice and a listening ear. A weekly memo was provided for the staff outlining upcoming events, praising teachers efforts, and supplying motivational thoughts. The principal also made sure that he was a part of the morning announcements, both for the teachers and the children. Staff meetings were also recognized by the teachers and principal as a tool used for communication in the building.

More Positive School #2

The school M2 was second of the “more positive” climates
selected for interviews. It was a suburban school with approximately 375 students located in a town of about 1,000 which was a suburb of a city with approximately 45,000. The town was approximately four miles from the larger city. The principal had been there seven years.

The teachers and principal echoed the same feelings about the school’s climate. They felt it to be cohesive, purposeful, and enthusiastic. Both the teachers and the principal addressed that students needs were “first and foremost at their school.” The principal saw himself as “the person who must lead this effort toward a purposeful climate.” The teachers felt that the principal was “the center of the climate and that his actions radiated out to everyone else.”

The teachers were very aware of the external climate, what the environment looked like. They could also describe an internal climate which was the reflected attitude within the staff, between staff and students, and between the staff and parents. This school had enhanced their climate through participating in the CLASS (Connecting Learning Assures Student Success) Program sponsored by the Indiana Department of Education. The principal shared that this staff “had always believed in a visually interesting and comfortable building, but that CLASS had helped them bring meaning to this belief.” They had focused much effort on the external look of the building and strived for a “homey” feeling. Children’s hand prints on the walls as borders, rocking chairs, soft music, lamps, plants, rugs, and pillows were just a few of the elements that had been added to the well-
maintained environment to make the school warm and inviting. The staff had also worked to redesign the lounge. They added comfortable seating, bright and motivational artwork, and a professional library. They spoke of people being "drawn to it and everyone making a conscious effort to speak positive things and focus on solving problems there." The teachers and principal felt that if corporate offices could be comfortable and inviting, that schools should create similar environments. They expressed that children and teachers must be able to spend their days in a place where they felt at home. One teacher stated, "If I'm not comfortable in my classroom, then I bet my kids aren't either."

The internal climate was approached in an open and participatory manner. The principal felt that communication was a strength in the building. Much informal communicating happened between the staff and principal in the hallways, lunchroom, lounge, and in the classrooms. The principal supplied the staff with a "Morning Memo" that promoted people's accomplishments, shared teaching tips and staff development ideas, supplied humor and motivation, and outlined daily events taking place in the building. The teachers and the principal both felt that the principal's door was always open and he was willing to listen to problems and work through solutions with the staff.

Staff development happened both on a school-wide basis and an individual basis. School-wide staff development happened after the school had investigated an area of interest and felt that pursuing more of it would be beneficial to the school's purpose. The principal discussed
that he was “conscious of what worked best for individual teachers.” He wanted to “encourage and help them grow professionally on an individual basis.” The principal felt that he must be “aware and supportive of each teacher’s individual teaching style and beliefs about how their children learned best.” The teachers acknowledged this attribute also and appreciated his “acceptance of their personal approaches to teaching.”

A description of a principal’s typical day by both the principal and teachers found him at school early and being very accessible to teachers during this time. He purposefully greeted students as they entered the building in the morning. All agreed that he was very visible in classrooms and hallways throughout the day, and during lunchtime. He made it a point to be in every classroom every day. The teachers believed that he spent a lot of time listening during the day to teacher and student personal problems. The teachers felt that he was aware of their personal lives and concerned about their well-being beyond school. The principal felt that “one of the most important parts of my job is that of modelling life skills for the teachers and students.” The teachers stated that he was a “good role model for the faculty.”

More Positive School #3

M3 was the third of the “more positive” schools. It had 688 students and was located in a suburban area of a city of 750,000. The principal had been there two years and seven years at another elementary school in the same corporation prior to this placement.
This principal was working to turn around a school that had been very negative for many years. When asked about climate, he said that before he came "the climate was very negative and teachers felt isolated. There was no direction for the teachers and the faculty was very disjointed. No faculty cohesiveness or collaboration existed and teachers felt very much on their own." He said he "has worked not to be a dictator and to stress collaboration." He has tried to "support teachers and treat them as professionals." He stated that "empowering them to make decisions has made many feel free to take risks in their instructional delivery." He likes seeing children for good work and feels there is a steady stream of students coming to his office for good things. He discussed how important it is for him to "model" for his faculty and "walk the talk." Discipline referrals are low, but this stems from him being very direct with the faculty about where discipline must really occur. He has made it a point to let teachers know that discipline is handled in the classroom and they must carry the weight of this. He said that when he first arrived "they were sending all discipline to me. Now, I have enforced a referral form and see only the most important referrals."

The teachers expressed feeling much better about the building climate and acknowledged that they felt "more confident, supported, and professional." They were "being allowed to make more decisions and feel more informed about happenings in the building."

The principal acknowledged that he was "responsible for the climate of the building" and that climate must become a
"philosophy of leadership." The principal stated that "setting the climate is my job, it must be deliberate." He felt that he must be a "model for both teachers and children." It was at this point he spent a great deal of time discussing his assistant principal. He described him as a "very positive person and very much loved by the faculty." He said that "he spreads sunshine wherever he goes."

His communication is both verbal and in a written form with faculty. He has an "open door" for his teachers and encourages them to share problems with him. "Being accessible to teachers" was mentioned as very important to his philosophy. He stated he "tries to be an active listener and treat professionals with intelligence. I like giving their ideas worth." He and his assistant put out the daily memo to faculty. It is an attractive, motivational, and informative communication that the teachers appreciate. He has faculty meetings only when needed. He had an agreement with faculty that "I won't bother them with needless faculty meetings, if they read my memos."

When the principal discussed change he said that he was "working now to establish trust." He feels that the staff knows "my heart is in the right place, even when I make big time mistakes." He felt that it was important "to enable people to change and not force teachers to do something they don't want to do." He tries "to build consensus and find a mutual understanding point for all parties involved." The teachers also mentioned the attempts at consensus building and site based management in the discussion of change.

The teachers described the principal as "organized, good
at delegating, and very communicative with the students in the school." They expressed feeling "raped of professionalism by past principals." The current principal helps them feel "backed, encouraged, and like professionals again." He had decreased classroom interruptions, kept the staff informed, and has become "more like a friend than a boss." They felt comfortable with him and noted that he "decorated his office just like the teachers do." They felt this led to such a comfortable feeling in his office, both for the children and the staff. They appreciated his focus on celebrating accomplishments and being visible throughout the day. They closed by saying "It is nice to have a principal with the same beliefs as we do. He handles things with great diplomacy."

More Positive School #4

School M4 was the fourth and final of the "more positive" climates. It was a rural elementary school in a town of approximately 1700. This was the principal's first year as an administrator, but he had been a teacher in the building for the past seven years. The teachers appreciated the knowledge of the building that the principal had and placed a lot of trust in directions and decisions made for the future based upon this prior knowledge.

The teachers and the principal both described the climate as cooperative, positive, and one of shared responsibility. The teachers greatly appreciated being given responsibility and authority in decision-making. The former principal was somewhat autocratic and the teachers were thriving in this new environment which gave them a structure
in which to participate in decisions. Both groups readily saw the principal as responsible for this climate. The principal felt it was "up to me to always be positive and see the bright side of things." The teachers expressed that the principal "must take the lead role in establishing climate" and were quick to identify items that the new principal had used to develop this positive atmosphere. They felt he was always "open to ideas and invited everyone's input." They had a role in the hiring of new faculty members and making curricular changes.

The teachers were very complimentary of his weekly bulletin, The Friday Focus. This weekly memo contained uplifting, positive observations about the school, staff development updates, teaching tips, praise and compliments for accomplishments, and upcoming events. They looked forward to this each week and found that "staff meetings were not bogged down in minutia because this publication kept them on top of things weekly." The principal found that writing this each week helped motivate him and keep him focused on the happenings in the school. He also mentioned that staff meetings were used for problem solving and staff development now because so many day to day agenda items were covered in the Friday Focus.

The principal made sure that he was a part of both the morning and afternoon announcements. The teachers appreciated this unity of school at these times and shared that they had added an all school reading time after the announcements each morning. The principal enjoyed this task a great deal and found that his participation in the opening
in which to participate in decisions. Both groups readily saw the principal as responsible for this climate. The principal felt it was "up to me to always be positive and see the bright side of things." The teachers expressed that the principal "must take the lead role in establishing climate" and were quick to identify items that the new principal had used to develop this positive atmosphere. They felt he was always "open to ideas and invited everyone's input." They had a role in the hiring of new faculty members and making curricular changes.

The teachers were very complimentary of his weekly bulletin, The Friday Focus. This weekly memo contained uplifting, positive observations about the school, staff development updates, teaching tips, praise and compliments for accomplishments, and upcoming events. They looked forward to this each week and found that "staff meetings were not bogged down in minutia because this publication kept them on top of things weekly." The principal found that writing this each week helped motivate him and keep him focused on the happenings in the school. He also mentioned that staff meetings were used for problem solving and staff development now because so many day to day agenda items were covered in the Friday Focus.

The principal made sure that he was a part of both the morning and afternoon announcements. The teachers appreciated this unity of school at these times and shared that they had added an all school reading time after the announcements each morning. The principal enjoyed this task a great deal and found that his participation in the opening
of the school day "pulled everyone together" and he even made sure that the office staff read during the silent reading time.

The teachers appreciated the fact that the principal was "very visible in the hallways and at lunch, but especially in the classrooms." It was enjoyable to them that he became a part of the lessons and conversed with them later on an informal basis about what was happening in the rooms. The principal felt it "important to be in classrooms and involved in the learning process." He wanted "to be able to teach more in front of the students and teachers to help show that I am an instructional leader." The principal also stated that "my presence reminds the students of what the school stands for and what my expectations are."

Teachers were praised by this principal in specific terms through notes and face to face exchanges. The teachers were very impressed by his efforts in this area and the principal saw it as necessary and important in "creating a staff that felt appreciated." He also stressed the importance of "knowing the personal side of the teachers." He made it a point to ask them about their day and be aware of their lives beyond school. He stated that, "I want them to know that I care about them."

The principal felt one of the most important elements of his job was "being a model for both the teachers and the students." When asked what he did to influence climate, the first thing the principal mentioned was that of "modelling expectations for students and teachers." "The high standards I have for my staff and teachers should be reflected daily in
my actions and words.” The teachers also mentioned his “ability to model and that he has shown them he is human, too.” They also value how he handles “not knowing all the answers.”

Change occurred mostly through implementing the PBA goals designed last year. The principal did mention the “importance of knowing individual staff strengths and interests and guiding appropriate staff development activities toward the teachers who might be interested.” The teachers also mentioned this and appreciated the knowledge the principal had about them as “individual educators.”

Both groups discussed the importance of his “ability to communicate with the community, parents, and central office administrators.” The teachers felt he was an excellent facilitator between the school and the central office administration and also very creative with funds and resources for the school.

Less Positive School #1

L1 was the first of the four “less positive” schools. It was located in a community of about 700 and would be considered a rural school. The principal indicated that the “climate varied throughout the year.” He believed that “three or four of his teachers had a power base in the building and that they dictated the climate of the school.” He indicated that these people were “outspoken, set in their ways, and could create dissension among faculty members.” He went to “these more vocal people for input on decisions.” The teachers indicated this same pattern and were concerned about “just a few voices being heard and acted upon in the
building.” They said these people were “vocal and negative veteran teachers in the building.” This small group “were the people that the principal talked to and made school mandates based upon their opinions.” When asked who they thought was responsible for the school’s climate they said, “I would think the principal should be.” They felt that this climate of giving power to a few had “affected teacher attitude and that this carries the poor quality of climate into the classrooms.” They felt that the principal should be “firm in staff meetings and not let one group override everything else.” They wanted to see “more consistency” and wished that “expectations were the same for all.”

Due to the power that the principal gave these veteran teachers, they dictated changes in the school. The teachers shared that interest surveys were taken, but they were never acted upon. They said that their input was asked for, but nothing was ever done with the information. They also commented that the structure of the building did not lend itself to open communication. The principal alluded that “change is difficult in this building” and that he uses “the powerful and more vocal teachers to facilitate change.”

All staff development and inservice were dictated by the building administration. The principal stated that “I come up with the ideas, give them to the teachers, and encourage them to investigate.” Both the teachers and the principal stated that teachers shared the contents of workshops they attended at faculty meetings. The teachers said they were “encouraged by the principal to share, but then the idea is dropped by the wayside.” The principal also indicated that
many of his faculty meetings turn into "knock down drag out fights" over issues. He said he had a tendency to "raise his voice with them when they started to raise theirs at him." He shared that his last meeting was one of these "gripe" sessions because he told them that all staff development in the coming year would be based upon weak areas in testing. He told them to "not come to me requesting to go to a workshop on an area that wasn't weak. Their request would be denied because the school was not deficit in this area."

Communication was handled in an open door fashion as expressed by both the teachers and principal. The principal did produce a Monday Memo outlining upcoming events, addressing problems, and periodically contained an uplifting thought. The teachers shared that they were concerned about the problems that were often written up in the Monday Memo. They shared that "these problems aren't everyone's and that often it is just one teacher and the principal will not deal with that person one on one. Unfortunately, everyone has to hear about this negative situation and this affects morale."

The teachers indicated that the principal "spent most of his day in his office and was rarely seen in other parts of the school." The principal also shared that this was true and he regretted this. He said "the amount of paperwork that I have to produce keeps me in front of the computer far more than I want to be." He shared that some teachers "freeze up" when he walks into their classroom, feeling as though "he is there to judge." The teachers shared that he was in classrooms at the beginning of the year, but not since then. They also said he was in and out of the lunchroom at the
beginning of the year, but this also dropped off after school started.

There were some visually interesting displays and decoration in the hallways. When asked about how this occurred, the principal stated that "it was caring teachers that took the time to make this happen." He shared that he "hates bulletin boards and the teachers just took over hallway displays." The teachers shared that the "secretary and staff are active players in making the school interesting and visually attractive." During my wait for the teacher and principal, I had the opportunity to observe the secretary with parents and teachers. She was a very pleasant, competent, and caring individual. Her tone helped maintain a positive feeling in the office.

Less Positive School #2

L2 was the second of the "less positive" schools. It was located in the heart of a town of about 45,000. The principal was in his second year at this school of about 250 students and thirteen teachers. The teachers and principal described this school as very urban and one that has been given little attention from central administration in some years. They felt the building was neglected and mentioned many rumors about turning it into an alternative high school. It was located directly across the street from the city high school. The building was very outdated and no children's work or color were displayed anywhere. The walls and floors were very pale and the office area was small and cluttered.

The principal described the climate as "open with easy communication between staff members and the community." He
felt he was "to some extent responsible for the direction of the climate based upon understanding staff skills and strengths." He wanted to get teachers involved in committee work that takes a lot of his time. He stated "I just don't have enough time to do everything." He wanted the "day to day, mundane things" to be done by the teachers. He was hopeful this would "create staff ownership in the building and allow openness in decision-making."

The teachers felt the climate was similar to "a family atmosphere and that the teachers get along very well." They expressed that the principal was "personable, friendly, down to earth, and helped them promote back to basics." The teachers were very confident that they were responsible for the climate of the school. They shared that the family atmosphere was brought from their own homes. They expected behaviors from the students in school as they would expect from their own children at home. "We are all like parents to these children. Everybody disciplines everybody." They stated they "didn't have much to show off about, particularly", but were strong in their belief that they offered "solid basics." They felt their school was a "nice school with a tough bunch of kids to reach." They mentioned often that the faculty was "strong" and had "professional respect for each other." They discussed that if they needed a break, they would "show a movie" and how they got together and talked about how "bad their day was and how much they wanted school to be out."

The principal discussed change as something he operated as the "middle man." He discussed that the small faculty
allowed for easy grade level communication and that everyone checks with him to make changes.

The teachers were quick to respond that they usually work out change among themselves. They said the principal had learned not to mandate or dictate change to them. "If he doesn’t get us to work on it from the bottom up, we won’t do it." They felt they were a pretty easy group to work with as long they were included. "We know what needs to be done and we do it. He is learning to appreciate this."

Communication was handled in a verbal fashion and memos were provided to staff as needed. The principal had decided to have staff meetings only when necessary, but the teachers have requested to begin these monthly meetings again. They discussed the need to "get together regularly to plan, get dates and times of upcoming events, and have closure on school events."

Discipline was an important issue to both the teachers and principal. He was hired to give the school a uniform discipline plan and restore order. The teachers and principal both felt he had been effective in this regard. The principal stated that much of his day was spent with discipline and repeat offenders. The teachers appreciated this, but noted that they don’t see him or know what he does after they enter the classrooms in the morning. They felt he had been "effective with discipline and prudent with chronic discipline problems." They also viewed him as a "liaison with the corporation central office."

In his closing comments, the principal described the school as "a nice little place, where kids feel pretty safe
and secure and know they are going to get a decent education.” He felt they were “a very typical school doing the best we can under the money and time constraints of education today.”

Less Positive School #3

The school L3 was the third of the “less positive” climates. This school was in an urban setting located in a city of approximately 750,000 people. The principal had been there seven years and this was his only administrative position. This building had a seventy-nine percent poverty rate and was located in an area that had active gangs and street violence.

The seven years this principal had spent here were devoted to changing a very traditional and negative educational climate into one that used site based management and approached education in a positive fashion. The principal began with the faculty by asking them, “If you could have anything you wanted for this school and its children, what would it be?” The staff felt that since these children came from such negative environments, they wanted the school to be a place that was a positive environment for the children to learn. They wanted a family atmosphere and to motivate the children from a positive perspective not a negative, punitive one.

The principal first focused on “changing teaching methods and working collaboratively together.” He felt that “a positive, cohesive approach to instruction and building purpose was important.” Grants supported the staff development for these areas. A large focus was also placed
upon discipline and eliminating corporal punishment. The staff began to reward acceptable behavior and began to create an environment where doing the right thing was the norm not the exception. The staff learned about the neighborhood gangs and studied why children felt the need to belong to one. They discovered that this belonging and feeling a part of something was a major reason children gravitated toward gangs. They began to institute a school motto and hand gestures that went with the motto, because these were examples of elements that attracted students to those types of organizations. The principal went on to discuss numerous staff development efforts and building projects.

The teachers felt that the climate reflected a "family atmosphere" and that the teachers "were very helpful to each other." They expressed concern that the amount of teams created for site based management made the climate "segmented." When asked who or what was responsible for the climate of the building, they stated that "a climate committee" handled this.

The principal also substituted in classrooms frequently since the school corporation failed to provide substitutes quite often. The building had no resource teachers or guidance counselor. The principal spent a lot of time talking to students about problems dealing with home and school. He saw it as important to be in the lunchroom, even though other staff members were on duty.

The teachers felt the principal was a "great leader," but they shared that he "was not able to complete the goals in the building he wanted to." They had concerns about the
committee approach to handling decision-making in the building. They stated that in the past professional development had been designed based upon what was comfortable to the individual teacher. There are now committees or task forces making these decisions for everyone and they feel staff development is suffering. The principal discussed these task forces and stated that "if a teacher comes to me with a concern, I determine which task force should be assigned the issue. The task force must meet about the problem and anyone is invited to come. Once a task force determines a possible answer or solution for the issue, it is brought to the staff for consensus." Although the description of this process sounded like everyone is or can be involved, the staff did not feel that the task forces were really informed enough to be making suggestions for the entire faculty. The principal did indicate in the interview that "teachers are still adjusting to this approach even after several years of implementation."

The staff also expressed concern about "so many projects going on in the building." It fragmented that staff, because there was not a common goal for everyone. They commented that "change isn't good for the sake of change."

It must also be noted that L3's school district was undergoing central office structural and leadership changes that were negatively affecting the school. The principal was retiring at the end of the school year, due to the rigors of the job. He felt that managerial issues were prohibiting him from being an instructional leader and he needed to get back to kids. The teachers indicated the same concern about rules
and regulations being enforced by a new superintendent and were somewhat sympathetic to the added burdens upon the principal. I noted at the end of my interview with them that I felt their answers were stilted and tempered at times. At times, I felt that I was not getting the whole story and they were afraid to open up with me. Much negativity surfaced in the teachers' attitude toward administration in general.

Less Positive School #4

L4 was the fourth of the "less positive" schools. This school was located in a small town of about 3500. There were approximately 510 students in the school and the principal had been there six years.

When asked to describe the climate of the building, the principal felt that overall "the group is willing to work together and that staff cohesiveness has been built up over the years." He also discussed varying levels of climate in the building. He felt there was "a surface climate" that "looked positive and this was projected to others by the teachers." There was also "a negative subclimate" that consisted "of pockets of people and individuals who tended bring things down quite a bit." He shared that it was "hard to motivate the staff to new ideas because they were satisfied with their traditional ways of doing things."

The teachers felt the climate was "very positive and caring for the children." They made a point to let the interviewer know that they were "a very close, veteran staff" and had "built a caring, family type atmosphere in the school."

The principal and teachers felt that "everyone was
responsible for the climate of the building." The principal shared that it had not been a good year for him personally and he told the teachers at the beginning of the year that he would "not be putting as much effort into this as I had in the past." He told them that somebody would have to "pick up the slack." The teachers shared that if the leadership in the building is "up and happy, it trickles down to the staff." "If he is not happy, it negatively affects the teachers and, in turn, the children." They went on to share concerns about the leader's "ability to successfully deal with people and build positive relationships." They were specifically concerned about his "inability to work with and nurture women."

The principal made numerous changes after he was hired. His first summer he changed many schedules and policies in the school because "no one was around to help me." These changes were not accepted well and he backed off. "For six to eight months nothing really got done and people got frustrated." He then told them, "If you want to do things, then you have to be the ones to make the decisions. I will be a part of the decision and help as best I can. I am not going to sit back in my chair and make decisions for you."

The teachers also shared that "six years ago he took care of everything." They now discussed changing recess because the secretary asked them to help with the schedule the principal had asked her to do. They like the new recess schedule and have made it work. They feel the principal has "just turned over a great deal to the secretary and the teachers because of lack of time and interest." The teachers also mentioned
that "several committees work throughout the year on change"
and that the building "has a staff release day every
Wednesday for meetings." They were concerned that "these
staff meetings were being used for logistical items and not
staff development and goal setting."

Communication was mostly handled by E-Mail. The
principal was visible in the mornings, but after this the
teachers say he is "in his office on the phone and computer
most of the time." The daily E-Mail is "very factual and any
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motivational thoughts or uplifting comments come from the
teachers." They stated that "the motivation in this building
has to come from within."

The principal shared that he tried to be in classrooms,
but just takes a "quick glance" in most of the time. "I
don't need to sit down and observe and have a teacher nervous
about what is going on or be bored to death while I am in
there." "I can tell more by who they send to the office and
who they set out in the hallway and is that same kid sitting
away from the whole group all day long." He discussed
spending a lot of time with the computer system. There are
lunchroom monitors that supervise the cafeteria. "I just
walk through periodically and monitor. I let the lunchroom
monitors deal with problems. If I see something, I just tell
the monitor."

The principal shared that there is no formal process for
goal setting in the building. He stated, "I have my own
goals and share those goals with others." The teachers felt
that goals were "top down" and that they were "responsible
for forming committees to implement goals that we had no part
In closing, the principal took time to explain that he feels "no leadership and guidance from my superiors." He has been "personally disappointed by the fact that many of my changes have been thwarted by constraints placed upon me." He described his job as having "a wide range of responsibilities, with very little control." The teachers shared a need for working on the "esprit de corps" in the building. They wanted to see the principal "work on dealing with people more positively and getting people to work together more." They felt that "communication and positive conflict/resolution needed to be addressed." They also saw a need for the principal to have an "understanding of personality types and how to successfully deal with different types of people."

**Summary of On-Site Interviews**

On-site interviews were conducted in order to gather data for the interview question, "Are there differences based upon on-site, structured interviews of principals and teachers, in the manner in which principals of schools with more positive climates and principals of schools with less positive climates (1) conduct school operations, and (2) implement change?" After compiling the data from the Instructional Climate Inventory, eight schools were selected to conduct on-site interview. The following discussion focuses on the summary of the findings of the study's interview stage.

1. Principals of more positive schools saw themselves
as responsible for the climate of the building. Principals of the less positive schools often focused on the entire staff as being responsible for the school climate. Each of the more positive school’s principals clearly stated that they were responsible for school climate. They viewed themselves as the person who sets the building’s tone and develops this into a philosophy of leadership. They found it necessary to be positive and able to see the bright side of things. They were aware of their access to the "bigger picture" of the entire school and how their attitude effects this "picture."

The teachers in the more positive schools saw the principal as having the lead role in establishing climate. They felt he set the tone and coordinates how everything comes together. They saw him as pulling everything together with enthusiasm. They discussed the fact that the principal can make work a pleasant place to be, always making the students the focus of the building. The principal was mentioned as the center of the climate and that what he did radiated out to everyone else.

The less positive principals were generally more inclined to state that everyone was responsible for the building’s climate. One of the principals wanted to be more in charge of climate, but admitted he had lost control to a power base of three or four teachers. He said that they basically dictated the climate of the school. None of the teachers in the less positive schools saw the principal as responsible for climate. One group of teachers wished that the principal would be and discussed how this lack of
direction negatively effected the teachers and in turn the students. One less positive school felt that their climate committee was in charge of climate, while the last two schools clearly felt that the teachers were responsible for maintaining the building climate.

2. Principals and teachers in the more positive schools saw the principal being visible during the day as an important aspect of their building climate. The less positive schools found the principal in his office doing paperwork and in front of the computer a large portion of the day. This was a perception of both the principals and the teachers in the less positive schools.

Each of the four principals of more positive schools saw visibility as a priority in their day. Two of the principals shared the importance of making their presence known to the children and the teachers. They felt this was a constant reminder of what the school stood for and the principal's expectations. Three of the four more positive school's teachers and principals felt that being at lunch with the teachers and children was an important aspect of their daily routine. These principals felt that this visibility gave them a chance to interact casually and cheerfully with the entire school population. They were clear in believing that this role was not just one of controlling children in the lunchroom, but talking to them about their day and doing the same with the teachers. The teachers in the more positive schools all felt that their principals were visible throughout the day. One teacher talked about how the principal was very visible on an informal basis with the
teachers and that he didn't find reasons to leave or avoid these conversations like previous principals had. Each of the four more positive groups of teachers mentioned a morning activity that the principal did every day. Two of the principals always greeted the students in the morning, while the other two participated in the morning announcements in some fashion. The teachers mentioned that this regular practice promoted unity of school each day. All four groups of teachers discussed the amount of time that the principal was in the classroom. They perceived their principals in almost every classroom each day. They appreciated the focus on what was happening in their classrooms and felt the conversations were more meaningful with the principal because of this regular observations of classroom activities. All of the principals mentioned the importance of being in the classrooms on a regular basis and how much knowledge this provided them when not only talking with the teacher, but also students and parents.

Two of the principals of less positive schools did not mention visibility as a priority and the other two wished they could be more visible, but said that district commitments, discipline, and computer work kept them out of the classrooms. One of these principals stated that the teachers "freeze up when I walk in their classrooms, feeling I am coming to judge." The majority of teachers said that their principals were visible in the mornings and sometimes during lunch, but they were not aware of what the principal did once school started. They assumed that the principals were working on their computers, taking care of discipline,
3. The principals of the more positive schools felt that being personally concerned and knowledgeable about the teachers' lives outside of school was an important part of their job in cultivating climate. They mentioned social events, understanding their teachers' lives beyond school, and asking them about their weekend or evening events. One principal stated, "I want them to know that I care about them." One teacher mentioned how nice it was to have a principal who remembered about important events in her life and made it a point to ask how things went after the fact. These teachers felt that "awareness" of the personal lives of staff added to a comfortable climate for staff.

This attribute was not mentioned by any of the principals in the less positive schools. One of these principals had asked the faculty to understand about changes in his personal life this past year. This principal's teachers mentioned in their interview that he needed to learn how to "nurture and understand his faculty members better." It is interesting that he would expect the understanding from his staff, but not be aware of their need for the same support. This principal's teachers felt he needed to be more nurturing and understanding of people.

4. The principals of the more positive schools supplied the staff with a daily or weekly memo. This memo was motivational as well as informational. In this correspondence, the principals mentioned that they thanked teachers for efforts, praised accomplishments, shared teaching strategies, encouraged staff development, outlined
weekly events, used humor, and made an effort for it to always be positive and uplifting. The principals felt it was a regular avenue they had to keep the goal and purpose of the school "front and center" for the teachers. Another mentioned the fact that he also gave this correspondence to cooks, custodians, and secretaries. It helped keep them informed about the school and feeling much more a part of the workings of the building. The teachers appreciated this correspondence and one group of teachers said they "loved it." The teachers felt it helped everyone stay organized and focused. They looked forward to it and felt it was another tool to unify the staff. One staff mentioned how it has helped staff meetings not get bogged down in minutia.

One of the less positive principals used this type of correspondence, but it was only informational and sometimes contained problems and negative situations. This school's teachers were critical of the format and believed that it could be written in a more productive fashion. The rest of the less positive principals only sent out memos on a needed basis and they were always calendars or logistics. One of these principals did this via E-Mail. When asked what these memos contained, the teachers stated they were only lists of events or dates. They said that anything motivational or positive on E-Mail came from the teachers to each other.

5. The more positive school's principals used staff meetings for purposeful discussions and consensus building exercises. The more positive schools tended to view staff meetings as a time to share, solve problems, and celebrate accomplishments. These principals tried very hard to make
staff meetings worthwhile, educational, and enjoyable for the teachers.

The less positive schools either did not have faculty meetings or they were used basically for sharing logistics and dates. One of the less positive principals shared that his staff meetings were often "knock down, drag out fights" and sessions in which everyone aired their complaints. Another of the less positive school's group of teachers requested that the principal begin having staff meetings again. They felt that the gathering together regularly and hearing the same information helps them plan better and achieve closure on certain activities. They felt they needed the regular time with their principal.

6. The more positive school principals were very aware of teacher's individual strengths and designed individual staff development for them. These principals were aware of different teaching styles and respected teachers for their variety of approaches. They encouraged individual professional growth and helped the teachers design plans to achieve personal professional goals. They used these teacher's strengths in leadership positions and sought out their opinions when their expertise could enhance decisions the principal might be making for the school. One principal was direct in pointing out that he believed there was not "just one way of doing things and that a successful whole requires lots of pieces that might be different. These differences are taking the best of all worlds to meet the needs of students, and they fit together beautifully, just like a pie."
Three of the less positive principals did not express awareness of these issues and spoke of teachers grouped more into negative and positive teachers. One principal did mention the importance of knowing this information about teacher strengths. When asked how he would utilize this knowledge about his teachers, he stated that he used it to understand climate. He also felt this helped him know what day to day, mundane tasks he could have them help with, because he just did not have the time to do everything. Two of the less positive principals shared that they set goals for the building staff. The teachers had no input on building goals. They asked teachers to explore certain areas of staff development based upon the building needs that each principal saw. One of these principals shared that he will not allow any teachers to attend professional development workshops if he does not perceive it as a need for the entire school.

7. The more positive school's teachers and principals discussed the important role the principal had in modeling for both faculty and students. One principal discussed how important it was to "walk the talk." This same principal also discussed how modeling respect of children was important for the staff and community to see. One of the principals said he modeled his expectations for the teachers. Whatever he wanted the teachers to do, he made sure he modeled it. Another principal felt that modeling was one of the most important things he did in helping the building establish climate and culture.

None of the less positive principals mentioned
themselves as role models for the teachers or students. One of the less positive school’s teachers were concerned that the principal’s negative attitude filtered down to the teachers and eventually the students. His attitude began to infiltrate the school and this produced an unhealthy effect on the entire school population.

8. Each of the more positive schools were visually neat, attractive, and student oriented. These schools had purposefully worked on an external “homey” feeling in their physical plant. The principals and teachers both expressed that as people entered the building it was important for visitors to see that children played an important part in their schools. The schools had attractive bulletin boards, student work, rocking chairs, plants, lamps, motivational themes or slogans, awards displayed in their foyers and principals’ offices. The halls and offices were neat, clean, and orderly. All of the principals made an effort to make their offices reflect this philosophy also. They had plants, lamps, couches, artwork, and personal items in their offices. Two groups of teachers in the more positive schools commented about how much they appreciate the fact that the principal carries this focus on atmosphere into their offices. One teacher stated, “See, he decorates his office just like the teachers do.” Another mentioned how much they appreciate the principal displaying children’s work in his office. One teacher discussed how this philosophy was also a part of the teachers’ classrooms. She stated, “IBM corporate offices look and feel like this. Why shouldn’t schools be a place where kids want to be? If I’m not comfortable in my
classroom, then I bet my kids aren't either." She also discussed the importance of making the lounge an atmosphere like this. The staff had worked together to redesign their lounge by giving it "comfortable seating, cheery artwork, and a professional library." She said it was "now an encouraging environment where people talked and spent positive time."

Three of the four less positive schools appeared dirty, unmaintained, and stark of student work. The hallways were bare and in some cases unclean. One office had plants, but they were brown and wilted. In the one less positive school that had student work displayed, the credit for this was given to the teachers by the principal. He shared that some teachers do this and that he hated doing hallway bulletin boards, so the teachers took over this responsibility on their own so they would not always be bare.

**Summary of Findings**

This chapter provided a summary of the findings in this study. It was divided into two major sections. The first was a summary of the testing of the three hypotheses. The second major sections was a summary of the on-site visits.

**Summary of Hypotheses Testing**

Three hypotheses were tested and following is a summary of the results.

1. Null hypothesis one was rejected. Significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of school climate and principal instructional leadership behaviors. The results showed a significant positive relationship
between the principals’ perceptions of Supervising Teaching and the teachers’ perceptions of Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, Promotes Instructional Climate, Accomplishment, and Recognition. There was also a significant positive relationship between principals’ perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate and teachers’ perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate.

2. Null hypothesis two was not rejected. There were no significant differences found between the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with more positive climates and the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with less positive climate. The means of the schools with the more positive climates in the areas of Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching and Promotes Instructional Climate were higher than the schools with the more negative climates. The mean of the more negative schools in the area of Monitors Student Progress was higher than the mean of the more positive schools. The t value for each of these descriptors indicated no significant differences between the principals’ perception of their instructional leadership behaviors in the more positive and less positive schools.

3. Null hypothesis three was rejected. There was a significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behaviors. Supervision of teaching had a significant positive relationship with seven of the twelve dependent variables in the multiple regression. Monitors Student
Progress had a significant negative relationship with three of the dependent variables.

Summary of On-Site Interviews

On-site interviews were conducted at eight elementary schools in Indiana. Following were the key findings.

1. Principals of more positive schools tended to see themselves as responsible for the climate of the building. Principals of the less positive schools often focused on the entire staff as being responsible for the school climate.

2. Principals and teachers in the more positive schools saw the principal being visible during the day as an important aspect of their building climate. The less positive schools found the principal in his office doing paperwork and in front of the computer a large portion of the day. This was perceived by both the principals and the teachers.

3. The principals of the more positive schools felt that being personally concerned and knowledgeable about the teachers lives outside of school was an important part of their job in cultivating climate. This attribute was not focused on by any of the principals of the less positive schools.

4. The principals of the more positive schools supplied staff with a daily or weekly memo. This memo was motivational as well as informational. The more positive school’s teachers enjoyed and looked forward to this regular correspondence. One of the less positive principals used this tool also, but it was solely informational and sometimes
contained problems and negative situations. The less positive school’s teachers were critical of the format and believed that it could be written in a more productive fashion.

5. The more positive school principals used staff meetings for purposeful discussions and consensus building exercises. The less positive schools either did not have faculty meetings or they were used basically for sharing logistics and dates.

6. The more positive school principals were very aware of teacher’s individual strengths and designed individual staff development for them. These principals were aware of different teaching styles and respected teachers for their variety of approaches. The less positive principals did not express awareness of these issues and spoke of teachers grouped more into negative and positive teachers.

7. The more positive schools’ teachers and principals discussed the important role the principal had in modeling for both faculty and students. One principal discussed how important it was to “walk the talk.” The less positive schools’ teachers were concerned that the principal’s negative attitude filtered down to the teachers and eventually the students. This produced a negative effect on the entire school population.

8. Each of the more positive schools were visually neat, attractive, and student oriented. These schools had purposefully worked on an external “homey” feeling in their physical plant. Three of the four less positive schools appeared dirty, unmaintained, and stark of student work. The
hallways were bare and in some cases unclean.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study

The two purposes of this study were to: (1) analyze the relationships between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behavior and; (2) investigate the differences in the manner in which the principals of schools with more positive and less positive schools climates conduct school operations and implement change.

Overall, the design involved the following basic procedures:

1. Approximately 231 public elementary schools located in 13 counties with a northern and eastern sixty mile radius of Terre Haute, Indiana were included in the original cluster sample.

2. Principal instructional leadership behavior data was collected from each of the principals of the identified elementary schools using the Instructional Leadership Inventory, developed by MetriTech, Inc. (Maehr & Ames, 1988).

3. Teacher perception of school climate data was collected in each of the identified elementary schools using the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T), developed by
4. On-site, structured interviews were conducted with a group of three teachers and with the principal in four of the elementary schools with more positive climates and four of the elementary schools with less positive climates. A half day was spent at each site observing the principal and the school environment. The interviews and observations were used to identify the differences in the manner in which principals of more positive and less positive school climates conduct school operations and implement change. The data gathered during the interviews, field observations, and artifact collection enabled the data to be triangulated for research purposes. The data collected was analyzed and categorized into domains of meaning. Those domains were: Climate Responsibility, Change, Staff Development, Communication, and Daily Routine. The researcher searched for themes that clarified relationships within and among the domains. These themes that emerged are presented in the Summary and Discussion of Findings. This information helped further identify how the principals of the schools visited conducted school operations and implemented change.

Statistical analysis of the data included descriptive statistics regarding the mean, frequency, percent and cumulative percent. Pearson product moment correlation, Independent two-tailed t-test, and Stepwise regression were used to test the null hypotheses and significance was identified at the .05 level. The statistical procedures were all performed using SPSS computer program.
Summary and Discussion of Findings

1. Significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of school climate and principal instructional leadership behaviors. The results showed a significant positive relationship between the principals' perceptions of Supervises Teaching and the teachers' perceptions of Defines Mission, Manages Curriculum, Supervises Teaching, Monitors Student Progress, Promotes Instructional Climate, Accomplishment, and Recognition. Based on the descriptors of the instrument subscales, this relationship can be interpreted to mean principals who spend time working on teaching skills with teachers, observing classes, and encouraging staff to try their best will have teachers that perceive the climate as purposeful and positive. These administrators support teachers who evaluate their own performances and set goals for their own growth. This is supported by research previously cited in this study (Smith and Andrews (1989), Foriska (1994), and Duke, 1982.)

2. There was also a significant positive relationship between principals' perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate and teachers' perceptions of Promotes Instructional Climate. Based on the descriptors of the instrument subscales, this relationship can be interpreted to mean school leaders who encourage teachers to try out new ideas and highly reinforce creativity are more likely to have teachers that feel their administrator acknowledges and supports their efforts. These principals nominate staff members for awards, write letters of commendation for a job well done, and ask parents to praise teachers for their good
work. The school reinforces high expectations by establishing academic standards and incentives. This supports the research that the principal must reward and encourage staff (Smith and Andrews, 1989), Northern and Bailey, (1991), Sweeney, (1988), Winter and Sweeney, (1994), and Adams and Bailey, 1989.)

3. There were no significant differences found between the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with more positive climates and the principal instructional leadership behaviors of schools with less positive climate. The t value for each of these descriptors indicated no significant differences between the principals’ perception of their instructional leadership behaviors in the more positive and less positive schools. Administrators in the more positive schools did not significantly perceive themselves differently as the administrators in the less positive schools perceived themselves. This indicates that the principals of the less positive schools perhaps lacked self awareness as leaders or the inability to admit areas of weakness. They might also be lacking sufficient knowledge of current climate and effective instructional leadership research. They may have also never had the opportunity to learn from and model an effective leader.

4. There was a significant relationship between teacher perception of school climate and elementary principal instructional leadership behaviors. Supervision of Teaching had a significant positive relationship with seven of the twelve dependent variables in the Stepwise regression. Based on the descriptors of the subscales, this relationship
can be interpreted to mean principals who spend time working on teaching skills with teachers and observing classrooms are perceived by their teachers as good communicators, purposeful leaders, and knowledgeable about curriculum. These teachers are also feel supported when they attempt innovation and rewarded when they put forth good effort.

5. Monitors Student Progress had a significant negative relationship with three of the dependent variables in the Stepwise regression. School leaders who place great emphasis on student performance data and use this student assessment information to gauge progress toward the school’s goals have teachers who view the principal’s management of curriculum and supervision of teaching negatively. They also feel the instructional climate is not conducive to risk taking. The research supports using testing information to guide instructional decisions and goal setting, but there is no mention of overemphasizing the information or gauging a school’s success solely upon test results (Krug, 1992).

6. Principals of more positive schools tended to see themselves as responsible for the climate of the building. Principals of the less positive schools often focused on the entire staff as being responsible for the school climate. The principals of the more positive schools assumed accountability for the tone of their buildings. They readily shared that their attitude and beliefs influenced the climate that existed in their buildings. The less positive principals wanted to share the responsibility with everyone else in the building. They often blamed certain teachers for the negative environments that existed in their building’s
climate.

7. Principals and teachers in the more positive schools saw the principal being visible during the day as an important aspect of their building climate. The teachers of each positive school saw this visibility as a major reason the building was positive and the principal was successful. They felt the principal was a constant reminder to all of the school's mission and focus. The less positive schools found the principal in his office doing paperwork and in front of the computer a large portion of the day. This was perceived by both the principals and the teachers. The importance of visibility is reflected in previous research cited in this study (Niece (1983), Andrews and Soder (1987), Colon (1994), and Smith and Andrews, 1989.)

8. The principals of the more positive schools felt that being personally concerned and knowledgeable about the teachers lives outside of school was an important part of their job in cultivating climate. Their teachers appreciated this recognition and felt their principals were sensitive their needs as a whole person. This attribute was not focused on by any of the principals of the less positive schools. The staffs of the less positive schools indicated that they wished their principals would work harder to acquire this skill. This supported the view of researchers that a quality instructional leader shows genuine concern for their staff's health and welfare and a high regard for their employees as human beings (Smith and Andrews (1989), Northern and Bailey (1991), Winter and Sweeney (1994), Adams and Bailey (1989), and Beck and Hillmar, 1987.)
9. The principals of the more positive schools supplied staff with a daily or weekly memo. This memo was motivational as well as informational. The more positive schools' teachers enjoyed and looked forward to this regular correspondence. They anticipated it as something to keep them attuned to school happenings and to supply them with teaching ideas, current classroom activities, and uplifting stories and thoughts. One of the less positive principals used this tool also, but it was solely informational and sometimes contained problems and negative situations. The less positive school's teachers were critical of the format and believed that it could be written in a more productive fashion. The rest of the less positive principals used no regular communication tool. The importance of regular interaction and communication is reflected in the research cited previously in this study (Niece (1983), Andrews and Soder (1987), Smith and Andrews (1989), and Northern and Bailey (1991), and Sweeney, 1992.)

10. The more positive school principals used staff meetings for purposeful discussions and consensus building exercises. Staff development was a high priority with the more positive principals and they valued the staff meeting time when everyone was together. They felt this time should be utilized to develop and implement the goals of the school. One of the more positive principals also used this as a unified problem solving session when needed. The less positive schools either did not have faculty meetings or they were used basically for sharing logistics and dates. The teachers in two of the less positive schools indicated that
meetings were often long and controversial. One of the less positive principals admitted that there were usually heated arguments at most of his faculty meetings.

11. The more positive school principals were very aware of teacher's individual strengths and designed individual staff development for them. These principals were aware of different teaching styles and respected teachers for their variety of approaches. The teachers were appreciative of the acceptance and could repeat the principals feelings almost word for word. It was obvious the principals had verbalized this belief to the teachers. They felt empowered to "be themselves" in the classroom. This approval from the principal made them feel comfortable to design learning combining the teacher's knowledge of his students and the teacher's teaching style. The less positive principals did not express awareness of these issues and spoke of teachers grouped more into negative and positive teachers. These principals never mentioned acceptance of individual teaching approaches. The importance of knowing teacher strengths and designing individual teacher goals is reflected in the research cited previously in this study (Smith and Andrews (1989), and Northern and Bailey, 1991.)

12. The more positive schools' teachers and principals discussed the important role the principal had in modeling for both faculty and students. One principal discussed how important it was to "walk the talk." The teachers in the more positive schools looked to the principal for modeling and felt that it influenced teachers, students, and parents. One of the less positive schools' teachers were concerned
that their principal's negative attitude filtered down to the teachers and eventually the students. This produced a negative effect on the entire school population. The other three schools never mentioned any modeling coming from the principal's office. This was consistent for both the teachers and the principals. The importance of the principal being a positive role model is supported in research cited previously in this study (Northern and Bailey (1991), and Smith and Andrews, 1989.)

13. Each of the more positive schools were visually neat, attractive, and student oriented. These schools had purposefully worked on an external "homey" feeling in their physical plant. Three of the four less positive schools appeared dirty, unmaintained, and stark of student work. The hallways were bare and in some cases unclean. The principals of these schools did not place emphasis on an neat and orderly climate. In the less positive school that was attractive, the principal said the warm appearance was due to caring teachers. He didn't see the importance of such things. This was reflected in his office, which was cluttered, had barren walls, and disorganized furnishings. These results again supported previous research cited in this study (Edmonds (1979), and Keefe, Kelley, and Miller, 1985.)

**Implications**

**Practicing Elementary Administrators**

School leaders in elementary schools must be aware that an emphasis on effective teaching can have positive benefits
in their schools. These principals need to spend time working on teaching skills with teachers, observing classes, and encouraging staff to always put forth maximum effort. These administrators should encourage teachers to reflect upon their teaching practices and set professional goals for their own personal growth. Encouraging teachers to try new ideas and techniques, can lead to teachers who feel supported. Principals need to reinforce creativity and reward teachers for their efforts. Teachers need to be nominated for awards, given notes and letters of commendation for a job well done, and share teacher successes and innovations with the community.

Elementary principals need to regularly allow the faculty to evaluate their leadership skills. This enables a school leader to determine faculty perception and guide their own professional growth as a principal. Many principals are unaware or unwilling to admit that their skills need to improve. Acquiring this knowledge from the faculty models willingness to change and a desire to become a more effective professional.

Elementary administrators should recognize their power in establishing the climate of the school. Principals have a direct effect on school climate and must assume responsibility for this aspect of their schools. School leaders need to show concern and regard for their staff’s well being and lives beyond school. This compassion is appreciated by teachers and models sensitivity to both faculty and students.

Regular communication with staff members, both formally
and informally, can positively enhance school climate. A weekly memo can serve multiple purposes while informing and motivating staff. School administrators in elementary schools must be visible and model expectations for their faculties. They need to be in classrooms regularly, providing support and feedback to teachers. This visual presence can have a positive effect on both teachers and students. The principal should be a constant reminder to everyone of what the school stands for and is working toward.

Elementary principals must work to keep their schools visually neat and attractive. Teachers need to be encouraged to carry this into their classrooms and praised when they make effort in this direction. Staff meetings should be driven by goals and purposeful discussions. This is a time for unifying faculty and working toward the mission of the school. School leaders in elementary schools must be aware of the strengths of staff members and work to build upon those strengths and areas of interest. Teachers should be encouraged to design individual professional goals and plans for implementation of those goals. The principal supplies the teacher with support and resources to meet these goals and helps the teacher celebrate when goals are achieved.

Implications for Further Research

Further research needs to be done to determine if the stated differences between more positive schools and less positive schools would appear in studies done at the middle and high school levels. Further research also needs to be done to determine if the more positive principals are truly
more aware of teachers' viewpoints than less positive principals. Also, if they are, then how can this skill be developed?

In the qualitative research portion of the study, one of the less positive schools had put in place a formal site-based management program. Site-based management is currently being encouraged as a decision making tool for schools. The effects in this building were not positive. Teachers were involved in mundane, trivial, and time consuming management decisions. Therefore, this was a negative example of a way to implement site-based management. This site-based approach should be studied in relation to more positive and less positive school climates to determine the most effective way to put this management technique into practice.

An outside observer visiting the same schools and replicating the qualitative portion of this study would be of value to future research. This would enable comparisons to be made in what was originally heard and observed and what is found in a second visit by a different researcher.

Further research could include observing the less positive schools' principals as they put into practice some of the techniques of the more positive principals. It would be interesting to see which of the techniques might have a perceived impact on school climate. Each of these items can appropriately be investigated and are worthy of further study.

Endnotes

The principal really can and does make a difference in
the climate of a school. The administrator’s leadership impacts not only the climate of the school, but the morale and perceptions of the staff. Being an effective principal is critical; quality leadership provides the foundation for quality education. Each day, the principal makes a difference in the lives of young people. The environment in which teachers and students function must be positive and motivating to ensure the basis for successful teaching and learning. This challenge to school leaders is achievable based upon the findings of this research.

Having vision, compassion, and effective communication skills will enable principals to guide and direct schools toward a climate that is inspiring and uplifting. Principals need to accept the responsibility of setting school climate and building a positive tone within a school setting. School leaders must be a visible presence in their schools to both teachers and students. Having knowledge of teacher’s strengths will enhance a principal’s ability to guide individual teacher development. Being in classrooms and knowing the strengths of staff members allows principals to have meaningful dialog about instructional and school related issues.

The principal can be the most powerful role model within a school. They set a tone and standard by their words and actions. They must realize this modeling can be a tool for improving a school and moving toward an environment of unified expectations. School leaders must model and encourage maintenance, cleanliness, and attractiveness of the school’s physical plant. This orderly climate can have
positive effects on teachers attitude and community perception.

Building administrators must acknowledge their place in setting climate. They should understand the needs of their building population and consciously work toward a climate this is comfortable, supportive, and positive.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE
November 15, 1995

Dear Principal,

The building level administrator has been the focus of much of the attention given to effective schooling in recent years. At Indiana State University we are conducting dissertation research on instructional leadership. We are requesting a few minutes of your time to assist us in gathering data for a research project which will encompass over 230 elementary schools in the state of Indiana.

The instrument we are using in the study is the Instructional Leadership Inventory. The purpose of this study is to collect information as to the instructional leadership behaviors of Indiana elementary principals. You are welcome to request the results of this survey after completion. Just provide a written request in your return envelope.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed along with the survey instrument.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and best wishes for a successful school year.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Libler, Department Chair

Beth Whitaker, Project Researcher
December 1, 1995

Dear Principal,

We are continuing our study of instructional leadership in Indiana elementary schools. We checked our list of schools who have responded to our recent survey of the Instructional Leadership Inventory and noted that we do not have information on your school. It is important that we have information on your school in order to develop a complete picture on instructional leadership of elementary school principals in Indiana. Enclosed is the brief survey. Please take a few minutes to respond and return the survey in the enclosed envelope.

We realize this is an imposition; however, we hope you appreciate the importance of research about instructional leadership and the relevance of that research to the ongoing improvement of the elementary schools we administer and thus the students we serve. Thank you for your assistance. We look forward to receiving your response as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Libler, Department Chair

Beth Whitaker, Project Researcher
January 15, 1996

Dear Principal,

The building level administrator has been the focus of much of the attention given to effective schooling in recent years. In addition, the climate of the school has also been the focus of much research. At Indiana State University we are conducting dissertation research on school climate. We are requesting a few minutes of your time to assist us in gathering data for a research project which will encompass over 230 elementary schools in the state of Indiana.

The instrument we are using in the study is the Instructional Climate Inventory, 108 short, multiple-choice statements and questions that require approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. If you give permission to participate in the study, we will be asking ten of your teachers to complete a survey, return them to the office secretary, and the secretary will then return the information to us.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between school climate and instructional leadership.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed along with the packet of survey instruments. Your secretary should use an alphabetical listing of teachers and starting with the first teacher, give the Instructional Climate Inventory to every other teacher for ten teachers. If your school has less than twenty teachers, the school secretary should give any remaining forms to teachers who did not receive one starting with the second teacher on the alphabetical list until all instruments have been distributed. Your secretary will then distribute, collect, and return the information in the stamped envelope provided. Again, the time requirements we are asking of you and ten of your teachers have been kept minimal because your participation will be crucial to the success of this study.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and best wishes for a successful school year.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Libler, Department Chair          Beth Whitaker, Project Researcher
January 15, 1996

Dear Secretary,

Enclosed are 10 copies of the Instructional Climate Inventory (Form T). Using an alphabetical list of teachers, starting with the first teacher, please give the Instructional Climate Inventory to every other teacher on the list until ten teachers have been selected. If your school has less than twenty teachers, please give any remaining forms to teachers who did not receive one starting with the second teacher on your alphabetical list until all instruments have been distributed.

The answer sheets should be filled out with a #2 pencil and returned to you within 3 days. If you have not received them within 3 days please remind the teachers to complete them. Have the teachers return all ANSWER SHEETS to you. Then, place all completed ANSWER SHEETS in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided for return to us. Please do not return the instruments, postage is provided only to cover the answer sheets. Please try to mail all answer sheets back to us within five days.

Thank you for your help in gathering this information and best wishes for a successful school year.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Libler, Department Chair

Beth Whitaker, Project Researcher
February 1, 1996

Dear Principal,

We are continuing our study of school climate in Indiana elementary schools. We checked our list of schools who have responded to our recent survey of the Instructional Climate Inventory and noted that we do not have information on your school. It is important that we have information on your school in order to develop a complete picture on school climate of elementary schools in Indiana. You should have received ten survey instruments with a cover letter for your secretary and a return envelope. Please have your secretary distribute the surveys to your teachers and then collect and return them.

We realize this is an imposition; however, we hope you appreciate the importance of research about school climate and the relevance of that research to the ongoing improvement of the elementary schools we administer and thus the students we serve. Thank you for your assistance. We look forward to receiving your teachers' responses as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Libler, Department Chair         Beth Whitaker, Project Researcher
APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP INVENTORY SAMPLE

MetriTech, Inc.
INSTRUCTIONS

This booklet contains questions and statements that deal with your views and how you typically handle certain kinds of situations. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers and no time limit, but try to answer each question as quickly as possible.

First, take out the answer sheet you have been given. Fill in the identification code you have been assigned in the section marked IDENTIFICATION NUMBER starting in column A. Next, fill in the "M" or "F" circle in the SEX grid, as appropriate. Finally, in column P under SPECIAL CODES fill in the "2" circle.

The booklet has three parts, each with its own instructions. Be sure to read these instructions before answering the items. Use the key at the top of each page to select your answers.

Remember to mark all your answers on the answer sheet with a pencil (No. 2 is best). If you decide to change an answer, erase the first mark completely.

Thank you for your cooperation.
PART 1

In this part, read each pair of statements and decide which represents the goal that is more important to you as an instructional leader. Mark your choice, A or B, on the answer sheet.

SELECT THE GOAL THAT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO YOU

1. (A) Foster cooperation among staff and students.
   (B) Achieve recognition for you and your school.

2. (A) Assume a strong position of authority in the school.
   (B) Create an enriching educational experience for students.

3. (A) Achieve recognition for you and your school.
   (B) Create an enriching educational experience for students.

4. (A) Foster cooperation among staff and students.
   (B) Stimulate the staff’s competitive spirit.

5. (A) Stimulate the staff’s competitive spirit.
   (B) Achieve recognition for you and your school.

6. (A) Create an enriching educational experience for students.
   (B) Foster cooperation among staff and students.

When you leave your current position, what would you want your staff to say about you? For each pair, pick the statement that you would be more proud to have said about you. Mark your choice, A or B, on the answer sheet.

WHICH WOULD YOU RATHER HAVE SAID ABOUT YOU?

7. (A) Was known and admired throughout the district.
   (B) Was fully committed to staff.

8. (A) Valued excellence above all else.
   (B) Was powerful and provided strong leadership.

9. (A) Was powerful and provided strong leadership.
   (B) Was known and admired throughout the district.

10. (A) Was known and admired throughout the district.
    (B) Valued excellence above all else.

11. (A) Was fully committed to staff.
    (B) Was powerful and provided strong leadership.

12. (A) Valued excellence above all else.
    (B) Was fully committed to staff.
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INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of instructional leadership and school climate. Your responses are anonymous and will be kept confidential. At no time will individual responses be shared with your principal. Your answers will be combined with those of others in order to develop a composite profile. There are no “right” or “wrong” answers and no time limit, but try to answer each question as quickly as possible.

First, take out the answer sheet you have been given. Use the “P” grid under SPECIAL CODES to code in the level of your school as follows:

3: Elementary
4: Junior High or Middle School
5: Senior High

The rest of the identification area may be left blank.

The booklet has two pages each with its own instructions. Be sure to read these instructions before answering the items. Use the key at the top of each page to select your answers.

Remember to mark all your answers on the answer sheet with a pencil (No. 2 is best). If you decide to change an answer, erase the first mark completely.

Thank you for your cooperation.
PART I

The following items deal with views you have about the school in which you're now employed and various career opportunities. Choose just one answer for each item. Use the following key to choose your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>(B) Disagree</th>
<th>(C) Uncertain</th>
<th>(D) Agree</th>
<th>(E) Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. My co-workers and I work well together.
2. Disagreements occur here because people frequently compete with each other.
3. I get rewarded in a fair way for the work I do.
4. I do my best work here because co-workers urge me to do so.
5. In this school we believe in what we're doing.
6. I feel I get sufficient pay for the work I do.
7. Employees here receive a lot of attention.
8. This school makes me feel like I'm a winner.
9. I like what I'm doing now, so I don't think of doing anything else.
10. I like my chances of doing good work here so I can get ahead.

11. I have a sense of loyalty to this school.
12. People spend a lot of time trying to get to know those in powerful positions in this school.
13. I identify with this school.
14. In this school, there is respect for each individual.
15. I'm satisfied with the opportunities I have to direct others.
16. I think about the future of this school.
17. There are many chances to compete with others to get ahead.
18. Everyone in this school knows what it stands for.
19. In this school we hear more about what people do right than the mistakes they make.
20. Communication within this school is very informal and frequent.

21. I'm doing the kind of work I want.
22. People at all levels of this school share information about how well it is doing.
23. This school stresses excellence.
24. I enjoy working with those to whom I report.
25. I'm involved in decisions that directly affect my future.
26. Employees here are afraid to make a mistake.
27. There is peer pressure here to do a good job.
28. This school makes me feel like I'm an important, productive person.
29. Around here we're encouraged to try new things.
30. This school is clear about what it expects from me.

31. Evaluations of my work are directly tied to how well I do.
32. There's a close knit feeling among us in this school.
33. I've regretted that I chose to work for this school.
34. Employees here don't really trust one another.
35. Almost everyone has similar values and ideas about what this school should be doing.
36. This school allows me to do things that I find personally satisfying.
37. Competition among teachers/departments is actively encouraged in this school.
38. This school really cares about me as a person.
39. I know what this school stresses.
40. In this school, we're encouraged to try new things.
PRINCIPAL/TEACHER STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe the climate in your school? (define climate if needed)

2. What or who is responsible for the climate in your school?
   - what role has the principal played in this? Describe specifically what they do.
   - what role has faculty played in this?

3. When a change occurs in the ongoing, managerial operations of the school how does it happen? (both major & minor)
   - who is involved in the decision making process?
   - who is involved in the discussion?
   - who makes the decision?
     - what is their level of involvement?
     - talk?
     - recommend?
     - decide?

4. When changes are made in the instructional operation of the school how does it happen? (both major & minor)
   - who is involved in the decision making process?
   - who is involved in the discussion?
   - who makes the decision?
     - what is their level of involvement?
     - talk?
     - recommend?
     - decide?
5. What staff development experiences have been provided during the last 2 years?
   - what was the issue?
   - who was involved?
   - what was their level of involvement

6. Does your school have a systematic process for solving problems? If so, please describe.

7. How does the principal of this school spend his/her day?

8. Is there anything further about your school you would like to share at this time?