DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 457   EA 030 372

AUTHOR   Ryan, Sherrill A.
TITLE   Principals and Teachers Leading Together.
PUB DATE   1999-04-00
NOTE   40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada,
                April 19-23, 1999). Some text may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Educational Administration; Educational Environment;
                Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership;
                Participative Decision Making; Principals; *School
                Administration; *Teacher Administrator Relationship;
                Teachers
IDENTIFIERS   *Teacher Leaders; Teacher Leadership

ABSTRACT
                This report has two main purposes: to examine the perceived
impact of teacher leadership, and to explore the conditions in schools that
support or constrain teacher leadership. It discusses peer-nominated,
nonadministrative leaders; leadership practices; and sources of power. The
report is based on a multisite case study of three schools, serving as an
extension of an earlier study of seven secondary schools where the staff were
undergoing various change initiatives. For the current study, school
personnel identified 12 teacher leaders, whereupon data on these leaders were
collected through onsite interviews. The findings suggest that the perceived
influence of teacher leaders in the three schools was linked to the context
of the school and the conditions as revealed through the eyes of the teachers
and principals. School A was small and collegial and the principal worked
with the strengths of the teaching staff. At school B, the principal
implicitly trusted the teacher leaders and power was shared at the grassroots
level with teacher leaders' decision-making mainly occurring at the
managerial level. The teacher leaders in school C were able to articulate
their concerns to the principal and to colleagues and were able to
demonstrate their commitment to providing programs to help improve the
students' potential. (Contains 94 references.) (RJM)

PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS LEADING TOGETHER

by

Sherrill A Ryan
e mail sryan@sympatico.ca

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, ON.
M5S 1V8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

Principals and Teachers Leading Together

Most of the literature on educational leadership has the principal of the school as its primary focus. Within the current climate of educational reform, there is a move towards expanding the study of school leadership to include the activities of others who have influence within the organization, particularly teachers It has become more evident that educational leadership may be the province of many persons other than superintendents, principals and vice principals (Hart, 1995; Wilson, 1993; Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996; Lieberman, 1988). The current emphasis on shared decision making, site based management, collaboration, teachers as change agents and as staff developers, all contribute to the distribution of leadership in the school (Fullan, 1993; Wasley, 1991; Smylie, 1995; Murphy, 1995).

The focus of this study is the concept of leadership as influence processes (Yukl, 1989). The first report of this study (Leithwood, Jantzi, Ryan & Steinbach, 1997; Ryan, 1998), describes who the peer nominated non-administrative leaders are, their leadership practices and their sources of power. This paper reports on a second analysis of the data and has two main purposes:

- the perceived impact of teacher leadership
- the conditions in the school that support or constrain teacher leadership

The findings are based on these phenomena as seen through the eyes of the peer nominated teacher leaders, their colleagues and the principal.

Conceptual Background and Literature Review

A review of the state of the art of knowledge about the purposes of this study is outlined in this section. The limited amount of research available on the topic prevents the use of a framework or a theory of teacher leadership as a guide for the data collection and analysis. A grounded approach is taken in order to explore the emergence of a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). However, certain areas of relevant theory and research were helpful in interpreting some of the data. This review of the literature presents an intellectual backdrop to the study with an emphasis on the concepts of leadership and in particular teacher leadership.

The Concepts of Leadership and Teacher Leadership

Leadership. The concept of leadership that frames this study is based on the literature that views leadership as existing throughout organizations in a non administrative, non role defined, informal way; leadership that emanates from any level of the organization, that is distributed throughout the organization; a concept of leadership about which Ogawa and Bossert (1995) say, "one that sees it everywhere" (p.241). Ogawa and Bossert (1995) conceptualize leadership as an organizational quality that is "embedded not in particular roles but in the relationships that exist among the incumbents of roles" (p. 235). Little (1995) points out that it is in this environment that the most promising approaches to teacher leadership programmes are likely to occur where there is evidence of interactive theories of leadership. Transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1992), facilitative leadership (Dunlap & Goldman, 1993), democratic empowering leadership (Blase & Anderson, 1995), synergistic leadership (Covey,1993), and communities of leaders (Sergiovanni, 1992, 1994; Barth, 1990) are all models of leadership that exhibit an interactive relationship and emphasize the changing role of leaders to one where leaders and followers are collaborators and where power is shared.

Studies by Leithwood and his colleagues (1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994) have indicated that the form of leadership perceived to be most helpful by teachers involved in educational change and restructuring is transformational leadership. Yukl (1989) defines transformational leadership as "the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objectives" (p. 204). Burns (1978), in his model of transformational leadership, posits that leaders gain commitment from followers by appealing to higher ideals, morals, values and empowerment. And Roberts (1985) articulates transformational leadership as a vision in which the workers can share. Current literature on transformational leadership, (Leithwood, 1994; Kowalski & Oates, 1993) suggests that the goal of commitment to a common purpose that rises above organizational detail is a moral value.

The less complex and more routine tasks that leaders assume are referred to by Burns (1978) as transactional, that is, a management style characterized by clear task definition and rewards. For Burns (1978) transformational and transactional leadership are mutually exclusive. In a critique of the work of Burns, Bass (1985) argues that these two forms of leadership are on opposite ends of the continuum and that although most leaders exhibit both transactional and transformational leadership, good leaders integrate them both.

Leithwood and his colleagues (1990, 1991, 1992, 1993) have identified seven practices of a transformational leader: 1) identifies and articulates a vision; 2) fosters the acceptance of group goals; 3) conveys high performance expectations; 4) provides appropriate models; 5) provides intellectual stimulation; 6) provides individualized support; 7) creates a productive school culture; 8) develops structures to foster participation in school decision making. In a recent study, Leithwood (1994) adds two transactional dimensions to the model: contingent reward and management by exception (p. 507).

Teacher Leadership. Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996) support the notion of leadership as influence processes by defining teacher leadership as "contributing to school reform or student learning (within or beyond the classroom), influencing others to improve their professional practice, or identifying with and contributing to a community of leaders"(p.5). Sirotnik and Kimball (1996), use the definition of leadership as "the exercise of significant and responsible influence" (p.183). They make no attempt to "alter the definition depending on whether we are talking about teacher or administrator leadership" (p. 183). They believe it is the role definition that makes the difference.

Some studies of teacher leadership describe formal positions (Wasley, 1991, Smylie & Denny, 1990; Hart, 1995; Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988; Smylie & Brownlee Conyers, 1992) while others describe informal roles (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1993; Whitaker, 1995a, Whitaker, 1995 b). Formal teacher leaders usually have been selected by the administration or by colleagues to be chairpersons, to hold positions such as department heads or grade level representatives. Sometimes these teachers represent the school and the principal at district office meetings or serve on district committees.

While teacher leadership can be enhanced by the creation of formal positions, it can also thrive informally. Informal teacher leadership roles can come from sources that are subtle and do not increase the hierarchy in the schools. In every school there are teachers who distinguish themselves from their peers by assuming informal leadership roles. These teachers are committed not only to their classroom work but also to the profession as a whole.

> [Informal leaders] define success in terms of what happens in the entire school, not just their classrooms. These teachers are recognized by their peers and administrators as those staff members who are always volunteering to head new projects, mentor and support other teachers, accept responsibility for their own professional growth, introduce new ideas, and promote the mission of the school (Harrison & Lembeck, 1996, p. 111).

The Perceived Impact of Teacher Leadership

Teacher leadership is promoted by advocates for school reform in order to successfully bring about change (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991), to make use of teachers' underutilized knowledge and expertise, (Smylie, 1995) to promote a more democratic school social system (Hart, 1995), and to enhance teaching as a profession (Fullan, 1993). Ultimately, this is expected to lead to improved teacher practice and student outcomes (Wasley, 1991; Smylie, 1995; Hart, 1995).

> Teacher leadership offers possibilities for improving teaching conditions. It replaces the solitary authority of the principal with collective authority; it provides a constructive format in which adults can interact that overcomes daily classroom isolation; and it helps transform schools into contexts for adults as well as children's learning (Barth, 1988, p.136).

While researchers such as Berman & McLaughlin (1977) and Fullan (1991) suggest that the principal is the key to the successful implementation of change initiatives, there is also recognition of the need for the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in order to assure institutionalization of the change (Sergiovanni, 1994; Fullan, 1993). For change to occur, those who are directly affected by the change should be involved in defining the problem and identifying the solution. Change initiatives imposed from the top down have rarely been successful. "Teachers, more than any

others, are the key to educational change" (Hargreaves, 1994, p. 10). Fullan (1993) argues that change to accomplish school restructuring can come about through teacher leadership, but first teachers must become a profession of learners who engage in inquiry and reflective practice, who are collaborative, who are capable of vision building and mastery.

Smylie (1989) and Showers (1989) have shown that through peer coaching and mentoring, new teachers draw on the expertise of other teachers to learn more about their instructional practice. Programmes of this nature provide a structure for collaborative professional development and contribute to "school norms of collegiality and experimentation" (Showers, 1985, p.45). Hart (1995) describes the role of experienced teachers in mentoring new teachers in an informal manner in the context of a trusting relationship as an important means of improving professional growth.

Professionalism for teachers suggests teachers who are changing and growing, who have a high level of training and practice, who have increased autonomy and authority, and are legitimately involved in making educational decisions (Darling Hammond, 1988). Whether it be in the formal establishment of teacher leaders or the informal roles, there is evidence that when teachers take on roles of leadership, their own learning increases (Wasley, 1991; Lieberman et al, 1988; Louis & King, 1993; Fullan, 1993). Involvement in union activities provides learning opportunities for teachers beyond their own school. Through summer institutes, union representatives who perform a formal leadership role, network with teachers from other districts thereby acquiring a sense of the work of their colleagues over a wider jurisdiction.

One of the benefits of formal and informal teacher leadership is the development of a more democratic school (Hart, 1995) that provides opportunities for teachers to participate in educational decisions and where the relationship of the teachers with the administrative staff can become one of collegiality and partnership. In this way the hierarchical nature of traditional schools can be flattened to include more sharing through the interaction of teachers and principals characterized by teamwork, dialogue and collaborative work.

Conley (1993) summarizes the benefits of teacher leadership in the following way: the possibilities for reflecting democratic principles of participation in the workplace; enhancing teachers' satisfaction with their work; increasing teachers' sense of professionalism; stimulating organizational change; providing a route to increased organizational efficiency; and revitalizing teachers through increased interaction with their colleagues (cited in Leithwood, et al, 1997).

Conditions that Support Teacher Leadership

School Culture. Since leadership in general and teacher leadership in particular are an organizational phenomenon (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995) it is important to understand the culture in which it operates.

> The extent of teacher leadership influence in a school depends in large measure on the group ethos, collegial and professional norms, and customs of a school or district (Hart, 1995, p. 12).

Teacher leadership, in whatever form it takes, formal or informal, is dependent on a collaborative relationship among teachers and between teachers and the administrators of the school. Nias, Southworth & Yeomans, (1989) suggest that collaborative school cultures are characterized by a strong sense of commitment among its teachers to a common task and set of goals, where both individuality and interdependence of individuals within the group are valued

Collaboration is based on collegiality. The most important skill required by teacher leaders to build collegiality identified by Lieberman et al. (1988) is building trust and rapport. Judith Warren Little (1982, 1988) has chronicled the power of collegiality in supporting and facilitating positive change. She maintains that collegiality is based on the extent to which teachers work, plan and share together.

Shared Decision Making. Shared decision making (SDM) is a most concrete form of participation that would determine the extent to which stakeholders actually have any say in what happens in schools.

The involvement of teachers in decisions that affect their work towards improving student outcomes has been available for some time. Rosenholtz (1985) has found that schools become more effective places for (student) learning when teachers participate

in activities which decrease their isolation and require them to assume responsibilities in addition to the day to day instruction of students. The basic assumption is that lasting school improvement and enhanced learning opportunities for students will occur when teachers become more involved in professional decision making at the school site (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Glickman, 1990). Duke, Showers and Imber (1980) identify benefits to teacher involvement in traditional SDM opportunities as: higher quality joint decisions, a sense of workplace democracy, teacher compliance with decisions, closer relationships among teachers, and opportunities for teacher career progression.

Researchers have found that teachers are more often involved in "technical" decisions which involve such things as decisions about textbooks, instructional and curriculum policy at the classroom level (Duke et al., 1980; Mohrman et al., 1978; Conley, Schmidle & Shedd, 1988; Rice & Schneider, 1994; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994). At the same time, the studies revealed that teachers wish to be more involved in the "managerial" domain that involve decisions around hiring and evaluating teachers, selecting department or team leaders, school budget, determining work assignments, determining the school's administrative and organizational arrangements general school policy and instructional issues. The higher the involvement in managerial decisions the higher their job satisfaction.

When teachers are deprived of decision making opportunities, they report more dissatisfaction, more stress and less loyalty to principals (Conley, 1991). Lack of involvment can lead teachers to feel isolated, alienated and without any sense of control of their workplace (Rosenholtz, 1989). Duke et al. (1980) describe the constraints of involvement in SDM as lack of time, loss of autonomy, teacher skepticism (often viewed by teachers as a formality or attempt to create the illusion of teacher influence) and jeopardizing collective bargaining agreements. The insular structure of schools and the lack of administrative expectations for teachers' involvement limit collegial and teacher-administrator interactions (Hargreaves, 1991, 1995). Weiss & Cambone (1990) and Weiss Cambone & Wyeth (1992), have shown that even where principals support the process of SDM and cooperate with teachers, the changes in the balance of power in the school presents problems. Corcoran's study (cited in Conley, 1991) of committee work

suggests also that although teachers produce policy and programme changes, their influence is diminished by principals who dominate meeting agenda and inconveniently schedule meetings. Weiss et.al. (1992) point out that the attitude of some teachers toward shared decision making may cool over time and although they want to be consulted and to be heard they often want the principal to make the decisions. If teachers are used to operating in a hierarchy, they also feel incapable of making many of the decisions (Wasley, 1991).

However, in spite of these constraints, it seems that teachers do not want to entirely give up the process. As Weiss et.al. (1992) suggest,

> In the schools that we studied, people complained a good deal about the aches and strains of shared decision making, but only one or two people said that they wanted to go back to the way things were in the past - and even they hedged. With all the discontents it foments, shared decision making gives school faculties a measure of control over their work lives and over opportunities for their students. It is not a benefit that most teachers are willing to give up (p.365).

The Role of the Principal. In their study of teacher leaders and their relationship with their principals, Smylie and Brownlee Conyers (1992) state that

> because most new teacher leadership roles depend heavily on teacher leader/principal interaction and collaboration, principals are in the first order positions to block, to support and facilitate, and to shape the nature and function of teacher leadership in their schools (p. 151).

The changing role of the teacher and the principal are central to the development of teacher leadership. The role of the principal is being redefined in more democratic terms to accommodate the interests of the stakeholders (Murphy & Seashore Louis, 1994; Leithwood, Jantzi & Fernandez, 1994; Bredeson, 1995). Democratic schools are marked by widespread participation in issues of governance and policy making. Teachers and principals must therefore learn to develop new skills of working together. "Although relationships between teacher leaders and other teachers are clearly important (Little, 1990; Smylie & Denny, 1990; Wasley, 1991), it is the relationship between teacher

leaders and their principals that may be the most crucial" (Smylie & Brownlee Conyers, 1992, p.151).

The literature is replete with suggestions of what principals and teachers must do. A recommended list would suggest that principals must provide opportunities for more teachers to come out of the classroom and assume leadership in a variety of ways (Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996); teachers must be encouraged to be critically reflective of their work and to find opportunities for their voices to be heard (Fullan, 1994); school organizational structures must change to accomodate leadership opportunites for teachers,and principals must disseminate information and promote staff development (O'Hair, Bastian, Spaulding & Kohl, 1996; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). "Support, facilitation and possibility" are stellar principal empowering behaviours identified by Reitzug (1994). Empowering teachers to share in decision making requires principals who are "intuitive, risk taking, visionary, self-confident, empathetic and trusting" (Donahue, 1993, p. 303). These kinds of leaders must "harness the collective genius" (Senge,1990, p. 257) of their organization and realize the value of collaboration and expand opportunities for teachers, parents, and local community members to be more substantially involved in guiding their schools.

Conditions that Constrain Teacher Leadership

A major constraint to the development of teachers as leaders and the opportunities to exercise leadership is the issue of time. Time taken for work outside of the classroom likely interferes with time needed for students (Smylie & Denny, 1990; Weiss & Cambone, 1994); if time is provided it is usually not enough (Wasley, 1991) and leaders often spend too much time doing administrative tasks rather than working with other teachers. As well, additional responsibilities takes time from personal lives (Bascia, 1977). Needless to say, leadership activities are not for everyone and many teachers find that they have enough on their plates and are not interested in responsibilities outside of their classroom.

Another constraint is the lack of training available for teachers to develop leadership skills (Wasley, 1991; Fullan, 1993). And in the same vein, the promotion of teachers to leader positions which are outside their areas of expertise can set up a

credibility gap with their colleagues (Little, 1995; Lieberman, et al, 1988). As a result, the studies show that teachers are more likely to learn and change classroom practices themselves than are those who are presumed to benefit from their work (Smylie, 1994), or the profession as a whole (Fullan, 1994). Teaching is known to have well established egalitarian and privacy norms of the profession. This can isolate teacher leaders from their peers and that set up a 'we-they' syndrome (Conley, Schmidle & Shedd, 1988; Wasley, 1991; Little, 1988, 1990; Smylie & Denny, 1990; Smylie, 1989; 1992).

And finally, lack of empowerment and lack of opportunity made available by the principal of the school can be a major condition that prohibits the growth of teacher leadership (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1993).

Methodology

Qualitative research methodology, based on the interpretive paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) was used in this study of leadership. Within this paradigm was the use of the multi site case study method. The case study approach is an "intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit" (Merriam, 1988, p. 16). In this study, the unit of analysis was the school and the phenomenon was teacher leadership.

The Sample.

This study was an extension of an earlier study (See Leithwood et al., 1997) in seven secondary schools where the staff were undergoing various change initiatives as a result of current government policies and were willing to participate in various data collections.

More than 400 teachers in all seven schools were asked to nominate teachers they regarded as leaders exclusive of the principal or vice principal. Nominees were rank ordered according to the number of nominations received. For the purposes of this study three schools were purposively selected from this group of six, in order to have variety in the size of the schools and the context. Each school was located in a different school district, two of which were Catholic school districts and one was a Public school district. One school was in a small, urban community, one school was located in the heart of a major urban centre, and one was located in a small rural community but was the largest

of the three schools serving a widely spread area. Another reason these three schools were chosen was that there had been little change in the teaching staff since the beginning of the study therefore providing stability to the information gathered as all teacher leaders were available for interviews over the three year period of the original and this study. The schools varied in size with populations of 550 to 1600 students. The schools also varied in their student population being representative of both diverse and homogenous student background in terms of ethnicity and socio economic status.

The top four teacher leader nominees in each school (12 in total), along with the eighteen nominators (some of whom were nominees) and the three principals were the research subjects for this study. Of the twelve teacher leaders, six were male and six were female. Ten were department heads, one was an assistant department head and one was a guidance counselor who was chair of an important committee in the school. Four of those nominated as leaders were currently, or had been in the past, the school representative to the teachers' union. Although teachers not in positions of responsibility were often mentioned, they were not among those most frequently nominated.

The principals were all male. Two of them had had terms as vice principal in the school in which they became principal.

Data Collection

For the purposes of this study, data were collected primarily through on-site interviews of the participants mentioned above. Direct observation during on site visits, and documentation such as reports, newsletters, newspaper accounts, meeting agenda, and in one case, a previous study, were collected and analyzed.

Semi-structured Interviews. An interview protocol was used to guide the interviews which provided data from three different points of view: the nominators, the nominees and the principal.

Interviews were carried out on site and were tape recorded. They lasted from 45 minutes (for nominees who had not been nominators) to an hour and a half (for teacher leaders who were also nominators and for the principals of the schools). The interviews were transcribed following each round.

Data Analysis.

Interview data were initially analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Guided by the research questions, all thirty six transcripts were coded into idea units and then examined for themes relating to demographic data relevant to the philosophies and personal characteristics of the nominees and the principals The perceived influence of the nominees and the conditions in the school were major themes. "By analyzing the data, the researcher generates a typology of concepts, gives the names or uses "native" labels, and then discusses them one by one"(Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 165).

I proceeded in the analysis in the following way. After reading all of the transcripts and identifying themes, I coded individual response sets. I developed a three celled matrix in which I placed a response set, a broad category for example "Influence on the Students" and in the third cell I determined a less broad category such as "enhanced student learning". I pursued this system for all of the transcripts, building a separate matrix for each research question and for each perspective i.e. nominator, nominee, principal. In some cases, where the responses were overlapping, I combined nominator and nominee. I was constantly comparing the data to the category, reorganizing and combining subsets of responses until I finally arrived at over reaching categories that summed up what I believed the participants to be saying. I counted the number of responses in each category in order to determine some similarities and differences among the schools and to provide data for cross case analysis. I then combined the data for each school into one matrix consisting of the broad category in cell one, and the number of responses for each school in their individual cell. I reported the findings in numberical displays as well as in narrative form. I preferred to use the numerical displays because it made me more comfortable with the claims I was making (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

As the process of categorizing proceeded, I was able to apply empirically based concepts in analyzing some of the data. As recommended by Brinberg and McGrath, (1982) "the investigator must explore whether there is a plausible, conceptual explanation for the findings" (p.18). I looked to the literature on organizational learning

(Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1995, p. 241) and applied these constructs of conditions to guide the categories for conditions in these schools. I added to that the constructs of transformational leadership to guide the analysis of principal leadership. The analysis of the perceived impact of teacher leadership was based on grounded theory where I developed a series of themes from the accounts of the subjects which I interpreted and categorized.

Background to the Study

The following is a brief outline of some of the earlier analysis concerning the nature of teacher leadership (Ryan, 1998). The demographic data portrayed teacher leaders typically as well qualified, in mid career, in positions of responsibility, involved in union activities and motivated by a desire to be involved in decisions and influence outcomes. All but one of the teacher leaders were in the position of department head or assistant department head. The one who was not in a formal position of responsibility was a guidance counselor and had a high profile in the school due to her role as head of the strategic planning committee.

The desire to "play a role in decision making and influence the outcomes" was the motivation of five of the teacher leaders to take on leadership practices beyond their job requirements. A personal tendency to leadership, a sense that teachers look to them for leadership due to their experience and expertise, and a strong work ethic were the other motivational forces for these teacher leaders. All, without exception, insisted that they were not on a career track to become administrators. The teacher leader practices were also similar in each school with administrative tasks most frequently mentioned although the types of administrative tasks differed. The power sources that the teacher leaders drew upon were experience, expertise, and positive personal characteristics.

Findings

The findings for each case are summarized in the narrative and displayed in a multi cell matrix (Tables 1 to 4) that encompasses the interpretations of the data for the purposes of comparison. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend that displays help to communicate findings to the reader.

Context

The description of the school settings in this study was meant to provide a detailed understanding about each school in order to help to clarify the relationship between where people worked and what they said.

There were differences among the schools in terms of size, their student populations and location. Students at School A represented a wide range in socio economic levels and academic levels. It was the policy of this school's district to integrate special needs students in the regular classroom, a policy that was popular with parents. As a result, the school had what one teacher described as 30 per cent "identified" students who required special programming. Also, the school building was inadequate and there were no amenities often associated with secondary schools such as a cafeteria and physical education facilities. As a result, teachers actively recruited students to attend the school which they suggested resulted in attracting lower achieving students or at least students with special needs.

Students at School B were fairly homogenous mainly coming from homes where education was valued, good grades were an expectation, and where there were average to above average income levels. This school offered academic programmes and recommended that students who required less challenging courses attend the neighbouring school.

Although many of the students in School C were academically oriented, a high number came from homes in which education was not valued and the cycle of social welfare was unbroken.

The reputation of each of these schools in their community also varied. School A was seen as having a lot of extra curricular activities and involvement in the community. School B was looked upon as having the sophistication of a private school. Students at School B wore school uniforms which may have contributed to this view. School C attempted to be a full service school, with social services available in the school such as a day care for the infant and pre school children of students as well as services from other provincial ministries.

There also were some differences in the philosophies of the schools and their histories. School A had only been in existence a short time. The school was established to fill a need in its geographic area, and it did not attract experienced teachers from the city some distance away where the school district offices were located. Indeed the principal and vice principal did not live in the immediate community and many of the teachers were new to the profession. The distance was a source of some resentment by the teaching staff as they felt that they were frequently ignored by the senior administrators. Although it was a Catholic school, the principal explained that many of the students were not of that faith and it was the programmes that attracted the students to the school.

The history of School B was rooted in the first principal who was a prominent educator in a Catholic high school located elsewhere in the school district. Staff members believed that he brought to their school its philosophical base. There was no problem attracting a highly qualified teaching staff as it was considered a desirable place to work. The principal had been there as vice principal and now as principal.

School C, had a culture that arose from the work of a former principal and a teacher who was head of student services. Along with a very committed staff, they were able to acquire social services for their school to meet the needs of their students. The school became open to the community for the full use of its constituents. Being located some distance from the district offices did not pose any problems for the teaching staff and in fact they welcomed the independence that the distance afforded them. The former principal was considered by the staff to be charismatic and able to get things done as well as to attract energetic and well qualified teaching staff. Although the new principal had been at the school as vice principal in the years when many of the changes were taking place, the staff continued to refer frequently to the former principal.

The Perceived Impact of Teacher Leadership

The impact of teacher leadership as perceived by the nominators and the teacher leaders themselves is indicated in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Nominators' View:

On Colleagues At School A, the nominators identified the improvement of teaching practices as the most significant area affected by the work of the teacher leaders in the school. They were a resource to the rest of the staff particularly the inexperienced teachers.

> The things I've learned from him, how well he works with high needs students [and as a result] my approach to them has been different. When I am dealing with things, topics that I'm not as versed in, politics and history, I'll go ask him for help.

Of significance in this category also were the number of comments made by nominators concerning the respect that they had for the teacher leaders. In School B some comments were:

> I look up to him and I think other people do too.
> When you talk to (him) you feel listened to.

At School C, the teacher leaders were respected particularly because they were willing to stand up for what they believe in. They also had an impact on colleagues by helping them. "She makes my job a lot easier than it might otherwise be". By spearheading the implementation of a Ministry initiative that was unpopular with the staff, one of the teacher leaders influenced the staff's willingness to buy into the programme.

It was noted that in all three schools, the union representative influenced colleagues by virtue of the information they were privy to and their efforts to keep the staff informed.

On Students. In all three schools, the influence of the teacher leaders on the students was evident. They provided many opportunities for students to have new learning experiences and thus enhanced their opportunities for learning. Most of the initiatives were of their own creation. As was said of a teacher leader at School C,

> She is able to recognize a student need and she seems to be able to create a programme that fits that need and she seems to be able to come up with staff who are appropriate for delivering [the programme].

A nominator also recognized the abilities of a teacher leader to work with students "doing a lot of intervention work with kids".

On the School. Nominators made many comments about the influence of the teacher leaders on the school in general. In School A there was an emphasis on the initiation of school activities. The teacher leaders also made an effort to promote the school in the community. As one nominator said about a teacher leader, "Certainly the programmes that he initiates and carries through have an effect on the school because they're seen in a very positive light in the community." At School B, the teachers emphasized the school mission in their comments. "He maintains the philosophy of the school. He is someone who helps us hold the course". And at School C, the teacher leaders also enhanced the reputation of the school and were instrumental in attracting experienced teachers to the school.

On the Principal. Only at School A and School B did the nominators suggest that the teacher leaders had an influence on the principal. At School C, the nominators only mentioned that the teacher leaders had "clout" and were willing to lobby the principal on issues that were important to the teachers in their departments.

Teacher Leaders' Views:

At all three schools, the teacher leaders' views were similar to that of the nominators except to mention some of their activities that would be less known to teaching staff in general. At School A, more than at any other school, the teacher leaders felt they influenced the teaching practices of their colleagues. The teacher leaders at School B felt they influenced student policies and influenced the provision of programmes and maintained the school mission. A teacher leader at School B influenced the direction of the school in the following way:

> I have a fairly well defined philosophy of what I think the school should be like, what the department should be like, what the responsibilities of teachers and counselors are, so I feel strongly about things. I'm constantly trying to move things in that direction.

At School C the guidance counselor influenced curriculum by reporting on patterns on report cards and making recommendations regarding what kinds of programmes that should be offered.

All except a less experienced teacher leader at School A, and the assistant head at School C, were involved in staffing decisions regarding their own department. All had responsibility for decisions regarding budgeting in their own department but only in School B were they involved in budget decisions that affected the school in general. Eight of the teacher leaders had opportunities to mentor colleagues but for the most part it was informal and usually involved new teachers in their departments.

While all the teacher leaders recognized that they could have influence on the principal, it was only at School B that they were able to change his opinion on issues. The teacher leaders talked about an instance when the principal wanted to implement a programme using a certain model. A committee was struck, they met, they researched the various models, consulted with the staff and convinced the principal to choose the model they preferred.

At School A, one of the teacher leaders thought it was not necessary to try to influence the principal because he knew intuitively what the staff would want and so their influence was not overt. These teacher leaders all thought that their principal was open to their suggestions.

It was mainly by virtue of their reputation and their ability to convince him of priorities that the teacher leaders at School C felt that they had influence on the principal.

Conditions that Support or Constrain Teacher Leadership

The conditions that support teacher leadership in the three schools in this study, are indicated in Tables 2, and 3 and presented from the point of view of the nominators, the teacher leaders and the principals. The categories for the coding of these conditions were guided by the research on learning organizations (Leithwood, 1995).

<center>Insert Table 2 about here.</center>

Nominator and Teacher Leader Views:

<u>Vision</u>. It was noted that while the teachers at School C made very little mention of the school vision per se, their commitment to the students was evident in their responses. Those in the other two schools spoke about the vision and mission of the school. As one teacher leader at School A said, "There is a lot of agreement in this school in terms of what we want in this school". At School B, they spoke of the mission

to impart traditional values of work ethic and social norms of behaviour while providing serious academic programmes.

School Culture. Because the teachers and teacher leaders at School A made many references to meeting the needs of students, they indicated that there was a culture in the school that centered on instructional practice, sharing of ideas and working together to achieve these ends. One teacher leader said, "If there is a problem here we all work at it". While those in schools B and C, also indicated that there's was a collaborative culture committed to meeting the needs of their students, the emphasis was on providing suitable programmes rather than improving instructional practices.

School Structure. Structures for decision making that provide for teachers and in particular teacher leaders to have input were discussed by most everyone interviewed. At School A, there was no formal decision making model or committee structure. Committees were set up for specific purposes and usually in an advisory capacity. As one teacher leader said. "We are not a committee type school". According to interviewees, sometimes they were effective and sometimes not. Also, the teacher leaders thought that teachers did not always want to be involved in everything going on in the school. They believed that there were times when not much could be done to solve a problem given time constraints, work load and so on. Still, teacher leaders felt that they had influence and that their concerns could be voiced. Influence was effected when teachers (and in particular the teacher leaders of the school) talked to the principal. Concerning this, one of the nominators expressed the view that one group had too much influence in the school.

At School B, the teacher leaders had designed the decision making model and the principal trusted them to decide what was best. The committee structure and decision making process were described in the following way:

> We developed a process where a problem was brought to the committee and the committee would kind of discuss it, survey the staff, bring the results back to the staff and the staff would vote on it and then we would see how it would be implemented by the administration. We did a little survey of the staff about what they liked and what they didn't like and one of the things that came up on several responses of the good things was the new school decision making model and people see it as there is a decision making process that involves the whole staff.

When the principal gives power to the committees, it is not just a talk thing. He actually does it because he has allowed certain decisions to override his personal beliefs.

The system of decision making at School C was in a state of flux as staff tried to move from a majority vote model to one of consensus. Those interviewed recognized that there was a system in place with authority given to committees after they had consensus, but at this time it did not appear to be working well. They thought that there were too many committees and the problem of gaining concensus took too long so that by the time the decision was made it was either too late or everyone had forgotten what the issue was in the first place. Some interviewees thought the principal was going to do what he wanted to do anyway.

School Strategies. School B had specific strategies in place that involved the staff as a group to set up systems of checks and balances designed to focus on priorities. This was partly due to their efforts to implement a Strategic Planning Committee whose agenda it was to develop these strategies. School A was in the planning process of using professional activity days to establish strategies. The work of one of the committees at School C was to arrive at strategies for group processes.

Policy and Resources. In Schools A and C, located in smaller communities, there was mention of the school reaching out to the community but for the most part, those interviewed made very few comments about policies and resources in their schools.

Principals' View:

Table 3 summarizes the conditions that support leadership in the schools from the point of view of the three principals.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Vision. The principals all spoke about the vision and mission of each of the schools. The principal of School A admitted that he was not sure that it was as clear to the whole staff as he would like.

School Culture. The principal of School A said that there was a culture of "doing" and being active in many ways. "There are a lot of self starters in the school".

There was a sense that anything "is a go as long as its going to benefit the classroom and the kids in the school".

The principal of School B said that there existed a culture that was relaxed, open and honest and that the teachers supported one another. There was no sense of "territorial empire building". Everything the teachers did was for the "betterment of the students".

Creating a culture that was willing to accept change was the goal of the principal of School C. The principals of Schools A and C wanted their staff to be more open to debate and sharing of ideas particularly from those who were not part of the core group of teacher leaders. All three principals shared the belief that they had a very strong, knowledgeable staff.

School Structures. Because the processes for decision making and input into the direction of the school was mainly through informal means and mainly limited to the core group who seemed to have the power, it was indicated that School A was not considered to be "open and inclusive". The principal recognized that there was a group of teacher leaders who had a great deal of influence and were not always open to dissenting ideas. Teachers at this school thought they had to get the support of this group before their ideas could be implemented. The principal believed that he had a good sense of "what was going on" because the school was small. The fact that it was small also was a condition that provided for team teaching, and the informal decision making processes.

At School B, the principal established a Strategic Planning Committee, provided the opportunitiy for the members to professional development sessions to learn strategies for implementation and basically left the rest up to the committee to go forward with it with his full support.

The principal at School C said that every staff member had to serve on at least one major committee. Committees met and then "floated mandates" until they reached consensus on what was acceptable to the staff. The principal of School C established cross department teaching assignments as an attempt to break down the balkanization of departments common to secondary schools.

School Strategies. All three principals thought that there were established strategies in their schools around school goals, growth plans, and opportunities for teachers to share expertise.

Policy and Resources. The three principals said that they were committed to providing resources for staff professional development. They agreed that the sharing of information was an important condition that supported teacher leadership and they made every effort to do so.

Principal Leadership

The leadership of the principal was analyzed according to the constructs of transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood, et al, 1995, 1996) and is presented in Table 4 from the view of the nominators and the teacher leaders. The principals' own view of their leadership is presented in narrative form only.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Nominator and Teacher Leader Views:

Informal observation suggested that Principal A was soft spoken, well mannered and respectful. Principal B was energetic, outgoing, and enthusiastic, while Principal C was quietly philosophical, well informed and somewhat detached.

The nominators and teacher leaders at all three schools agreed that their principal provided individualized support to anyone on the staff who was interested in leadership activities.

The principal of School A had strengths in the areas of shared purposes and goals, providing professional development for teachers and strengthening a culture of collaboration through the sharing of instructional practices. However, the lack of committee structure in the school indicated that he did not take steps to openly distribute power for leadership throughout the school.

The principal at School B was praised by staff members in every dimension of the categories used to define principal leadership. He had a vision, he encouraged collegiality, he actively shared power and promoted teachers and provided them with information. He celebrated their successes.

At School C there was an extensive committee structure that involved all of the staff. All four of the teacher leaders spoke negatively about the committee structure and the process for decision making, although one of them thought that the sharing of ideas and involving everyone in the process was worthwhile. The principal expressed concern that the process was slow to gain acceptance particularly with the "old guard" who in the past, through their persuasive powers, were able to gain support for a majority vote. But the teacher leaders and their peers still believed they were able to exercise leadership through their influence. It was the lack of authority they felt they were missing, authority they may have had in the past.

Principals' View:

All three principals saw themselves as having a vision shared with "the staff, the students, the parents and the community" They all had a system for setting goals with the staff and they described themselves as "enabling", "a facilitator", and "leading from the side". They all talked about having high expectations, sharing information, providing resources and opportunities for professional development.

There were, however, some differences in the emphasis that permeated their discussions. The principal of School A frequently returned to the theme of providing what was best for the students. He also built on the strengths of the teachers and provided the resources that were necessary and that allowed them to act on their area of interest.

At School B, the principal talked about his role in developing partnerships in the community in order to provide more resources for the students. Principal B was clearly committed to developing leadership in his teachers by encouraging them to take on responsibilities, especially those whom he thought had potential to be leaders. He also celebrated the work of the teacher leaders, and provided interested staff with books, articles, minutes of meetings and so on in order to spark their interest. He attended conferences and workshops and shared the information with the staff. He sought out opportunities for staff members to sit on district committees.

An emphasis on developing a true model of shared leadership seemed to be a poignant issue for the principal of School C. He was committed to developing leaders

among the staff and his approach was through the committee structure where he believed those with expertise would stand out. He also shared information through the committee structure by providing what was needed to those involved.

The principals of Schools B and C believed that there existed a culture that was open to disparate ideas but was an area that all three principals, particularly Principal A wanted to improve.

Constraints

Nominator and Teacher Leader Views:

The significant constraints that the teacher leaders identified were mainly to do with the decision making processes particularly in School A and School C. The teachers at School C found that the decision making processes were too complex. The teachers at School A thought that because there were some less than hard working department heads, it was inevitable that there were a core group of leaders particularly among those who were willing to give more of their time to the students and the school in general. In all of the schools the traditional structures prevented them from being more collaborative through planning and working together.

Principals' View:

The principals identified some constraints to the development of teacher leadership. The principal of School A felt constrained by the structures that prevented creative ways of providing for differentiated use of staff due to the restrictions imposed by the teachers' union. The principal of School B felt the constraint of teachers not being ready or for that matter not wanting to take on extra responsibilities. He believed this interfered with his efforts to develop teacher leadership. The principal of School C discussed the "growing pains" of a staff moving towards a new decision making model while wanting to hold on to the former system.

Point of View

Much of the findings of this study were presented from the point of view of the nominators, the teacher leaders and the principals of the schools. One cannot make numerical comparisons as to the frequency of the 'idea units' as expressed in the interviews as there was only one principal, four teacher leaders and six nominators for

each school. However, it was of interest to see if these subjects indicated a different perception of such things as the impact of teacher leadership and school conditions. There was an overall tendency for the nominators to have a more narrow perspective because they did not always know all that the teacher leaders were doing. Also, the teacher leaders were often reluctant to talk about themselves while the principal tended to have a very broad focus. Given these caveats, the varying points of view suggested that the perceived impact of teacher leadership seemed to be similar for both the teacher leaders and the nominators. The conditions in the school, some of which were significantly different one from the other, were similar within the schools in the eyes of the nominators, the teacher leaders and the principal.

The analysis of these points of view would suggest that those working within the school tend to see their colleagues and the conditions in the work place in a similar light with only slight variations.

Summary and Discussion

The staff of these schools were engaged in reform initiatives and were participating in another study which suggests that these teachers and their principal were committed to taking steps toward school improvement. Nevertheless, the interview and observational data provided different perspectives on teacher leadership in secondary schools as they are commonly structured, an area that has not been widely researched.

Some of the effects of teacher leadership as well as conditions and constraints identified in the literature were evident in this study.

The Perceived Impact of Teacher Leadership

Much has been written about the contribution that teacher leaders can make in the "larger arena- the arena of school reform" (Troen & Boles, 1995, p. 376). A major focus of current reform initiatives is the stimulation of teacher leadership to bring about change (Fullan, 1993, 1995; Little, 1988) and the provision to capitalize on the knowledge and expertise of teachers to enhance the professionalism of teachers. In all three schools some of the teacher leaders in this study were able to influence staff to accept change.

Improving colleagues' teaching techniques has been identified as an important role for lead teachers (Wasley, 1991; Lieberman et al, 1988; Trachman & Levine, n.d.;

Smylie, 1992). Overall, the teacher leaders in this study had a significant influence on the instructional practices of their colleagues which could be considered to be part of their job definition as department head. Nevertheless, they had to have the expertise in order to share it and they did share their expertise outside of their departments. Teacher leaders were available to their colleagues as a resource in such areas as instructional practice, assistance in dealing with difficult students, helping to plan new programmes and even offering advice on personal matters. They assisted students in countless ways all of which were intended to promote student learning. They had influence on student opportunities for learning, student policies and activities, school policies. The teacher leaders made decisions about curriculum issues, selection of programmes, timetabling and their own professional development. These kinds of involvements ranged from the technical to managerial. As for the increased capacity of the teacher leaders and their colleagues, there was also evidence that they all were increasing their knowledge and skills. In these ways and no doubt in countless other ways, they contributed to the professionalization of teaching.

In all of the schools it was evident that participation in decision making and influence was possible without fundamentally changing the formal authority structure of the school. Ideally, teachers should not have to become administrators in order to have an impact on policies. As Goodlad (1984) suggests, many teachers prefer to work in a school where an able principal is in charge and they have opportunities for influence. Smylie and Denny (1989) have suggested that there are many areas of school decision making in which teachers do not wish to be involved. The teacher leaders in this study did not wish to have authority beyond their positions as department heads. They wanted to have an influence on school policies that affect the quality of their students' education as well as their professional lives but they could accomplish this with their existing sources of power. All the teacher leaders said that they had as much influence as they wanted, even in School C where they were unhappy with the decision making process.

A remarkable effect noted by nominators was the respect they held for the teacher leaders. In the school setting, respect "refers to the honoring of the expertise of others" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 763). The notion of respect is further supported in a

study by Louis, (1998) concerning the quality of work life of teachers, where when teachers were given an opportunity to participate, they felt more respected.

The teacher leaders had varying degrees of influence on the work of principals. All of the principals said that they considered the point of view of the teacher leaders (and other teachers as well) when making a decision.

Conditions that Support or Constrain Teacher Leadership

Conditions which support teacher leadership that have been reported in the literature include collaborative school cultures (Leithwood, 1992; Stone, Horejs & Lomas, 1997; Yarger & Lee, 1994), mutual support among teachers (1994; Wasley, 1991; Leiberman et al, 1988), inclusive decision making structures (Leithwood, 1992) and principal support (Barth, 1988; Leiberman, 1988; Bredeson,1995; Yarger & Lee, 1994; Stone et al, 1997).

While there were many similarities across the study schools in the impact of the influence of the teacher leaders in the three schools, there were significant variations in the conditions influencing teacher leadership. School cultures, structures for decision making processes, and principal leadership were the most notable. Some of the subcategories of school conditions as reported in the literature were weakly represented in the data (for example, school strategies and policy and resources). This could be either because these conditions were not a factor in the school or because the open ended questioning did not illicit the information.

What is important about school culture for teacher leadership are opportunities for collaboration in which teachers share their expertise, call on each other for assistance in addressing problems of practice, offer each other support and have a willingness to work together towards common goals. While there was evidence of these conditions in all three schools, teachers at School A placed more emphasis on the 'teaching' aspect of their work and their interpersonal relations of support. There are some possible explanations for this. One might be that the younger staff were more focused on their own learning and desire to be good teachers. Perhaps the small size of the school supported cohesive staff relationships. Sizer (1992) suggests that small schools create situations that nurture more openness among staff members.

In all three schools, the teacher leaders tended to reach out beyond their departments which not only provided them with a profile in the school as a whole but also suggested that the teaching staff were accepting of leadership from teacher leaders other than within their own subject area.

The school structures that included opportunities for teachers to be involved in decision making processes were evident in two of the schools in the study. In School B, the decision making structure was well established and well received. In this school there was decision making opportunity not only for those nominated as teacher leaders but for other interested staff members. The decision making structures in School C were in the process of being reorganized and although presenting problems, were nevertheless in place. In the School A, although no formal decision making processes were in place, the teacher leaders believed they had plenty of opportunity for input.

The third condition of great importance for teacher leadership was the leadership of the principal. The constructs of transformational leadership were evident in such things as a focus on the mission of the school, and the individual support provided to the staff to participate in opportunities to have influence on the direction of the school. All three principals appeared to be comfortable in sharing power and influence and expressed confidence in the teacher leaders. Principals A and B were described by nominees and nominators as open to suggestions and supportive of staff. Principal A preferred suggestions and requests to be made informally, while for Principal B, issues usually started in an informal way and then went to the committee process. The teacher leaders at School C felt that they could go to the principal and speak with him informally about any of their concerns but their influence would mainly be through the committee structure. The principal, although well known to the staff, had recently been appointed as principal to the school following a very charismatic principal. Perhaps a sufficient amount of trust between him and the teacher leaders had not yet developed. In fact, one of the teacher leaders openly stated that she thought that the principal did not trust them.

Constraints

Because the teacher leaders in this study were in positions of responsibility, many of the conditions constraining teacher leadership, as identified in previous research, were

absent. For example, having the time to participate in leadership activities is a major constraint identified in the research (Wasley, 1991). The lack of contact time afforded these teachers through their collective agreement, permitted them to be available for some of their leadership activities during the teaching day. However, they were also hard working and as was so frequently commented by their nominators "not nine to three types" and "willing to go the extra mile". They did, however mention time and structures as constraints for teachers wanting to plan together.

Another frequently mentioned constraint in the literature (Little, 1988, 1990 a; Hart, 1995; Smylie, 1992) was the norm of egalitarianism in the teaching profession. In this study there was no evidence of "Who do they think they are?" and again that could be because they were mainly department heads and therefore leadership was expected of them. They did not seem to meet with resistance from their fellow teachers who accepted their assistance.

Research (Zinn, 1997; Stone et al, 1997) also indicates that the lack of support of the principal of the school is a major constraint for the development of teacher leadership. There was evidence in this study that the principals did provide opportunities (albeit in different ways) for teacher leadership to flourish in these schools.

Conclusion

The findings concerning the perceived influence of teacher leaders in these three schools were linked to the context of the school and the conditions as revealed through the eyes of the teachers and principals. School A was small, there was a culture of collegiality and strongly shared purpose and the processes for decision making were informal. Nevertheless there were opportunities for teachers to assume leadership and to have an impact on colleagues particularly in assisting new teachers to become better at their work. The principal worked with the strengths of the teaching staff in order to meet the goals they had established. At School B, the principal had total trust in the teacher leaders and power was shared at the grass roots level with teacher leaders' decision making mainly in the managerial level. The principal had been at the school a long time and had built a staff of professionals who were very capable and willing to be involved beyond the classroom. The ability of the teacher leaders in School C to articulate their

concerns to the principal and to colleagues and their commitment to providing programmes for students that would help to improve their future potential were major sources through which they exercised influence.

Implications for Future Research

Further studies on the topic of teacher leadership in schools are recommended with consideration given to the variables of school conditions such as the decision making structures, the collaborative school culture, the support and encouragement of colleagues and the leadership of the principal. There lies within this study also the genesis of a relationship between the constructs of transformational leadership and teachers who exhibit leadership in their schools.

Given the limitations of this study, future studies based on this design may wish to limit the sample to teachers who exercise leadership in more typical secondary schools and who are not in positions of responsibility. The findings of this study arouse interest in other aspects of teacher leadership such as the differences in the relationship that teacher leaders have with their colleagues compared to that of the principal.

Implications for Educational Practice

In broad terms, there are implications from this study that have to do with school reform which points to the need to shift the focus from the leadership of the principal alone to a more inclusive form of leadership, to the empowerment of teachers and a recognition of the importance of promoting positive collegial relationships. The findings of this study point to the effect that teacher leaders have on many aspects of school life and therefore suggest the need for school leaders to take advantage of the power and expertise of teachers in the schools. The opportunities for sharing of knowledge and expertise to enhance the professionalization of teaching could and should ultimately lead to improved student learning. As well, there are implications that reach out to teacher education and the need to develop programmes that will provide teachers with the many skills required in order to be leaders in their profession.

References

Barth, R.S. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 129-147) New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Bascia, N. (1997). Invisible leadership: Teachers' union activity in schools. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33, (2/3), 69-85.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Blase, J., & Anderson, G., (1995). The micropolitics of educational leadership. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bredeson, P.V. (1995). Role change for principals in restructured schools: Implications for teacher preparation and teacher work. In M.O'Hair & S. Odell (Eds), Education teachers for leadership and change (pp. 25-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Brindberg, D., & McGrath, J.E. (1982). A network of validity concepts within the research process. In D. Brinberg & L. Kidder (Eds.), New directions for methodology of social and behavioural science: Forms of validity in research, 12 (pp. 5-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. London: Heineman.

Conley, S. (1991) Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. Review of Research in Education. 17, 225-266.

Conley, S., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J (1988) Teacher preparation in the management of school systems. Teachers College Record 90 (2) Winter. 261.

Covey, S.R. (1993). Principle-centered leadership. New York: Simon and Schuster

Darling Hammond, L. (1988) In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Donahue, T. (1993) Finding the way: Structure, time and culture in school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, Dec., 298-305.

Duke, D., Showers, B., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16, (1), 93-106.

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

Fullan, M., with Stiegelbauer, M., (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for? Working together for your school. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Fullan, M., (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. Toronto: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1994). Teacher leadership: A failure to conceptualize leadership. In D. Walling, (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Perspectives on the professional development of teachers (pp. 241-253). Bloomingham IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Fullan, M. (1995, November). Broadening the concept of teacher leadership. Paper prepared for the National Staff Development Council, New Directions.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Glickman, C (1990). Pushing school reform to a new edge: Seven ironies of school empowerment. Phi Delta Kappan, 72 (1), 68-75.

Goodlad, J., (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micro politics of teacher collaboration. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times. Toronto: OISE Press.

Harrison, J.W., & Lembeck, E. (1996). Emergent teacher leaders. In G. Moller & M. Katzenmeyer (Eds.), Every teacher is a leader: Realizing the potential of teacher leadership (pp.101-116). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass

Hart, A.W. (1990 . Managing school performance: The role of the administrator. In P. Reyes (Ed.), Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity. (pp 241-276). London: Sage.

Hart, A.W. (995). Reconceiving school leadership: Emergent views. The Elementary School Journal, 96 (1), 9-28.

Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (1996).Awakening the sleeping giant: Leadership development for teachers. Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press,

Kowalski, T.J. & Oates, A. (1993). The evolving role of superintendents in school-based management, Journal of School Leadership, 3 (4), 380-390) .

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 1. 249-280.

Leithwood, K.A., Begley, P.T., & Cousins, J.B. (1991). The nature, causes and consequences of principals' practices: An agenda for future research. Journal of Educational Administration, 28 (4), 5-31.

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 8-18.

Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1993). Total quality leadership: Expert thinking plus transformational practice. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7 (4), 311-338.

Leithwood, K (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30 (4), 498-518.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Fernandez, A. (1994). Transformational leadership and teacher's commitment to change. In J. Murphy & K. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Newbury Park CA: Corwin Press.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R., (1995). An organizational learning perspective on school responses to central policy initiatives, School Organizations, 15 (3) , 229-252.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1996). Towards an explanation of teachers' perceptions of transformational school leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32 (4), 312-538.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Ryan, S., & Steinbach, R. (1997, March). Distributed leadership in secondary schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Lieberman, A., Miller, A., (1984) Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lieberman, A. (1988) Expanding the leadership team. Educational Leadership, 45 (5), 4-8.

Lieberman, A., Saxl, E.R., & Miles, M.B. (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp.148-166). New York: Basic Books.

Little, J.W. (1982) Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19 (3), 325-340.

Little, J.W. (1985) Teachers as teacher advisors: The delicacy of collegial leadership. Educational Leadership, November, 34-36.

Little, J.W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J.W. (1990 b). Teachers as colleagues. In A.Lieberman, (Ed.), Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now (pp. 165-193). New York: Falmer Press.

Little, J.W. (1995). Contested ground: The basis of teacher leadership in two restructuring high schools. The Elementary School Journal, 96 (1), 47-63.

Louis, K.S. & King, J. (1993). Professional cultures and reforming schools: Does the myth of Sisyphus apply? In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schools. Newbury Park..CA: Corwin

Louis, K.S., Marks, H., & Kruse, S., (1996) Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. American Educational Research Journal, 33 (4) pp. 757-798. Winter.

Louis, K.S. (1998). Effects of teacher quality or work life in secondary schools on commitment and sense of efficacy. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. 9 (1) 1-27

Merriam, S., (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mohrman, A.M. Jr. Cooke, R.A. & Mohrman, S.A. (1978).Participation in decision making: A multi-dimensional perspective. Education Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), 13-19.

Murphy, J., & Seashore Louis, K. (1994). Reshaping the principalship. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1995) The changing role of the teacher. In M.OHair & S. Odell (Eds.). Educating teachers for leadership and change (pp 311-323). Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press.

Nias, J., Southworth, G., & Yeomans, R. (1989). Staff relationships in the primary schools. London:Cassell.

Ogawa, R.T., & Bossert, S.T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31 (2), 224-243.

O'Hair, M., Bastian, K., Spaulding, A, & Kohl, P., (1992, April).Principal empowering behaviors, obstacles, and stressors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Reavis, C., & Griffith, H. (1993). Restructuring schools: Theory and practice. Lancaster, Basel: Technomic Publishing Co.

Reitzug, U.C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behaviour. American Educational Research Journal, Summer, 31 (2), 238-307.

Rice, E.M., & Schneider, G.T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision making. 1980-1991. Journal of Educational Administration, 30. (1). pp. 43-58.

Roberts, N. (1985). Transforming leadership: A process of collective action. Human Relations, 38 (11), 1023-1046.Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teacher's workplace. New York:Longmans.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (3).

Ryan, S. (1998). Teacher leaders: Who they are and what they do. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Meeting, San Diego.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Doubleday.

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

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Showers, J. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, April, 43-48.

Sirotnik, K. (1994). Curriculum: Overview and framework. In M.J. O'Hair & S. Odell (Eds.), Educating teachers for leadership and change (pp. 235-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sirotnik, K., & Kimball, K. (1996). Preparing educators for leadership: In praise of experience. Journal of School Leadership. 6, 180-201.

Sizer, H. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smylie, M. A. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. Elementary School Journal, 89, 543-558.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 14, 53-66.

Smylie, M. A. (1995). New perspectives in teacher leadership. The Elementary School Journal, 96 (1) 3-7.

Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J.W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (2), 150-184.

Smylie, M.A., & Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1992). Teacher leaders and their principals: Exploring the development of new working relationships. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (2), 150-184.

Smylie, M. (1994). Redesigning teachers' work . In L. Darling Hammond (Ed.) Review of research in education, 20, Chapter 3, pp 129-177. Washington D. C.: American Educational Research Association

Stone, M., Horejs, J., & Lomas, A. (1997). Commonalties and differences in teacher leadership at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Taylor D. L., & Bogotch, I. E. (1994). School level effects of teachers' participation in decision making. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16 (3) 302-319.

Trachman, R., & Levine, M (n.d.). Towards a definition of teacher leadership. New York: Authors.

Troen, V., & Boles, K. (1994). Two teachers examine the power of teacher leadership. In D. Walling (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Perspectives on the professional development of teachers (pp. 275-286) Bloomingham, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Troen V., & Boles, K. (1995). Leadership from the classroom. In Dunlap, D.M., & P.S. Schmuck (Eds.), Women leading in education. SUNY Press.

Wasley, P.D. (1991). Teachers as leaders: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weiss, C., Cambone, J. & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (3), 350-367.

Weiss, C., & Cambone, J. (1994). Principals, shared decision making and school reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16 (3) 287-301.

Whitaker, T. (1995a). Informal teacher leadership: The key to successful change in the middle school. NASSP Bulletin, January, 76-81.

Whitaker, T. (1995b). Accomplishing change in schools: The importance of informal teacher leaders. Clearing House. 68 (6), 356-357.

Wilson, M. (1993). The search for teacher leaders. Educational Leadership March. 24-27

Yarger, S.J. & Lee, O. (1994).The development and sustenance of instructional leadership. In Walling, D.R. (Ed.). Teachers as leaders: Perspectives on the professional development of teachers (p. 223-237). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Yukl, G. (1989) Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs. N J: Prentice-Hall.

Zinn, L. (1997).Supports and barriers to teacher leadership: Reports of teacher leaders. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago.

Table 1

The Perceived Impact of Teacher Leadership at Schools A, B and C (Nominator and

Teacher Leader Views)

	Nominator School A	Teacher Leader School A	Nominator School B	Teacher Leader School B	Nominator School C	Teacher Leader School C
COLLEAGUES						
improve teaching practices	5	5	1	3	3	2
increase understanding of student needs	3	1	2		1	2
affect personal and professional growth and comfort level	5	2	4	3	3	2
teacher leaders gain respect/deference of peers	3	2	15	1	6	6
emulate teacher leaders					3	1
influence to accept change	1	2	2	2	2	2
STUDENTS						
has good effect on students	3	2	2	2	3	2
provides enhanced opportunities for student learning	3	2	2	3	2	1
influences student polices (discipline, code of behaviour, promotion and evaluation)		3	2	6	2	1
influence on student activities	5	3	2	1	2	
SCHOOL						
maintains the school mission	2	2	4	4	1	
enhances the reputation of the school	2	2	1	1	1	
influences the school budget decisions		4	1	3		
influences the quality of programmes, development of curriculum, timetabling	8		8	3	4	
influences personnel decisions (hiring)		4		4	1	3
influences general decision making	1	4	2	4		2
PRINCIPAL						
influences the work of the principal	1	3	3	4		2
principal changed position on an issue/s			3	3		2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Conditions that Support or Constrain Teacher Leadership (Nominator and Teacher Leader Views

	School A	School B	School C
School Vision and Mission			
clear and accessible to most staff	2	5	
shared by most staff	6 (1neg)	1	1
perceived to be meaningful to most staff	1		1
pervasive in conversation and decision making	3	3	
School Culture			
collaborative	3	1	2
shared belief in the importance of continuous professional growth			
norms of mutual support	7	2	3
belief in providing honest, candid feedback to colleagues	2		2
informal sharing of ideas and materials	5	2	3
respect for colleagues' ideas	4	4	4
support for risk taking	6	4	1
encouragement of open discussion of difficulties	3	3	1
shared celebration of successes		1	
all students valued regardless of their needs	2	3	2
commitment to helping other students	8	5	4
School Structure			
open and inclusive decision making processes	2	5	2 neg
distribution of decision making authority to school committees	5(1neg)	6	5(2neg)
decisions by consensus		1	2(neg)
small size of school	3		
team teaching arrangements	2	`	1
brief weekly planning meetings			
frequent problem solving sessions among subgroups of staff	4	3	2
regularly scheduled professional development time in school	1	1	
arrangements of physical space to facilitate team teaching			
freedom to test new strategies within teachers own classroom	4	1	1
common preparation periods for teachers to work together			1neg
cross department appointments of teachers			
School Strategies			
use of systematic strategy for school goal setting with students, parents and staff		1	2
development of school growth plans		3	
development of individual growth plans reflecting school plans			
establishment of a restricted, manageable number of priorities		3	
periodic review and revision of school goals and priorities		3	
encouragement for observing one another's classroom practices	2		
well designed processes for implementing specific programme initiatives, including processes to ensure follow through	2(1neg)	3	2
Policy and Resources			
sufficient resources to support essential professional development	1	3	
using colleagues within one's own school as resources for professional development	1	1	
availability of a professional library and professional reading circulated among staff		1	1
availability of curriculum resources and computer facilities	1		
access to technical assistance for implementing new practices	1		
access to community facilities	2		1

* (neg) indicates that the comment was negative.

Table 3

Conditions that Support Teacher Leadership in Schools A, B and C (Principals' View)

	School A	School B	School C
School Vision and Mission			
clear and accessible to most staff	✓	✓	✓
shared by most staff	✓	✓	✓
perceived to be meaningful to most staff		✓	
pervasive in conversation and decision making	✓	✓	✓
School Culture			
collaborative		✓	
shared belief in the importance of continuous professional growth		✓	✓
norms of mutual support	✓	✓	
belief in providing honest, candid feedback to colleagues	✓	✓	✓
informal sharing of ideas and materials		✓	
respect for colleagues' ideas		✓	✓
support for risk taking	✓	✓	✓
encouragement of open discussion of difficulties		✓	✓
shared celebration of successes	✓	✓	
all students valued regardless of their needs	✓		
commitment to helping students	✓	✓	✓
School Structure			
open and inclusive decision making processes		✓	✓
distribution of decision making authority to school committees	✓	✓	✓
decisions by consensus			✓
small size of school	✓		
team teaching arrangements	✓		
frequent problem solving sessions among subgroups of staff		✓	
regularly scheduled professional development time in school	✓	✓	
arrangements of physical space to facilitate team teaching	✓		
freedom to test new strategies within teachers own classroom	✓		
common preparation periods for teachers to work together			
cross department appointments of teachers			✓
School Strategies			
use of systematic strategy for school goal setting involving students, parents and staff	✓	✓	✓
development of school growth plans	✓	✓	✓
development of individual growth plans reflecting school plans		✓	
establishment of a restricted, manageable number of priorities	✓	✓	✓
periodic review and revision of school goals and priorities		✓	
encouragement for observing one another's classroom practices		✓	✓
well designed processes for implementing specific programme initiatives, including processes to ensure follow through	✓	✓	✓
Policy and Resources			
sufficient resources to support essential professional development	✓	✓	✓
using colleagues within one's own school as resources for professional development	✓		
availability of a professional library and professional reading circulated among staff	✓	✓	✓

Table 4
Principal Leadership at Schools A, B and C (Nominators' and Teacher Leaders' Views)

		School A	School B	School C
Purposes	develops a widely shared vision for the school	1	3	1
	builds consensus around school goals and priorities	5	3	1
	holds high performance expectations		1	1
People	provides individual support	7	8	4
	provides intellectual stimulation	6	7	3
	provides money for professional development and in support of changes agreed on by the staff	3	4	
	models good professional practice		3	2
Structure	distributes the responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school	1	4	6 (3 neg)
	takes staff opinion into account when making own decisions	4	5	1neg
Culture	strengthens school culture by clarifying the school's vision for teacher collaboration and for the care and respect of students and by sharing with staff norms of excellence for staff and culture	3	4	1

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Principals & Teachers Leading Together.

Author(s): SHERRILL A. RYAN PhD.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: April 99.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1
[✓]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A
[ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B
[ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Sherrill A Ryan PhD

Organization/Address: 160 Ontario St. Cobourg, ON K9A 3B5

Printed Name/Position/Title:

Telephone: 905 373 0655   FAX:

E-Mail Address: sryan@sympatico.ca   Date: Nov 30/99.

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com