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Principals play a critical role supporting the student’s academic achievement. Their work has become increasingly challenging over past decades due to demands for increased accountability and a decline in fiscal and human resources. Principals, regardless of size and geographical locations, have had to assume additional work responsibilities, including additional administrative roles, in response.

There is a plethora of research documenting the important role principals provide in supporting the academic achievement of students (Chickering and Reisser, 1993; Cotton, 2003; Figlio, 1999; Halinger and Heck, 2011; Leithwood, 1994; and Senge, 2007). Marzano et al’s., (2005) research, as described in his book, School Leadership That Works, identified 21 principal responsibilities for school leadership that are empirically correlated to increased student achievement.

Given the current dilemma of an increasing number of principals having to assume additional leadership responsibilities, coupled with continuing demands placed on school leaders and teachers to increase student achievement, this investigator sought to determine whether there were differences, if any, between principals who held single and multiple administrative roles and their ability to implement Marzano’s second-order change responsibilities.
To conduct this study, 62 principals in a Midwestern area were contacted and asked to participate. A SurveyMonkey instrument was administered to principals and they were asked to indicate their level of agreement with 36 statements related to Marzano et al.’s. (2005) second-order principal-leadership responsibilities.

The study identified seven directional hypotheses that were closely aligned to Marzano’s second-order change responsibilities. An independent t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the perception of principals in schools with single administrative roles, as compared to principals holding multiple administrative roles, and their capacity to implement Marzano’s second-order change responsibilities.

Findings in this study indicate there was one hypothesis that found a significant difference between the two groups of principals. Principals with multiple administrative roles indicated they had more difficulty in monitoring and evaluating staff, programs, and procedures than their corresponding counterparts.

The study concludes with recommendations for further study and suggestions to district administrators, professional organizations and school boards for improving the working conditions of principals in these challenging positions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Over the last 30 years, increasing concern has been expressed about United States students’ academic ability compared to the rest of the world. In 1983, the Nation at Risk Report (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983) set off a national conversation about the educational return on taxpayers’ monetary investment being produced from our public schools. Since then, multiple approaches have been used at the national level to foster student success. However, as a nation, we continue to fall behind in National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) scores as compared to other industrialized countries (Lee, 2012). The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) shows our students to be behind other developed countries in math and science achievement (Gonzales, 2001). These studies demonstrate that our nation is not meeting the educational needs of American students, which will leave them unable to complete with other students in the industrialized world.

In contrast with the decrease in student achievement, funding for public schools increased between 1983 and 2001, which raised questions about public schools’ effectiveness when money would seem to have been available. Dewey (2000) also noted the contrast in terms of increasing concern about student achievement. He showed that funding for education continued to increase for nearly two more decades after the conversation about declining achievement started (Dewey, 2000). When this increase in funding is contrasted with the national decline in student success, it is natural for citizens to raise questions about the effectiveness of public education (Rubin, 2004). Rubin found
that taxpayers expect to see the results of their spending in the form of increased student achievement.

The discussion around funding for education and student achievement intensified as the country experienced the recent economic recession. Beginning in 2002, revenues to school districts and municipalities decreased significantly (Fahy, 2011; Kotsopoulos, 2008; Lutz, 2011; Patrick, 2012), and student achievement continued to decline (Lee, 2012). Figlio (1999) found that as revenues for school districts decreased, districts needed to find ways to provide effective education to children at a lower cost. Rees (2004) found a need to save funds motivated districts to share principals. Yet as districts explored sharing principals, they found that guidance for ways to reduce costs while increasing student achievement were less clear. Figlio (1999) explains research about the effectiveness of education spending is complex and consists of conflicting evidence about the value of certain types of spending. Hanushek (2000) believes that there is little or no correlation between financial input and school results. Jacques (2000) would argue that as funding is reduced, student achievement declines. This lack of clarity in research is especially a problem in assigning school principals. When districts assign a principal, or other administrative staff, to multiple administrative roles in a school or district, this lack of clear guidance may create a challenge for both the school administrator and the district.

There is considerable research about the need for effective building principals, but little research connecting the assignment of principal’s roles to their best effectiveness. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005, et al.) established a connection between effective principals and student achievement in their book, School Leadership that Works. In this
publication, the authors examined theories of school leadership, and performed a meta-analysis of 69 studies conducted from 1978 to 2001. They identified 21 responsibilities of a school leader that correlate with increased student achievement. They also identified seven of these responsibilities that lead to second-order, or lasting, change (Marzano et al.’s, 2005). Second-order change can be defined as a fundamental break with the past that cannot be reversed, requiring new knowledge and skills for successful implementation (Senge, 1990). While Marzano et al.’s (2005) work specifies the responsibilities that lead to improved student achievement, it was not designed to examine the effect that assigning principals to multiple sites, or to perform multiple administrative roles, has on student achievement.

The research is less clear about principal assignment and its residual impact on the ability of the principal to provide effective instructional leadership than the research on the sharing of principals to reduce administrative costs. Research conducted by Halinger and Heck (2011) about the effect of the principal upon student achievement suggests that the specific setting of a school plays a significant role in the impact a principal has. A principal has an effect upon student achievement, and yet there is little known or being studied about the principal’s impact on student achievement in differing school contexts or principal administrative role settings.

Understanding the effect of assigning administrators to single schools or multiple schools, and its residual impact on student achievement, is very complicated (Chickering and Reisser, 1993). With funding tight, and especially with principal assignment being a challenging task, principals may be assigned to multiple administrative roles without thought as to how student achievement may be affected. To date, this researcher has not
discovered any empirical studies that have attempted to measure this impact. This study’s design rests on the work of Marzano et al. (2005) and his body of research that documents the relationship between principal responsibilities and their corresponding influence on improved student achievement. By using these responsibilities as the lens through which student achievement is impacted, the complexity of defining student achievement becomes less important. Consequently, if principals are able to incorporate these disciplines within the scope of their responsibilities, it is highly likely that improvement in student achievement will occur. By examining the perception of principals who are actively working at this time, insight may be gained into the extent and effect of the problem of multiple principal administrative role assignment and their ability to incorporate the leadership responsibilities outlined by Marzano et al. (2005).

**Problem Statement**

The problem that this study addressed was namely this: to what extent is there a difference in the perception of principals who work in multiple administrative positions (e.g., principal, athletic director, special education director, etc.) regarding their ability to implement Marzano’s seven second-order change leadership responsibilities as compared to the perception of principals who have single administrative positions?

The practical problem is that due to difficult economic times, principals are assigned multiple administrative roles in order to save money. However, student achievement is on the decline over the past 30 years (Gonzales, 2001). This researcher has not been able to document the effect of principals having multiple administrative roles and its corresponding impact on student achievement. There is research to support there are measurable cost-savings when school districts decide to combine the role of the
principal with other administrative responsibilities within and across school districts (Figlio, 1999; Hernandez, 2012; Wright, 2006). Unfortunately, the unintended consequences have yet to be documented. Rees (2004) studied districts that paired buildings with one principal to handle the administrative responsibilities of operating both schools. She found that a lack of qualified principals and a need to save money motivated districts to share principals. At the same time, this researcher has yet to find work examining the achievement effect upon students of sharing principals. In addition, there is research that factors like principal gender are connected with success as a leader (Calabrese, 1989; Gaus, 2011), yet these studies do not include the contextual setting of shared or single administrative roles.

There is also ample research about the components of principal’s responsibilities that increase student success (Marzano et al., 2005). However, there has been a paucity of research examining the impact of Marzano’s leadership responsibilities in districts that have, primarily due to financial necessity, combined the role of the principal with other administrative responsibilities. Consequently, the major question this study will shed light on is whether Marzano’s leadership responsibilities have merit with principals who now have to assume more responsibilities in schools due to declining economies, particularly with respect to the administration of schools in small and rural communities that cannot afford to hire needed, and specialized, administrative support personnel.

This question is particularly significant for small and rural schools with fewer administrative staff. Many small and rural school districts suffer from having to deal with federal and state demands for increasing student achievement and the concomitant responsibilities of addressing student discipline, and providing support to teachers, and to
address parent and community concerns (Lees, 2009). Having to perform other administrative responsibilities further compounds the problem of principals that have to perform multiple administrative responsibilities. Ugboko (2012) stressed that principals need to have constant contact with students to prevent discipline issues. Yet principals need to consistently spend time reflecting in collaborative, policy, and visionary matters, which cannot be done while maintaining constant contact with students (Matthew, 2013).

**Background of the Problem**

The problem identified in this study of the effect of shared principal administrative roles on implementing Marzano’s (2005) 21 responsibilities and, more specifically, the seven responsibilities that are related to second-order change, can be set into a historical context of the principal’s work going back to Burns (1978) transformational leadership theory. According to Burns, in order to develop lasting improvement, a principal must engage in transformative leadership, which involves lasting or second-order change (Burns, 1978). In addition, Burns points out that “the ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people’s enduring needs” (Burns, 1978, p. 461). Researchers concur about the transformative properties of second-order change. Leithwood (1994) provided a summary of his own work that reviewed previous theory and examined individual aspects of transformational leadership. He created a synthesis of transformational leadership practices that is similar to Marzano et al.’s. (2005) 21 responsibilities. Leithwood reinforced the importance of transformational leadership in the school setting. Senge (2007) found that transformative practices create lasting improvement in a school building by bringing about second-order change. Senge’s (2007) research rests on
previous leadership theory, and highlights a history and a consistency of research about second-order change.

This study focused on seven of Marzano et al.’s (2005) responsibilities that involve second-order change. Those seven responsibilities are: (1) knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (2) being an optimizer; (3) promoting intellectual stimulation; (4) being a change agent; (5) monitoring and evaluating on a regular basis; (6) providing flexibility; and (7) having strongly developed ideals or beliefs. Each individual second-order change responsibility has a history attached to it. Using one as an example, it is possible to trace the belief that each of these seven responsibilities is key to lasting improvement in student achievement and transformational success in schools. This study is not just built on the work of Marzano, because Marzano et al. (2005) builds on the work of Kenneth Leithwood (1994), and Bass and Avolio (1994) who, in turn, support the research findings of Bass (1985), and Burns (1978).

Tracing the history of one of the seven second-order change responsibilities can be used as an example of the historical building of each responsibility. One of Marzano’s (2005) responsibilities is Intellectual Stimulization, which consists of helping staff members think of old problems in a new way. Kathleen Cotton (2003) identified the idea of Intellectual Stimulization in her 25 principal behaviors as leading a discussion of instructional issues. Bass and Avolio (1994) call Intellectual Stimulization by a different name: intellectual stimulation. Greenleaf (1978) discussed the same concept in terms of developing the skills of those people within the organization. The second-order responsibilities described in Marzano’s work are not new. With slightly differing names,
the responsibilities of an effective principal are supported by a long line of research. The seven second-order change responsibilities can be thought of as the essence of what a successful principal does.

It is important to have additional historical context of the leader’s role becoming more complex, even as the historical responsibilities have remained the same. In this context of a consistent history about principal’s responsibilities, Trimble (2013) noted that the role of a leader is changing. The changing role of school leadership can be viewed in several phases (Trimble, 2013) including the Human Relations, Civil Rights, and School Reform Movements. The Human Relations phase focused leaders on building relationships, and the Civil Rights phase brought great additional change politically and in public policy. She found the School Reform Movement has deeply altered the role of the school leader. Accountability for student achievement became the main focus of leaders’ work. In addition to simply providing instructional leadership, principals must be able to engage in leadership tasks needed to manage and operate a school building, while keeping a focus on transformative practices centered around student achievement (Marks, 2003).

Finally, in contrast with the private sector, role assignment of principals in light of the increasing complexity of the principal role is little-researched. In the private sector, role assignment has been deliberately researched more so than in public schools. In organizations struggling with declining human and financial resources, combining personnel helps to reduce employee benefit costs, like insurance and pensions. This is a common and established practice in the private sector, and has been less utilized in the education sector. The concept of multi-skilled employees and a lean organization is an
established business practice (Wright, 2006). This is less clear when examining the school principal position.

In the public school sector, the principalship has become so complex that it is nearly impossible to succeed long term, and so the profession is in a highly stressed state. As decisions are being made about principals’ administrative roles, it is not clear that the time necessary to implement transformative practices through second-order change is being considered. Copeland (2001) talked about the multiple administrative roles that principals serve. He pointed out that principals in smaller schools often complete tasks that are performed by multiple people in larger districts. As financial realities continue to impact schools, time resources—the time necessary to accomplish the necessary job tasks— are negatively impacted for building leaders. Without consideration of necessary job tasks, principals are being assigned extra administrative roles or covering two buildings as an alternative to the hiring of another staff member (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2013).

The idea has surfaced that the position of the principalship has come under such scrutiny, and expectations are so high, that no human can be successful at all of the responsibilities now considered part of the position (Copeland, 2001). The principal is so busy being a building manager, dealing with daily student and teacher activities, and the inevitable emergencies that are part of the position, that long-term, second-order change activities are not possible. In looking at the complex set of tasks necessary, Leslie (1999) suggests that the principal position actually needs to be split and other roles, even those such as instructional leader, be delegated to an assistant or lead teacher position. DiPaola’s (2003) findings concur with previous researchers as he found that the job of the
principal has become far more complex and incorporates many more roles than just the traditional building manager. DiPaola’s (2003) study concludes that this is a profession under stress and that having multiple roles is impacting the work of principals in a negative way. Public schools may be making principal administrative role assignment decisions based on a dwindling funding supply that are negatively impacting both student achievement, and the very profession of the principalship as well.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for this study is grounded in research about how a building principal influences student achievement in his or her building. Marzano et al. (2005) detail 21 responsibilities that, if performed by the principal, lead to higher student achievement. The relationship between performing these responsibilities and student achievement serves as the foundation for this study. The ability of principals to perform the responsibilities Marzano identified is clearly linked to student achievement in the work he and his co-authors conducted. What is not clear is how principals perceive their ability to perform these responsibilities. Especially unclear is their perception of being able to perform these responsibilities if they have to oversee multiple administrative roles, such as principal of multiple buildings, special education director, athletic director, or even as the superintendent of the school district. This lack of clarity may be a problem in assigning administrators in ways that maximize student achievement. The perception of the principal’s ability to perform transformational leadership responsibilities also has not been specifically studied in small rural schools.

The concept of the independent variables in this study consists of each of the selected items from Marzano’s 21 responsibilities, and the demographic characteristics of
each principal. The dependent variable will be the mean aggregate score of each group of principals as defined by the demographic. For example, if the group of principals responding were divided into two groups, one group of principals having a single administrative role and one group of principals having multiple administrative roles, would the mean aggregate score on any of Marzano’s responsibilities change? In this example, the study is examining if a relationship exists between the administrative role type of the principal, and their aggregate perception of being able to meet these responsibilities that are linked to student achievement. In addition, the comfort level of principals in regard to second-order change itself is of interest.

Development of this conceptual framework came about from trying to know if differences in principals and their administrative roles had an impact upon student achievement. It is not known if a busy principal, with multiple administrative roles, is less able to complete the responsibilities because of the multiple administrative roles. Perhaps the busy principal accomplishes more in terms of the responsibilities, perhaps not. An anecdotal case may be made for either view, yet statistical evidence is not clear. It is especially unclear in small, rural school settings.
Figure 1: A conceptual framework illustrating the relationship between principal’s perceptions regarding second-order responsibilities and their impact on student achievement.
What is missing from research in this area is specific information about how the responsibilities play out in the daily work of principals in different work assignments. It is not clear, for example, how differently a principal in a small, rural district, who also carries additional administrative roles outside of those of a principal, may perceive their ability to provide an educational climate that supports academic performance as compared to a principal assigned a single administrative role as instructional leader in their building. This study attempted to provide answers to the questions posed in this research by establishing the degree of relationship between the variables identified in this conceptual model.

The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether there are differences in the perceptions of principals with multiple administrative roles, as compared to principals that have single administrative roles, about their ability to implement Marzano’s second-order change leadership responsibilities. In addition to examining if working multiple administrative roles affects student success, this study sought to reveal which of the specific responsibilities that are linked to second-order change are affected when a principal works multiple administrative roles. In the increasingly complex work that principals do, adaptive work, which necessitates second-order change, is important. This study’s results may enhance superintendents and school boards’ ability to provide support to building principals who must assume multiple responsibilities, in specific areas that would increase their ability to support the academic achievement of their students.

**Hypotheses of Study**

This research study will test the following hypotheses listed below.
H₁: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Involvement and Knowledge of Curriculum” leadership responsibility.

H₂: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Being an Optimizer” leadership responsibility.

H₃: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Promoting Intellectual Stimulation” leadership responsibility.

H₄: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Being a Change Agent” leadership responsibility.

H₅: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Monitoring and Evaluating” leadership responsibility.

H₆: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as
they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Providing Flexibility” leadership responsibility.

H7: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Strongly Developed Ideals” leadership responsibility.

**Research Variables**

The independent variables were items from Marzano’s seven second-order change responsibilities asked in a questionnaire format to principals, as well as the demographic characteristics of the principal’s role. The dependent variables were the mean aggregate scores attained on each domain of Marzano’s leadership responsibilities.

**Research Design**

This study used a quantitative research design. The researcher examined principal perceptions using an *ex post facto* design. Shavelson (1981) explains that an *ex post facto* design can be used to describe the relationship between two variables. The researcher is examining the data after the fact, rather than manipulating a variable as would be typical in an experimental or quasi-experimental design (Shavelson, 1981). In order to provide a quantitative description of the perceptions and demographic data of the population of principals, a survey design was employed (Creswell, 2009). A t-test was used to determine whether there were significant differences between the two populations of principals (Shavelson, 1981). The 0.05 level of confidence was used for determining statistical significance.
Population

There are 596 school districts in this Midwestern state studied (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Four-hundred and twenty-six are public schools. The population studied consists of Kindergarten through twelfth grade public school principals from these public school districts.

Sample

The sample in this study is a geographical convenience sample from the available population of public school principals in a Midwestern state, and consists of Kindergarten through twelfth grade public school principals in 27 districts from an eight county region. Within this geographic area, a census sample was used (Creswell 2009). All 62 principals in the sample were contacted and asked to participate in this study. The sample was selected from a directory maintained by the Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) that oversees the region.

Selection

A complete, non-probability selection of principals in the sample was made (Babbie, 2011). Given the large number of principals in the sample, there was no expectation that the lack of statistical power due to a small N size would be an issue (Keppel & Wickens, 2004).

Procedures for Data Collection

Prior to proceeding with this research study, an application was made to the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). The HSIRB is charged with the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects in research conducted in connection with Western Michigan University.
Initial contact with principals was done by a United States Postal Service mailing containing an informed consent letter and return opt-out form. Identified participants were asked to participate in this study. The purpose of obtaining informed consent is to allow the individuals being studied to know how their rights will be protected, their participation is voluntary, and that they may leave a question unanswered or withdraw at any time without consequence (Creswell, 2009). By informing participants of the specific ways in which their rights were safeguarded, they were able to make an informed choice about their participation. It was made clear to participants that data regarding the structure of their role would be asked. They also were informed that no risk to them, nor any benefit outside of receiving a copy of the results of the study, existed. The approximate time to complete the study was stated up front, along with notification that there was no cost or compensation associated with participation. The questionnaire itself was conducted electronically, with follow up reminders at two and three weeks after initial electronic mailing to participants.

**Instrumentation**

A copy of this study’s questionnaire is located in Appendix A. This instrument is both valid and reliable. (The reader is referred to Marzano’s book, *School Leadership that Works*, for a detailed discussion on the validation of this instrument.) In this study, the investigator selected items from the following seven second-order change responsibilities: (1) knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (2) being an optimizer; (3) promoting intellectual stimulation; (4) being a change agent; (5) monitoring and evaluating on a regular basis; (6) providing flexibility; and (7) having
strongly developed ideals or beliefs. Additional items examined general comfort with second order change.

Selected items from the 92-item questionnaire used by Marzano et al. (2005) were matched with the second-order change responsibilities to make up this study’s instrument. A four-point Likert scale was used, similar in form to Marzano et al.’s (2005), to allow each principal to indicate their level of agreement on each stated survey item. In addition to this, each respondent was asked to select categories that would describe their administrative role as single or multiple, and if they have multiple administrative roles, what those roles are.

Data Analysis

Because this study is examining the differences in perception of two groups, a T-test was appropriate for statistical analysis in order to examine these differences. A two-way t-test was used because it wasn’t necessary to determine the direction of this difference (Shavelson, 1996). To test each hypothesis, the mean response of each of the two groups was assessed, then the two group means compared. Statistical analysis allowed determination that any difference between group means for a particular hypothesis was due to a significant difference rather than just a chance variation in perception.

This is an ex post facto design, as the subjects are being surveyed about work they have already done, as opposed to being in a true experimental design (Shavelson, 1996). A 0.05 level of confidence was used for determining statistical significance.
Significance of Study

This study attempted to shed light on the possible differences between multi-role and single-role principal’s ability to implement Marzano et al.’s (2005) seven second-order change related responsibilities. The results could be used by school districts to make their assignment of principals yield more effective results in terms of student achievement. There is significant research about the complex work that school principals perform and the roles and responsibilities that make up their daily tasks. Research about the responsibilities that principals perform and their effect upon student achievement is summarized in Marzano et al.’s (2005) work. Marzano’s (2005) meta-analysis reviewed 69 research studies and failed to identify the condition of the principals’ assignment (single v. multiple administrative roles). There is also a paucity of research that considers the context in which many principals work such as the size and geographic location of schools. Hallinger (1996, 2013) recognizes the need to consider the cultural and contextual factors in educational leadership practice. The failure to do so is problematic to the research on educational leadership practice. In examining 57 studies since 1990 dealing with school size, Leithwood (2009) showed that the size of the school has an effect on student’s achievement, especially with diverse or disadvantaged students.

The research conducted by Cotton (1980) also found that the relationship of class size to school effectiveness depended on the context of the setting. It was shown that smaller class sizes, where possible, benefitted early elementary students, but this effect was not as significant at the secondary level. Previous studies have failed to consider the growing demand that is occurring in small and rural school districts of hiring principals to perform other administrative functions while serving as the building principal. The results
of this study will fill the gap in the literature and help school districts make decisions regarding the assignment of principals.

There is ample research about the components of principal’s responsibilities that increase student success. There has been a lack of research examining the impact of leadership responsibilities in districts that have, primarily due to financial necessity, combined the role of the principal with other administrative responsibilities. Consequently, the major question this study attempts to shed light on is whether Marzano’s leadership responsibilities are able to be met by principals that are now having to assume more responsibilities, particularly with respect to the administration of schools in small and rural communities that cannot afford to hire needed, and specialized, administrative support personnel.

In addition to examining if working multiple administrative roles affects student success, this study attempted to reveal which of the specific responsibilities that are linked second-order are affected when a principal works multiple administrative roles. In the increasingly complex work that principals do, adaptive work, which necessitates second-order change, is critical. Fullan stated, “an adaptive challenge requires complex learning in politically contentious situations where there are many inertial forces pulling us back to the status quo” (2005, p. 46). It may be that the additional challenge to a principal who has to adapt to multiple administrative roles as opposed to a single administrative role, requires more or different supports in order to be successful in terms of student achievement.

The supports may be different as the work of second-order change involves different outcomes than traditional managerial work. In an analysis while preparing to
implement a university/public school collaboration project, Korach (2011) identified five differences important to enacting second-order change in schools: (1) Increase understanding of personal responsibility and accountability; (2) Move from a compliance culture to a collaborative culture; (3) Move from deficit thinking toward cultural competence; (4) Move from perceiving inquiry and conflict as negative to positive; and (5) Emphasize performance accountability. The project endured criticism of reform efforts typical in the United States. By using these five components as their conceptual framework for leadership and professional development, the project was able to move past the dissonance inherent with intense second-order change. The result was increased student achievement. A secondary result was deeper satisfaction for the principals involved in the work.

O’Sullivan (2011) describes the educational system in Ireland, which is facing criticism and change similar to the United States, as needing to decide what DNA to part with, and what DNA to keep. This description fits with Senge’s (2007) definition of second-order change being irreversible change. The author’s describe a picture of diminished public resources, a move towards standardization, the loss of community identity as schools combine to more efficiently use resources, and the fairness of accountability. Educational leadership must be work of adapting, not just executing. Executing fits with first order change, which is change that will go back to the status quo when the leaders stop executing current action, whereas adaptive change cannot go back.

While all of Marzano et al.’s (2005) responsibilities are important, there are seven tied to second-order change, which is critical for the adaptive results that lead to increased innovation, learning, and adaptability on the part of students (Slater, 2013;
Taylor, 2011; Uhl-Bein, 2009). All three studies describe the complexity of the modern principal’s world, and emphasize the importance of long-term adaptability and second order change. In addition to the tie between second-order change, adaptability and student academic success, Connolly (2000) connects both second-order change and adaptive work directly back to Bass (1985), and lists several themes the author’s term as significant. Each of the themes can be matched up with the seven second-order change responsibilities from Marzano et al.’s (2005) work. In short, the literature agrees on what second-order change and adaptive work are on the part of principals, and that both are connected to each other, and to increased student achievement.

Understanding the second order change responsibilities that are affected by a principal having multiple administrative roles will be a benefit for school districts having to assign principals to such administrative roles. This study’s results would enhance superintendents and school boards’ ability to implement support for building principals that must assume multiple responsibilities, in specific areas that would increase their ability to support the academic achievement of their students.

**Delimitations of Study**

In designing this study, the researcher made certain choices that frame the boundary of the research. The framework of this study is bound by the 21 responsibilities that Marzano et al. (2005) identify in their work. There are many other studies that identify differing perspectives about the work of principals. Because of the purposeful focus on Marzano et al.’s (2005) 21 responsibilities, this study did not consider the perspectives of other authors in the data collection scheme.
Because of time and financial limitations, the researcher chose to study a limited population within a Midwestern state. The researcher studied the perceived differences of principals selected Midwestern counties. Therefore, there is no attempt to generalize the findings outside of this population.

**Limitations of Study**

Limitations may be thought of as potential weaknesses or problems of a study (Creswell, 2009). In research, there are conditions that cannot be controlled by the researcher. These uncontrollable conditions place restrictions on both methodology and conclusions, and may influence the study’s results.

This study was limited to public school principals within a certain Midwestern state and did not include public school principals in other Midwestern states. This study was limited to participating principals that were selected in 27 buildings in eight different counties in a Midwestern state and did not include principals beyond these participating school districts. And finally, of necessity, there is no attempt to generalize the findings to include principals in other districts that did not participate in the study (Creswell, 2009).

**Assumptions**

The information used in this study was drawn from principal’s own self-reporting on the questionnaire. Because of this self-reporting of individual perceptions, accuracy of the responses may affect the results of the survey. Therefore, it was assumed that any and all information provided by the principals was an accurate account of their perception.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms will be used throughout the study and are operationally defined as:
First order change. A preliminary, superficial change with past and current institutional structures within a district or school building (Wagner, 2002).

Monitor. A principal’s ability to monitor school practices and their impact on student learning (Marzano et al., 2005).

Responsibility. In this work, the term responsibility will refer to the 21 responsibilities outlined by Marzano et al. (2005).

Role. In this work, the term role will refer to the administrative role assigned to a principal, especially in reference to whether that assignment contains a single duty, or multiple administrative roles, such as principal and athletic director.

Second-order change. A fundamental break with past and current practices requiring new knowledge and skills for successful implementation (Wagner, 2002).

Stimulator. A principal’s ability to make faculty and staff aware of, and create discussion of, the most current theory and practice (Marzano et al., 2005).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As the effectiveness and funding of public education has come into question in recent years, the need to understand the principal’s role and the context of his/her work (Dimmock, 2000) has risen to the forefront of discussion. During the last four decades, the role of the principal has become even more complex, yet to see the true context of the recent principal role it is important to understand that this is more than a continuation of the evolution over the last 160 years. The changes that principals and education have undergone in this time period have accelerated, and are taking place at a much deeper level than daily activity involving first-order change. The role of the principal involves understanding the importance of second-order change in doing lasting, transformative work (Burns, 1978). Therefore, this literature review will examine the evolution of the principal role and the connection of second-order change to improving student achievement. The relationship of situational context to principal’s work will also be examined as it is connected to student achievement, and is critical to the success of implementing lasting change (Hallinger and Heck, 1996). Impacts of funding on the intensity of the principal position will also be discussed. Finally, the impact of funding on all of the above, which is not well-understood in small, rural schools, will be examined. The purpose of this research is to begin to shed light on this context.

Evolution of Principal Role

The principal role emerged in the last half of the 19th century, when traditional one and two-room schoolhouses began evolving into school buildings with more than one teacher. As school buildings grew the natural responsibility of one or two teachers to
maintain daily care of the building also grew. In order to assign duties and help maintain order, a teacher was often designated to be the main or principal teacher. These early principals still were connected to the classroom as teacher leaders (Rousmaniere, 2013), but also supervised other teachers and acted as a link between the community and school.

In addition to building care responsibilities, the duties of the principal teacher started to include enrolling pupils, keeping attendance, dealing with severe disciplinary issues, and tracking materials, books, and work days of teachers (Andreas, 1885). The principal served as a functional manager only (Andreas, 1885), as no concept of an academic leader was in place. Responsibilities were clerical as opposed to educational. Kate Rousmaniere (2013) sums up the role by stating:

> Of the many organizational changes that took place in public education in North America at the turn of the last century, few had greater impact on the school than the development of the principalship. The creation of the principal’s office revolutionized the internal organization of the school from a group of students supervised by one teacher to a collection of teachers managed by one administrator. (p. 3)

As the principal moved away from the classroom, an interesting contradiction regarding educational purpose took root that still exists today. The principal became less connected to the classroom, yet more responsible for student educational success (Grissom, 2011).

The term principal and the concept of a principal teacher came from the European headmaster, who had complete control over every aspect of the school building. The period from 1890 to World War I had been described as the heyday of the principalship, with compulsory attendance laws becoming universal, and the principal having complete
autonomy in decisions over all aspects of the school (Saxe, 1968). Importantly, as in the United States at the time, the European headmaster was the master teacher, and was selected because of a recognized ability to teach, not lead (Jenkins, 1972). Leadership outside of the classroom had not yet become a clear part of the principal role. In 1928, principals spent only about two hours per week engaging the community. It was considered an extra duty if they had time (Rousmaniere, 2013).

In addition to the change in staff structure, traditional focus on reading, writing and math was about to change. In the late 1800’s and the first half of the 20th century, progressive practices became in vogue. John Dewey is seen as the movement’s main figure in the United States, although there were many other leaders around the world (Fairfield, 2009). Dewey saw education as a process of developing children, not just learning about subjects. He believed that democracy could be taught only by students participating in it, as opposed to watching it (Fairfield, 2009).

The progressive education movement was codified with the publication of the 1918 Cardinal Principles Report by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Wraga, 2001). In it, schools were encouraged to take into account student’s individual differences, goals, attitudes, abilities, and civic objectives. The report added seven principles of healthy life practices to mathematics, writing, and reading. The principles included oral expression, written expression, worthy home membership, vocational preparation, civics, physical education, ethical practices of personal responsibility and initiative (Rousmaniere, 2013). In the 1930’s, the Progressive Education Association’s launched the Eight-Year Study Project, which looked at human development, interdisciplinary studies, student involvement in curriculum planning, and
community engagement in schools (Kridel, 2007). As a result, the objectives people thought schools should cover were made even more broad.

Previous to the progressive education movement, the principal-teacher was the teacher who was in charge of conveying the school board’s wishes to the rest of the teachers in the building (Rice, 1969). As the progressive education movement connected with principals evolving out of the classroom, the role of the principal moved toward being more of a representative of a centralized bureaucracy. Students became more often separated by grades, especially in larger schools. This graded school concept also led to principals being physically separated from the *teaching hall*, and move into an office with desk, table and filing cabinets. Sometimes a secretary was hired to help with filing and greeting the public while they waited to talk with the principal. This was not only a physical separation from the classroom, but a move towards the separate role of the *professional principal* (Pierce, 1935).

Part of the impact of the transition from principal teacher to building principal was the lessening of time that principals were focused on academics. A dissertation by Neumon (1971) sheds light on Albuquerque principal’s major issues at the time. The principals were concerned about there being too many meetings to attend, spending too much time on non-leadership activities, and dealing with problems of obtaining supplies, poor communication, and excessive paperwork (Neumon, 1971). It was also noted that articles critical of school performance were starting to be more common, a change in the absolute authority previously known by principals.

**The Principal as Manager**
By the 1950’s most principal roles were a managerial position with a main role of supporting teachers, but not being directly connected with their daily academic work. Because of the work of education reformers earlier in the twentieth century, schools were moving away from the old head teacher role to the principal being a more authoritarian administrator who supervised teachers (Altenbaugh, 1992). By the late 1950’s, Albert Shanker organized New York City’s United Federation of Teachers, in part as a reaction to the authoritarian role of the administration that had emerged in since World War II (Lortie, 1975). This not only changed the relationship between teachers and principals, it further confused the role of the principal. As most union contracts were bargained between the superintendent level and teacher unions, the principal was caught in the middle (Cooper, 1976; Knoester, 1978). The impact was especially intense when difficult negotiations led to strikes (Heller, 1978). This confusion between whether the superintendent or the principal had authority over the teachers led to further erosion of the principal’s authority.

Two pieces of this movement existed with both advocacy on behalf of teachers by principals and advocacy by teacher unions as well. Principal authority, and their ability to advocate for teachers, was eroded further by the beginning of teachers’ rights movement in the United States after World War II (Lortie, 1975). Both contemporary reports and later research document the rise of unions in response to the professionalization of the principal position. Previously, when the principal gained unquestioned authority over teachers, resistance developed. This further separated the role of the principal from that of the classroom educator (New York General Education Board, 1923; Rappolee, 1955). Activism in support of teachers by principals rose in parallel, although principals who
bucked the established rigid boss role risked their careers. Coupled with the questioning of principal’s authority, the establishment of teacher unions led to the rise of principal’s clubs and unions of their own (Rousmaniere, 2013). The challenge of principals being caught between schools board and teachers started to solidify.

Silberman (1971) tied together and added deep credibility to general criticism of schools with his critique of the educational system in the United States when he published *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education*. He was the director of the Carnegie Study of the Education of Educators in the three years that he conducted research for the book. In it, Silberman describes the status of United States education as in disarray, with serious problems that are intellectually and esthetically empty. His recommendations generally followed the example of the open school model, which grounds learning in what the student is interested in, as opposed to what the teacher wants to teach. His credibility had a deep impact on the conversations Americans were having about education at the time. His vast credibility further complicated the arena in which principals worked because it completely reversed the idea of a standard curriculum that needed to be taught to all public school students.

The change in learning and teaching approaches was a final push away from being focused on supporting classrooms, to supervising them. Jenkins (1972) asserts that the principal was no longer the master teacher for most schools, especially secondary buildings. The role became larger, more of a building manager, rather than a master teacher. Eventually, the principal became critical to maintaining the school building environment, rather than the classroom (Palaniuk, 1991). Kearney (1977) sets forth that the principal’s approach has evolved to view the school as a base to encourage and
provide structure that develops a team approach among teachers. Principals must believe that school improvement comes through developing teachers. Kearney (1977) also asserts that a faction of principals believe the individual teacher orientation important for success may be slipping away. More confusion about roles has developed since. In a national study looking at the management component of public school principals, Overy (1981) found that principals overwhelmingly want more time to deal with managerial aspects of their duties. (Gender did not appear to be a factor, though this was especially prevalent among principals with higher degrees and more experience.) The removal of the principal from the classroom, which started physically several decades ago, became complete, as the principal role has completely left the classroom to manage the school.

The Human Relations Movement

Outside the classroom, the initial leadership role became one of supervising teachers and dealing with building management. Later, as societal influences changed public schools, the modern leadership role of the principal changed as well (Berrien, 1957). In the 1950’s, after World War Two, The Human Relations Movement focused the principal on developing relationships between staff, students, parents and the community. As early as the 1890’s, the high school principal’s role changed from the 1850’s role of being the lead teacher, to that of the leader of a comprehensive school program (Hampel, 1986). By 1900, goals beyond the intellectual education of students started to come into play, such as individual, social and vocational education. Goals similar to these continued to frame the work of public education until the middle of the 20th century (Green, 1999). In the mid 20th century, the complexity of administrative work dramatically increased for
both elementary and secondary principals (Beck, 1993). The external influences of the school grew, positioning principals between the increasing policy demands from schools boards, superintendents and central offices, and the new involvement by the community. In addition to the usual classroom teacher supervision, and supporting teachers with supplies, facilities, and curriculum, there were legal requirements around employment, community engagement, testing, transportation and traffic safety, and insurance (Beck, 1993). The state and federal governments, organized teacher’s unions, activist parents, the emerging youth popular culture, and increased ethnic and class conflict affected public schools. Traditional conformity to the unquestioned authority of principals eroded and power structures became more complicated (Beck, 1993). This led to role confusion on the part of the principal, especially for leaders who had started their careers in the time of absolute authority, but were now facing shared leadership because of outside influence.

As the baby boom grew school enrollments in the late 1950s and early 1960’s, a new youth culture rose up. Postwar affluence, changing family structures, and the 1960’s anti-establishment culture affected the authority structure of schools (Angus, 1999). The traditional structure of schools relaxed (Silberman, 1971). There was an expansion of interdisciplinary courses, more unscheduled time, and credit for out of school activity. The expansion further complicated the work of the principal, and the relaxation of the traditional structure continued to erode the absolute authority that principals once held. During this time, Sergiovanni (1994) championed the concept of the school building becoming a community. He felt it was critical to have a sense of a school being a learning community, and that instructional and curriculum decisions be made within the context of
that community. While academics were still important, he had a strong focus on soft
skills and the school being a democratic microcosm. It was important that students,
parents, and community members saw the school community as a place to find meaning
and that it was an inclusive environment for all.

The launch of Sputnik (Urban, 2010) in Oct of 1957 and the National Defense
Education Act of 1958 brought the less structured atmosphere of the 1950’s to a sudden end. The Russian success at beating America into space deeply affected the USA psyche. The impact was so deep, in fact, that the word Sputnik became synonymous with the concept of a cataclysmic intervening event, for example Jennings (1987) describing the economic challenges of the 1980’s “The Sputnik of the 1980’s”. Prior to Russia’s launch of Sputnik, public education had become complacent, viewing the Soviets as inferior. The shock of the launch caused the United States to rise to the challenge and embark on the 1960’s mission of putting a human on the moon. Technology came to the forefront of American life.

The impact was felt in education as well. Increased career testing and guidance became standard in high schools. Federal funding for vocational education was increased (Steeves, 2009). In response to a perceived lack of science and engineering graduates, triggered by the Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite, a national framework of school reform came about. At the time, the use of schools to further public policy was becoming more common. Sputnik was an opportunity, because of the view that public education was linked to national defense, to strengthen this connection (Steeves, 2009). Another affect of the National Defense Education Act was to further federal control of public education. The act occurred not long after Brown v. the Board of Education. There was
still much resistance to federal involvement in education, and deep resistance to anything that would further educational opportunity for minority populations. It has been speculated that perhaps the real impact of the NDEA was to cement the position of the federal government in directing state and local education (Loss, 2011).

In addition to increased educational demands upon existing students, the Civil Rights Era was peaking, and a new population of students moved into the mainstream in schools during the later 1970’s. The new demands for student learning, and a broader population of students to serve set the stage for change in the federal role in public education. Several acts of federal law opened opportunity for students with special needs and cemented the federal role in controlling education efforts by the states.

The Civil Rights Movement

The context in which the Civil Rights Movement occurred is complex. As the movement was playing out nationally, there was a greater involvement of the federal government in state’s issues, as can be seen by a number of acts aimed at improving education, and furthering the federal role. In the educational arena, this played out with the passage of the first broad federal act aimed at improving the equality of educational access for all children.

On March 26, 1965, Congress approved the Federal Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. While the impact of the programs established is a debate beyond the scope of this writing, the assumption by the federal government of a controlling role in public education became clear (McKay, 1965). The act was revolutionary in that it connected the socioeconomic status of a student’s family to the services that student
received in school. The act provided $1.3 billion to public schools, and $1.08 billion of that aid was directly linked to low-income students, establishing what we now know as Title I programs. In addition to direct student aid for the first time, the act provided for library materials and aid, supplemental facilities and materials, and educational research.

Another landmark act was The Civil Rights Act of 1964. This Act legislated that no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance (Determan, 1966). Previously, the role of the federal government in dealing with discrimination was one of neutrality. The effect of the act created a change in the perspective because federal aid increasing in large amounts in the 1960’s. Previously, some states worked to delay implementation of federal pressures to reform socially. With the ten-fold increase in federal aid, and the coupling of that aid to anti-discrimination legislation, states had a much harder time ignoring federal mandates. The impact was deep, extending to college admissions and recruitment, student use of facilities, employment in schools that receive federal funds, discrimination in medical services, and literally all aspects of public schools. In addition, because of compliance reporting and the ability of the United States Department of Justice to investigate, there was a mechanism to gradually enforce the law where states, communities, or schools chose to ignore it (Determan, 1966). Other acts were proactive, seeking to encourage improvement of minority’s living situations, rather than dealing with past discrimination. The Equal Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, part of President Johnson’s War on Poverty, was not directly aimed at benefitting public education. It did provide for high school work-study,
adult education, and limited-English proficiency programs (Phi Delta Kappan, 1965). In
addition, it contained provisions for Community Action Programs (CAP), and college-
level work-study programs.

Several executive orders, starting with Executive Order 10925 required
government contractors to provide equal employment opportunity and to take affirmative
action to do so. Executive Order 11246 outlawed hiring or employment decisions based
on race, color, gender, religion, and national origin. It was the first anti-discrimination
legislation dealing with equal pay for men and women, and was known as the Equal Pay
Act of 1963 (Stillson, 2001). While the Act was outside of student issues, the activity of
challenging the status quo in one area led to challenges on behalf of students in the
educational arena.

*Lau v. Nichols* (Modrall, 2001) presented as a language policy case involving
Chinese speaking students in San Fransisco. After it was settled, it ended up setting up
civil rights protects for bilingual students, and giving the Office of Civil rights, which
was part of the U.S. Department of Education, the ability to compel bilingual education
through policy. Like the Civil Rights Act, it gave minority students, this time based on
language, the right to an equal education, and contained the means to enforce the law.
P.L. 92-142 (Milgrim, 1986) did the same for handicapped students, reinforcing their
move into the mainstream and forever placing the term least restrictive environment into
the language of public education (Hampel, 1986). During the reauthorization of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1968, Title VII of the act was known as the
Bilingual Education Act (Secada, 1990). While there are conflicting approaches to
bilingual education–students need to assimilate English vs. classrooms need to assimilate
the bilingual student—the encouragement offered by the act cemented bilingual education, and continued to establish the federal role in driving public education.

Examining the literature brings to light an important facet of the evolution of the principal role, for which the Civil Rights Movement is a good example. History is often viewed as a set of separate eras taking place one after another. This view downplays the complexity of history, how interwoven it is, and the deep, conflicting affects historical changes had on the principal’s role. It was not a clean change the principal could adapt to and move on. It was, and still is, a constant change that cannot fully be adapted to. The Civil Rights Movement is often viewed as having taken place after the Human Relations Movement in the last half of the 20th century, when very public and visual events took place. The reality is that the changes in the 1950’s and 60’s actually have roots closer to the beginning of the 20th century. In education, as early as 1911 in Cincinnati, Jennie Porter started work against segregation law affecting African American students and educators (Rousmaniere, 2013). The changes brought about by the Civil Rights Movement happened in parallel with societal changes connected with the Human Relations Movement.

The Civil Rights Movement forced the principal to deal with issues related to equality and equity. This meant the principal, on top of the larger and more diverse youth culture, and confusion about the role of school leadership, was on the front line of a societal upheaval. It is difficult to overstate the negative condition of segregated African American schools the principal’s were trying to lead. A description from the time was as follows:
There were piles of papers everywhere, strewn and tattered textbooks, pieces of desks, broken bottles, papers and shards of metals, and utter slop up and down the sidewalks and walls. There were shattered window and boards, and the building looked smoky, and it was sooted and singed, as were the boards, some blackened, cracking and peeling. The guys of the school were hanging and falling all over the place. And there were shrieks and screams of children gone wild, shivering in the already frigid air and flattening the tones of the constant false alarms clanging through the windowless frames. (Rousmaniere, 2013, p. 112)

In the 1930’s African American educators earned about 60% of the amount earned by their Caucasian counterparts (Baker, 1995). The NAACP, in an attempt to make the separate education systems more costly to maintain, did file and prevail in a number of lawsuits over salary discrimination, but school boards were still able to maintain segregated schools (Baker, 1995). In general, African American principals were more able to develop community engagement earlier than separate Caucasian schools, in the early to mid 20th century. Before the 1954 Brown v. the Board of Education court case, they effectively operated a separate closed African American system. Strong curricular work within this system occurred, most notably in the North with the efforts of Gertrude Ayer (Rousmaniere, 2013). African American principals had almost complete control within this separate school and enjoyed strong community support. While they were virtually powerless outside their system, some middle ground was developing as part of emerging African American middle class between African American and Caucasian social groups (Rousmaniere, 2013).
The legal decisions that separated school facilities for African American and Caucasian students were ruled unconstitutional in the landmark United States Supreme Court decision, *Oliver Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas* (Phi Delta Kappan, 1994), more commonly known as *Brown v. the Board of Education*. In the case, an African American student, Linda Brown, was being transported past schools attended by Caucasian students to reach her segregated school. The NAACP had spent two decades working to create precedent cases in the lower courts. As the Brown case moved to the United States Supreme Court, long years of work came to a head. Not only would the decision allow African American students into Caucasian schools, it would force Caucasian students to attend African American schools (Phi Delta Kappan, 1994). The decision was not surprising, coming at a time that other American systems were becoming desegregated. In fact, in hindsight, it appears that particularly in the South, elaborate plans were made by leaders long before the decision was made. Those plans were not about how to implement the decision, rather they were focused on how to delay implementation as long as possible.

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was yet another outside influence from the federal government principals had to contend with. The act allowed federal funds to be withheld from local districts if they did not desegregate. The principal was put in the position of dealing with fallout from court proceedings related to segregation. While a court may order the busing of students, and the board of education and superintendent carry out that order, it was the principal who felt the affect in the culture of the school building (Duff Landino, 1996). Examples of the affects include effigies of African American students hung from school flagpoles, to student strikes and sit-ins
across the country. As Brown was implemented, African American school buildings were closed and many African American principals were left without work. Particularly in the South, numbers of African American principals declined as much as 50% (Karpinski, 2006). This not only meant a loss of African American leaders, but a destruction of a system that was in some ways effective in encouraging minority children to become educators and administrators. Even a decade after the Brown decision, a large percentage of students still attended school in segregated facilities (Siddle Walker, 2005). The issue is not only one of clashing populations, but the melding of very different cultures (Harrington, 1968). Further complicating the expanse of the issues facing principals was the growth of Hispanic and Native American populations inside the public schools, along with other cultures in smaller numbers depending on the area of the country (Spencer, 2012). Each population had differing ways of life and their children’s needs varied. This mean that schools needed to adapt to the different ways of life, and move into areas of supporting students that were not previously offered.

There were deep personal affects upon principals as well. Marcus Foster was an administrator who was assassinated by the Symbionese Liberation Army in 1973 in Oakland, California (Scott, 1974). He had been successful in urban schools as a principal who made a difference in situations without hope. As the Oakland superintendent, he was a gifted leader who advocated for many reform efforts. On November 6, 1973, he was shot to death in a parking lot while leaving a board of education meeting. He was not an extremist, nor interested in conflict or disruption. An article written at the time describes him as working with “varied composition of groups and individuals” (Scott, 1974, p.
and that reforms could only be achieved through cooperation and responsible action.

Outside of the issues faced by African American principals, principals in general saw an erosion of their leadership role. Complicating the authority of principals was Tinker v. Des Moines that guaranteed students and teachers constitutional due process rights within the school building. In this case, students who wore black armbands to school in order to protest against the Vietnam War were suspended. In lower court proceedings, the students complained against school officials to no avail. The United States Supreme Court reversed the lower court decision and set a future standard that such actions must “materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school (United States Supreme Court, 1969, p. 1). This led to the ability of students, parents, and teachers to further challenge principal’s authority. Vietnam war unrest and protest gave examples for students to follow and showed in terms of dress code, smoking, censorship and other challenges to school leader’s traditional authority (Trump, 1969). Drugs in schools, student pregnancy, school sit-ins, and student violence became more prevalent. The effect was not limited to students. The teachers union movement that had started in the early 20th century began to gain momentum around the same time as the Civil Rights Act (Lortie, 1975). So as principals were dealing with equity in terms of students from various backgrounds, they were also facing similar issues within the teaching population they led.

In the chaos that marked the 1970’s in public schools, a federal role in education started to emerge as leaders sought solutions for social issues, and brought forth new complications for principals like free-market competition through school choice, which
played out through programs such as vouchers and charter schools. This added a further layer of bureaucracy and work into the already complicated life of principals. It also led to another educational era for principals, the School Effectiveness Movement.

**The School Effectiveness Movement**

In the early 1980’s the School Effectiveness Movement made school leaders, not just teachers, accountable for student achievement. The principal needed to understand and coordinate curriculum among his teachers, and take the lead in accountability, especially among minority groups whose performance trailed other groups. Effective leaders needed respond to these new realities, and strongly believe in making a difference in the lives of children (Allison, 2011). The Coleman Report (Aigner, 1970; Kahlenberg, 2001; LaBrecque, 1973; Towers, 1992) was part of the initiation of the High School and Beyond research that is still ongoing. The study asserted that socioeconomic status was the largest contributing factor to student achievement. This led to a more widespread understanding by the general public that groups of students, especially minorities, were not achieving at the same rates as others. Work following the Coleman Report (Aigner, 1970) continued, and in 1983, the Nation at Risk Report (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983) triggered an examination of the value of our public schools. Since then, despite work to improve, United States schools have continued to fall behind in National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) scores as compared to other industrialized countries (Lee, 2012). So, despite 50 years, multiple education Acts, and billions of dollars, the conversation that started in the 1960’s regarding the quality of United States education continues to this day.
Schmidt (2012) describes United States student’s performance on worldwide measures as mediocre at best. While he was primarily concerned with math performance, similar issues were occurring in science as well. One of his striking findings was that while elementary aged students were fairly close together in terms of their performance scores, older students were not. Fourth grade students from 1997 to 2005 ranked in the top 60% to 70% in both the TIMSS and NAEP assessments, across socio-economic divisions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). As students age, the division increases, with eighth grade showing 33% of Caucasians and only 11% of African Americans scoring proficient, and in 12th grade, 30% of Caucasians and just 6% of African Americans scored at or above proficient. In addition, as time goes on, it gets worse, even in elementary grades. According to the 2009 NAEP, 44% of Caucasian students achieved proficiency in fourth-grade mathematics while only 15% of African American students did (Schmidt, 2012). The gaps becoming public led to cries, like Schmidt’s, for schools to address the issue.

While calls for principals to refocus on academic success came as early as the work of Tyler in the 1950’s, the school reform movement started becoming mainstream in the 1980’s, as test scores and the various reports of educational failure became more known. Of particular interest and fueling the conversation was the achievement gap between minority and Caucasian students, especially in large urban schools (Bossert, 1982). Another complication (Dougherty, 2012) during the 1970’s was the end of the baby boom. Enrollment began to taper off in public schools, which led to economic issues inherent with a smaller population supporting the existing infrastructure, and staffing meant for a larger amount of students. The intersection of economic stress and
concern about unequal achievement led to conversations about national standards, and eventually to a federal program named Goals 2000.

Goals 2000 had its start in 1989 when the National Governors’ Association realized that substantial investment in the education of their young people was necessary to bring about long-term economic gain (Schwartz, 2000). The idea also ties back to President Reagan’s view about the Nation At Risk Report (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983), that the poor performance indicated a risk for our national economic security. President George H. W. Bush had invited the National Governors’ Association to join him in an education summit in late 1989. Governors Bill Clinton of Arkansas and Carroll Campbell of South Carolina had been asked to co-chair a task force on national goals. They set the agenda for the summit. In April 1991, America 2000 was announced by the U.S. Department of Education. While there were components of local organizing, pilot schools funded with a private/public partnership, and demonstration grants using tuition vouchers, the striking component was new, voluntary testing for public schools based on international standards (Schwartz, 2000). The force behind the national strategy, as it was called, was discretionary federal funding. The congressional response was mixed and the controversy centered around who should be setting standards for schools, local governing bodies or the federal government. As the Clinton administration moved into the White House, and Goals 2000 came into being, the focus shifted to the federal government setting broad example goals for states to meet, but the states were responsible for setting their own standards and meeting them, using national goals as a guide. With this flexibility built in, Goals 2000 was enacted in April, 1994 with broad bipartisan support and millions of dollars of funding to states as they
reconfigured curriculum and educational delivery processes (Schwartz, 2000). While the effects of the act were felt for years, as the Republican Party took control of Congress in 1995, the federal role in funding education started to lessen, and the effects of Goals 2000 waned as other political activities came of interest.

By 2001, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, first authorized in 1965, called No Child Left Behind (NCLB), set specific accountability targets for public schools. Principals were charged with following specific state and federal curriculum in order to be able to succeed on the testing mandated by the act (Alvarado, 2011). The “high-stakes” accountability program laid out a series of penalties that included firing principals, state takeover of school buildings, and closure of underperforming schools (Ravitch, 2011). The NCLB specifically made the principal legally responsible for student achievement, with personal penalties for failure. Principal Pamela Brown summed up the effect of the NCLB Act: “The pressure on public school principals has become unbelievable. The No Child Left Behind Act has made a challenging job even more daunting with its requirements to achieve academic gains on a yearly basis and to provide all children with the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education” (Brown, 2006, p. 47). The principal was now in a position of personal responsibility for the achievement of the students being overseen (Ravitch, 2011). By this point, a plethora of research was showing that principals have an indirect influence on improving student achievement (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996; Leithwood, 2008; Seashore-Louis, 2008).

There were many unintended consequences brought on by the No Child Left Behind Act. The focus on teaching students to master the specific information tested,
instead of providing a well-rounded education, re-opened the market for school choice as academically focused, and sometimes “for-profit” schools were able to access public funding (Mahler, 2011). This increased competition, and further uncertainty for principals, led to higher turnover rates, to as high as 66% yearly in New York and 90% in Atlanta (Ravitch, 2011). One of the other unintended outcomes in the first part of 21st century was the further decentralization of authority (Vitteriti, 2009). Even in the 1990’s, district offices began to take a less authoritarian role, and principals were required to work with school building-based committees that included teachers, parents, community members and sometimes students. A cumulative outcome was the shortage of qualified principal candidates as hours became longer, compensation stagnant and stress greater (Miller, 2009).

After years working to meet the tenants of the No Child Left Behind Act, a shift in the national leadership party in the 2008 election, as well as frustration with the direction public education was heading, led to the Race To The Top (RTTT) legislation (Viteritti, 2012). At the end of the era of No Child Left Behind, members of congress were hearing from their constituents that the Act was not working. There was not the political will to reauthorize the act in its current form, and states were seeking ways around the legislation. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, passed in 2009, contained funding for education, that while not enough to fund all states, it could be enough money to drive change if split among a handful of states. Race to the Top was set up to have states compete with each other to meet four benchmarks: (1) adopting internationally benchmarked standards; (2) improving the recruitment, retention, and compensation of teachers and school administrators; (3) improving data collection; and
(4) implementing strategies to turnaround failing schools (Viteritti, 2012). One major criticism of the program is that because of its competitive nature, it may benefit states with the most capacity rather than the states with the most need. Overall, the effect of the act is to again strengthen the federal role in public education. An additional benefit of the act was to bring transformative practices back into the forefront of educational leadership.

**Transformative Leadership Practices and Second-Order Change**

Transformative practices emerged during the School Reform Movement as ways to create lasting improvement in a school building by bringing about second-order change. Second-order change can be defined as a fundamental break with the past that cannot be reversed, requiring new knowledge and skills for successful implementation (Senge, 1990). While second-order change became the buzzword in the early 1990’s, transformational practices go back to the late 1970’s.

In 1978, Burns detailed his theory of Transformational Leadership. Other researchers have built upon the groundwork Burns laid out. Cross-cultural research, for example, is a comparison across countries and culture. Bass (1997) examined the concept of the transactional/transformational paradigm and concluded that it has been studied on nearly all of the continents and holds true worldwide. Leithwood (1994) found that transformational leadership affects motivation as well as performance. He reviewed previous theory and examined transformational aspects of leadership. The work of Marzano et al. (2005), who studied responsibilities that principals do in order to increase student achievement, builds on the work of Leithwood (1994), Bass and Avolio (1994), earlier work by Bass (1985), and Burns in 1978.
Burns was a political historian, who moved the view of leadership to the relationships between leaders and followers, rather than the actions and characteristics of the leader. He believed that by working together toward mutual goals, work in an organization could transform both that organization and the workers within (Burns, 1978). The term *transformational leadership* was created in 1973 by J.V. Downton, who was studying transactional leadership in politics from a sociological point of view (Jessop, 1974). Burns (1978) asserted that transformational leadership was an ongoing process of leadership that improved organizations by focusing on higher-level goals and ideas. In contrast, transactional leadership was focused more on the characteristics and daily actions of leaders (Jessop, 1974). The actions of transformational leaders were focused on building long-term relationships with those they led.

Burns felt the influence of Maslow’s ideas and saw the need to elevate action to the higher levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy (Cox, 2014). Burns believed “The leader’s fundamental act is to induce people to be aware or conscious of what they feel -- to feel their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can be moved to purposeful action” (Burns, 1978, p. 44) Purposeful action instead of raw power is another aspect of Burn’s (1978) thinking, as he saw that a leader can create lasting improvement by working with healthy purpose, rather than forcing follower’s action with power alone. His distinction was between *leaders* and *power wielders*.

Bass (1985), a professor of organization behavior who studied leadership problems in organizations for 55 years, was a follower of Burn’s ideas. He examined the concept of the transactional/transformational paradigm, and explained much of the underlying psychology behind the work of Burns. According to Bass, the development of
a vision, long-term goals, and the building of trust and respect are the components that make transformational leadership work. He was interested in measuring leader success, and developed the idea that a leader is measured by the influence exerted on followers (Bass, 1993). He continued to look at ways the work of a transformative leader could be measured in terms of motivating followers to perform (Bass, 1985), including how resources are shared, spoken and unspoken rules, and how trust and initiative play out in an organization. Bass also looked in differing contexts over a period of time, such as schools vs. businesses. He helped outline the scope of research that had been conducted and concluded that transformational leadership has been studied on nearly all of the continents and it held true worldwide (Bass, 1997). He saw Burns work as starting a revolution in the study of leadership (Bass, 1993).

As Avolio, who was more of a business leadership researcher, entered the picture in the 1990’s, Bass and Avolio’s work starts moving into quantification and prediction. An example would be a study for the Army (Bass and Avolio, 2003) that sought to examine the stability of a unit under stress. The authors examined leadership ratings during stable periods, then correlated those ratings with performance of the unit during combat simulation exercises. They found that both transactional and transformational leadership were positively correlated to performance, yet transformational leadership was linked to higher commitment and performance (Bass and Avolio, 2003). This is a contrast to Burns, who saw transactional leadership as ineffective (Burns, 1978).

Transformational leadership’s was connected to school performance by Leithwood’s work (1990; 1994). He reviewed previous theory and examined aspects of transformational leadership within the schools. In developing a model of transformational
leadership for schools, he saw that school conditions had a dramatic effect upon the link between student achievement and school leadership (Leithwood, 1994). Four school conditions that he outlined were: 1) Purposes and goals; 2) Organizational culture; 3) Structure and organization; and 4) Information collection and decision making (Leithwood, 1990). Clear purpose and well-defined goals as a mediating variable was connected by Hallinger and Heck (1996) to principal performance and its influence upon student achievement. While school planning was a separate variable in some of the studies, it was put under this first condition when the four were outlined. Organizational culture is tied to finding shared meaning and values within an organization, a concept that goes back to Burns (1978) transformational thinking. Structure and organization is about the relationships between people within the organization, and progress monitoring was the focus in the fourth school condition of collecting information and making decisions based upon it.

Many studies ignored the context of school conditions and did not find a strong connection; those that accounted for the mediating variables inherent in schools found such a connection. Hallinger and Heck (1996) is held by Leithwood as an example of work that found strong correlation between student achievement and leadership because their work took the school context into account. As many others build onto the work originated with Burn’s start in 1978, many concepts are built off of Leithwood’s (1994) model. One such example is the idea of intellectual stimulation which is a concept from transformational leadership literature (Sharratt, 2007). Principals that take the time to engage in instructional conversations with students and staff facilitate increased student
achievement. In looking at such examples, this researcher found thousands of similar examples, which sets up the work of Marzano, Walters, and McNulty.

Intellectual stimulation is one of the 21 responsibilities that came out of Marzano et al.’s (2005) work. The authors examined the huge amount of literature available to guide principal’s work towards increased student achievement. They performed a meta-analysis on much of this information to guide educators. The meta-analysis is not just a quantitative summary of the literature. Marzano and Waters correct for sampling and measurement error that could affect the study’s results (Tortu-Rueter, 2012). They also lay out the connection between district leadership and student achievement. Marzano, et al. (2005) also set forth specific leadership behaviors that positively affect student achievement. Of the 21 responsibilities, they relate seven to second-order change. In doing so, they cap the development of transformative leadership, involving second-order change, which was started by Burns in 1978, and translate the thoughts expressed in literature to a practical outline for leaders.

**Situational Context in Leadership Effectiveness Research**

Situational context has emerged in the last half-century as important when understanding and applying educational research. Research about educational leadership context goes back to the late 1950’s (Getzels, 1959). This early examination of culture in the practice of educational leadership continued in the 1960’s, when increasing research viewed context as a missing variable that was often not addressed when examining leadership (Getzels, 1961). Getzels (1968) was a professor of education at the University of Chicago. In the 1950’s and 1960’s he wrote a great deal about varying contexts in how educational resources, and the context of their delivery, are different depending on what
segment of society a student belonged to. While he wrote about different levels of schooling, one of the most interesting examples this researcher found was a consultant study he did for the 1968 White House Conference on Education (Getzels, 1968). He noted that 13.4% of preschool students in what he termed the Business Class were below 90 in IQ, 42.5% of Working Class preschool students were below 90 in IQ. This finding in itself would have been important, yet in addition, he asserts that the educational community has known this and done nothing for 50 years. He goes on to detail questions about how environment affects children’s learning, and what the long-term impact would be from this context. His goal in writing the report was to “…encourage the kind of dialogue that will be equal to the seriousness and magnitude of the task” (Getzels, 1968, p. 23). He is starting the national dialogue about the need to examine context in education, with a study of preschool students.

A second phase of the study of context in educational leadership research can be found in the late 20th Century. In the 1970’s and 1980’s, culture and context were still somewhat secondary to comparison models of good leaders (Dimmock, 2002). It was in the 1990’s and later that comparison of context, not just leaders themselves, became more mainstream. School building context as an organizational quality (Pounder, 1995) also became more of a focus. Traditional assumptions about the nature of leadership being tied to specific leadership positions were challenged (Ogawa, 1995). The context of schools also became more important in determining why schools change and how they may be changed (Hallinger, 1996; Pounder, 1998).

Comparison of context, not just leaders, emerged in study in the 1990’s, and by 2000, context is mainstream. As the new century arrived, there is a plethora of research
comparing context to both school and societal research (Cambron-McCabe, 2005; Hallinger, 2011; Huen, 2002; Jackson, 2012), and to student achievement (Heck, 2009; Heck, 2010; Leithwood, 2008). Context has become a large part of the literature of educational leadership in general, and specifically, research about principal roles.

Context is a large part educational research, yet there is a pattern of lack of context in studying principal job responsibilities. Previous research has not considered the fulfillment of principal’s job responsibilities in the context of small, rural schools, differing principal administrative roles, principal characteristics, and characteristics of the school that the principal works in. Marzano’s (2005) work was a meta-analysis, which looked at many other studies, and while strong because of the large amount of data studied, it did not examine specific populations or contexts in which many principals work. In addition, there is little other research that takes into account contextual issues like the size and location of the schools being studied. As this researcher looked at previous work, a pattern emerged regarding the size and location of schools studied.

This pattern first appeared in looking at the literature about Marzano et al.’s (2005) school climate responsibility. Using the category of school climate as an example, Leithwood (1990) demonstrated the influence of the principal on school culture in several roles including communication, sharing power, and fostering staff development. This study was conducted across Ontario in schools nominated for high achievement, but had no connection with other school contexts. Communication was cited as important to school climate by Roeschlein (2002). This study was conducted with 254 Indiana schools and did not differentiate results in relation to school size and location. In his book, Open Schools/Healthy Schools, Hoy (1991) examines the relationship between school climate
and student achievement, again touching on principal’s responsibilities. School size and location were not examined.

The point in citing these three examples is principals’ administrative roles and responsibilities are often studied without examining the context of the rural school. The principal’s administrative roles are not viewed in light of other roles that are performed. This same gap can be seen in other general research about principals’ administrative roles and responsibilities. Camburn’s (2010) work looking at measuring principal leadership practice studied one urban school district. A study by Marks (2003) about principal leadership and school performance used a national sample, but only examined high schools. Even work by Taylor (2005) for the American Association of School Administrators that specifically addressed principal administrative roles only included participants from communities of 75,000 people or larger.

Noticing this pattern, this researcher examined literature related to Marzano et al.’s (2005) second-order change responsibilities in more detail. In the responsibility of optimizer, results specific to school size or location are not included in research even though optimism was considered important (Harris, 1994; Coleman, 1996; Harris, 1998; McGuigan, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2013). Providing intellectual stimulation was linked to student achievement in work by Balyer, 2012; Eyal; 2011, Griffith, 2004; Crow, 2011; Hsiao, 2012). In each of these items, school size and location were not considered when interpreting results. School size and location were not a part of research in the role of being a monitor/evaluator (Derrington, 2011; Lefgren, 2006; Moye, 2005; Jacob, 2008), the concept of the principal being a curriculum driver (Walker, 2011; Hord, 1987; Arlestig, 2007), or being a change agent (Annese, 1971; Aquila, 1988; Cherian, 2008).
The same pattern was found in the responsibilities of flexibility provider (Caldwell, 1998) and being a goal or ideal setter (Sherman, 2008). The results of all the above research did not include school size and location as important contextual information.

In further examining this previous lack of context in the research, the researcher found Hallinger, et al. (2006) bring the idea of cultural context into educational leadership practice. The authors cite culture as a missing variable in leadership theory. The pattern of school size and location not being included in research may connect with this idea. Community context varies widely within a given nation, and may account for variations of educational expectations. Those differing expectations may affect the study of Marzano et al.’s (2005) 21 responsibilities. While there is broad research about principal roles, the gap that Hallinger, et al. (2006) identifies is that of not considering the associated community context.

In contrast to research about cost noted earlier in this chapter, research about principal assignment and its residual impact on the ability of the principal to provide effective instructional leadership is less clear. In addition to conducting research, the implementation of research results without considering the context of the community in which the research took place may be problematic (Hallinger, 1996). In research examining 57 studies since 1990 dealing with school size, Leithwood (2009) showed that school size does have an effect on student’s achievement, especially with diverse or disadvantaged students. The work showed a negative correlation between large schools and elementary student achievement, and while more varied, similar support for smaller schools at secondary levels. Cotton (1980) provides a more detailed view in his research on class size as part of the Alaska School Effectiveness Project. The authors found that
the relationship of class size to school effectiveness depended on the context of the setting. As an example, smaller class sizes, where possible, benefitted early elementary students, but this effect was not clear at secondary levels. To summarize, school size, location, and even class size, have been shown to affect both the educational attainment of students, and the work of conducting research about the student’s educational attainment. In addition, the implementation of previously conducted research can be better done if a school understands the context of the study being considered. Unfortunately, much research about the administrative roles and responsibilities of the principal has been conducted apart from consideration of context, especially in small, rural schools.

**School Funding and Student Achievement**

The research about school funding is focused on sources of funding, distribution within funding areas, and the adequacy of funding. When relating to school funding, student achievement is viewed by the government as Adequate Yearly Progress or AYP, a term coming out of the No Child Left Behind Act. Sources of funding are property tax, sales tax and income taxes from local, state and federal sources (Nichols, 2004). Before the 1970’s, local funds were the dominant source of district funding, with states and federal funding sources relegated to a more minor role. This is because the United States Constitution doesn’t address which entity is responsible for funding public education, and the Tenth Amendment keeps powers not specified in the constitution reserved for the states, leaving education as a state function. As a result, most state constitutions assume responsibility for public education (Peng, 2010). Historically, local district and municipal revenue came from property taxes, as communities sought to educate their local children.
Property taxes are relatively stable given the ups and downs of the economy, which helps to insulate schools from economic cycles. Because the assessment of property usually lags behind changes in home values, reductions or increases in values are delayed, so school districts are not immediately affected (Peng, 2010). About one-half or more of school funding comes from the state level (Anderson, 1997), although this varies both between and within states, with funding often higher in suburban schools on the outskirts of large metropolitan areas.

The equality of public education became more important in the 1970’s, and state and federal roles in funding increased. Before they became more involved, funding levels were a local decision. Local districts voted their funding within the district through millage elections. In more wealthy districts, voters could choose to support schools at a higher level, which led to huge disparities between rich and poor districts. When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 came into effect, the federal role in funding public education rose above the previous typical amount of ten percent of the usual district’s budget, which started to erode local control of funding. While increases in state funding started after World War II, lawsuits filed in the 1970’s regarding unequal funding between local districts had the effect of forcing the states into a stronger funding role (Peng, 2010). As equal rights under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were litigated in the employment arena, there was a spillover effect in public education. Litigation occurred regarding schools that were not funded as well as others in the state. This drove states to examine distribution methods and differences between local district’s level of support for education (Taylor, 1986). The equal protection lawsuits led to a change in the distribution of funding for public education, with states funding a larger
share of public education costs, sometimes from redistributing local property taxes, and more often by supplementing property taxes with funds from income and sales tax. While the supplemental funds are a positive for local schools, they are also more volatile means of raising revenue. Once local districts became dependent on state funding, a challenge occurred locally when states reduce funding because revenues went down, and local districts had no way to make up the difference (Peng, 2010).

The study of school funding goes back to the early 1900’s as the transition of quality schooling from a privilege of the elite to a need of all children occurred (Bancki, 2014). Since 1929, per-pupil spending has declined four times, with the most significant during the Great Depression due to the collapse of the national economy and during World War II as spending was directed towards the war effort (Peng, 2010). After the war, spending gradually increased especially with new state and federal roles, as returning veterans sought education and the Industrial Revolution peaked. In the early 1980’s, there was a period of slight decline in funding as the nation recovered from the economic challenges of the 1970’s. The Nation at Risk report became public in 1983, and the study of adequacy of public education funding came more into focus (Odden, 1986). After the 1983 Nation at Risk report, funding grew 15.8% from 1983 to 1985 as academic improvement efforts were supported by increased spending by governments trying to show they were doing something about the weak student achievement (Odden, 1986). However, when adjusted for inflation, this increase becomes 7.2%, and federal spending over the time period actually decreased. So the gains starting in this time period were typically inflationary increases, if even that, and continued at such a pace into the late 1990’s. Anderson (1997) found that in the 1993-94 school year, total spending on
United States public education approached $300 billion, averaging $5,721 per pupil across the nation, and the federal government connection to educational goals increased in late 1990’s, as the nation saw a need for educational goals being met as a component of adequacy. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 moved the federal role closer to one-third of the budget for locals (Peng, 2010). According to Lewis (2000), the federal government was much more affective at targeting money to reach students who are in need. Federal guidelines direct money toward student populations based on low income and areas of academic need, in order to service the children who need to improve the most. In a study examining the five largest programs from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Goals 2000, she found that the poorest 25% of districts in the nation received 43% of the federal funding as opposed to only 23% of funding from the state level. This means that the poor districts are relying more so on federal funding, rather than being supported by the states.

There are also outside affects on school funding, some based on myths that persist about problems with school spending. While this discussion will focus on funding, it may be helpful to remember the funding conversation is clouded by political and social disagreement, not based on research, about spending. A common myth is that schools spend huge amounts to pay for lavish administrative salaries and benefits, for an increasing number of administrators. Anderson (1997) analyzed research by the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and found districts typically spend less than ten percent of their budgets on administrative overhead. Anderson would also argue that, while the number of superintendents has gone down, additional administrative staff has been hired to handle the same or growing amount of responsibilities. On the other side of
the discussion, Peng (2010) would argue that spending on school leadership has increased, especially when school funding is examined as a percentage of US Gross Domestic Product (GDP) instead of per pupil dollar amounts. In his study, the author analyzed school funding in terms of a percentage of GDP from 1910 to 2010. They also controlled for inflation, and found that each year, schools had more money than the previous, with rare exceptions, and teacher salaries have increased 42% over the last half century in terms of constant dollars. Particularly as the federal government becomes more involved in school funding, Peng (2010) asserts that arguments about funding adequacy are no longer necessary because schools are adequately funded based upon the amounts they are spending.

Regardless of viewpoints about spending, which tax streams school funding comes from, or public misconceptions that exist about school funding, the specific stream of revenue coming into a school district is finite. As such, districts are in a position of having to operate with a balanced budget. On the revenue side of its budget, between the taxpayers giving money and schools receiving it, are a number of influences (Jackson, 1972). In a 1972 study, Jackson evaluated two models of processes used in municipal budgeting. One model is the internal or bureaucratic model, which is based on budgets being formed by the rules and procedures inherent within an organization. The second model is the external or determinants model, which postulates that budgets are determined by demands for services from constituents, or other outside forces. The internal model tends toward stability over time, with small changes in budget expenditures based on increased or decreased revenues. The external model would see broader changes in expenditure amounts when demands for services result in a revenue
increase to meet that specific demand. A municipality or school district would typically be a hybrid of the two models, and it is the estimation of that hybrid model that Jackson (1972) brings forth in his study. As an example of a hybrid concept, a district may go along year after year with a relatively internal model and budget expenditures stay roughly the same. Employees may get modest raises and utility costs may increase, but the budget is fairly steady overall. At some point, there is a demand from parents for a new facility or expansion of an educational program with the necessary hiring of more staff. This would fall more toward the external model, and may be more subject to political will. The increased revenue necessary may require a vote of the constituents to move forward. Jackson’s ideas are the traditional views of influences upon school funds between the time that taxpayers pay and schools receive. In more recent years, other influences have upset this historic situation, including the Rise of the Tea Party and the No Child Left Behind Act.

The modern Tea Party is held together by three core ideas: (1) limited government; (2) unapologetic United States Sovereignty; and (3) constitutional originalism (Foley, 2012). Viewing the sovereignty of the United States as critical and interpreting the constitution in a strict manner have not affected school funding. Unfortunately, the forceful movement to limit the size of government has had dramatic effects on willingness to collect taxes for school funding (Foley, 2012). This occurred as the Tea Party moved into local boards of education as a method of assimilating into the political system. Such positions are often a jumping off point for higher office. When boards come into Tea Party control, historic rates of taxation were lowered on the local
level. Now, as Tea Party politicians moved into state level offices, similar taxation limitation has occurred (O’Hara, 2010).

While the Tea Party has been active at the national level, it hasn’t made in roads similar to that made at local and state levels. After nearly two decades of conservative and moderate federal government, the 2008 elections brought in a more liberal leadership. From 2008 to 2010, the Democratic Party controlled the Senate, House of Representatives, and the Executive Branch of the United States. What seemed like a swing away from conservative governance actually led to the Tea Party Movement growing in reaction to liberal policy (Switzer, 2010). While the movement is complex and has been attributed to many differing reasons, the main effect on education has been the Tea Party’s move to limit government revenue at the local, state, and federal level. This has made it necessary for governments to cut budgets, reduce staff, and limit support for public education. An example of the impact in the Midwest is two-thirds of Wisconsin school districts receiving less state aid for the 2012-13 school year after a shift from a Democratic to Republican Party dominance in state politics (Richards, 2012).

Complicating the funding reduction related to the Tea Party Movement is that when budgets look drastically different each year, and when leadership is not sure of funding on a long-term basis, they react by going into a survival mode. As a result, it becomes impossible to plan purchases and staffing over the long-term, which is the most cost effective way to do both. It leads to short-term thinking, and staffing decisions that may allow a district to survive the school year, but are unwise in terms of long–term student success, and ultimately community economic success (Beckett-Camarata, 2009).
Perhaps the largest example of political action in school funding interfering with schools was The No Child Left Behind Act. Like previous versions of the Elementary and Secondary Acts from 1965 forward, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act had the same focus of establishing consistent educational outcomes for all students in the country. This Act went further in holding students and staff accountable for each child meeting a specific standard, and in raising teacher qualifications across the nation. The law required that all students meet state standards (which were based on national norms) by 2014 and rated schools on their achievement of *Adequate Yearly Progress* (AYP), as determined by a fairly complex formula. The formula included progress by individual groups of students sorted out by race, gender and socio-economic status. Any individual sub-group not achieving AYP would keep the entire school from achieving AYP. Funding, continued employment of the principal, and eventually reorganization of the school are all contingent on making adequate yearly progress (Reeves, 2003). An additional piece is the ability of students to move to another school, or in some cases even another district, if targets are not met.

Another component of the Act was to require all teachers to become *highly qualified* in each area they teach, which generally means all teachers are required to have a college major or minor in each subject they teach. Teachers only having certification in a subject, not a minor, were given time and methods to become highly qualified. The methods included submitting a portfolio of work in some cases, and for others, taking college coursework or passing subject area tests. The implementation of the act sent shockwaves through teaching ranks as mid-career teachers essentially became unemployable with their current level of education (Eppley, 2009). The idea behind the
goal was sound, yet the unintended consequences were incredibly disruptive for small and rural schools. Larger schools had the economy of scale to quickly train or reassign teachers who did not meet the new requirements, but small, rural districts did not. Secondary schools were especially affected in rural areas because teachers taught many different subjects during the course of a day. In a large urban high school, one teacher, with a major in English, typically teaches six classes of high school English during the day. In a small rural school, that same teacher would likely have an English major, a social studies minor, and teach English, social studies, and an elective course or other core courses. In a very small school, it would not be unusual for this teacher to teach four English, two social studies, and a basic math class or two. Even though they did not have a minor in math, they could be certified to teach math. This coverage outside a major and minor area was commonplace, very workable, and widely accepted practice in rural schools prior to the No Child Left Behind Act (Reeves, 2003). When this practice ended however, small schools often needed three teachers in places they previously only had two. The results were part-time positions, and incredibly difficult hiring situations in districts that were geographically isolated and not able to share teachers with each other.

Not only did the new certification requirement present an immediate issue for small, rural schools, it resulted in a long-term unintended consequence, as well. Implementation of the new act dried up the supply of teachers able to be certified in multiple areas (Jimerson, 2005). A teacher able to cover three core areas would have to have a major and two minors, as in the example of one person teaching English, Social Studies and Math classes. Therefore, it became rare to find such teachers. Even if one could be found, they could name their salary and go to any district they chose, which
typically wasn’t a small, rural district. The teaching labor market shifted dramatically. The higher cost of hiring a multiple-subject qualified teacher put small rural schools in an untenable position (Reeves, 2003).

Another way the Act adversely affected small rural districts was in their ability to obtain supplemental funding that was included in the Act. The additional funding was targeted for low-income populations, which are more a characteristic of large urban schools. In addition, the additional funds were allocated on a per-pupil basis, which often meant the total amount of money available to a small district, even if it met the qualifications of receiving the additional funding, would be so small as to be nearly insignificant for meeting educational goals. Larger districts were also in a position to have federal program staff and grant writers in place to take advantage of these funding opportunities, a luxury not afforded to small rural districts. Finally, even if funding could be had by a small, rural district, it needed to be spent in ways that would add a new activity to the school’s list, rather than fund a basic area that was already in trouble, such as the ability to transport students.

Even though small rural districts have a history of providing a good basic education for students, the very nature of a small district made it difficult to maintain adequate yearly progress. For example, small schools may have year-to-year fluctuations in class ability that are not present in larger districts. A few families moving in or out of the district could completely change the makeup of a grade level, or even an entire building. This would be especially challenging if the family fell in a racial subgroup or had special needs children. The consequences were not mild. If a school were to not meet adequate yearly progress, one of the options parents could take advantage of is finding
alternative education, with the school paying the additional transportation costs. Because of the rigorous testing involved in the No Child Left Behind Act, and the possibility of failure in any number of subgroups in the school, small schools lived in constant fear of not making the standards. This placed an enormous pressure on schools to meet AYP goals, which in some cases are simply impossible. In hindsight, the goals of No Child Left Behind were impossible from the start. The disruption it caused, especially for the funding of small schools is yet to be calculated (Sherman, 2008).

**Rural School Funding**

Rural school funding is a broad field of study in itself (Dayton, 2003), with a history of lawsuits, property tax issues, and lack of equity (Vollrath, 2013). Researchers have studied from the gap in school funding between the North and South after the Civil War, through to modern analysis of the No Child Left Behind legislation (Lewis, 2003). Concern over rural school funding is also not limited to the United States, as other countries, such as Australia (Zadkovich, 2011) and Finland (Autti, 2014), deal with similar issues. The major issues that the literature show with regard to rural school funding include mandated reforms, population decline, and the disproportionate affect of tax revenue distribution formulas (Williams, 2011). Another issue is the very definition of the term *rural* itself. A small village in New England and a vast plain in the Midwest are both rural areas, but are vastly different in terms of geography, infrastructure, and population distribution (The Rural School and Community Trust, 2003). The common traits rural areas show are a sparse population, low property wealth, small populations of students, less infrastructure, geographic isolation, and a strong sense of community. Outside of sparse population, each individual area may not contain all of these traits. This
lack of common traits also is a problem when rural schools are studied, because methods
that isolate variables by these traits may not accurately capture strictly rural areas.

One study that overcame the lack of common traits was conducted at the
University of Minnesota in Duluth. Williams (2011) performed a mixed-methods
research project that first surveyed rural administrators to establish common themes that
affected education in rural settings. The survey was designed to examine differences in
school districts that were designated as rural, and what the impact of mandated reforms
was on those school districts. Focus groups were then used to follow up in detail around
the themes and to validate the research. Those themes were:

1. Attainment of Student Performance and Learning Goals;
2. Curriculum and Instruction;
3. Diverse Learner Needs;
4. Fiscal Management;
5. Professional Development and/or Mentoring Services;
6. Recruitment of Qualified Teachers and other Professionals;
7. Retention of Qualified Teachers and Other Professionals;
8. Sparsity and Transportation;
9. Staff/students Ratio;
10. Strategic Planning;
11. Students with Special Needs (IEP or 504);
12. Use of Instructional Technology; and
13. Working with School Board Members.
While all of these are affected by funding, student performance and fiscal management emerged as the two key areas of concern. The study included an overwhelming list of needs that are not being understood by policymakers, let alone being met financially. When a policymaker doesn’t understand the consequences of a legislatively mandated reform, unintended consequences may result. A simple example included the cost of energy for a rural district. The amount of fuel necessary in a rural area to transport students, the distance and transmission cost of electricity, and the cost of heating or cooling fuel are all generally higher in small, rural schools. In addition to the higher cost, the number of students to spread that cost over is fewer than urban or suburban schools. With most funding coming to districts on an equal per student basis, the only way a district can accommodate higher ongoing per student energy cost is to reduce per student spending on materials, or personnel costs. Since personnel costs make up about 80% of the typical school’s budget, rural districts are forced to pay less than urban or suburban districts. In addition to the issue of hiring quality personnel with less available money, the ability to continue professional development for staff is a concern, as well (Williams, 2011). This effect of other costs like energy driving down salaries put districts in a funding bind in addition to the effects of hiring teachers who were highly qualified under the No Child Left Behind Act (Reeves, 2003). The effect was to expose the inequality in funding structure inherent in small rural school districts (Lewis, 2003).

A comparative study in Alabama (Lindahl, 2011) also found higher costs for rural schools, especially in the area of transportation, than urban and suburban school districts. By analyzing National Center for Educational Statistics, the author concluded that rural schools were funded at a lower level than their non-rural counterparts, and dealt with
smaller populations, lower socio-economic levels of students, and had higher per pupil costs in many budget areas. In this study, it was found that because Alabama’s funding system sets a minimum in terms of funding, called a **foundation amount**, rural schools funding comes from state sources at a 20% higher level than non-rural districts. They rely less on local and federal sources.

Population decline is another major issue for rural schools. Pre 1970, when small communities were centered in a more local, often agricultural subsistence, the local schools were supported to the best of the community’s ability. As businesses became larger and less local, small communities changed, with communities that retained larger employers growing, and those that lost employers shrinking. As a result, some communities lost students, to the point that there simply wasn’t the quantity of students in a given area for schools to operate at the same cost per student as a suburban or urban school district. McLaughlin (1998) found that over time, income levels in rural populations have declined, especially among women, leading community members to move out of rural areas in an attempt to provide a better life for their families. Beall (2009) studied the process behind the ongoing loss of the most highly educated people from rural areas. The specific areas examined were declining population, persistent poverty, changing demographics, and ongoing accountability requirements. They found that people leave to attend college and seldom return home because they find employment elsewhere. A long-term consequence of this is families discouraging children from higher education to avoid having them leave the area, which leads to lower education levels in the community as time goes on. Since economic development is tied to entreprenuerial effort by educated adults, the cycle of poverty, lack of education, and
continued downward socio-economic status of the community tends to perpetuate (Beall, 2009). Relying on property taxes for school funding makes the cycle even worse. As the socio-economic condition of a rural community degrades, school boards have less funding through property taxes to continue programs that benefit students. This forces difficult choices in funding priorities, and reliance on state and federal funding, which often have requirements for additional programing, student services, or accountability attached. In looking at the state of Nebraska’s implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Bryant (2007) found that the burden of increased property taxes in rural areas, and the inability to advance economically, led families to leave rural areas. This further exacerbated the cycle of population decline.

The distribution of funds raised by taxes is another concern for rural schools. The general trend since the 1980’s has been one of states having increased control over the distribution of funds. In 1960, local governments in the United States provided 59% of school revenue. By 1992, that figure had dropped to 50%. In studying Kansas school funding reforms in the early 1990’s, Duncombe pointed out that there is a difficult balance between equity of distributing resources to various types of districts, and the need to have efficiency in using resources, with some districts inherently being structured more efficiently due to economies of scale. In 1973, Kansas adopted a system of redistributing school aid in a way that helped rural districts. The more wealthy districts were to receive less aid until the large differences in funding between urban and rural schools were corrected. Unfortunately, the amount of revenue needed to complete the design never materialized. The state also provided a rebate of 24% of all state income tax collected from the district in order to help balance out funding. Over time, this rebate
became a more important source of school income. Significant variations in funding continued to exist into the 1990’s, with one example of per pupil property tax valuation showing $8,063 in one district, and $563,680 in another. Eventually, districts joined together and sued the state. In 1991, the finance system was declared unconstitutional, and had to be overhauled. Similar examples occurred in Michigan, Texas, and Kentucky, all of them due to inherent underfunding of rural and small districts (Duncombe, 1998).

The Kansas system of distributing state funds had previously been described as having arbitrary adjustments for low-income districts (Duncombe, 1998). The author examined the new system being put into place, which assigned a higher weighting to low-enrollment districts, students who were eligible for school lunches, and to students needing bilingual education, school transportation, or vocational education. Using regression techniques, the Kansas system was compared to a cost model the authors developed. The cost model included the items from the Kansas system, as well as the average county wage, transportation miles, and the percentage of children at risk. Between the model and the new system, the correlation was a positive 0.95, or very high.

As states are under more pressure to provide equal resources to all districts, the model of distribution has shifted to a more centralized system, and local control has been traded off in the process. Kansas provided an interesting state to examine the issue as the western half of the state is very rural, and the eastern half quite urban, with two large cities holding 32% of the school-age population. Even locally raised property taxes have been structured into state distribution formulas in a way that increased local taxes trigger a lowering of state support. This makes it impossible for local districts to raise funds by voting locally, since any increase in local does not result in an overall increase in school
funding. This structure also has the effect of reducing local control over school outcomes (Duncombe, 1998).

Chronic underfunding of rural schools by state distribution systems, unfunded mandates that rural schools struggle to comply with, and a continuing population decline in general are challenging the very existence of rural schools. In addition, issues with school funding affect student achievement in all schools. In the background section of her study, Loubert (2008) points out that major researchers like Hanushek (1986) found no relationship between funding and achievement early on. In the 1990’s, as Hanushek looked more deeply than broad relationships between funding and student achievement at specific spending patterns, a positive correlation began to appear, centered on how schools used their resources. In 1996, Hanushek concluded that it did matter how schools spent their money. Hanushek studied the research methods of other authors over a long period of time, and points out their results concluding that school funding matters for student achievement are due more to the methods used to study school funding and the bias of the author, than any true significant correlation. His belief until this time was that it matters far more how schools spend their resources than how much resources they have (Hanushek, 1996). Loubert’s (2008) study was prompted by Texas’s reforms in school funding due to a 1993 court case, and analyzed local district’s percent change in local funding down to the school neighborhood level. She looked at the funding change from 1990 to 1997, and the pass rates on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) for elementary students. Through regression analysis techniques, she concluded that for every 1% increase in funding per pupil, there is 0.5% increase in TAAS scores in that neighborhood school district.
Harter (1999) agreed that it mattered how schools spent their money. She studied school spending at the building level, rather than the district level, in 2800 Texas elementary schools. Building level expenditures were broken down into 11 categories within four main areas of operation: (1) compensation, (2) purchased services, (3) materials and supplies, and (4) other spending. Student’s socioeconomic status, academic potential, and school building characteristics were held constant, as a multiple regression analysis was conducted to look at the relationship between school per pupil expenditures and student achievement on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests. The regression analysis was performed first on all 2800 schools, then on schools grouped according to low and high concentrations of economically disadvantaged students. Conclusions included a positive correlation between spending on salaries for highly rated teachers, basic supplies and maintenance. Negative correlations showed for substitute teacher and support staff spending (Harter, 1999). While the study seems to support Hanushek’s (1996) idea that how money is spent is a more productive focus, it also shows a positive connection between higher spending and higher student achievement. The Harter and Loubert studies are examples of the connection between spending and achievement. There is a direct correlation, which is unfortunate for student achievement when funding goes down.

**Cost Reduction Affecting Principal Roles and Student Achievement**

As revenues decrease, school districts need to find ways to provide effective education to children at a lower cost. The same is true about private sector companies. When examining patterns of cost savings, this researcher noticed the private sector has found a larger variety of ways to reduce costs. Personnel is the largest cost center in
school districts, so comparison was made between personnel cost reduction in the private and public sectors. One method used to reduce cost in schools is reducing administrative overhead at the building or principal level (Edmonds, 2011; Hanushek, 2000). There is some research about the cost savings incurred when districts share principals. Rees (2003) studied schools that were paired to share a principal, and found that the lack of qualified principals and a need to save money motivated districts to share principals.

Rees (2003) studied a specific slice of funding principal assignment. Other research about saving money by reducing administrative overhead includes a great amount of information, virtually all of it related to reducing staff. Research about the effectiveness of education spending is complex and consists of conflicting evidence about the value of certain types of spending (Figlio, 1999). In a study that developed a model for school-based expenditure analysis in place of district-based analysis, Odden, (2003) found that even school-level analysis of the value of certain types of educational spending is not clear. It was an issue to determine true value of school-based personnel, and difficult to establish position value for staff that were shared among schools.

Guidance for districts in deploying staff during difficult financial times is murky at best (Simpson, 2009), leaving school leaders without clear direction or assistance. While Rees (2003), found it is possible, in both the private or educational sector, to determine if the combining of personnel across organizations is cost-effective over the long term on the basis of filling a position, the value achieved by the person in that position, related to the cost, is unknown. In a school setting, this researcher has not found clear direction about how combining administrative roles allows principals to fulfill the responsibilities
necessary to provide lasting academic results by addressing the responsibilities leading to
second-order change and student success.

Public schools don’t have the research available or seem not using it to make
administrative role assignment decisions. A district may choose to have a principal take
on multiple administrative roles in order to save money, yet they may not understand any
unintended academic effect. If districts understood the effect of multiple administrative
roles, they could make better decisions when assigning administrators (Cole, 2010).
Jacques (2010) points out that saving money on administrative assignments makes no
sense if student achievement is negatively affected. He concluded in his research, that
even if savings in school district administration from consolidation were spent on
instruction, state average test scores would decrease slightly (Jacques, 2010). Role
combination has an effect upon student achievement that may be not clear, especially in
small schools.

Also not clearly found was research in small schools about the effect principal
gender and experience, or community size and status have on student achievement. In
addition to the effect of role combinations assigned to the principal, their gender may
have a bearing on their leadership. Gieselmann (2004) found that female leadership has a
slight positive effect upon test scores in an elementary setting. Both the behavior and
characteristics of a principal have been shown to have an effect upon student
achievement (McCord, 1982). In addition, many other studies indicate that multiple other
items such as educational level, tenure in position (Middleton, 2010), building condition
(Berner, 1993), building location and size (Yee, 2007), and socio-economic status (Fan,
2012) all play a role in student achievement.
In contrast to research about cost, research about principal assignment and its residual impact on the ability of the principal to provide effective instructional leadership is less clear. How principal administrative roles affect student achievement is more complex than just saving money. Among much research done by Halinger and Heck (2011) about the effect of the principal upon student achievement, there is little known about the principal’s influence in differing contexts or settings. While there is ample research (Marzano et al., 2005) about the components of principal’s responsibilities that increase student success, they have not been examined in light of a district need to assign principals to multiple administrative roles. This may be an even greater problem in small rural districts that cannot afford staff to assist principals.

In the most simple terms, reducing personnel cost at the principal level generally plays out in having each principal cover more duties. Real, lasting, second-order change takes time and effort (Senge, 2007). The high expectations in the position of principal has grown in such a way that success at all of the responsibilities now considered part of the position may be impossible (Copeland, 2001). Decisions about assignment of principals’ administrative roles in rural districts may not consider the time necessary to implement second-order change.

Private sector patterns appear to look more closely at the actual duties inherent in a leader’s role. In contrast with the private sector, administrative role assignment of principals in light of the increasing complexity of the principal role is little-researched. In the private sector, role assignment during funding reductions has been thought through and studied more so than in public schools. Much has been written in the private sector
about staff reduction and the effects it has (Jones, 2010; Knable, 2011; Cooke, 2013; Gleason, 1993).

Practices to reduce leadership and staff costs in the private sector are much more broad than in education. The range is from practices similar to fewer principals covering more duties, which is termed staff reduction in the private sector, to Fisher’s (2003) model of equal pay reduction. In some cases, staff reduction is sudden and unexpected such as the WellCare (1993) layoff of one-third of its workforce. This situation involved a company starting to struggle financially. WellCare had to make massive changes in order to avoid insolvency. It chose to make those changes by shifting the workload to the remaining two-thirds of the staff, which resulted in employee exhaustion and poor performance for the company. The other end of the continuum of staff reduction involves no layoffs. Fisher (2003) compared French and United States legal protections for people who had been downsized. In the process, he developed a model for across-the-board pay reductions, instead of massive layoffs. He theorized this would avoid the in-fighting and politics inherent in layoff situations, and keep the workforce in place. With layoffs, employees become overworked and productivity goes down (Fisher, 2003). In Fisher’s (2003) model this doesn’t occur since the entire staff is kept intact.

Enriching the study of the full continuum between massive layoff and the model of retaining all staff and reducing salary, private sector research examines specific situations and the response of employees to that situation. An example is the work of Shafiro (2007), which studied employee’s reactions to benefit reductions. It found that reactions depended on how well the changes were communicated and if changes were equally distributed across the workforce. Similar work has been undertaken to study
employee effort as it relates to wage reduction. Airline pilots were studied by Lee (2007), who found that reduction in wages did not necessarily predict poorer flight performance. As well as the study of effects of wage and benefit changes, a wealth of information exists regarding downsizing in the private sector. This includes studies about allocation of resources (Eyal-Cohen, 2013), the effect of downsizing across social contexts (Budros, 2004), and employee satisfaction after downsizing took place (Ko, 2013). Coping strategies of downsizing survivors (Waraich, 2012) have been documented as well. Demps (2011) elaborates six ethical considerations when utilizing best practices in downsizing that took place across a variety of organizations in Florida. An extensive work by Gandolfi (2013) lays out an analysis of systems used to downsize, the specific tactics involved, and the results from them. He concluded that downsizing is complicated, that there is an extensive amount of literature in the private sector about its effects, and that downsizing is widespread even though the long-range effects are negative (Gandolfi, 2013).

In summary, the purposeful study of lean organizations and methods to operate more effectively is an established and ongoing practice in the private sector (Wright, 2006). In the educational world, this researcher found little guidance that would parallel the private sector work. We know a great deal about the work of the principal. We know little about how changes in the structure of that work, such as working multiple administrative roles, affects a principal’s ability to succeed.

**Summary of the Intersection Between Funding and Effective Role Assignment**

Decisions about assignment of principals’ administrative roles in rural districts may not consider the time necessary to implement second-order change (Cole, 2010).
Because of the focus on saving money, districts may be assigning principals without consideration of the effect upon student achievement. There is research to support there are measurable cost-savings when school districts decide to combine the role of the principal with other administrative responsibilities within and across school districts (Rees, 2003; Cole, 2010; Jacques, 2010). Marzano et al. (2005) provides ample research about the components of principal’s responsibilities that increase student success. It is clearly known that student achievement depends upon the work of principals, yet one of the main cost-savings approaches used by districts is to assign more work to fewer principals.

This researcher has found no studies examining the impact of Marzano’s leadership responsibilities in districts that have, primarily due to financial necessity, combined the administrative role of the principal with other administrative responsibilities. In addition, no previous research connecting the assignment of principal’s administrative roles to their best effectiveness in terms of student achievement has been found. By examining the perception of principals who are actively working at this time, insight may be gained into the extent and effect of the problem of principal administrative role assignment. In order to do this, it is helpful to examine the context in which principals in a region work. Methodically collecting demographic information about the principals and their administrative roles, then looking for patterns in their perception of their ability to be effective with known responsibilities linked to student achievement was the goal of the research process presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study attempted to determine whether there are differences in the perceptions of principals with multiple administrative roles, as compared to principals that have single administrative roles, about their ability to implement Marzano’s second-order change leadership responsibilities. In addition to this, study also attempted to determine whether principals in different administrative roles need support in certain responsibilities of their position.

A quantitative research design was used to explore these phenomena. The researcher examined principal perceptions using an *ex post facto* design. Shavelson (1981) explains that an *ex post facto* design can be used to describe the relationship between two variables. The researcher is examining the data after the fact, rather than manipulating a variable as would be typical in an experimental or quasi-experimental design (Shavelson, 1981). In order to provide a quantitative description of the perceptions and demographic data of the population of principals, a survey design was employed (Creswell, 2008). Independent two-tailed t-tests were used to analyze the data collected (Shavelson, 1981).

Sampling and Participation

Population

There are 596 school districts in the state of Wisconsin (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Four-hundred and twenty-four are public schools. The
population studied consists of Kindergarten through twelfth grade public school principals from these public districts.

**Sample**

It is important to have a large enough sample to be confident in the significance of the statistical testing of each hypothesis. This is known as effect size. In this design, effect size is expressed as a percentage of variance that is due to the variable under study (Creswell 2008).

The sample in this study was a geographical convenience sample from the available population of public school principals in Wisconsin, and consists of Kindergarten through twelfth grade public school principals in 27 districts from an eight county region. Within this geographic area, a census sample was used (Creswell 2008). All 62 principals in the sample were contacted. The sample was derived from directory information maintained by the Cooperative Educational Service Agency that oversees the region.

**Selection**

A complete, non-probability selection of the principals in the sample was made (Babbie, 2011). Given the large number of principals in the sample, there was no expectation that lack of statistical power due to a small N size will be an issue (Keppel & Wickens, 2004; Ilhyeok, 1999).

**Research Variables**

The independent variables were selected second-order change items from Marzano’s 21 responsibilities asked in a questionnaire format to principals. The
dependent variables were the mean aggregate score attained on each of the responsibilities. The reader is referred to Table 1.

Table 1.  
*Table Showing Relationship Between Each Purpose, Related Questions, And Data Type.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics regarding single/multiple role, and types of additional roles</td>
<td>Questions 1 &amp; 2 at beginning of questionnaire</td>
<td>1. Binary choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alphanumeric input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁-H₇: Significant proportions of principals that have single administrative roles are more likely to report that they are able to implement Marzano’s “<em>Second-order Responsibility</em>” leadership responsibility than principals that have multiple administrative roles.</td>
<td>Questions 3-36</td>
<td>1-4 Likert scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

A copy of this study’s questionnaire is located in Appendix A. This instrument is both valid and reliable. (The reader is referred to Marzano’s book, *School Leadership that Works*, for a detailed discussion on the validation of this instrument.) In this study, the investigator selected questionnaire items from the following seven second-order change responsibilities: (1) knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (2) being an optimizer; (3) promoting intellectual stimulation; (4) being a change agent; (5) monitoring and evaluating on a regular basis; (6) providing flexibility; and (7) having strongly developed ideals or beliefs. In addition, general perceptions about implementing second-order change were examined. Selected items from the 92-item questionnaire used by Marzano et al. (2005) were matched with the second-order change responsibilities to make up this study’s instrument. The items were used with permission of McCrel (See Appendix). The reader is referred to Table 2 for the connection of each question to the corresponding responsibility.
A four-point Likert scale was used, similar in form to Marzano et al.’s (2005), to allow each principal to indicate their level of agreement on each stated survey item. In addition to this, each respondent was asked to select categories that would describe the principal’s administrative role as single or multiple, and what multiple roles exist, if any.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to assess the participant’s perception of their ability to perform each of the seven second-order change responsibilities, overall second-order change, and to gather demographic data related to their administrative role.

**Validity and Reliability**

A copy of this study’s questionnaire is located in Appendix A. This instrument is both valid and reliable. (The reader is referred to Marzano’s book, *School Leadership that Works*, for a detailed discussion on the validation of this instrument.)

**Procedures for Data Collection.**

Prior to proceeding with research, application was made to the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). The HSIRB is charged with the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects in research conducted in connection with Western Michigan University.

Initial contact with principals in the selection was by a United States Postal Service mailing containing an informed consent letter and opt-out instructions. The purpose of obtaining informed consent was to allow the individuals being studied to know how their rights were protected (Creswell, 2009). By informing participants of the specific ways in which their rights were safeguarded, they were able to make an informed choice about whether to be involved or not.
The actual survey was conducted electronically, via email contact. Consent was obtained electronically as part of the survey. Utilizing Survey Monkey, questionnaires were made available to selected principals in the population. This Midwestern state maintains a current database of principals in the state. The data is available for mailed or emailed survey use. The process was structured so as to not identify the person completing the questionnaire. Questions were taken from the McCrel instrument, with permission of the authors.

Several strategies were used to ensure a high rate of response (Cresswell, 2008; Armstrong, 1991). A pre-survey notification advising principals of the coming questionnaire was sent. An endorsement letter from the regional superintendent of the districts in which principals are being surveyed was included to encourage completion of the survey. This pre-notification also advised them of the research problem being studied, and offered them the opportunity to receive a copy of the results. As an additional measure to increase the rate of response, follow up emails were sent after two weeks, and then after an additional week to remind participants of this initial request. In addition, respondents were informed that if they have any questions about the survey, they had the opportunity to contact my Dissertation Advisor, Dr. Walter L. Burt at Western Michigan University. His office telephone number is: (269) 387-1821. They were also be given the option of contacting the HSIRB office at Western Michigan University at 269-387-8293.

Upon completion of this survey instrument, all completed survey instruments are maintained in the Office of Dr. Walter L. Burt for a period of three years. After this, these instruments will be destroyed according to HSIRB requirements.
Data Analysis

Because this study is examining the differences in perception of two groups, a t-test was appropriate for statistical analysis (Shavelson, 1996). An independent two-tailed t-test determined if a sample mean from one group (i.e. multiple-administrative role principals) was statistically significantly different than a sample mean from another group (i.e. single-administrative role principals) (Sturm-Beiss, 2005).

Four assumptions described by Shavelson (1996) necessary for the use of a t-test are (1) the dependent variable is continuous data, (2) the data are independent, (3) there are no significant outliers, and (4) the dependent variable is normally distributed. In this study, the data was analyzed by t-test to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the multiple-administrative role principals and the single-administrative role principals surveyed.

This is an ex post facto design, as the subjects are being surveyed about work they have already done, as opposed to being in a true experimental design (Shavelson, 1996). A 0.05 level of confidence was used for determining statistical significance.

Conclusion

The principals in a Midwestern Region were surveyed to determine their perceptions about their ability to implement seven of Marzano, et al.’s (2005) second-order change responsibilities, and their general perceptions about implementing second-order change. In Chapter 4, the investigator reports the findings in this study. To perform this task, each hypothesis is restated and a corresponding statistical test was utilized to test the hypothesis. The chapter concludes by providing a brief summary of findings.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF STUDY

Introduction

This study sought to determine whether there were differences in the ability of principals’ to implement Marzano, et al.’s, (2005) seven second-order change related responsibilities. In order to determine whether differences existed between these two populations, this study surveyed principals from a selected geographical region of a Midwestern state. One of the primary purposes of this study was to identify which, if any of the responsibilities, principals were having difficulty implementing, and most importantly, findings from this study may help to shed light on support principals who serve in multiple administrative roles may need to improve their leadership practices that will result in improved student achievement.

Response Rate

It was determined that there were 62 principals working in the selected region. Utilizing Survey Monkey, each of the principals received an email requesting them to participate in the study. Table 2 below provides an overall rate of response for this study.

Table 2.
Response Rate for Principals in a Midwestern State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 62 emails administered, 28 instruments were completed and returned (45.2 percent response rate). Of the 28 instruments returned, 21 of the responding principals served in multiple administrative roles, and the remaining 7 served in single administrative role (Principal).

**Testing of Hypotheses**

In this section, each hypothesis is restated and an appropriate statistical test provided to determine whether the hypothesis was either accepted, or failed to be accepted. In all test applications, the 0.05 level of confidence was used for determining statistical significance.

H1: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Involvement and Knowledge of Curriculum” leadership responsibility.

Table 3 provides information that allows one to determine whether significant differences existed between the mean of principals that had a single administrative role as principal as compared to the mean of principals that had multiple administrative roles when queried about their ability to implement the responsibility associated with knowledge and involvement of curriculum.
The data in the above table indicate that there was not a significant difference between the perception of principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to principals that held multiple administrative roles, when it involves their perception of implementing the Responsibility of “Involvement and Knowledge of Curriculum.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.

H$_2$: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Being an Optimizer” leadership responsibility.

The second hypothesis was designed to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the perception of principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to principals that held multiple administrative roles, regarding their ability to implement the responsibility of “Being an Optimizer” under Marzano’s 21 areas of leadership responsibilities. The reader is referred to Table 4.
The above data show that there was not a statistically significant difference between the single and multiple-administrative role principals regarding their ability to implement the responsibility of “Being an Optimizer.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.

H₃: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Promoting Intellectual Stimulation” leadership responsibility.

Table 5 provides data that show the differences between the perception of single and multiple-administrative role principals regarding their ability to implement the responsibility of “Promoting Intellectual Stimulation.”

Table 4.
An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to the Implementation the of the Responsibility of Being an Optimizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.3740</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4167</td>
<td>.4425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T₀₅, 2₆) = 2.056

The above data show that there was not a statistically significant difference between the single and multiple-administrative role principals regarding their ability to implement the responsibility of “Being an Optimizer.”

Table 5.
An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to the Implementation of the Responsibility of Promoting Intellectual Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0357</td>
<td>.4880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>.4699</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T₀₅, 2₆) = 2.056
The information in Table 5 indicates there was not a significant difference between single and multi-administrative role principals when it comes to implementing the responsibility of “Promoting Intellectual Stimulation.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.

H4: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Being a Change Agent” leadership responsibility.

Table 6 provides information that allows one to determine whether significant differences existed between single and multiple-administrative role principals’ perception concerning their ability to implement the responsibility of “Being a Change Agent.”

Table 6. An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to the Implementation of the Responsibility of Being a Change Agent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1071</td>
<td>.4970</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.8690</td>
<td>.4784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T_{05, 26}) = 2.056

The data in the above table indicate that there was not a significant difference between principals that occupied single and multiple administrative roles when implementing the responsibility of “Being a Change Agent.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.
H₅: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Monitoring and Evaluating” leadership responsibility.

The data contained in Table 7 provide information that allows one to determine whether there was a significant difference between principals who held single and multiple administrative roles regarding their perception of being able to implement the responsibility of “Monitoring and Evaluating.”

Table 7.
An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Roles Administrative Responses Pertaining to the Implementation of the Responsibility of Monitoring and Evaluating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4643</td>
<td>.4432</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>.6191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T_{0.05, 26}) = 2.056

The data in the above table indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to principals that held multiple administrative roles, when it came to implementing the responsibility of “Evaluating and Monitoring” staff, policies, and programs.

Decision: This hypothesis is accepted.

H₆: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple
administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Providing Flexibility” leadership responsibility.

The sixth hypothesis was designed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to principals that held multiple administrative roles, when it relates to their ability to implement the responsibility of “Providing Flexibility.”

The reader is referred to Table 8.

Table 8.
*An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to the Implementation of the Responsibility of Providing Flexibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.3134</td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.3214</td>
<td>.3273</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in the above table indicates that there was not a significant difference between principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to principals who held multiple administrative roles, when it relates to the implementing the responsibility of “Providing Flexibility.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.

H7: There will be a statistically significant difference between principals that have single administrative roles and principals that have multiple administrative roles as they self-report their ability to implement Marzano’s “Strongly Developed Ideals” leadership responsibility.
The reader is referred to Table 9 to the results of this hypothesis.

Table 9.
An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to the Implementation of the Responsibility of Strongly Developed Ideals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.3134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4643</td>
<td>.4130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T_{05, 26}) = 2.056

The data in the above table indicate that there was not a statistically significant difference between principals who held single administrative roles, as compared to their corresponding counterparts who help multiple administrative roles, when it pertains to their ability to implement the responsibility pertaining to “Strongly Developed Ideals.”

Decision: This hypothesis fails to be accepted.

Summary of Findings

Of the seven hypotheses tested, there was a statistically significant difference between principals that held single administrative roles, as compared to their counterparts holding multiple administrative roles, when it came to their ability to implement Marzano et al. (2005) responsibility pertaining to “Monitoring and Evaluating.” There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of principals holding single and multiple administrative roles when it involved implementing the following responsibilities: (1) knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (2) being an
optimizer; (3) promoting intellectual stimulation; (4) being a change agent; (5) providing flexibility; and (6) having strongly developed ideals or beliefs.

Another finding was that in all seven responsibilities, the mean response for both groups was slightly above three on a four-point Likert scale. This may indicate that both groups have at least some difficulty implementing these responsibilities. In Chapter 5, the investigator will summarize the findings of the study, draw conclusions about the study results, and present recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The final chapter summarizes the findings of this study based upon research conducted in a Midwestern state that examined the difference in the perception of principals holding a single administrative position as compared to other principals that were required to assume additional administrative responsibilities. It was the primary intent of this study to determine whether principals holding multiple administrative positions were able to implement Marzano’s et al., (2005) second-order change responsibilities as well their counterparts holding a single administrative position.

To facilitate this discussion, the researcher will review the initial purpose of this study and provide answers to this question based upon the findings from this investigation. The chapter continues with summative remarks about how this study adds to, contradicts, or introduces new findings that previous research studies have failed to investigate.

The chapter concludes by making recommendations for future studies. It is hopeful that these studies will lead to greater understanding about how to support the professional development and the administration of responsibilities of principals that work in schools requiring principals to assume multiple administrative assignments.

Summary of Findings

This study examined the differences in the perceptions of principals who held both single and multiple-administrative roles in a Midwestern state. Utilizing an ex post facto design, 62 school principals that worked in urban, suburban, and rural school
districts were surveyed in this regional service area. The purpose of this study was to
determine whether there were significant differences between principals who held single
administrative positions, as compared to their corresponding counterparts, who assumed
other administrative positions beyond their role as a principals (e.g, principal of a second
building, athletic director, special education director, etc.) and their ability to implement
Marzano’s et al., (2005) second-order change responsibilities.

The findings in this study suggest the following. For the first four hypotheses
related to Marzano’s et al., (2005) responsibilities of “Involvement and Knowledge of
Curriculum;” “Being an Optimizer;” “Promoting Intellectual Stimulation;” and “Being a
Change Agent,” failed to be accepted because there was no statistically significant
difference between the perception of the two groups of principals in terms of their ability
to implement these responsibilities. The same lack of statistical significance was found
for hypotheses six and seven, which related to Marzano’s et al. (2005) responsibilities of
“Providing Flexibility” and “Strongly Developed Ideals,” and these also failed to be
accepted.

The fifth hypothesis examined principal’s perceptions about their ability to
implement Marzano’s et al’s. (2005) responsibility of “Monitoring and Evaluating.” This
hypothesis, that there would be a significant difference, was accepted. In this regards,
there was a significant difference in the perception of principals who held single and
multiple-level administrative roles. Higher proportions of principals that held multiple-
level administrative roles felt they were unable to implement this responsibility than their
corresponding counterparts.
Most of the findings in this study are consistent with the relevant literature. The finding regarding principal’s perceptions of their ability to implement Marzano’s et al.’s. (2005) responsibility of “Monitoring and Evaluating” contradicts earlier research, especially Simpson (2009), that the complexity surrounding activity of the principal is so murky as to not be able to draw effective conclusions. The difference in perception about a principal’s ability to monitor and evaluate their work points to the need for research that may shed additional light on finding ways to help support multiple-administrative role principals in areas related to monitoring and evaluating staff within their respective school buildings. In addition, in all seven responses, the mean for both groups was only slightly above three. This may indicate that both groups have at least some struggle implementing these responsibilities. Given the pressures by state and national educational goals and testing, local pressure driven by school choice programs, and the general pressure to succeed in the global competition for achievement, any inability to implement Marzano (2015 et al.’s.) second-order change responsibilities that lead to better student achievement is disturbing.

Conclusions of Study

This study provides evidence that many of the perceptions of principals who hold single-administrative role may not be different, in terms of Marzano (et al.’s, 2005) seven responsibilities that are linked to second order change, than principals who hold multiple-administrative roles. In addition to Marzano’s seven responsibilities, the data derived from the study also support the contention that the inherent perceptions between the two groups regarding implementing second-order change are not different. Against this backdrop of consistent perceptions, the study does conclude that with regard to the
responsibility of “Monitoring and Evaluating” there is a difference. This difference is demonstrated by principals with multiple administrative positions clearly perceiving a lesser ability to monitor and evaluate their staff, policies, and programs. The importance of this finding is connected to the correlation of the responsibility of “Monitoring and Evaluating” found in Marzano et al.’s (2005) work. The responsibility had the third-strongest correlation to high student achievement in the meta-analysis the authors conducted (Marzano et al., 2005, p 63.) This is especially troublesome as the ability to monitor and evaluate is absolutely critical to the adaptive work second-order change requires (Fullan, 2005; Korach, 2011).

The work of the principal is critical to the success of a school and the students within it (Marzano et al. 2005). The principal’s role is continuously becoming more complex, even as the historical responsibilities have remained the same (Trimble, 2013). In this complex work that principals do, adaptive work, which necessitates second-order change, is critical (Fullan, 2005). The support principals need to monitor and adjust, which is an essential component of adaptive work, may need to be different to support adaptive outcomes (Korach, 2011). The findings of this study indicate the necessity of different supports may be especially true for principals with multiple administrative roles.

The majority of the findings in this study support the current literature. Over the last two centuries, the modern role of the principal has emerged as one of a transformational leader who must bring a community of students and associated adults through a complex maze of adaptive work, requiring constant development of the principal’s own skills, and of those in this community (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1994; Marzano et al., 2005). The majority of this study’s findings
affirm that the relevant leadership literature applies regardless of the administrative role of the principal or the context of the setting within which the principal works.

In the examination of Marzano et al.’s (2005) seven second-order change responsibilities, the implementation is likely consistent no matter the administrative role of the principal. Regardless of whether a principal works in a single or multiple administrative roles, the responsibilities of having clear goals, a positive organizational culture, clearly defined structure, and quality decision-making skills are necessary (Halinger and Heck, 1996; Leithwood, 1990). The ability to discern changing context before a principal makes a decision, and in understanding the affect of that context while implementing the decision, apply regardless of the administrative role the principal is working in (Dimmock, 2002; Getzels, 1959; Ogawa, 1995; Pounder, 1995). Understanding context is critical to the advancement of student achievement regardless of the principal’s work role (Cambron-McCabe, 2005; Hallinger, 2011; Heck, 2010; Huen, 2002; Jackson, 2012; Leithwood, 2008). Whether a principal works in single or multiple administrative roles, the ability to communicate optimism is vital for success (Hoy 1991, Roeschlein, 2002).

Even in a broad view of transformative leadership, this study clearly confirmed the value of openness to second-order change, shown in the literature to be critical to adaptive work, as a large part of the modern principal’s success (Fullan, 2005).

The study demonstrated the value of second-order change is observed regardless of the principal’s administrative role. When principals, including principals who held single, or multiple administrative roles, were queried about their overall perception of their ability to implement second-order change responsibilities, the findings in this study...
suggest there was not a significant difference between principals, regardless of having single or multiple administrative roles and their perception of being able to implement second-order change in their school building. The reader is referred to Table 10.

Table 10.
An Independent T-test Comparing Principals with Single and Multiple Administrative Roles Responses Pertaining to their overall response regarding second-order change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Role</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2619</td>
<td>.5681</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0317</td>
<td>.6272</td>
<td>(T_{05, 26}) = 2.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consistency of this finding, and the findings about six of the seven responsibilities examined herein, provide a greater understanding of the difference made evident by this study. That difference is that when it comes to the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating staff, the role of the principal is further compounded when principals have to take on additional administrative responsibilities.

This study also reinforces the challenge of this area of research as researchers do not agree about the role of the principal and contextual factors that may impede a principal’s ability to implement the responsibilities outlined by Marzano. Numerous research studies examine individual principal responsibilities without connecting role context to implementation (Arlestig, 2007; Balyer, 2012; Eyal, 2011; Crow, 2011; Hsiao, 2012). Even simple research examining general principal leadership characteristics didn’t account for context like school size or varying community characteristics (Camburn, 2010; Marks, 2003; Taylor, 2005.) It is difficult, at best, to provide guidelines for
deploying principals in a manner that facilitates fulfilling their responsibilities to the best and highest purpose. This sentiment is best conceptualized by Simpson (2009), who indicated how murky the research is in this area. It is challenging to provide clear guidance about the effect of context, and it’s effect upon the principal’s role, when it comes to an understanding of a principal’s work and responsibilities in an ever-changing complex society.

Compounding the difficulty of examining the effects of principal’s administrative roles was the complexity of the principal administrative role itself. The role is constantly changing, requiring the principal to continually adapt to new information, new people, and new work as part of the role. This constant adaption of existing complexity in the principal role, set in a milieu of community context that differs greatly between school buildings, creates a landscape in which it is extremely difficult to survive long-term as a principal, let alone study and adapt as the role requires (DiPaola, 2003). The ability to monitor and evaluate is critical to understanding and moving through this complex maze (Jacques, 2010). This means that the finding of significant differences between single and multiple-administrative role principals in the area of monitoring and evaluating is all the more important.

This study departs from current research, which is lacking in terms of the context of both studying and implementing findings of principals and the effect given their differing administrative roles. As the researcher in this study, I found no other studies that examined the impact of Marzano’s leadership responsibilities in districts that have combined the administrative role of the principal with other administrative responsibilities. In addition to this, I found no previous research that attempted to connect
the assignment of principal’s administrative roles to leadership behaviors that have a direct impact on increasing student achievement. The main focus of this study was to examine how single and multiple-administrative role principals differ in terms of implementing responsibilities. The intent was to examine implementation in light of the context, which is clearly important (Halinger, 1996, 2011; Hanushek, 1996, 2000), but not well-studied (Simpson, 2009). Current research does not address the ability of principals in differing administrative roles having differing abilities to know “how they are doing.” This study found the lack of research particularly problematic in the area of principals being able to monitor and evaluate their work, which is essential in adapting to the complexity inherent in the role.

The new finding in this study brings forth a dimension for examining the context of a principal’s work and the impact it may have on their ability to monitor and evaluate the work of teachers and support staff in their buildings. The conceptual framework developed for this study places the seven principal responsibilities that Marzano et al. (2005) linked to second-order change as the focus, and the perception of the principals being studied as a reflection of that focus. With this framework in mind, there was one area that stood out in this Midwestern region in terms of differences between single and multiple-administrative role principals. Clearly, the principals that had multiple administrative roles had significantly more difficulty monitoring and evaluating their staff, policies, and programs than principals with single administrative responsibilities. Given the complexity of the principal’s role, and the critical need to do adaptive work, any inability to monitor their work is a significant problem. Simply put, it is critical to
know, “how am I doing,” and principals in multiple administrative roles are less able to know this.

The study’s group mean in regard to Marzano’s (et al., 2005) responsibility of Monitoring and Evaluating is significantly lower for principals who have multiple administrative roles. This suggests that principals who carry additional administrative roles have more difficulty monitoring and evaluating staff, policies, and programs than principals who have single administrative roles. This finding adds to the work of Copeland (2001), who suggested that it is not clear about the time necessary to implement transformative practices associated with second-order change in the context of the role modern principals play. Principals who are assigned to work multiple administrative roles, and are not able to deeply implement practices of monitoring and evaluating staff may be hampered in their attempt to increase student academic achievement. The reason for this phenomenon may be due to the lack of time they have to work through second-order change processes. These individuals may be in need of additional support to correct this perplexing dilemma.

The ability of a principal to do the adaptive work that is such a part of the modern principal role is critical, and is affected by the lack of time to complete second-order change work (Senge, 2007). As Fullan (2005) pointed out, the challenge of adaptive work is deeply rooted in complex learning in situations where many competing and constantly changing forces exist. The necessary supports for the modern principal may be different, as the work of second-order change involves different outcomes than traditional managerial work (Korach, 2011). Clearly, the question of being able to complete
monitoring and evaluating work has been answered for this region of principals in light of the research by Korach (2011) and the data from this study.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Six of the seven hypotheses in this study showed no significant differences for single or multiple administrative role principal’s perceptions in regard to implementing Marzano (2015 et al.’s.) second-order change responsibilities. These six responsibilities aligned with and supported the existing and relevant findings in the research literature. Previous research (Cotton, 1980; Hallinger, 1996, 2013; and Leithwood, 2009) recognized the need to consider the cultural and contextual factors such as class size, school size, and other such factors in educational leadership practice. Yet past study’s failure to do so is problematic to the research on educational leadership practice in terms of how single or multiple administrative role positions affect principal’s efforts. The replication and expansion of this study, and other’s work with the addition of principal’s administrative roles included as an independent variable, would shed further light on the contextual effect of single or multiple principal administrative roles. Therefore, it is recommended that further study be conducted in three areas: (1) replication; (2) supports for principals; and (3) specific issues principals face with implementing second-order change that is so necessary for the modern, adaptive work oriented principal.

**Replication**

First, this study showed a difference in only one of the seven hypotheses in the Midwestern region studied. The monitoring and evaluation responsibility stood out in this region, but may not be a significant issue in another region. The reverse could be true as other responsibilities that are linked to second-order change may stand out in different
regions of the country. This study examined a very small segment of the population of principals in the United States. In this study, there were only 28 of 62 principals, or (45.2%) that responded. Of the 28 responding principals, only seven principals were found in schools with single-administrative role responsibilities. Such a small sample size in one of the study groups creates a challenge in terms of the strength of the study’s findings.

The challenge could be overcome by replicating this work with larger groups of principals, in districts and areas more representative of what we would see in typical United States’ school building. A survey of principals that are representative of principals throughout the United States would yield greater precision in the statistical estimates. Perhaps differing conclusions may be found with a greater increase in statistical estimates.

In addition, there is a plethora of previous research, covering many leadership topics, that fails to consider differing school contexts in their research structure. Replication of previous research, with the inclusion of gathering data about principal’s administrative roles, may yield previously uncovered knowledge.

**Supports for Principals**

The second area of research especially helpful to principals and school boards would be to examine what supports could allow principals assigned to multiple administrative roles to do a better job of monitoring and evaluating their staffs, policies and programs. The need to continually examine data in order to monitor student success, evaluate programs, and update policies is clear (Reeves, 2011). The ability of a principal to monitor and adjust over an extended period of years has been linked to student
achievement (Kearney, 2012). The effectiveness of programs in terms of their helpfulness to principals to do such work should be researched. This would allow for boards, professional organizations, and universities to develop systems to assist principals that have multiple administrative roles in sustaining second-order change over a long period of time in their assignment, as opposed to simply surviving each day.

Another way to develop further support for principals would be to connect current research into principal evaluation systems (Wallace Foundation, 2015). A possible consideration for school districts would be to include findings from this study by modifying their instruments that would enable school districts to document principals’ ability to implement second-order change responsibilities in their work and how this change has impacted instructional practices that support improved student achievement. The finding is troublesome that principals may struggle when attempting to implement second-order change responsibilities particularly as it relates to the adaptive work they perform. Given the current state of education and the increasing pressure placed on principals to increase the performance of all students, principals must be prepared to respond to these challenges in ways their predecessors could not even anticipate. Continually monitoring principal’s progress and putting in place systems to examine and document their performance is paramount to improving teaching and learning in America’s schools. The business community has made tremendous strides in developing continuous progress monitoring systems and the use of real time data to gauge employee performance. This movement is spurring considerable interest in the education community and may shed light on how we can improve upon our own leadership evaluation systems.
Specific Issues

The third recommendation is to conduct research into specific issues that principals with multiple administrative roles face. Qualitative analyses and follow up studies with interested principals may reveal more subtle differences in terms of monitoring and evaluating than what this broad, quantitative analysis revealed. Beyond just knowing if statistically significant differences existed in the perception of principals who held single and multiple administrative roles in other regions, it would be helpful to know the nature and extent of these differences.

Senge (1990) points out that often schools examine issues from a first-order change perspective and address these issues from a “quick fix” perspective. Given the necessity of providing effective leadership as a principal, with a growing workload which is increasingly complex, and continual adaptation to relentless change, school boards would do well to examine how they could provide additional support, or different support, to principals who take on additional administrative roles. Specifically, this study makes clear that principals working in different administrative roles may need different supports in terms of monitoring and evaluating their staff, students, facilities, policies, and practices.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Letter
Western Michigan University
Educational Leadership, Research, & Technology

Principal Investigator: Dr. Walter L. Burt
Student Investigator: Michael A. Gaunt
Title of Study: Single and Multiple Leadership Roles of Building Principals: Perceived Differences in Leadership Responsibilities in Selected Midwestern Districts

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "Single and Multiple Leadership Roles of Building Principals: Perceived Differences in Leadership Responsibilities in Selected Midwestern Districts." This project will serve as Michael Gaunt’s dissertation for the requirements of the Doctor of Philosophy degree. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
This study is trying to see if there a difference in the perception of principals who work in multiple administrative positions (e.g., principal, athletic director, special education director, etc.) about their ability to implement Marzano’s seven second-order change leadership responsibilities as compared to the perception of principals that have single administrative responsibilities.

Who can participate in this study?
All CESA 8 4K-12 grade principals are being invited to participate in the study.

Where will this study take place?
Data collection will be through an electronic survey delivered to each principal’s email address on file with CESA 8.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
The time commitment for this study is less than 20 minutes.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
The questionnaire itself contains two role questions and 37 multiple-choice questions. It should take less than 20 minutes to complete.

What information is being measured during the study?
The formal work roles assigned to each principal will be asked. The participant’s perception of different leadership activities will be asked, to be answered on a four-point scale with “This does not characterize me or my school” as a 1 to “This characterizes me or my school to a great extent” as a 4.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?
No risk to participants is known. With any use of electronic technology the possibility of unauthorized or accidental disclosure of participant’s responses exists. The possibility of this is being minimized by using an established software system, SurveyMonkey, to conduct the survey.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?
There is no personal benefit associated with participation, outside of receiving a copy of the results of the study. The results may provide benefit to principals by giving insight into working in multiple formal roles, and the additional support that a principal may need if assigned multiple roles.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?
There are no costs associated with participation in this study.

**Is there any compensation for participating in this study?**  
There is no compensation associated with participation.

**Who will have access to the information collected during this study?**  
Identifying data will not be connected with returned surveys once responses have been received from participants. It will not be possible to link identifying information with responses given.  
Upon completion of this survey instrument, all completed survey instruments will be maintained in the Office of Dr. Walter L. Burt for a period of three years. After this, these instruments will be destroyed.

**What if you want to stop participating in this study?**  
You can choose to stop participating in the study at anytime for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study. **In order to opt out of the emailed survey, simply call Mr. Gaunt at 906-370-8133 or email him at mikegaunt1@gmail.com.**

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator Dr. Walter L. Burt at 269-387-1821 or Walter.Burt@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.
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Email texts
Email 1:

Dear Principal:
Two weeks ago, a letter was mailed to you explaining the nature of this survey. A link is enclosed to SurveyMonkey to reach the questionnaire. This brief survey consists of 37 multiple-choice response items and two demographic questions. All information will be confidential and kept separate from your name and email.

The survey should take less than 20 minutes. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. I thank you for helping to shed light on the assignment of principal roles, and the supports principals may need if assigned to multiple roles.

I have read this informed consent document attached to this email. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. By electronically submitting my response and clicking the link below, I agree to take part in this study.

(Link)

Again, thank you for your help!

Mike Gaunt, Ph.D Candidate
Western Michigan University
Email 2

Dear Principal:
Two weeks ago, an email was sent to you explaining the nature of this survey. This is the second and only follow up email that will be sent. If you have already completed the survey, thank you.

This brief survey consists of 37 circled response items and two demographic questions. All information will be confidential and kept separate from your name and email.

The survey should take less than 20 minutes. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. I thank you for helping to shed light on the assignment of principal roles, and the supports principals may need if assigned to multiple roles.

I have read this informed consent document attached to this email. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. By electronically submitting my response and clicking the link below, I agree to take part in this study.

(Link)

Again, thank you for your help!

Mike Gaunt, Ph.D Candidate
Western Michigan University
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McREL Questionnaire Permission Letter
Permission to Use McREL Material

October 30, 2013

Permission is hereby granted to Michael Gaunt to use in the dissertation that he is writing the following material which was published by McREL:

Figure TN 11.1: Questionnaire Used for the Factor Analysis, pp. 162–164 from School leadership that works: From research to results.

We understand that the table will be adapted as part of the dissertation. The survey should be marked as to the source of the material and include the statement “Reprinted by permission of McREL.” The bibliography should include a full citation as follows:


ProQuest may supply copies on demand of this dissertation, which includes McREL’s copyrighted information. This permission is limited to the use and materials specified above. Any change in the use or materials from that specified above requires additional written permission from McREL before such use is made.

Please send McREL a copy of the completed dissertation for our records.

Sincerely,

Maura McGrath
Knowledge Management Specialist
Appendix D

CESA 8 Introduction Letter
July 15, 2015

CESA 8 Principals:

I am asking for your assistance. The enclosed information comes from Mike Gaunt, a former CESA 8 superintendent, who is finalizing his doctoral work at Western Michigan University. As part of the requirements, he is conducting a survey of CESA 8 principals. I urge you to support Mike in his doctoral endeavor by completing the 20-minute survey about principal roles and student achievement. The survey will arrive, via the email address you have on file with CESA 8, during the first week in August, 2015. His findings will be directly related to your work as principals and will be made available to you if you so desire.

Sincerely Appreciated,

Donald J. Viegut, Agency Administrator
CESA 8

Cc: CESA 8 Superintendents
Appendix E

Survey Instrument
## Principal's Perceptions of Marzano's Responsibilities

### Introduction and Purpose

Thank you for being involved in the effort to understand how principal’s formal roles affect their work. The information you enter will be kept confidential. It will be used to compare principals working in multiple formal roles with principals working in single formal roles to see how they perceive being able to fulfill Marzano’s principal responsibilities.

By completing this questionnaire, you are helping the profession understand how principals are affected by being assigned multiple roles, and the additional support a principal may need. The questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes. The questions are from the book School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results, and are reprinted by permission of McREL.

If you would have questions or concerns, please contact me: mikegaunt1@gmail.com or 906-370-8133.

Thanks again!

Mike

---

1. In addition to your formal building principal role, have you been formally assigned any additional roles?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☑ No

2. If you have been assigned an additional formal role beyond building principal, please check the boxes that indicate that role.
   - [ ] Superintendent
   - [ ] Principal in more than one building
   - [ ] Special Education Director/Coordinator
   - [ ] Title 1 Director/Coordinator
   - [ ] Athletic Director/Coordinator
   - [ ] Curriculum Director/Coordinator
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

3. Question 3 consists of 37 statements. Please check the most appropriate response that best represents your perception.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This characterizes me or my school to a great extent.</th>
<th></th>
<th>This does not characterize me or my school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The changes I am trying to make in my school will represent a significant challenge to the status quo.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am directly involved in helping teachers design curricular activities for their classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am very knowledgeable about effective instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I consciously try to challenge the status quo to get people thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I try to inspire my teachers to accomplish things that might seem beyond their grasp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The teachers in my school are aware of my beliefs regarding schools, teaching, and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I continually monitor the effectiveness of our curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am comfortable making major changes in how things are done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I stay informed about the current research and theory regarding effective schooling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>In my school, we systematically consider new and better ways of doing things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am directly involved in helping teachers address instructional issues in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This characterizes me or my school to a great extent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The changes we are trying to make in our school require the people making the changes to learn new concepts and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am very knowledgeable about classroom curricular issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am comfortable initiating change without being sure where it might lead us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I always portray a positive attitude about our ability to accomplish substantive things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I continually monitor the effectiveness of the instructional practices used in our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I encourage people to express opinions that are contrary to my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I continually expose teachers in my school to cutting-edge ideas about how to be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>There are deeply ingrained practices in my school that must be ended or changed if we are to make any significant progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I can be highly directive or nondirective as the situation warrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am directly involved in helping teachers address assessment issues in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This characterizes me or my school to a great extent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The change I am trying to make in my school will challenge the existing norms.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am very knowledgeable about effective classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Unless we make significant changes in my school, student achievement is not going to improve much.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I try to be the driving force behind major initiatives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I have well-defined beliefs about schools, teaching, and learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I continually monitor the effectiveness of the assessment practice used in my school.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of a given situation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>In my school, we systematically have discussions about current research and theory.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The most important changes we need to make in my school are the ones the staff most strongly resists.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I provide conceptual guidance for the teachers in my school regarding effective classroom practice.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This characterizes me or my school to a great extent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. In my school, we consistently ask ourselves, “Are we operating at the edge versus the center of our competence?”</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I believe that we can accomplish just about anything if we are willing to work hard enough and if we believe in ourselves.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I have explicitly communicated my strong beliefs and ideals to teachers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. At any given time, I can accurately determine how effective our school is in terms of enhancing student learning.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I my school, we systematically read articles and books about effective practices.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My behavior is consistent with my ideas and beliefs regarding schools, teachers, and learning.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you wish a summary of the findings in this study, please include your name and address below, or contact me via email or phone. (Mike Gaunt: mikegaunt1@gmail.com or 906-370-8133)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!
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HSIRB Approval Letter
Date: June 23, 2015

To: Walter Burt, Principal Investigator
    Michael Gaunt, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 15-06-15

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Single and Multiple Leadership Roles” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study”). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: June 22, 2016