
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

Principal And Teacher Perceptions Of Change Implementation Practices In 2007 And 2008 Small Learning Communities Grant Recipient

Benjamin Bristo
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Bristo, Benjamin, "Principal And Teacher Perceptions Of Change Implementation Practices In 2007 And 2008 Small Learning Communities Grant Recipient" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4193.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4193>



PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION
PRACTICES IN 2007 AND 2008 SMALL LEARNING COMMUNITIES GRANT
RECIPIENT HIGH SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA

by

BENJAMIN JUDD BRISTO
B.A. Texas A&M University, 2002
M.S. Barry University, 2005

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2010

Major Professors: Rosemarye Taylor
Stephen Sivo

© 2010 Benjamin Judd Bristo

ABSTRACT

Leading through change is a difficult process. School leaders who hope to create meaningful, long-term change must be cognizant of numerous factors. This study was undertaken with the hope of increasing educational leaders' awareness of how their decisions are viewed by those who follow them. Case studies revealed pertinent data within two schools that have undertaken a significant change initiative.

All 2007 and 2008 Small Learning Communities (SLC) grant-recipient schools in Florida were invited to participate in a series of case studies. Participating principals were questioned about their perceptions of how they fulfill their change leadership role related to the seven factors of second-order change, as identified by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005). Teachers were questioned about their perceptions of the principal's performance in leading the new initiative by the same seven factors. Principal and teacher scores were then compared for each school to identify potential differences in perceptions related change implementation and the seven factors.

Although the data cannot be generalized, statistical analyses did reveal significant differences in perceptions of between principals and teachers in each of the two participating schools. In Study 1, these differences existed in Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Optimizer; Flexibility; and Ideals/Beliefs. In Study 2, differences were identified in the same areas as in Study 1, but in Intellectual Stimulation and Monitoring/Evaluating as well. Differences in teacher perceptions across the schools were identified in Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; and in Intellectual Stimulation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I wish to mention my beautiful wife Carolyn. You stood by me through many moments of both jubilation and tribulation in this dissertation process. I could not have accomplished this without your unwavering support. Your patience and encouragement were indispensable, and I look forward to providing you with the same support when you undertake your doctoral studies. I love you.

Many thanks go to my mother, Alta Bristo. Her constant encouragement and interest in my studies not only buoyed my spirit, but held me accountable as well. My brothers, James and Daniel, were also great sources of strength as they helped push me along.

Dr. Rosemarye Taylor was an absolutely wonderful mentor and advisor throughout the entire dissertation process. I hold her in extremely high regard as a teacher and leader. Thank you so much, Dr. Taylor, for all your efforts to transform me into a true academic. I am still amazed at the speed of your red pen.

I owe Dr. Stephen Sivo, Dr. George Pawlas, and Dr. Maureen Ambrose a great debt of gratitude for their patient input and assistance with the construction of this research study. Your assistance and guidance were invaluable.

I am also exceedingly grateful to all of the professionals I have worked with and for throughout my career in education. I have been blessed to be surrounded by many people who truly care and give their all to educate children.

Finally, and above all, I give thanks to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: my source of strength, assurance, and peace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DESIGN COMPONENTS	1
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	1
Problem Statement/Purpose	11
Research Questions.....	12
Definition of Terms.....	12
Study Design.....	13
Study Population.....	15
Data Collection	16
Data Analysis	17
Limitations	17
Delimitations.....	18
Significance of the Study.....	18
Organization of the Study	19
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	20
Introduction.....	20
Second-Order Change Responsibilities	20
Small Learning Communities	24

Systems Thinking.....	26
Change Leadership.....	29
Leader-Member Exchange.....	38
Summary.....	41
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES.....	43
Introduction.....	43
Problem Statement.....	43
Population.....	44
Instrumentation.....	45
Data Collection.....	47
Dependent Variables.....	48
Independent Variables.....	48
Data Analysis.....	48
Data Analysis for Research Question 1.....	48
Data Analysis for Research Questions 2 and 3.....	49
Data Analysis for Research Question 4.....	50
Summary.....	50
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	51
Introduction.....	51

Population Description.....	51
Research Question 1	52
Research Questions 2 and 3	58
Research Question 4	67
Summary.....	68
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
Problem Statement.....	70
Methodology.....	71
Population	71
Instrumentation	72
Data Analysis	72
Summary and Discussion of Findings	73
Research Question 1	73
Research Question 2	75
Research Question 3	77
Research Question 4	78
Conclusions.....	79
Recommendations for Practice	81
Recommendations for Further Research.....	82

APPENDIX A: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE.....	85
APPENDIX B: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE	93
APPENDIX C: TARGETED COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS	101
APPENDIX D: UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	105
APPENDIX E: LAKE COUNTY RESEARCH REQUEST AND APPROVAL	107
APPENDIX F: APPROVAL FORMS FOR DUVAL, HILLSBOROUGH, AND ORANGE COUNTIES	109
APPENDIX G: PARTICIPANT CONTACT EMAILS	113
APPENDIX H: QUESTIONNAIRE RELIABILITY TABLE.....	119
APPENDIX I: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT	122
APPENDIX J: INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO PRINCIPALS’ QUESTIONNAIRE	125
LIST OF REFERENCES	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Second Order Change Leadership Behaviors and Associated Principal and Teacher Questionnaire Items (Item Associations)..... 46

Table 2: T-Tests: Differences Between Teacher Means and Principal Scores for Responsibility Question Groups in Study 1 56

Table 3: T-Tests: Differences Between Teacher Means and Principal Scores for Responsibility Question Groups in Study 2..... 57

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Principal Responses by Responsibility: Study 1 59

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Principal Responses by Responsibility: Study 2 60

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Responses by Responsibility: Study 1 61

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Responses by Responsibility: Study 2 62

Table 8: Independent T-Tests: Teacher Mean Scores Across Responsibilities 64

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DESIGN COMPONENTS

Introduction

Change has become a constant truth. The educational world is wracked by change every fall as new initiatives from federal, state, and local government entities push campaign promises into the classroom. The task falls upon school leaders to implement the changes in a way that is not only in line with the requirements of the bureaucratic system, but also effective with worthwhile and lasting results. Setting a systematic change into motion simply because it is required by the boss is no way to reach success; any change, self-initiated or otherwise, must be executed through strategic planning and with the intention of making a positive difference. To do otherwise is dishonest to a leader's constituents and doomed to failure.

Literature Review

One of the greatest hurdles in the change planning process is developing a strategy to implement the new policy or program in the face of almost certain resistance from those most affected by it. When change is forced from the top, whether it is from the federal government or a school principal, many teachers will often fail to see the necessity of the new initiative (Zimmerman, 2006). As change often brings, at least initially, an increase in workload, many people will actively defy new initiatives if they do not see an absolute necessity for their implementation. Change also shakes up how

people view their role within an organization, which disrupts their mental models of how things work (Schultz, 2007; Senge, 1990; Zimmerman).

The methods school principals use to implement change are often the difference between the success and failure of that change (Schultz, 2007). However, change leaders may never be aware of how their actions are perceived by those who are at the receiving end of their planning and decision-making. A principal could spend a great amount of time mapping out a detailed implementation strategy, only to have it lead to open rebellion among the teachers and staff tasked with carrying out the idea. According to Owens and Valesky (2007), such a result demonstrates a lack of alignment between principals and their followers, and a struggle for power within the organization.

Change Leadership

Schultz (2007) described systemic change as a threat to the established mental models of those who are affected by the change. He stated that workers form a place for themselves in the larger scheme of the organization, and become comfortable with their place and the necessity of their role. Change shakes the foundation of that comfort, and causes workers to doubt both their roles in the organization and their ability to fulfill those roles.

In order to head off this frustration and its subsequent resistance, Schultz (2007) listed eight steps to assist change agents and leaders in successfully implementing new systems. The first of these steps is to define the need for change. Put simply, this step calls for leaders to provide evidence of organizational shortcomings or pitfalls which require corrective action. The second step Schultz proposed is to create and

communicate a purpose which unites the organization. Such a purpose or vision should be designed in a way that gives stakeholders a reason to come along for the ride. Coming from a business perspective, Schultz wrote that the purpose of the organization should take customer expectations as well as stakeholder needs into consideration.

Next, Schultz (2007) called for leaders to identify both formal and informal groups and cliques in the organization and solicit their support and participation. Steps four and five instructed leaders to create a plan of action and give people the means to take action. Providing employees with the tools to create change allows them to take ownership of their role in the process. The sixth and seventh steps involve the creation of expanding benchmarks to show improvement. Leaders should start small, and then expand their expectations. Schultz's final step is to reinforce the new system.

Each of these steps requires change leaders to be consciously aware of how their proposed shifts in operation will affect those on the receiving end. According to Schultz (2007), the way in which leaders handle systemic change will affect their relationships with their employees, and determine not only how successful the new system can be, but how well future improvements and changes can be created.

In her exploration of the roots of teachers' resistance to change, Zimmerman (2006) uncovered many of the same causes of dysfunction as Schultz (2007). Zimmerman wrote that barriers to change include failure to recognize the need for change, habit, fear of the unknown, threats to expertise, threats to power relationships, and threats to resource allocations. The connections to the barriers against change as discussed from the business perspective are amazingly clear. Zimmerman's finding of the leaders' failure to recognize the need for change strikes a solid parallel to Schultz's

call for leaders to identify those needs. Zimmerman also connected Schultz's identification of power groups for support and the idea of organizational uncertainty (Rice, O'Connor, & Pierantozzi, 2008).

Zimmerman (2006) also addressed the use of mental models that clarify people's roles in the school. Reminiscent of Senge's (1990) model of Systems Thinking, Zimmerman described how mental models not only shape the identity of the followers affected by systemic change, but can also cloud the school leader's recognition of the source of resistance to that change. A leader who expects change to simply occur through mandate will be at a loss to explain why that change failed to actually occur. To counter resistance, Zimmerman called on school leaders to step outside of their comfort zones along with their teachers, and to build a culture where change is accompanied with shared decision-making, trust, and a concern for the well-being of the individual. The initial success of a change is not a guarantee of its future implementation. As change progresses, nostalgia for old ways can hinder its growth and development (Goodson, Moore, & Hargreaves, 2006). As teachers move through a cycle of perceived unneeded or actually unwanted change, they fall back on the systems and beliefs that propped them up to this point in their careers. Goodson, et al. attributed this sense of nostalgia to both the degeneration of the aging teacher (loss of energy and commitment) and the agendas and beliefs that carried them through their careers. Connecting back to the previously discussed literature, these teachers, who are often veterans and highly respected at their school, can form the nucleus of the power center that the school leader needs to address.

Fink and Brayman (2006) argued that attitudes about leadership succession and the role of the school leader contribute to the phenomenon of change resistance. School

leaders are viewed not as leadership agents for the school community, but rather as managers for a district or state system agenda (Fink & Brayman). People become hostile to change proposed by school leaders, both established and new principals, when they believe that the leader does not serve the best interest of the school, but rather the mechanical proddings of a faceless initiative. This mentality toward change initiatives connects to the concepts of taking stakeholder needs into consideration (Schultz, 2007) and organizational uncertainty (Rice, et al., 2008). These situations can also be indicative of a system where mutual trust and shared decision making are non-existent (Zimmerman, 2006).

Some research suggests that building a culture of teacher learning within a school will assist with implementing future changes. Learning communities exist in schools “because members of the community have common understandings and knowledge to share with one another” (Printy, 2008, p. 193). Printy reported that these school cultures foster learning and professional growth among both faculty and administration, and administration is viewed as the facilitator of the learning. Teachers look to the administration to assume leadership in charting the course for the school and to facilitate professional collaboration. Printy also stated that leaders emerge from within the community without being granted formal titles. These leaders rise to their position through their expertise and the trust of the community around them. It is these leaders that administration must address and convince when trying to create lasting systemic change, as described by Schultz (2007) and Rice, et al. (2008). The respect and trust that is given to these informal leaders by the faculty must be passed on to the administration, and the administration must do everything possible to earn and nurture that trust.

Owens and Valesky (2007) reported that school leaders must be able to identify conflict within the work setting. This includes being able to notice where conflict might exist, and where it might not, despite appearances to the contrary. Owens and Valesky define conflict as two groups striving for incompatible goals. Therefore, conflict in school change will be centered on the goals of the opposing parties. The importance of the goals to each group relates back to the necessity for change. If teachers do not see a new program as beneficial to their own personal and professional goals, they will actively resist its implementation, creating conflict with the administration.

Systems Thinking

Senge's (1990) work in Systems Thinking identified four core disciplines for building an organization capable of creating and sustaining effective change: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. Senge stated that these disciplines must be in place in order to create a learning organization. Learning organizations are able to identify problems in how they operate before they become crises, and make the necessary adjustments to prevent such escalation. People who implement these disciplines seek to master their role within the organization while seeking to better themselves and contribute to the growth of the team. They have made themselves open to new ways of viewing their work, and have bought in to the success of the organization. When people make habits of these disciplines and understand that the entire organization is affected by their personal success or failure, it becomes much easier to implement new models and methodology that may fly in the face of the previously existing template.

Fullan (2001) echoed the Systems Thinking model in his description of school capacity. Citing the work of Newmann, King, and Youngs, Fullan listed five components of school capacity: teacher knowledge, skills, and dispositions, professional community, program coherence, technical resources, and principal leadership. A teacher's knowledge, skills, and dispositions are analogous with Senge's (1990) personal mastery (in making this comparison, it is especially important to understand the role of dispositions as related to personal mastery; people must be willing to stretch beyond their current abilities in order to gain new levels of proficiency). Program coherence and professional community align with shared vision and team learning. Mental models are challenged through strong principal leadership. The strongest comparison between these lines of thinking, however, lies in Fullan's assertion that each of these components must work together synergistically in order to create success. Likewise, Senge postulated that his core disciplines must all work in concert with Systems Thinking in order to birth a true learning organization.

Applying Senge's (1990) four disciplines to the school setting, Joyner (2000) holds that many methods of staff development aimed at school improvement do not sufficiently connect the new learning teachers should acquire to that which they already know. No methods are put into place to reinforce new techniques and practices, and school and district administrators are often uninvolved in the training. The result is, "a smorgasboard [*sic*] of staff development workshops where the instructors don't listen to the participants, they don't talk to each other, and they might even contradict each other" (Joyner, p. 386). The creation of such a disjointed system of staff development can only serve to disrupt efforts to install lasting change in a school. The situation Joyner

described is one where Systems Thinking is not employed; leaders and followers alike are unaware of what is happening in the big picture. People are aware there is a need for improvement, but they are unable to identify the source of the need or prescribe the proper plan of action.

The mental models concept helps explain various anticipatory phenomena. The term anticipatory justice refers to the idea that when one expects to find unfairness or injustice in an organization, that is what they will see unless given indisputable proof to the contrary (Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001). Other research has shown the anticipatory phenomenon to apply to performance reviews (Siegall, 1992), job interviews (Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994), and even polygraph results (Elaad, Ginton, & Shakhar, 1994). Humans tend to find what they believe they should see in a given situation. Therefore, followers' perceptions of their leader's behavior could be more important to them than anything the leader may be doing or accomplishing beyond their view. It could be hypothesized, then, that a follower may never be satisfied with a leader's performance without solid proof of success.

Second-Order Change Responsibilities

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified 21 responsibilities that school leaders must address. The authors stated that each of these 21 responsibilities is tied to successful first-order change, which is incremental, or "the next most obvious step to take in a school" (p. 66). Second-order change, according to Marzano et al., is more deep and drastic than first-order change. It often involves "a dramatic shift in direction and

require[es] new ways of thinking and acting” (Marzano et al., p. 66). Marzano et al. correlate seven of the 21 responsibilities to second-order change. They are:

1. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
2. Optimizer
3. Intellectual Stimulation
4. Change Agent
5. Monitoring/Evaluating
6. Flexibility
7. Ideals/Beliefs (Marzano et al., p. 70)

These responsibilities are correlated to creating deep and long-term systemic change, such as one would see in the implementation of a Small Learning Communities (SLC) model.

Marzano et al. (2005) report that while Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment may appear to be a straightforward and obvious trait for a school leader to possess, studies have shown that it is often not a major part of a school principal’s daily practice, and is often not adequately assessed in administrative hiring processes.

The Optimizer responsibility, “refers to the extent to which the leader inspires others and is the driving force when implementing a challenging innovation” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 56). Marzano et al. wrote that meeting the role of the Optimizer requires principals to inspire teachers to accomplish that which they believe they cannot, to be the driving force in major change initiatives, and to maintain positive attitude about the abilities of the faculty to accomplish the tasks set before them.

To fulfill the responsibility of Intellectual Stimulation, the principal must ensure that the faculty is aware of and has access to current theories of best instructional practices (Marzano et al., 2005). This duty requires the principal to not only stay current with emerging research, but to facilitate the passage of the new knowledge to the faculty and facilitate its implementation into the daily functions of the school.

As Change Agent, the school principal must be willing to “challenge...the status quo” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 42) within the organization. An effective principal will not be satisfied to coast along when things seem to be going smoothly.

Marzano et al. (2005) also task the principal with the responsibility of Monitoring/Evaluating. In order to bring about successful change, the principal must be able to set benchmarks for the progress of the new implementation and check actual progress made against those benchmarks.

Flexibility as an effective school leader requires the principal to be willing to adapt his or her leadership style to meet the demands of fluid situations (Marzano et al., 2005). The principal’s ability to adapt and be flexible is correlated closely by Marzano et al. to success within a school.

Finally, effective communication of the philosophy of education and beliefs regarding the school’s operations has been shown to have a strong correlation to school success (Marzano et al., 2005). According to Marzano et al., principals who clearly impart their philosophy, meeting the responsibility of Ideals/Beliefs, will be more successful at gaining buy-in and support from the faculty.

Felner, Seitsinger, Brand, Burns, and Bolton (2007) stated that far-reaching, systemic change in school operations is required to address the challenges of recent

reforms. Successful implementation of the (SLC) model forces school leaders to create a total systemic shift that will surely shake the modus operandi of both administration and faculty. Schools that have adopted this school-in-a-school format have placed teachers, “into more intimate educational environments” (Supovitz, 2002, p. 1592).

Implementation of the SLC design will seek to individualize and personalize the educational experience for students, regardless of the size of the school’s overall student body (Lee & Friedrich, 2007). Such efforts can provide a “continuity of care” (Connell & Klem, 2006, Fall, p. 56) that provides continual support throughout a student’s time at the high school. Since the SLC design is a drastic shift in the way a high school works, this research will treat the implementation process as second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005), even in situations where the systems was gradually implemented.

Problem Statement/Purpose

This study examined the alignment between principal and faculty perceptions of change implementation. Senge’s (1990) work in Systems Thinking formed the theoretical framework of this study. School administrators may have a picture in mind of how certain change management practices work. They may ask, “Does the picture align with the reality of those at the tip of the change spear?” If there is a conflict between the principal’s perception of change progress and that of the faculty, then it will be difficult to anticipate and address problems that could arise due to disagreement of mental models (Senge). Important aspects of change culture, such as trust and respect (Arbuckle, 2000) and ecological influences (Barker, 1965; Scileppi, 1988) could give rise to festering troubles without leaders ever being aware there was a problem.

Research Questions

1. What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers along Marzano et al.'s (2005) responsibilities for Second-Order Change?
2. How do principals view their actions in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?
3. How do teachers view the actions of the principal in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?
4. What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarification, the following terms are used throughout this study:

Small Learning Communities (SLC) – a system of organizing schools into smaller groups of students that share common teachers. SLCs may be organized as academies, houses, or other terms as decided by the individual school.

Educational Leader – one who holds a position of legitimate authority and responsibility within a school.

Second-Order Change – a long-term change in an organization that fundamentally shifts the way the culture or operations of the group (Marzano et al., 2005).

Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment – an educational leader’s awareness of research based methods (Marzano et al., 2005).

Optimizer – the role of the educational leader as motivator and source of inspiration (Marzano et al., 2005).

Intellectual Stimulation – the role of the educational leader to find and pass along relevant new research and information (Marzano et al., 2005).

Change Agent – the role of the educational leader in challenging the typical methods of operation at their school (Marzano et al., 2005).

Monitoring/Evaluating – the role of the educational leader to track and assess the change effort (Marzano et al., 2005).

Flexibility – the ability of the educational leader to adapt to changing situations (Marzano et al., 2005).

Ideals/Beliefs – the process of the educational leader sharing their vision and philosophies of practice with the faculty (Marzano et al., 2005).

Study Design

Case study participants were from high schools in Florida that implemented a SLC model and were awarded SLC grants from the United States Department of Education for 2007 and 2008 (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The studies were limited to schools in the 2007 and 2008 grant cohorts in order to limit administrative turnover since the grant was implemented at each school. By selecting participants in

this manner, the researcher focused on one specific second-order change, rather than second-order change in general. The online questionnaire, hosted by Zoomerang©, automatically screened out principals and teachers if they were not in their current roles during the 2007-2008 school year.

This research was conducted through separate questionnaires for principals and teachers (see Appendices A and B). The questionnaires were designed specifically for this study with input from professional educators, including high school teachers who have experience in SLC implementation. Dr. George Pawlas and Dr. Rosemarye Taylor from the University of Central Florida College of Education, and Dr. Maureen Ambrose from the University of Central Florida College of Business also provided feedback for the content validity of the questionnaires. As these are new questionnaires, no reliability tests had been conducted prior to their use in these studies.

The first questionnaire was directed toward principals. The principals of each school in the study were asked to participate. This questionnaire required them to reflect on and describe their practices for instituting change within their school. Methods identified in this questionnaire were then matched against the teacher questionnaire to examine if the needs and desires of the change recipients were being met by the change initiators.

Teachers were questioned regarding their perceptions of their principal's behavior aligned with the seven responsibilities of second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005). These questions also examined teachers' attitudes and responses toward those behaviors and practices. All teachers from the participating schools were invited to participate in the study, provided they were on their school's faculty in the 2007-2008 school year.

The theoretical basis for the questionnaires came from Marzano et al.'s (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for second-order change. Questions were linked to one or more of the identified responsibilities. Questionnaire responses were analyzed to identify what, if any, differences exist in each administrator's view of successful second-order change implementation and teachers' views on the same.

Both versions of the questionnaire also contained an item asking respondents to rate the current overall success of the transition to the SLC model. While this is a subjective measure of success, such metrics have been shown to be positively correlated to the results found through objective measures (Wall, et al., 2004). Finally, all respondents were asked to describe specific actions they had taken to drive the implementation of the SLC model.

Study Population

Principals from 40 schools in seven counties across Florida were invited to participate in case studies (see Appendix C). These schools were selected because they were awarded Small Learning Communities (SLC) grants from the United States Department of Education in the 2007 and 2008 cohorts. Only two schools' principals elected to participate in the study in time for their teachers to be included as well (one other principal screened out of the study due to time in office at their current school, and another completed the questionnaire after the deadline date). The final study population included 206 teachers and two principals. A total of 122 teachers responded to their invitations to participate in case studies, with 101 completing the questionnaires after screen-outs and opt-outs. The final response rate for the teacher population was 40.78%.

Data Collection

In order to conduct these studies, a research application was submitted to and approved by the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once IRB approval was obtained (see Appendix D), additional applications were submitted to the appropriate offices in each of the targeted counties, with the exception of Lake County. Lake County had no formal process for regulating outside research, but permission was obtained from the Chief Academic Officer of the school district (see Appendix E). The researcher was granted permission to conduct the study in Orange, Hillsborough, and Duval Counties as well (see Appendix F). Email addresses were obtained from either the schools' websites or through formal requests to schools as necessary.

The questionnaires were distributed, completed, and returned electronically. Once approval was received from the individual counties, principals and selected teachers received notices of their selection for participation in the study (see Appendix G). Participants later received a link to the appropriate questionnaire, a letter with directions for completing the instrument, and a copy of the informed consent document (see Appendix H). Follow-up letters were sent by email in order to increase the study response rate (Dillman, 1999). In total, participants received up to five contacts throughout the study.

Each study participant was assigned a five-digit control number. The first two digits indicated the school with which the participant is associated. Control numbers were used only to keep track of completed responses and collect aggregate results for

each school. Summaries of each school's results were sent to the respective principals and district offices if requested.

To streamline data collection, principals were contacted first. Teachers were not contacted until their school's principal has completed the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Once the data were collected, descriptive statistical tests were conducted to determine means and standard deviations for each question. The researcher examined these results to see if any of the seven correlated responsibilities receive, as a trend, significantly stronger or weaker ratings than the others. Differences between teacher and principal perceptions were tested using analysis of variance procedures. Relationships between perceptions of success and perceptions of leadership behaviors were tested using multiple regression tests. Statistical significance was analyzed to an alpha level of .05 using SPSS.

Limitations

The results of this study were limited by:

1. The honesty of the respondents. Some teachers may not feel comfortable with providing an honest critique of their principal's actions for fear of reprisal.

Likewise, principal respondents may provide positive responses on the questionnaire in order to hide any perceived failure on their part.

2. Limited responses. A low response rate could prevent the study from uncovering the actual overriding perceptions across a campus; instead, perceptions would be garnered only from the few who chose to return questionnaires.
3. Lack of personal interaction with respondents. Questionnaire-based research may cause some respondents to feel forced to select specific answers to convey generalized feelings.
4. Teachers excluded by lack of principal participation. Some schools' teachers may have been excluded from the study because their principals choose not to participate.

Delimitations

Delimitations built into this study included:

1. Only schools that have received SLC grants will be involved. This helped identify schools which have implemented the SLC model.
2. Principals' time of service at the school. Only schools whose principals who have facilitated the SLC change process from its inception at the school were included in the study.
3. Teachers' time of service at the school. Only teachers who have been at the school since the inception of the SLC transition were included in the study.

Significance of the Study

While the study sample for this dissertation was limited to schools in Florida which have received SLC grants from the federal government during 2007 and 2008, it is

hoped that the results of this work will have a more universal application. Using schools from the SLC grant cohorts served to identify schools which are undergoing a specific second-order change. The real focus of the study was on perceptions of change implementation strategies, rather than concepts which were specific to the SLC model.

By examining hypothesized differences in perception, it was hoped that this study would assist school leaders in identifying and resolving areas of resistance that may arise through the course of a change implementation process. Through identification of resistance and awareness of follower perceptions, school leaders can more effectively address the needs of their organizations while in a state of flux.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of the study has introduced the problem, the research questions, the study population and its selection process, and an outline of the data collection and analysis procedures. Chapter 2 examines the relevant scholarly literature, with special focus on the organizational behavior models that form the bedrock of this study. Chapter 3 further details the methodology of the study, and describes the data collection and analysis procedures. Chapter 4 focuses on the data that were uncovered for each case study and their results, and Chapter 5 discusses the findings and examines possible applications and opportunities for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Change leadership and organizational behavior have received a great deal of attention in research literature. However, there has not been a great deal of attention paid to the perceptions of leadership behavior from the viewpoint of subordinates and how those perceptions compare to the leader's view of their own behaviors. This chapter will outline the current literature regarding second-order change, small learning communities, systems thinking, change leadership, and leader-member exchange.

Second-Order Change Responsibilities

The primary school/organizational behavior concepts analyzed in this study related to second-order change. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified 21 responsibilities that school leaders must address to improve student achievement. The authors stated that each of these 21 responsibilities is tied to successful first-order change, which is incremental, or "the next most obvious step to take in a school" (p. 66). Second-order change, according to Marzano et al., is more deep and drastic than first-order change. It often involves "a dramatic shift in direction and require[es] new ways of thinking and acting" (Marzano et al., p. 66). Marzano et al. correlate seven of the 21 responsibilities to second-order change related to student achievement. They are:

1. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
2. Optimizer

3. Intellectual Stimulation
4. Change Agent
5. Monitoring/Evaluating
6. Flexibility
7. Ideals/Beliefs (Marzano et al., p. 70)

These responsibilities are correlated to creating deep and long-term systemic change, such as one would see in the implementation of a SLC model.

Marzano et al. (2005) reported that while Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment may appear to be a straightforward and obvious trait for a school leader to possess, studies have shown that it is often not a major part of a school principal's daily practice, and is often not adequately assessed in administrative hiring processes.

The Optimizer responsibility, "refers to the extent to which the leader inspires others and is the driving force when implementing a challenging innovation" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 56). Marzano et al. wrote that meeting the role of the Optimizer requires principals to inspire teachers to accomplish that which they believe they cannot, to be the driving force in major change initiatives, and to maintain positive attitude about the abilities of the faculty to accomplish the tasks set before them.

To fulfill the responsibility of Intellectual Stimulation, the principal must ensure that the faculty is aware of and has access to current theories of best instructional practices (Marzano et al., 2005). This duty requires the principal to not only stay current with emerging research, but to facilitate the passage of the new knowledge to the faculty and facilitate its implementation into the daily functions of the school.

As Change Agent, the school principal must be willing to “challenge...the status quo” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 42) within the organization. An effective principal will not be satisfied to coast along when things seem to be going smoothly.

Marzano et al. (2005) also task the principal with the responsibility of Monitoring/Evaluating. In order to bring about successful change, the principal must be able to set benchmarks for the progress of the new implementation and check actual progress made against those benchmarks.

Flexibility as an effective school leader requires the principal to be willing to adapt his or her leadership style to meet the demands of fluid situations (Marzano et al., 2005). The principal’s ability to adapt and be flexible is correlated closely by Marzano et al. to success within a school.

Finally, effective communication of the philosophy of education and beliefs regarding the school’s operations has been shown to have a strong correlation to school success (Marzano et al., 2005). According to Marzano et al., principals who clearly impart their philosophy, meeting the responsibility of Ideals/Beliefs, will be more successful at gaining buy-in and support from the faculty.

Felner, Seitsinger, Brand, Burns, and Bolton (2007) stated that far-reaching, systemic change in school operations is required to address the challenges of recent reforms. Successful implementation of the Small Learning Communities (SLC) model forces school leaders to create a total systemic shift that will surely shake the modus operandi of both administration and faculty. Schools that have adopted this school-in-a-school format have placed teachers, “into more intimate educational environments” (Supovitz, 2002, p. 1592). Implementation of the SLC design will seek to individualize

and personalize the educational experience for students, regardless of the size of the school's overall student body (Lee & Friedrich, 2007). Such efforts can provide a "continuity of care" (Connell & Klem, 2006, Fall, p. 56) that provides continual support throughout a student's time at the high school. Since the SLC design is a drastic shift in the way a high school works, this research will treat the implementation process as second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005), even in situations where the systems was gradually implemented.

Marzano et al. (2005) also point out that perceptions of responsibilities related to first-order change can be affected during second-order change implementation. Culture, Communication, Order, and Input may be seen as deteriorating through the transition period.

Culture is disrupted when team spirit and common language are disturbed. In the example of a Small Learning Communities (SLC) high school, the reorganization of the faculty into career academies or houses may disrupt team spirit, while new terminology related to the academies can add confusing new ideas to the school's common language regarding teaching and learning. As the school is reorganized, preexisting lines of communication become scrambled, adding to the uncertainty of the transition. As the familiar system passes by the wayside in the second-order change process, the faculty's sense of Order may be shaken as predictable and comfortable systems expire. Finally, several faculty members may feel their input is no longer welcome as they change progresses despite their concerns or objections.

Small Learning Communities

Small learning communities (SLCs) encompass elements of organization around houses or career academies, while intensifying focus on learning and the learner (Oxley, 2005). The structural basis of SLCs is an interdisciplinary team of teachers sharing a group of students in an area dedicated to their collaboration and common planning (Fine & Somerville, 1998; Oxley, 2001). The literature in this section illustrates why a change to an SLC model is a second-order change, required deep changes to the very operational mentality of a school.

Oxley (2005) detailed five essential components of successful SLCs: building and district support, teaching and learning teams, inclusive programs, rigorous and relevant curriculum and instruction, and continuous program improvement. District and building-level administration must reform bureaucratic structures to “facilitate SLC personalization, flexibility, and autonomy” (Oxley, 2005, p. 46). She goes on to state that the most successful SLC initiatives are the ones that are set as the central foundation of their school’s organization, rather than as yet another add-on program.

Interdisciplinary teaching teams sharing a pool of no more than a few hundred students will allow teachers and students to “form relationships that bind them to the school, and teachers are better able to identify and respond to students’ needs” (Oxley, 2005, p. 46). According to Oxley (2005), team collaboration will increase teachers’ shared sense of responsibility for student achievement while improving relational qualities between students and teachers, as well as students and their peers.

SLCs support, and likewise require, rigorous and relevant curriculum based on autonomy and flexibility (Oxley, 2005). Oxley (2005) envisions a system in which

collaborative teacher teams are able to organize field work, or involve community partners in creating opportunities for students to gain real-world experience. Course content across the curriculum would be student-centered based upon career interests.

In the final element of SLC construction, these systems are to be inclusive of all students based on academic and career interest rather than past performance. Students “are able to pursue honors as well as remedial options within their SLC” (Oxley, 2005, p. 48). It is also necessary for schools to implement practices that draw in community partners and parents to strengthen the foundation of the SLC organization as well as relationships with those outside the school walls.

SLCs designed with the intention of bridging the gap between school and work have been shown support academic learning while at the same time raising the importance and prestige of vocational education (Little, Erbstein, & Walker, 2001). Little et al. found that career academy reform structures brought together what had been two previously disparate groups within the high school culture:

...the most ambitious integration models such as career academies have generally succeeded in garnering the respect of academic teachers, parents, and students....Such models appear to achieve their effect with their students largely on the basis of (a) general “planfulness” about the future (including both postsecondary education and career); (b) small scale and close socioemotional support for students of the sort also attempted by other small school or school-within-a-school models; and (c) the press for achievement communicated by teachers who monitor student progress closely. (p. 22)

By grouping students into interest based career-preparation academies, the importance of strong vocational and technical education becomes clearer to those on the academic side of the equation.

One observed benefit of the SLC structure is the shared experience and knowledge of teachers working together as a team across the various academic and vocational disciplines. Supovitz and Christman (2005) report, however, that creating the basic SLC structure within a school is insufficient; learning communities must be centered on instruction, legitimized, supported, and provided with professional development opportunities. School leaders are called upon to focus the efforts of each SLC within their school on instructional practice. Common planning and accountability for collaborative practices are identified as essential components for effective SLC implementation.

Systems Thinking

Senge's (1990) work in Systems Thinking identified four core disciplines for building an organization capable of creating and sustaining effective change: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. Senge stated that these disciplines must be in place in order to create a learning organization. Learning organizations are able to identify problems in how they operate before they become crises, and make the necessary adjustments to prevent such escalation. People who implement these disciplines seek to master their role within the organization while seeking to better themselves and contribute to the growth of the team. They have made themselves open to new ways of viewing their work, and have bought in to the success of

the organization. When people make habits of these disciplines and understand that the entire organization is affected by their personal success or failure, it becomes much easier to implement new models and methodology that may fly in the face of the previously existing template.

The four disciplines identified by Senge (1990) dovetail directly into the issues examined in this study. Learning organizations are distinguished by their capacity to grow through new challenges. The research instruments in this study ask participants to examine their schools as learning organizations. Senge's four disciplines are not explicitly stated in the questionnaires, but the second-order change responsibilities assessed by them are easily associated Senge's work.

Fullan (2001) echoed the Systems Thinking model in his description of school capacity. Citing the work of Newmann, King, and Youngs, Fullan listed five components of school capacity: teacher knowledge, skills, and dispositions, professional community, program coherence, technical resources, and principal leadership. A teacher's knowledge, skills, and dispositions are analogous with Senge's (1990) personal mastery (in making this comparison, it is especially important to understand the role of dispositions as related to personal mastery; people must be willing to stretch beyond their current abilities in order to gain new levels of proficiency). Program coherence and professional community align with shared vision and team learning. Mental models are challenged through strong principal leadership. The strongest comparison between these lines of thinking, however, lies in Fullan's assertion that each of these components must work together synergistically in order to create success. Likewise, Senge postulated that

his core disciplines must all work in concert with Systems Thinking in order to birth a true learning organization.

Applying Senge's (1990) four disciplines to the school setting, Joyner (2000) holds that many methods of staff development aimed at school improvement do not sufficiently connect the new learning teachers should acquire to that which they already know. No methods are put into place to reinforce new techniques and practices, and school and district administrators are often uninvolved in the training. The result is, "a smorgasboard [*sic*] of staff development workshops where the instructors don't listen to the participants, they don't talk to each other, and they might even contradict each other" (Joyner, p. 386). The creation of such a disjointed system of staff development can only serve to disrupt efforts to install lasting change in a school. The situation Joyner described is one where Systems Thinking is not employed; leaders and followers alike are unaware of what is happening in the big picture. People are aware there is a need for improvement, but they are unable to identify the source of the need or prescribe the proper plan of action.

The mental models concept helps explain various anticipatory phenomena. The term anticipatory justice refers to the idea that when one expects to find unfairness or injustice in an organization, that is what they will see unless given indisputable proof to the contrary (Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001). Other research has shown the anticipatory phenomenon to apply to performance reviews (Siegall, 1992), job interviews (Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994), and even polygraph results (Elaad, Ginton, & Shakhar, 1994). Humans tend to find what they believe they should see in a given situation. Therefore, followers' perceptions of their leader's behavior could be more important to

them than anything the leader may be doing or accomplishing beyond their view (this concept will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter). It could be hypothesized, then, that a follower may never be satisfied with a leader's performance without solid proof of success. Anticipatory phenomena will be discussed again in later sections in this chapter.

Leadership through change is difficult, regardless of the setting. Many factors, both internal and external, influence the ways in which change is instituted and how people respond to that change. It is essential that change leaders be aware of these factors, and that they strive to work through them to create meaningful and lasting change. All organizations face challenges in shifting the way people perform their jobs. The question for leaders is not why people fail to respond to change, but rather what can be done to monitor and observe the change process in order to identify and address problems as they arise.

Change Leadership

Change leadership literature examines how organizational leaders go about implementing successful changes. The concepts examined here demonstrate the methods that can be used to successfully affect change in previously static organizations.

One of the early models of change leadership, proposed by Lewin (1951), was a simple three-step process: unfreeze, movement, refreeze. Essentially, Lewin theorized that leaders should destabilize the status quo, create the desired movement or change, then establish the new as the set method of operation. Kotter's (1996) eight-step model and Ulrich's (1998) seven-step model both include more complex methods, including

consideration for vision, accountability, and individual empowerment. However, these and other rigid process-based models have been criticized for “failure to recognize the complexity of change, simplistic assumptions of success..., and lack of preparedness for resistance” (Gilley, Gilley, & McMillan, 2009, p. 78).

Schultz (2007) described systemic change as a threat to the established mental models of those who are affected by the change. He stated that workers form a place for themselves in the larger scheme of the organization, and become comfortable with their place and the necessity of their role. Change shakes the foundation of that comfort, and causes workers to doubt both their roles in the organization and their ability to fulfill those roles.

In order to head off this frustration and its subsequent resistance, Schultz (2007) listed eight steps to assist change agents and leaders in successfully implementing new systems. The first of these steps is to define the need for change. Put simply, this step calls for leaders to provide evidence of organizational shortcomings or pitfalls which require corrective action. The second step Schultz proposed is to create and communicate a purpose which unites the organization. Such a purpose or vision should be designed in a way that gives stakeholders a reason to come along for the ride. Coming from a business perspective, Schultz wrote that the purpose of the organization should take customer expectations as well as stakeholder needs into consideration.

Identifying areas of necessary reform is a major challenge for organizations. As Gibson and Billings (Gibson & Billings, 2003) point out, there can be literally thousands of interdependent parts of the entire organization that contribute to the overall result. How, then, does a leadership team identify where to start? Senge and Fulmer (1993)

write that understanding the working of a large system is necessary to break through the initial confusion. It is vital for management to understand how each of those interdependent parts works, and their role in producing the final product or profit. Focusing on only one area of operation, whether in corporate retail or school reform, can be a fatal mistake. Senge's concept of systems thinking dictates that for change to be effective, it must permeate the entire organization. There is no silver bullet that will lead to dramatic success with one little tweak of the system. Nadler's (Nadler & Hibino, 1998) systems matrix creates a visual aid for leaders seeking to evaluate how their organizations are currently operating, and how change in any particular area will affect the other components of the organization.

Once needs are identified, Schultz (2007) called for leaders to identify both formal and informal groups and cliques in the organization and solicit their support and participation. Steps four and five instructed leaders to create a plan of action and give people the means to take action. Providing employees with the tools to create change allows them to take ownership of their role in the process. The sixth and seventh steps involve the creation of expanding benchmarks to show improvement. Leaders should start small, and then expand their expectations. Schultz's final step is to reinforce the new system.

Each of these steps requires change leaders to be consciously aware of how their proposed shifts in operation will affect those on the receiving end. According to Schultz (2007), the way in which leaders handle systemic change will affect their relationships with their employees, and determine not only how successful the new system can be, but how well future improvements and changes can be created.

In her exploration of the roots of teachers' resistance to change, Zimmerman (2006) uncovered many of the same causes of dysfunction that Schultz (2007) would later describe. Zimmerman wrote that barriers to change include failure to recognize the need for change, habit, fear of the unknown, threats to expertise, threats to power relationships, and threats to resource allocations. The connections to the barriers against change as discussed from the business perspective are amazingly clear. Zimmerman's finding of the leaders' failure to recognize the need for change strikes a solid parallel to Schultz's call for leaders to identify those needs. Zimmerman also connected the identification of power groups for support and the idea of organizational uncertainty (Rice, O'Connor, & Pierantozzi, 2008).

Zimmerman (2006) also addressed the use of mental models that clarify people's roles in the school. Reminiscent of Senge's (1990) model of Systems Thinking, Zimmerman described how mental models not only shape the identity of the followers affected by systemic change, but can also cloud the school leader's recognition of the source of resistance to that change. A leader who expects change to simply occur through mandate will be at a loss to explain why that change failed to actually occur. To counter resistance, Zimmerman called on school leaders to step outside of their comfort zones along with their teachers, and to build a culture where change is accompanied with shared decision-making, trust, and a concern for the well-being of the individual.

Anticipatory phenomena could be dovetailed into discussion of mental models or maps with regards to change readiness (Marzano et al., 2005). The first examinations of anticipatory justice centered around team reorganizations (Rodell & Colquitt, 2009). Anticipatory justice affects the way people perceive experienced justice, demonstrating

the correlation between mental models and anticipatory phenomena. When people expect things to go a certain way, they create their own perceptions of reality that shape actual experienced events to fit the mental model they have prepared. Bolman and Deal (2003) report that justice is the capacity to create a fair process to decide who gets what, since leaders cannot give every follower everything they will want. If employees or followers do not anticipate a fair process for change or restructuring, they may simply refuse to see the fairness that actually exists.

Another identified source of change resistance is the stakeholders' readiness to participate in the planned change (Folarnon, 2005). Folarnon listed four phases of general change readiness: contentment, denial, confusion, and renewal. In the contentment phase, individuals express satisfaction with the current status of the organization, and feel there is no need to initiate any major change processes. The denial phase involves the recognition of a need for change, but individuals project the necessity of change onto those around them rather than accepting their role in the process. Once an individual accepts that their involvement is required in the change initiative, they will usually experience a sense of confusion regarding how to successfully implement the new ideas. This mindset marks the third phase. Finally, participants enter the renewal phase, "once a plan is drawn up or a methodology is employed and the change process is allowed to move forward" (Folarnon, p. 40). The following strategies were suggested to move individuals through the four stages of general change readiness:

1. Present a vision of the future to move individuals out of the contentment phase.
2. Provide data supporting the need for organization-wide change participation.

3. Create a clear and consistent plan to move individuals through the confusion phase.
4. Leverage improvements and engage individuals in other change initiatives in order to sustain the renewal phase of change readiness.

Stasny (1996) examined how vision and structure, among other factors, influenced perceptions of organizational learning among school teachers, which reflects the ability of their organization to accept and successfully implement change (Masci, Cuddapah, & Pajak, 2008). Using both individuals and schools as units of measure, Stasny found that both presentation of vision and clear, structured approach to change were positively correlated to teachers' perceptions of their schools as learning organizations.

Folaron (2005) also identified five factors, which he called the ADCOM model, that influence the ability or willingness to change: (a) ability, or the "physical capacity...to perform the tasks required by the change" (p. 42); (b) direction, or a clear understanding of the expectations of the individual's performance in the change process; (c) competence, or knowledge and skills requisite to performing assigned tasks; (d) opportunity, or the time and tools necessary for success; and (e) motivation, or an acceptance of the value of success in the change initiative. Motivation was noted as the most important element of sustained, successful change in the ADCOM model, as none of the others can overcome a lack of motivation and individual effort.

Perceptions of organizational justice and participatory input have a large impact of organizational loyalty (Brockner et al., 1994; Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). Similarly, perceptions of justice can be influenced by pre-existing loyalty to the organization. Brockner, Tyler, and Cooper-Schneider (1992) found that employees with

previously high levels of organizational loyalty were the most heavily devastated by perceived injustices. The same article reported similar finding for effects on commitment to legal authorities. In both examinations, Brockner et al., found that commitment to the organization or entities examined decreased the most among those with high prior commitment once a perceived injustice occurred.

An individual's commitment to an organization can have a profound effect on their commitment to organizational change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Meyer and Allen (1991) found that organizational commitment is rooted in three components: affective, continuance, and normative. They described these three components as follows:

Affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they *want* to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance remain because they *need* to do so. Finally, normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they *ought* to remain with the organization. (p. 67)

These various states of organizational commitment can also be applied to commitment to organizational change (Herscovitch & Meyer). Commitment to organizational change can reflect the following:

...(a) a desire to provide support for the change based on a belief in its inherent benefits (affective commitment to change), (b) a recognition that there are costs associated with failure to provide support for the change (continuance commitment to change), and (c) a sense of obligation to provide support for the change (normative commitment to change). That is, employees can feel bound to support a change because they want to, have to, and/or ought to. (Herscovitch & Meyer, p. 475)

The initial success of a change is not a guarantee of its future implementation. As change progresses, nostalgia for old ways can hinder its growth and development (Goodson, Moore, & Hargreaves, 2006). As teachers move through a cycle of perceived unneeded or actually unwanted change, they fall back on the systems and beliefs that propped them up to this point in their careers. Goodson, et al. attributed this sense of nostalgia to both the degeneration of the aging teacher (loss of energy and commitment) and the agendas and beliefs that carried them through their careers. Connecting back to the previously discussed literature, these teachers, who are often veterans and highly respected at their school, can form the nucleus of the power center that the school leader needs to address.

Conversely, change can often bring about a short-term drop in organizational performance. Gibson and Billings (2003) described a curve model for illustrating performance loss in the immediate wake of major organizational change. If one views organizational performance as a parabolic curve, change should ideally occur at the peak of an operational system's productivity. When systemic change is implemented, the organization can expect to see an initial loss in performance. Rather than continuing up

or down the same performance curve, the organization will jump to a completely new curve, with productivity significantly lower than was experienced under the previous system. This can lead to initial backlash from the followers of the change; if they are not prepared, for all intents and purposes, to start over from square one in a new system, they will not understand the drop in results. This is especially true if the organization's leadership has focused on the changes necessity from a cost or detriment containment perspective (Ye, Marinova, & Singh, 2007).

Fink and Brayman (2006) argued that attitudes about leadership succession and the role of the school leader contribute to the phenomenon of change resistance. School leaders are viewed not as leadership agents for the school community, but rather as managers for a district or state system agenda (Fink & Brayman). People become hostile to change proposed by school leaders, both established and new principals, when they believe that the leader does not serve the best interest of the school, but rather the mechanical proddings of a faceless initiative. This mentality toward change initiatives connects to the concepts of taking stakeholder needs into consideration (Schultz, 2007) and organizational uncertainty (Rice, et al., 2008). These situations can also be indicative of a system where mutual trust and shared decision making are non-existent (Zimmerman, 2006).

Some research suggests that building a culture of teacher learning within a school will assist with implementing future changes. Learning communities exist in schools "because members of the community have common understandings and knowledge to share with one another" (Printy, 2008, p. 193). Printy reported that these school cultures foster learning and professional growth among both faculty and administration, and

administration is viewed as the facilitator of the learning. Teachers look to the administration to assume leadership in charting the course for the school and to facilitate professional collaboration. Printy also stated that leaders emerge from within the community without being granted formal titles. These leaders rise to their position through their expertise and the trust of the community around them. It is these leaders that administration must address and convince when trying to create lasting systemic change, as described by Schultz (2007) and Rice, et al. (2008). The respect and trust that is given to these informal leaders by the faculty must be passed on to the administration, and the administration must do everything possible to earn and nurture that trust.

Owens and Valesky (2007) reported that school leaders must be able to identify conflict within the work setting. This includes being able to notice where conflict might exist, and where it might not, despite appearances to the contrary. Owens and Valesky define conflict as two groups striving for incompatible goals. Therefore, conflict in school change will be centered on the goals of the opposing parties. The importance of the goals to each group relates back to the necessity for change. If teachers do not see a new program as beneficial to their own personal and professional goals, they will actively resist its implementation, creating conflict with the administration.

Leader-Member Exchange

Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX) focuses on the role of professional relationships in leadership (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Because of the drastic nature of second-order change, successful implementation requires school leaders to be aware of issues of organizational justice and relational perceptions.

In detailing the evolution of LMX, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) describe how previous research validated the concept of differentiated dyadic relationships within an organization. Rather than using a one-size-fits-all approach, leaders develop relationships of varying quality and trust with individual employees, or members. Further research has found that these relationships can affect employees' perceptions of justice and fairness within an organization (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996).

Sin, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2009) examined the concept of LMX agreement. Since LMX theory deals with dyadic relationship, Sin et al. found it interesting that previous studies had indicated the existence of extraneous mitigating factors which influenced leader and member perceptions of the leader-member relationship. One of their hypotheses postulated that LMX agreement was negatively related to a degree of inflation in the supervisors' responses to LMX questions. In other words, supervisors rated themselves higher than the members rated them on certain items pertaining to attitude, cognition, and action because they viewed these as personally evaluative questions, rather than, "an evaluation of the dyadic relationship" (Sin et al., p. 1049).

Furst and Cable (2008) theorized that the LMX relationship could affect employee resistance or acceptance of change. Their research examined several types of management influence tactics and their outcomes based on LMX levels within organizations. They hypothesized that use of sanctions as an influence tactic would vary in its effectiveness based upon the strength of each LMX dyad. The results of their research showed a correlation between use of sanctions and increased employee resistance to change when the LMX relationship was weak. They found similar results for the use of legitimization and ingratiation techniques as well. Employees with low

LMX viewed legitimization and ingratiation techniques as condescending and contrived, aligning with their previous perceptions of their supervisor. The correlations discovered in this research supported the importance of previously existing LMX relationships in quelling employee resistance to change. In particular, “results suggested that employees may use the quality of their relationship with managers to interpret the meaning and intent of some influence tactics” (Furst & Cable, p. 458).

The work by Rodell and Colquit (2009) regarding anticipatory justice and change also supports the importance of interpersonal relationships and acceptance of change. In this study, the authors found that individual employee perceptions of anticipatory justice from their supervisors were positively correlated to their perceptions of experienced justice. In other words, employees saw exactly what they planned to see, which was heavily influenced by their pre-existing relationships with and perceptions of their leaders. Similar to the findings by Furst and Cable (2008), this study found that peoples’ pre-existing perceptions of leadership and change can become self-fulfilling prophecies.

Moving the LMX relationship upward, Erdogan and Enders (2007) examined how supervisors’ perceived organizational support (POS) affected their LMX relationships. Their research showed that supervisor POS moderated the relationship between subordinate perceptions of LMX and job satisfaction, and, to a lesser degree, LMX and job performance. When high LMX subordinates believe their supervisor has the support of the higher organization, they believe the supervisor is in a better position to support their work and provide the resources necessary for successful task completion. When low LMX subordinates see a high level of supervisor POS, they may see a situation where the supervisor has greater potential to withhold resources or unfairly punish

subordinates. While low LMX subordinates' job performance ratings were consistent regardless of supervisor POS, high LMX subordinates' job performance ratings were heavily moderated by supervisor POS. High POS was strongly correlated to better job performance among high LMX employees.

Work environment relationship styles can also influence perceptions of effective leadership (MacDonald, Sulsky, & Brown, 2008). MacDonald et al. found that people who were conditioned and prepared for interdependent leader-member relationships identified elements of transformational leadership theory as effective leadership techniques. Conversely, those conditioned and prepared for independent leader-member relationships identified elements of transactional leadership theory as effective leadership techniques. Relational style had a strong relationship with perceptions of effective leadership.

Summary

There are numerous factors which affect the potential success of change. Research has shown that interpersonal relationships and perceptions of fairness and justice play a major role in how well change efforts will be accepted by members of an organization. It is incumbent upon leaders, then, to be aware of the quality of the relationships they have established or are in the process of establishing. While there are several methods for instituting change, the numerous variables that exist in organizational life make it impossible to identify a one-size-fits-all silver bullet.

Just like the perceptions of relationships, perceptions of organizational roles and processes affect peoples' willingness to grasp or accept change. These mental models are

part of how people view their member system and their place within that system. In order to successfully change an organization, leaders must be able to shift the mental models of their subordinates in a way that still provides a useful place for the employee to belong in the organization.

The SLC movement in American high schools seeks to create seek to create a system where students move through their high school years with a consistent small group assigned to a cohort of common teachers. Since SLC advocates call for a fundamental shift in thinking about school organization and instructional design, it is necessary for school leaders to understand how to implement deep-seeded, second-order change. The responsibilities identified by Marzano et al. have been correlated to success in implementing such change as judged through student achievement.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter reviews the problem statement, describes the study populations, instrumentation, and data collection. The procedures for examining the research questions are also included.

Problem Statement

Change leadership has received extensive attention in the research literature, but little has been written about the alignment of change perception between leaders and followers. It would be a simple thing for leaders to assume that their followers feel the same about a change and its implementation as they do, but that could be an extremely inaccurate perception. Change leaders may not be aware of problems in the implementation process if they are not in touch with their followers' perceptions of the change and its success.

This research employed multiple case studies to examine the differences, if any, in the perceptions of principals and their teachers of the implementation of federal SLC grant programs. The research questions are:

1. What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers along Marzano et al.'s (2005) responsibilities for Second-Order Change?

2. How do principals view their actions in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano et al.'s (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?
3. How do teachers view the actions of the principal in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano et al.'s (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?
4. What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status?

Population

This study focused on Florida schools that received federal SLC grants in 2007 and 2008. These schools were selected in order to identify schools undergoing a second-order change where Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven responsibilities would be easily applicable.

Schools from seven districts in Florida received grants during 2007 and 2008 (Duval, Hillsborough, Lake, Manatee, Miami-Dade, Orange, and Palm Beach). Formal research applications were completed and submitted to each county except Lake and Manatee. Lake County did not have a formalized research application process; permission to conduct research was acquired through email from the district's Chief Academic Officer (see Appendix E). The researcher was unable to make contact with officials in Manatee County, and therefore did not obtain permission to conduct research there. Permission to conduct research was granted by Duval, Hillsborough, and Orange

counties (see Appendix F). Permission was denied by Palm Beach County in a voice message, and no response was ever received from Miami-Dade County.

The principals from each grant-receiving school were invited to participate. Once a school's principal completed his/her questionnaire, all teachers, guidance counselors, instructional coaches, and other instructional-level employees were invited to participate. Principals and instructional personnel who were not with the school during the 2007-2008 school year were screened out of the questionnaire. This was done to ensure that everyone participating in the study was with the school at the inception of the SLC change process.

Instrumentation

Two questionnaires were created for this study; one to be completed by principals (see Appendix A) and the other to be completed by teachers and other instructional personnel (see Appendix B). Both questionnaires had 37 items, 36 of which contained Likert scale responses. The final questionnaire item was open-ended, asking participants to describe what they have done to support SLC implementation on their campus.

All but one of the Likert scale questions were aligned with Marzano's (2005) seven responsibilities for second order change. Participants were asked to rate their perception of the success of the SLC implementation at their school in the remaining item.

Table 1: Second Order Change Leadership Behaviors and Associated Principal and Teacher Questionnaire Items (Item Associations)

Leadership Behavior	Questionnaire Items (both questionnaires)
1. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	5, 13, 17, 26, 36
2. Optimizer	4, 15, 18, 27, 33
3. Intellectual Stimulation	8, 16, 19, 28, 37
4. Change Agent	9, 12, 20, 29, 34
5. Monitoring/Evaluating	7, 11, 14, 21, 30
6. Flexibility	6, 22, 31, 35, 38
7. Ideals/Beliefs	10, 23, 24, 25, 32

Since both questionnaires were identical except for their audience, reliability analyses were conducted using all cases across both instruments. All questionnaire items had a corrected item-total correlation greater than .4, and all Chronbach's Alpha if Deleted scores were equal to or less than the overall alpha score of .967. Alpha if Deleted scores ranged from .965 to .967 (see Appendix H). Squared multiple correlation could not be computed for any item.

Data Collection

The principal and teacher research questionnaires were distributed to the study population through email using the Tailored Design Method (Dilman, 2000). Study participants received up to five contact letters until their completion of the questionnaire, or their request to be removed from the study (see Appendix I). Each participant received an introductory email explaining the purpose of the research study. Approximately a week later, each participant received a second email containing a link to the appropriate questionnaire at Zoomerang.com, their five-digit identification code, the appropriate informed consent letter, and, if applicable, the appropriate research approval letter from their district office. The first two digits of the identification code were used by the researcher to indicate which school the participant belonged to, while the last three served to identify each participant. The codes were the only identifiable information provided by participants on the questionnaire, and the names for each code were held only by the researcher.

Participants who did not initially respond were sent three reminder emails over the course of two to three weeks. As participants either completed the questionnaire, opted out, or screened out they were removed from the reminder list.

Initially, the link to the questionnaire and identification code was included at the bottom of the second email. The researcher received much feedback, however, from the first group of teacher participants that they could not find their identification code. The link and code were moved up to the middle of the subsequent contact emails, and for the second email set to any other participants.

Dependent Variables

The questionnaires examined perceptions of principal change leadership performance related to the seven responsibilities for second order change: (a) knowledge of curriculum and assessment, (b) optimizer, (c) intellectual stimulation, (d) change agent, (e) monitoring and evaluating; (f) flexibility; and (g) ideals/beliefs.

Independent Variables

Independent variables included employment status (principal or teacher) and place of employment (school).

Data Analysis

Completed questionnaire results were downloaded from Zoomerang into Microsoft Excel 2007. Once the consent results and the final open-ended question were excluded, the data were exported to SPSS Version 18.0 for Windows. The findings are presented in Chapter 4.

Data Analysis for Research Question 1

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers along Marzano et al.'s (2005) responsibilities for Second-Order Change?

One-sample t-tests were conducted to determine if any statistically significant difference existed between mean teacher scores and individual principal scores along the seven identified responsibilities for each case study. These tests were conducted based

on using the principal's aggregated score for each responsibility as the test value. One-sample t-tests were also conducted to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in perception of success of the change implementation between the principal and the teachers at each school.

The low number of participating schools severely hampers the ability to generalize the data as representative of all SLC high schools. Therefore, the results of these tests should be seen as applying only to the specific schools studied, and not as indicative of wider trends or patterns.

Data Analysis for Research Questions 2 and 3

How do principals view their actions in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano et al.'s (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

How do teachers view the actions of administration in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano et al.'s (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

Descriptive statistics for individual item responses are presented for principals and teachers. Independent t-tests were run to determine the existence of statistically significant differences between the scores of teachers at the two schools along the seven responsibilities. Since only two principals completed case studies, no statistical tests were conducted on their scores. Chapter 4 reports the results for each individual question and each of the seven identified responsibilities. Qualitative data are presented to

illustrate actions that teachers and principals report taking to support the implementation of the SLC model.

Data Analysis for Research Question 4

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status?

Since only two schools completed case studies, it is not feasible to correlate factors of school size, urban status, or student socioeconomic status to teacher or principal scores. These statistics are reported, however, in Chapter 4 for each school.

Summary

Summaries of school demographic information, individual principal responses, and mean teacher responses are included in Chapter 4. Analyses of t-test results are also included. The results of these analyses provide the foundation for the conclusions and recommendations found in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study examined principal and teacher perceptions of change implementation practices within Florida's federal Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) grant-recipient high schools for the years 2007 and 2008. Using a questionnaire created by the researcher, participants were asked a series of questions that were aligned with identified principal responsibilities for second-order change as correlated to student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). These responsibilities, as identified in Chapter 2, were: (a) Knowledge of Curriculum and Instruction, (b) Optimizer, (c) Intellectual Stimulation, (d) Change Agent, (e) Monitoring/Evaluating, (f) Flexibility, and (g) Ideals/Beliefs. The first section presents a description of the study population, including return rates. The second section of this chapter revisits the four research questions, presents and analyzes the statistics of their associated responses, and compares the results between the two participating schools.

Population Description

The study population came from a rural/suburban school district in Central Florida. While the initial universe for this study was to include 38 schools from seven school districts across the state (see Appendix C), only two principals from the same district are in the study. The context of high schools during the study year of 2009 – 2010 is important to understanding the low resulting participation. Districts and high

schools are in corrective action under Florida's No Child Left Behind accountability program. Several districts and schools, either officially or unofficially, decided not to engage in any extraneous activities outside of those directly related to improving student achievement. One principal from a large urban district attempted the questionnaire, but was screened out because the principal was not at the high school when it received the grant. Another principal completed the questionnaire after the closing deadline. Since teacher responses were paired with their principals' answers, only schools whose principals were able to and chose to participate could be included as case studies.

Within these two participating schools, the final study population included 206 teachers and two principals. The final response rate for the teacher population was 40.78%. No demographic data were collected from the study participants.

For reporting purposes, the separate case studies will be referred to as Study 1 and Study 2.

Research Question 1

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers along Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) responsibilities for second-order change?

Questionnaire items were grouped according to their association to each of the seven principal responsibilities for second-order change, as shown in Table 1. Scores for each group of items were summed to give a total score for that responsibility. For data reporting purposes, Likert-scale values were inverted: a score of 5 in Table 4 indicates

“Strongly Agree,” a score of 4 indicates “Agree,” a score of 3 indicates “Neither Agree Nor Disagree,” 3 indicates “Disagree,” while a score of 1 indicates “Strongly Disagree.” A response of “No Opinion” is treated as missing data. In this way, higher scores indicate stronger agreement with the questionnaire statements, and stronger positive views of principal actions. Cases with missing data in a responsibility group were excluded from the analyses for that responsibility.

Since only two schools completed case studies, it was not feasible to look for overall trends in alignment between principal and teacher perceptions. Therefore, the researcher examined the overall alignment for each of the two schools that participated and reports the data as Study 1 and Study 2. One-sample t-tests were employed to determine if teacher mean scores in each group of items were significantly different from their principal’s scores in the same group. While the low number of case studies provided less data than originally hoped for, group trends related to alignment of principal and teacher perceptions may be generalized based on these two studies. The analyses conducted are based on an assumption that a single principal’s score can serve as a test variable against which teacher means within the same school may be compared. The comparisons that follow are not intended to show trends of all principals in SLC grant recipient high schools; rather, they may be used to indicate levels of alignment between principal and teacher perceptions within the individual schools. Table 2 shows the results for Study 1, while Table 3 displays data for Study 2.

Statistically significant differences were found in four of the seven variables in Study 1. The teacher mean for perceptions of Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment was 18.18 (sd = 4.382), which was significantly different from the

principal's score of 21, $t(21) = -3.016$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of the Optimizer role was 16.29 ($sd = 5.271$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(23) = -3.447$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Flexibility was 15.65 ($sd = 4.886$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 18, $t(22) = -2.304$, $p < .05$. Finally, the teacher mean for perceptions of Ideals/Beliefs was 16.96 ($sd = 5.295$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(24) = -2.870$, $p < .01$.

In Study 2, statistically significant differences were found in six of the seven variables. The teacher mean for perceptions of Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment was 19.00 ($sd = 2.357$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(54) = -3.146$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of the Optimizer role was 16.870 ($sd = 3.426$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(53) = -6.713$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Intellectual Stimulation was 18.77 ($sd = 2.412$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(54) = -3.823$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Monitoring/Evaluating was 18.35 ($sd = 2.792$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 21, $t(49) = -6.772$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Flexibility was 15.55 ($sd = 3.625$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 17, $t(43) = -2.662$, $p < .05$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Ideals/Beliefs was 17.44 ($sd = 2.600$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 19, $t(47) = -4.163$, $p < .01$.

In Tables 2 and 3, N varies across the variables because it references the number of teachers that provided complete data for the category of responsibility. If a participant

selected “Undecided” for any questionnaire item, the answer was treated as missing data. The rest of the individual’s answers for the associated responsibility were then excluded from the tests.

Table 2: T-Tests: Differences Between Teacher Means and Principal Scores for Responsibility Question Groups in Study 1

Variable	Principal Score	Teach Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error Mean	N	df	95% Confidence Level		t	Sig. (2-Tail)
							Lower	Upper		
Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	21	18.18	4.382	.934	22	21	-4.761	-.875	-3.016	.007
Optimizer	20	16.29	5.271	1.076	24	23	-5.934	-1.483	-3.447	.002
Intellectual Stimulation	18	17.42	4.781	.976	24	23	-2.602	1.436	-.598	.556
Change Agent	18	17.67	4.040	.825	24	23	-2.039	1.373	-.404	.690
Monitoring/ Evaluating	18	17.61	4.906	1.023	23	22	-2.513	1.730	-.383	.706
Flexibility	18	15.65	4.886	1.019	23	22	-4.460	-.235	-2.304	.031
Ideals/ Beliefs	20	16.96	5.295	1.059	25	24	-5.225	-.854	-2.870	.008

Table 3: T-Tests: Differences Between Teacher Means and Principal Scores for Responsibility Question Groups in Study 2

Variable	Principal Score	Teach Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error Mean	N	df	95% Confidence Level		t	Sig. (2-Tail)
							Lower	Upper		
Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	20	19.00	2.357	.318	55	54	-1.637	-.363	-3.15	.003
Optimizer	20	16.87	3.426	.466	54	53	-4.065	-2.195	-6.71	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	20	18.77	2.412	.322	56	55	-1.878	-.586	-3.82	.000
Change Agent	18	18.18	2.693	.381	50	49	-.585	.945	.47	.639
Monitoring/ Evaluating	21	18.35	2.792	.391	51	50	-3.432	-1.862	-6.77	.000
Flexibility	17	15.55	3.625	.546	44	43	-2.557	-.353	-2.66	.011
Ideals/ Beliefs	19	17.44	2.600	.375	48	47	-2.318	-.817	-4.16	.000

Research Questions 2 and 3

How do principals view their actions in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

How do teachers view the actions of administration in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

Individual item responses on the Principals' Questionnaire are presented in Appendix J. Likert-scale values were inverted; a score of 5 in Table 4 indicated "Strongly Agree," a score of 4 indicated "Agree," a score of 3 indicated "Neither Agree Nor Disagree," 3 indicated "Disagree," while a score of 1 indicated "Strongly Disagree." Neither principal selected "No Opinion" for any of the questionnaire items. Both principals indicated in Question 39 they agree that their schools are successfully implementing the SLC model.

Mean principal responses for each responsibility in Study 1 (Table 5) and Study 2 (Table 6) were calculated. Descriptive statistics for each responsibility are provided below. The principal in Study 1 had the strongest agreement with questionnaire items related to Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($m = 4.20$, $sd = .447$). This principal scored a mean of 4.00 in Optimizer ($sd = .000$) and Ideals/Beliefs ($sd = .707$), and a mean of 3.60 in Intellectual Stimulation, Change Agent, Monitoring/Evaluating, and Flexibility ($sd = .548$ for all three responsibilities).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Principal Responses by Responsibility: Study 1

Responsibility	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
KCIA*	4	5	4.20	.447
Optimizer	4	4	4.00	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	3	4	3.60	.548
Change Agent	3	4	3.60	.548
Monitoring/ Evaluating	3	4	3.60	.548
Flexibility	3	4	3.60	.548
Ideals/Beliefs	3	5	4.00	.707

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

The principal in Study 2 had the strongest agreement with questionnaire items related to Monitoring/Evaluating ($m = 4.20$, $sd = .447$). This principal scored a mean of 4.00 in Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($sd = .000$), Optimizer (sd

= .707), and Intellectual Stimulation (sd = .000). The principal received a mean score of 3.80 in Ideals/Beliefs (sd = .447), a mean of 3.60 in Change Agent (sd = .548), and a mean of 3.40 in Flexibility (sd = .548).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Principal Responses by Responsibility: Study 2

Responsibility	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
KCIA*	4	4	4.00	.000
Optimizer	3	5	4.00	.707
Intellectual Stimulation	4	4	4.00	.000
Change Agent	3	4	3.60	.548
Monitoring/ Evaluating	4	5	4.20	.447
Flexibility	3	4	3.40	.548
Ideals/Beliefs	3	4	3.80	.447

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Descriptive statistics for teacher scores across the seven responsibilities were calculated in Study 1 (Table 6). Likert-scale values were recoded as described above. N represents the number of answered items within that responsibility.

In Study 1, the teachers had highest mean scores on statements regarding their principal's role as Change Agent ($m = 3.57$, $sd = 1.166$). The teachers obtained their lowest mean scores on statements regarding Flexibility ($m = 3.10$, $sd = 1.253$).

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Responses by Responsibility: Study 1

Responsibility	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
KCIA*	123	1	5	3.54	1.042
Optimizer	128	1	5	3.22	1.223
Intellectual Stimulation	128	1	5	3.48	1.157
Change Agent	127	1	5	3.57	1.166
Monitoring/ Evaluating	123	1	5	3.52	1.133
Flexibility	127	1	5	3.10	1.253
Ideals/Beliefs	129	1	5	3.36	1.261

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Descriptive statistics for teacher scores across the seven responsibilities in Study 2 are reported in Table 7. Teachers had highest mean scores on statements regarding their principal's Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($m = 3.78$, $sd = .842$). The teachers obtained their lowest mean scores on statements regarding Flexibility ($m = 3.08$, $sd = .958$).

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Responses by Responsibility: Study 2

Responsibility	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
KCIA*	279	1	5	3.78	.842
Optimizer	278	1	5	3.38	.987
Intellectual Stimulation	280	1	5	3.75	.790
Change Agent	274	1	5	3.65	.910
Monitoring/ Evaluating	275	1	5	3.65	.906
Flexibility	264	1	5	3.08	.958
Ideals/Beliefs	271	1	5	3.46	.942

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Independent t-tests were conducted to compare responsibility means between the two schools. Significant differences were found in only two areas (see Table 8). Participants in Study 2 ($m = 3.78$, $sd = .842$) scored significantly higher than those in Study 1 ($m = 3.54$, $sd = 1.042$) in perceptions of their principals' Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment [$t(195.18) = -2.328$, $p < .05$]. In perceptions of the principals' Intellectual Stimulation [$t(183.102) = -2.460$, $p < .05$], Study 2 participants ($m = 3.75$, $sd = .790$) were again significantly higher than Study 1 ($m = 3.75$, $sd = 1.157$). F scores from Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances for each variable were less than .05, so equal variances were not assumed.

The last Likert-scale item in the teacher questionnaire asked participants to rate their agreement with the statement, "I believe the school is successfully progressing toward full implementation of the SLC model." There was no significant difference between mean responses in Study 1 ($m = 3.27$, $sd = 1.282$) and Study 2 ($m = 3.40$, $sd = .935$), $t(79) = -.520$, $p > .05$.

Table 8: Independent T-Tests: Teacher Mean Scores Across Responsibilities

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
KCIA*	-2.328	195.183	.021	-2.48	.107	-.459	-.038
Optimizer	-1.348	206.119	.176	-.166	.123	-.409	.077
Intellectual Stimulation	-2.460	183.102	.015	-.277	.113	-.499	-.055
Change Agent	-.737	199.886	.462	-.086	.117	-.317	.145
Monitoring / Evaluating	-1.096	194.592	.275	-.127	.116	-.355	.102
Flexibility	.181	199.322	.856	.023	.126	-.225	.271
Ideals / Beliefs	-.867	198.327	.387	-.108	.125	-.355	.138

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Principals and teachers were asked to report specific actions they had individually taken to support implementation of the SLC model at their schools. Principal responses included the following:

Participation and development [*sic*] of our Strategic Planning Team was most essential to the formulation of a[n] action team and plan to promote the SLC.

SLC structures are embedded.

PLCs actively running each SLC and held accountable for student performance, attendance, and discipline.

Each SLC administrator reports progress to Principal after each of the eight grading periods.

Principal reports progress monitoring data to SAC, District Office, and School Board after each of the eight grading [sic] periods.

Teacher responses included the following from each study:

Study 1:

Why ask about the principal, who cares, the concept is the students [sic] needs, faculty drive SLC, the principal is in the passenger seat not the drivers [sic] seat. The SLC was never voted on as a faculty. [S]o it is hard to get behind something that was rammed down our thoughts [sic]!! WE never voted.

There some teething problems with the implementation of SLC at our school, but overall, I think our staff buys into the introduction and implementation.

Collaborative cross curricular planning, implementation of Advisories.

I've tailored my Advisory classes to the needs of my students as opposed to just what was given to us.

As department chair I have been accountable to encourage new ways of dealing with both affectual and cognitive strategies within my department. I have visited numerous classrooms offering advise [sic], encouragement, and support.

I include a lesson on cooperation by giving groups of students a blank puzzle which each group had to put together without any talking.

[I] advocated a[n] slc model for 5+years based on career base for each slc. [I]

have participated in planning and sample applications[.]

Project CRISS, Differentiated Instruction in the whole group setting workshop,
SMART technology workshop.

Advisory meetings with students once a week.

Lots of talk, little to no action.

I have taken an active role in the planning of the presentation that will be given to our faculty in Jan in order to continue to allow the teachers opportunities to understand the benefits of the SLC model.

I have led trainings on collaboration between teachers. I have attended multiple trainings and meetings regarding SLCs at [my school].

Two years into our first hearing of this program, I have seen no changes in how we do things. Although I think that the SLC may be a good idea, I do not feel that the way it was approached or the way it is being implemented is the best way to do it. It was sort of shoved down our throats.

Study 2:

I was the manager of the federal grant that the school received to initiate the SLC program. I believe that I was the one who got the ball rolling and was the prime advocate [*sic*] for the implementation during the initial period. I have supported the work for the second grant and provided the plan for setting up the school into SLC's.

I am making an effort to get to know specific teachers that belong to specific students. This is easier because I have less choices [*sic*] to hunt down for an English or History teacher. I am also meeting with other core curriculum teachers

of specific students to better meet specific individual student needs. As a group, us teacher meet to discuss individuals in our small learning community.

Many faculty members are dragging their feet with SLC implementation. They either are convinced that SLC will not bear fruit or they just don't want to change the same practices that they have fallen into year after year.

Participated in leadership to generate ideas.

I have taken a more active role in participating in my Academy meetings.

I attend regular academy meetings with teachers of some of the same students. I teach students from all academies. This makes it is difficult to coordinate information with other teachers.

I do not agree with this model but it has been forced upon us. I feel it forces the teacher to become the counselor, so I try to keep my students abreast of what they need to know for the future.

[A]nother teacher and I have implemented Whole Brain T[e]aching and are preparing to introduce it to the rest of the staff.

I have bought in to the small learning communities by creating family type relationships with my students. I have adopted portfolio assessments so students may have a voice in what they believe is their best work.

Research Question 4

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status?

As explained in Chapter 3, it was not feasible to test school demographic data as a factor related to principal or teacher perceptions that were tested in this study because of the low number of participating schools. The data are reported solely for informational purposes, and are not meant to imply any correlation to scores for principals or teachers from either participating school.

According to the 2008-2009 Florida Department of Education No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Public Accountability Report, the school in Study 1 served 1,349 students. Minorities made up 33.6% of the school population, with 19.6% Black and 11% Hispanic included. Thirty-four percent of the Study 1 school's students were classified as Economically Disadvantaged, 10.6% were disabled, and 3.8% were English Language Learners (ELL). No official data for urban status were located.

The NCLB Public Accountability Report indicated that the school in Study 2 had 2118 students in 2008-2009. Minorities were 36.8% of the school population, including 11.9% Black and 20% Hispanic. Thirty-two and seven tenths percent of the school's students were classified as Economically Disadvantaged, 12.3% were disabled, and 4.9% were reported as ELL. No official data for urban status were located.

Summary

This chapter presented data analyses of scores from the principal and teacher questionnaires for two participating schools. Responses to individual questionnaire items were grouped into their appropriate responsibility for second-order change. Principal scores were also reported for each individual item. These scores were presented without

statistical analysis due to the extremely low number of principal participants, although descriptive statistics for each responsibility grouping were computed. Teacher scores were analyzed to identify which responsibilities elicited the strongest overall perceptions of principal performance. Means were then compared between the two participating schools to identify any significant differences in perception of principal performance in each of the seven responsibilities. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and implications for professional practice.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a review of the problem statement, methodology, instrumentation, and data analysis for the study on principal and teacher perceptions of change implementation practices. The findings of each research question are summarized and discussed, then suggestions for further research and professional implications are provided.

Problem Statement

This study sought to examine the perceptions of high school principals and teachers regarding applied change implementation practices in their schools. Expanding on Senge's (1990) concept of mental models in systems thinking, the study examined how teachers viewed their principals' actions in leading the change to the Small Learning Communities (SLC) model and compared their views to those of their principals. Change implementation practices were grouped into seven principal responsibilities based on research by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005). The seven responsibilities are (a) Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, (b) Optimizer, (c) Intellectual Stimulation, (d) Change Agent, (e) Monitoring/Evaluating, (f) Flexibility, and (g) Ideals/Beliefs.

Methodology

Population

This study focused on Florida schools that received federal SLC grants in 2007 and 2008. These schools were selected in order to identify schools undergoing a second-order change where Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven responsibilities would be easily applicable.

Schools from seven districts in Florida received grants during 2007 and 2008 (Duval, Hillsborough, Lake, Manatee, Miami-Dade, Orange, and Palm Beach). Research applications were made to all but two of the listed school districts, and the researcher received permission to conduct research in four, including one district without a formal research application procedure. The researcher was unable to make contact over email or phone with any officials from one of the districts. Permission to conduct research was denied by one district, while no reply was given to the application from another. Introductory emails were sent to each of the 19 grant-recipient schools' principals in the participating districts. Links to the online questionnaire, along with informed consent documents, were sent to the principals a few days later, followed by a maximum of three follow-up emails were sent until the participant completed the questionnaire, opted out, or screened out. Four principals returned questionnaires, but only two were usable. Of the other two responses, one screened out and the other completed the questionnaire after the closing date.

Once the principals successfully completed their questionnaires, the same pattern of emails was sent to the participating schools' teachers, guidance counselors, and other instructional personnel. In total, 206 teachers and instructional personnel were contacted

to participate in this study. Of those contacted, 122 accessed the online questionnaire. There were 82 successful completions of the questionnaire, while 19 respondents opted out of participation and 21 were screened out due to their short tenure at the school.

Instrumentation

Two questionnaires were created for this study; one to be completed by principals (see Appendix A) and the other to be completed by teachers and other instructional personnel (see Appendix B). Both questionnaires had 37 items, 36 of which contained Likert scale responses. The final questionnaire item was open-ended, asking participants to describe what they have done to support SLC implementation on their campus.

All but one of the Likert scale questions were aligned with Marzano's (2005) seven responsibilities for second order change. Participants were asked to rate their perception of the success of the SLC implementation at their school in the remaining item.

Data Analysis

Completed questionnaire results were downloaded from Zoomerang into Microsoft Excel 2007. Once the consent results and the final open-ended question were excluded, the data were exported to SPSS Version 18.0 for Windows.

Item scores were summed by responsibility, and means were calculated for teacher sums by school. Using one-sample t-tests, these means were compared against the principal sum for the school to identify significant differences between principal and teacher perceptions of each of the seven responsibilities. Teacher mean scores for each

responsibility were also compared between the two schools to determine if there were any significant differences between teacher perceptions.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Using the ever-present debates over school reform and educational change as a backdrop, these case studies were constructed in the hopes of illuminating how principals and teachers view the methods taken at their schools to create deep-seeded change. The following sections summarize and discuss the findings of the research questions examined in this study.

Research Question 1

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers along Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) responsibilities for second-order change?

One-sample t-tests revealed significant differences between principal and teacher perceptions for Study 1 participants in Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, Optimizer, Flexibility, and Ideals/Beliefs. The teacher mean for perceptions of Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment was 18.18 (sd = 4.382), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 21, $t(21) = -3.016$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of the Optimizer role was 16.29 (sd = 5.271), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(23) = -3.447$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Flexibility was 15.65 (sd = 4.886), which was

significantly different from the principal's score of 18, $t(22) = -2.304$, $p < .05$. Finally, the teacher mean for perceptions of Ideals/Beliefs was 16.96 ($sd = 5.295$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(24) = -2.870$, $p < .01$.

Relying on one-sample t-tests again, Study 2 found significant differences between principal and teacher perception in the following responsibilities: Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Optimizer; Intellectual Stimulation; Monitoring/Evaluating; Flexibility; and Ideals/Beliefs. The teacher mean for perceptions of Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment was 19.00 ($sd = 2.357$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(54) = -3.146$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of the Optimizer role was 16.870 ($sd = 3.426$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(53) = -6.713$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Intellectual Stimulation was 18.77 ($sd = 2.412$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 20, $t(54) = -3.823$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Monitoring/Evaluating was 18.35 ($sd = 2.792$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 21, $t(49) = -6.772$, $p < .01$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Flexibility was 15.55 ($sd = 3.625$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 17, $t(43) = -2.662$, $p < .05$. The teacher mean for perceptions of Ideals/Beliefs was 17.44 ($sd = 2.600$), which was significantly different from the principal's score of 19, $t(47) = -4.163$, $p < .01$.

While generalizability of the data is limited based on the two case studies, there commonalities between the two studies are not insignificant. It is possible to conclude that teachers' perceptions and principals' perceptions are quite different regarding performance and the second order change process, even when the target change (in this

instance, smaller learning communities) is the same for both groups. It is also possible that this information could serve to assist the leaders of the two schools in understanding how their actions are viewed by their faculty, as well as alert other second order change leaders to the possible pitfalls that await them through the change implantation process.

The differences in perception may be attributable to different mental models held by the principal and the teachers. Approaching the data from a systems thinking perspective, it is reasonable to interpret that the principals and their teachers have different views of how those responsibilities should look. Differences in perception may also be based on incomplete information, as teachers may or may not be aware of all steps taken by the principal to implement the SLC model. Such a disconnect is not unexpected, as Marzano et al. (2005) illustrated that systems of communication may appear to some faculty members to be negatively impacted throughout the second-order change process.

Research Question 2

How do principals view their actions in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each principal's responsibility groupings. In this way, it was possible to see how each principal scored perceptions of their own performance within the seven responsibilities. Likert-scale responses for each

item were inverted for these calculations; a score of 5 indicates “Strongly Agree,” while a score of 1 indicates “Strongly Disagree.”

The principal in Study 1 had the strongest agreement with questionnaire items related to Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($m = 4.20$, $sd = .447$). This principal scored a mean of 4.00 in Optimizer ($sd = .000$) and Ideals/Beliefs ($sd = .707$), and a mean of 3.60 in Intellectual Stimulation, Change Agent, Monitoring/Evaluating, and Flexibility ($sd = .548$ for all three responsibilities).

The principal at Study 2 had their strongest agreement with questionnaire items related to Monitoring/Evaluating ($m = 4.20$, $sd = .447$). This principal scored a mean of 4.00 in Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($sd = .000$), Optimizer ($sd = .707$), and Intellectual Stimulation ($sd = .000$). The principal received a mean score of 3.80 in Ideals/Beliefs ($sd = .447$), a mean of 3.60 in Change Agent ($sd = .548$), and a mean of 3.40 in Flexibility ($sd = .548$).

The findings of these two case studies are similar to those of La Cava (2009), whose study of successful principals of Title I elementary schools said in interviews that they were not flexible with implementation of second-order change. With a larger sample of principals, it would be reasonable to aggregate the means to detect overall trends of principals’ perceptions of their performance in the seven responsibilities. In this situation, however, these data serve best to provide the participating principals with information on which they can base some measure of self-reflection and examination of their current practices.

Qualitative data from the principal questionnaires addressed actions taken to implement the SLC program. Comments centered around specific administrative actions

and processes that had been put into place. One principal commented on the importance of strategic planning prior to implementation.

Research Question 3

How do teachers view the actions of administration in Small Learning Communities implementation as compared to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven leadership responsibilities for successful second-order change?

Means for teacher scores in each responsibility were calculated for each school. Independent t-tests were employed to compare each responsibility mean across the two schools. In Study 1, the teachers had highest mean scores on statements regarding their principal's role as Change Agent ($m = 3.57$, $sd = 1.166$). The teachers obtained their lowest mean scores on statements regarding Flexibility ($m = 3.10$, $sd = 1.253$). In Study 2, the teachers had highest mean scores on statements regarding their principal's Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment ($m = 3.78$, $sd = .842$). The teachers obtained their lowest mean scores on statements regarding Flexibility ($m = 3.08$, $sd = .958$).

Once the t-tests were conducted, significant differences were found in only two areas. Participants in Study 2 ($m = 3.78$, $sd = .842$) scored significantly higher than those in Study 1 ($m = 3.54$, $sd = 1.042$) in perceptions of their principals' Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment [$t(195.18) = -2.328$, $p < .05$]. In perceptions of the principals' Intellectual Stimulation [$t(183.102) = -2.460$, $p < .05$], Study 2 participants ($m = 3.75$, $sd = .790$) were again significantly higher than Study 1 ($m = 3.75$, $sd = 1.157$).

These data, can provide useful information to the principals that participated in this study, as well as providing other educational leaders with data necessary to plan for areas of perceptual dissonance, which may lead to change resistance. By examining the teachers' perceptions of their performance in the individual responsibilities, principals can equip themselves to address issues of perceptual misalignment that they may have not known existed.

Qualitative data regarding individual actions to support SLC implementation varied in tone. Some comments expressed active support for the change initiative, while others showed resistance or resentment. One participant claimed that the principal is in the "passenger's seat," since SLC is student-centered and faculty driven. Marzano et al. (2005) presented a list of four day-to-day responsibilities that are often negatively affected by the second-order change process: Culture, Communication, Order, and Input. Communication and Input deal directly with many of the concerns reported in Chapter Four. Qualitative statements from teachers regarding lack of input and transparency are supported by the findings of Marzano, Waters, and McNulty.

Research Question 4

What significant differences, if any, exist in perceived implementation of Small Learning Communities between principals and teachers based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status?

Findings from this research question are presented for informational purposes only. Since only two schools elected to participate in the study, no correlations can be discovered with relation to school demographic status.

According to the 2008-2009 Florida Department of Education No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Public Accountability Report (2009), the school in Study 1 served 1,349 students. Minorities made up 33.6% of the school population, with 19.6% Black and 11% Hispanic included. Thirty-four percent of these students were classified as Economically Disadvantaged, 10.6% were disabled, and 3.8% were English Language Learners (ELL). No official data for urban status were located.

The NCLB Public Accountability Report (Florida Department of Education, 2009) indicated that the school in Study 2 had 2118 students in 2008-2009. Minorities were 36.8% of the school population, including 11.9% Black and 20% Hispanic. Thirty-two and seven tenths of these students were classified as Economically Disadvantaged, 12.3% were disabled, and 4.9% were reported as ELL. No official data for urban status was located.

Conclusions

This research was undertaken with the goal of identifying what significant differences, if any, existed between principal and teacher perceptions of change implementation practices in Florida SLC grant-recipient schools. The extremely small sample size precluded any universally applicable findings; however, it is possible to apply the data that were produced to the participating schools. Therefore, after

consideration of the Review of Literature and the statistical data, the following conclusions could be reached:

1. Both participating schools had statistically significant differences between principal and teacher perceptions of principal actions in Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) seven responsibilities for second-order change. Leaders should create strategies that will align perceptions through improved communication input, collaboration, and relationships throughout the change process.
2. Some qualitative comments from teacher participants in both schools indicated confusion or ignorance of the necessity of the change and what implementation procedures have been put into place. Clarification of the rationale for the SLC model and the change process will assist with successful implementation.
3. Some qualitative comments from teacher participants in both schools indicated great differences with the principals over mental models of role and performance. Addressing these disconnects will assist with successful change implementation.
4. Some qualitative comments from teacher participants in both schools indicated concerns over issues of fairness and opportunities to participate in the decision-making process. It would be beneficial for principals to address any dyadic leader-member exchange (LMX) issues in order to help bring resistant individuals on board.

Recommendations for Practice

The data collected in this study, along with the Review of Literature, point toward the following recommendations for application of this research:

1. Principals of schools making second-order change should increase the transparency of the implementation process. Teachers should be aware of future plans for the school, even if they do not directly affect each individual. Continued efforts to clarify the rationale behind such deep change in the school are necessary; resistant faculty members may work to poison others as driving forces behind the change are forgotten. Principals should also seek to create a climate of change ownership rather than buy-in (Marzano et al., 2005).
2. Principals need to clarify their roles in second-order change implementation, and actively advertise movement toward full implementation through an explicitly communicated transition plan (Marzano et al., 2005). Such behavior will not only assist teachers in understanding the implementation process, but will also assist in freezing the new model into place. These actions should also serve to close the gaps in perception of the principal's performance along the seven second-order change responsibilities.
3. Principals in the participant schools will benefit from identifying teachers who are actively or passively resisting or inhibiting the implementation and working with them individually. Resistance may be based in disparate mental models, fear of loss of personal mastery or role in the organization, or feelings of resentment some past perceived or actual injustice. Marzano et al. (2005)

explained how teachers' perception of their ability to provide input can be severely disrupted during second-order change. Identifying these individuals and strengthening the dyadic LMX relationship will aid in overcoming change resistance.

4. Principals need to prepare their staff for the disruption to the status quo by paying extra attention to the four responsibilities that may be affected.

Marzano et. al (2005) wrote that leaders should, "communicate the fact the innovation will disrupt the established routine to some extent" (p. 122). By setting the stage for the impending change and its associated confusion, principals can better assist their staff through the process of changing mental models and rebuilding personal mastery.

Recommendations for Further Research

Many opportunities for further research exist in the arena of change implementation perceptions. Based on the Review of Literature and reported research data, recommendations for further research include:

1. Replicate the study in an attempt to increase participation and generate more universally applicable data with additional case studies.
2. Revise questionnaire to a forced-choice format to reduce instances of missing data.
3. Examine perceptions of change leadership based on teachers' time in the profession.

4. Examine teacher perceptions of change leadership based on gender of associated teachers and principals.
5. Examine perceptions of change leadership based on how many different principals teachers have worked with.
6. Analyze teacher perceptions of dyadic LMX relationships as a factor in change leadership perceptions.
7. Analyze teacher and principal perceptions of their assigned roles in change implementation efforts.
8. Examine political climate (Corrective Action status, school grade, etc.) as a factor in principal and teacher perceptions and their alignment. Through the data collection process, the researcher received two emails from invited participants stating they did not have time to complete the questionnaire because of the added pressures of their school's corrective action status and school grade. Five other invited participants emailed that they did not have time to participate, although they did not specifically mention corrective action. Palm Beach County denied the researcher permission to contact targeted schools because of their corrective action status.
9. When the current political situation seems prohibitive to high participation in research projects, employ additional strategies to add value to participating in the study. Seeking advocacy, official sponsorships, or endorsements may encourage desired research subjects to participate. In these studies, obtaining an endorsement from the United States Department of Education (USDOE) may

have added incentive for participation since the schools received their SLC grants from the USDOE.

APPENDIX A: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire below is a paper version of the research instrument, which was completed electronically. Formatting was adjusted as appropriate for the electronic version.

Principal Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

The questionnaire consists of 40 items, most of which use a scale response system. Please select the answer that most closely reflects your thoughts or opinions on the question asked, then click submit at the bottom of each page. Please complete all questions.

Again, thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire. Your answers help provide a better understanding of change management practices in high schools.

**PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE PRACTICES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
SMALL LEARNING COMMUNITIES (SLC) MODEL**

by Judd Bristo

Principal Questionnaire

1. Please enter the 5-digit ID code you received in your invitation email.

2. Please click on each agree-upon statement below.

- I have read the informed consent document and AGREE to participate in the research study.
- I have read the informed consent document and would like to receive a copy of the published results of this study upon its completion.
- I have read the informed consent document and would like to receive results for my school upon the completion of this study.
- I DO NOT wish to participate in this study.

3. Were you the principal of this high school during the 2007-2008 school year?

- Yes
- No

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
4. The faculty of this school have bought in to the Small Learning Communities (SLC) model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The SLC model helps support best practices in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Implementation of the SLC model has forced me to change my leadership style.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I am up-to-date on the progress being made towards full implementation of the SLC model at the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
8. I have provided opportunities for my faculty to learn new techniques and practices to help the transition to the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I proactively look for ways to challenge the status quo at my school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. My faculty understands my philosophy of educational practice and how it relates to our SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I regularly meet with faculty leaders to discuss the progress and needs of our SLC change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My faculty understands the benefits of moving to a SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I am willing and able to provide guidance to individual teachers regarding content, assessment, instructional practices, and other classroom issues that may arise through our SLC transition.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I provide timely feedback to administration, staff, and faculty regarding the execution of their roles in SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I am the driving force behind our SLC change at my school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I actively encourage professional learning communities within the school as a method of improving our SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
17. My faculty believes I am competent in best instructional practices and how they relate to our transition to SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I know how to motivate my faculty for the SLC change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I share research/best practices of SLCs with my faculty in appropriate formats.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Our school is moving forward rather than staying stationary or regressing regarding SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Teachers know that administration will regularly visit their classroom to monitor progress in the SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Teachers feel comfortable making suggestions or providing constructive criticism about our SLC transition.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. My administrative team works within the framework of my overall plan for school operations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I discuss my opinions about educational issues and how they relate to our SLC change with the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I ensure faculty members feel “in the loop” regarding plans for SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I have access to the latest research regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
27. It is my responsibility to motivate my faculty to work toward successful implementation of our SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. My school has implemented a formal, accountable system of professional learning communities within our SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I have established clear, sequential benchmarks for successful implementation of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Teachers are held accountable for implementing new practices for collaboration within their SLC.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I create plans to address problems that arise throughout the course of the SLC transition.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. My faculty believes my decisions regarding SLCs are driven by what is best for the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Part of my job is to get people motivated to try new ideas within our SLC framework.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. It is important for the faculty to see me as a proponent of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. In planning for the SLC implementation, I try to examine all possible outcomes before deciding on a course of action.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. I look for opportunities to have my faculty try new instructional practices in the context of our SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
37. I actively encourage my faculty to seek out pertinent and engaging professional development opportunities to help build SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I try new motivational techniques when I notice the transition to SLCs has become stagnant.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I believe the school is successfully progressing toward full implementation of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6

40. Please share some examples of specific actions you have taken to support implementation of the SLC model at your school.

Thank you for your input. Your time is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX B: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire below is a paper version of the research instrument, which was completed electronically. Formatting was adjusted as appropriate for the electronic version.

Teacher Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

The questionnaire consists of 40 items, most of which use a scale response system. Please select the answer that most closely reflects your thoughts or opinions on the question asked, then click submit at the bottom of each page. Please complete all questions.

Again, thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire. Your answers help provide a better understanding of change management practices in high schools.

**PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE PRACTICES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
SMALL LEARNING COMMUNITIES (SLC) MODEL**

by Judd Bristo

Teachers' Questionnaire

1. Please enter the 5-digit ID code you received in your invitation email.

2. Please click on each agree-upon statement below.

- a. I have read the informed consent document and AGREE to participate in the research study.
- b. I have read the informed consent document and would like to receive a copy of the published results of this study upon its completion.
- c. I have read the informed consent document and would like to receive results for my school upon the completion of this study.
- d. I DO NOT wish to participate in this study.

3. Were you a teacher at this high school during the 2007-2008 school year?

- a. Yes
- b. No

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
4. The faculty of this school have bought in to the Small Learning Communities (SLC) model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The SLC model helps support best practices in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Implementation of the SLC model has forced my principal to change their leadership style.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. My principal is up-to-date on the progress being made towards full implementation of the SLC model at the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
8. My principal regularly meets with faculty leaders to discuss the progress and needs of our SLC change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I understand the benefits of moving to a SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. My principal is willing and able to provide guidance to individual teachers regarding classroom management, instructional practices, and other issues that may arise from the transition to SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My principal provides timely feedback to administration, staff, and faculty regarding the execution of their roles in SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My principal is the driving force the SLC change at the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. My principal encourages professional learning communities within the school as a way to assist with the SLC transition.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. My principal regularly meets with faculty leaders to discuss the progress and needs of our SLC change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I understand the benefits of moving to a SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
16. My principal is willing and able to provide guidance to individual teachers regarding classroom management, instructional practices, and other issues that may arise from the transition to SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I believe the principal is competent in best instructional practices in the context of our SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. My principal knows how to motivate the faculty for the change to SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. The principal shares research/best practices for SLCs with the faculty in appropriate formats.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Our school is moving forward rather than staying stationary or regressing regarding the SLC change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I know that administration will regularly visit their classroom to monitor the progress of our SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I feel comfortable making suggestions or providing constructive criticism regarding the SLC implementation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The administrative team works within the framework of the principal's overall plans for how our school should operate.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
24. My principal discusses their opinions about educational issues and how they relate to our SLC model with the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Faculty members feel “in the loop” regarding the SLC implementation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. My principal has access to the latest research regarding curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. My principal makes it their responsibility to motivate the faculty to work toward successful SLC implementation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. My school has implemented a formal, accountable system of professional learning communities within our SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. There are clear, sequential benchmarks for successful implementation of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Teachers are held accountable for implementing new practices for collaboration within their SLC.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. My principal creates plans to address problems that arise throughout the course of the SLC transition.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. The principal’s decisions regarding SLC implementation are driven by what is best for the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Continue on Next Page

Continue Here

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided
33. My principal motivates people to try new ideas within our SLC framework.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I see the principal as a proponent of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. In planning for the SLC implementation, my principal tries to examine all possible outcomes before deciding on a course of action.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. My principal looks for opportunities to have the faculty try new instructional practices in the context of our SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. My principal actively encourages the faculty to seek out pertinent and engaging professional development opportunities to help build SLCs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. My principal tries new motivational techniques when the transition to SLCs becomes stagnant.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I believe the school is successfully progressing toward full implementation of the SLC model.	1	2	3	4	5	6

40. Please share some examples of specific actions you have taken to support implementation of the SLC model at your school.

Thank you for your input. Your time is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX C: TARGETED COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS

Research requests were sent to each of the following counties. The schools listed under each county were identified in the requests as desired participating institutions for this study.

Duval County

Englewood High School

First Coast High School

N.B. Forrest High School

Robert E. Lee High School

Terry Parker High School

William Raines High School

Jean Ribault High School

Edward White High School

Hillsborough County

Armwood High School

Brandon High School

Durant High School

Hillsborough High School

Jefferson High School

King High School

Riverview High School

Robinson High School

Lake County

Eustis High School

South Lake High School

Manatee County

Bayshore High School

Braden River High School

Manatee High School

Palmetto High School

Lakewood Ranch High School

Southeast High School

Miami-Dade County

American Senior High School

Booker T. Washington High School

Coral Gables High School

Miami Beach High School

Miami Dade High School

Miami Jackson High School

North Miami Beach High School

Orange County

Apopka High School

Palm Beach County

Atlantic Community High School

Glades Central Community High School

Lake Worth Community High School

Palm Beach Gardens High School

Palm Beach Lakes High School

Santaluces Community High School

APPENDIX D: UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW
BOARD APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Benjamin Bristo**

Date: **September 10, 2009**

Dear Researcher:

On 9/10/2009, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE
IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES IN 2007 AND 2008 SMALL
LEARNING COMMUNITIES GRANT RECIPIENT HIGH
SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA
Investigator: Benjamin Bristo
IRB Number: SBE-09-06399

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Joseph Bielitzki, DVM., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Janice Turchin on 09/10/2009 04:12:07 PM EDT

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Janice Turchin'.

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX E: LAKE COUNTY RESEARCH REQUEST AND APPROVAL

RE: Research Proposal

Velez, Nancy

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 12:31 PM

To: Bristo, Judd

As long as it is not mandatory, I think it will be fine. You will need to contact both principals and get their permission as well.

Nancy S. Velez

Chief Academic Officer

Lake County Schools

352.253.6516

We do it right... We do it right every time... We do it better than anyone else.

Under Florida's "Public Records" law, absent a specific exclusion, written communications to or from Lake School District employees are considered public records. Email communication with this correspondent may be subject to public and media disclosure upon request.

From: Bristo, Judd

Sent: Monday, September 21, 2009 7:25 AM

To: Velez, Nancy

Subject: Research Proposal

Mrs. Velez,

Dave Bordenkircher told me to contact you regarding research for my doctoral dissertation. Is there an official procedure to get permission for research in Lake County? I would like to survey the teachers and principals at South Lake and Eustis High Schools. I have attached my proposal for you to read at your convenience. Please let me know if there is anything I need to do.

Thanks,

Judd Bristo

Geography

South Lake High School Flight Academy

Cornell Team Leader

APPENDIX F: APPROVAL FORMS FOR DUVAL, HILLSBOROUGH, AND
ORANGE COUNTIES



Instructional Research and Accountability
Timothy R. Ballentine, Executive Director
1701 Prudential Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32207
(904) 390-2976
www.duvalschools.org/reseval

October 2, 2009

Benjamin Judd Bristo
1646 Stanley Ave.
Groveland, FL 34736

Dear Mr. Bristo:

Your request to conduct research in Duval County Schools has been approved. This approval applies to your project in the form and content as supplied to this office for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol must be cleared with this office prior to implementing such changes.

Participation in studies of this nature is voluntary on the part of principals, teachers, staff, and students. Our approval does not obligate any principal, teacher, staff member, or student to participate in your study. A signed copy of this letter must accompany any initial contact with principals, teachers, parents, and students.

Our approvals for research run through June 30th of each school year. If your research will extend beyond that date, you will have to resubmit an application at the appropriate time. You will be required to supply copies of signed consent and assent forms at that time. If there have been no changes to the approved protocol you may refer to the previously submitted paperwork.

The Chief Officer of Human Resources has advised that neither you nor your students/colleagues are to be in any Duval County Public School nor have any contact with students until you have gone through the fingerprinting process at DCPS. Please schedule an appointment with the Human Resources department and bring a copy of this approval letter with you to your appointment.

Upon completion of the study, it is customary to forward a copy of the finished report to the Office of Instructional Research and Accountability, 1701 Prudential Dr., rm. 326, Jacksonville, Florida 32207. This office also shall be notified, in advance, of the publication of any reports/articles in which Duval County is mentioned by name.

If you have questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to call me or Dawn Botkin at 390-2976.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Timothy R. Ballentine". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Timothy Ballentine
Executive Director
Instructional Research and Accountability

September 30, 2009
Page 2

- 7) This approval **WILL EXPIRE IN DECEMBER 2009**. You will have to contact us at that time if you feel your research approval should be extended.
- 8) A copy of your research findings must be sent to us for our files and must be submitted to this department **BEFORE ANY DATA IS PUBLISHED IN ANY FORM.**

SERVE VOLUNTEER FORMS/FINGERPRINTING:
Your proposal indicates that you will **NOT COME INTO CONTACT** with any students.
IF THIS CHANGES, YOU MUST contact us for further instructions.

Good luck with your endeavor. If you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,



Theodore Dwyer
Manager of Evaluation
Assessment and Accountability

TD/dsr

cc: Dan Bonillia Principal, Jefferson High School (1)
Pamela Bowden, Principal, Durant High School (4)
Carla Bruning, Principal, King High School (7)
JoAnn Collings, Principal, Riverview High School (8)
Carl Green, Principal, Brandon High School (8)
Mark Hutec, Principal, Armwood Senior High School (8)
William Orr, Principal, Hillsborough High School (6)
Laura Zavatkey, Principal, Robinson High School (1)

Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to: Accountability, Research, and Assessment P.O. Box 271 Orlando, FL 32802-0271	Orange County Public Schools RESEARCH REQUEST FORM	Your research proposal should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Title • Purpose and Research Problem • Instruments • Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis 	
Requester's Name <u>Benjamin Judd Bristo</u>		Date <u>9/14/09</u>	
Address <u>1646 Stanley Avenue</u> <u>Groveland, FL</u> <u>34736</u> <small>Street City, State Zip</small>		Phone <u>352-557-3224</u>	
Institutional Affiliation <u>University of Central Florida</u>			
Project Director or Advisor <u>Dr. Rosemarie Taylor</u>		Phone <u>407-823-1469</u>	
Address <u>UCF College of Education, 222L, Orlando, FL, 32826</u>			
Degree Sought: (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Associate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctorate <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Master's <input type="checkbox"/> Specialist			
Project Title: <u>Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Change Implementation Practices in 2007 and 2008 Small Learning Communities Grant Recipient High Schools in Florida</u>			
ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT			
PERSONNEL/CENTERS	NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)	SPECIFY/DESCRIBE GRADES, SCHOOLS, SPECIAL NEEDS, ETC.
Students			
Teachers	150	30 minutes	
Administrators	1	30 minutes	Principal
Schools/Centers	1		Apopka High School
Others (specify)			
Specify possible benefits to students/school system: <u>Orange County Public Schools will be able to identify areas of resistance to change and create specific plans to address the organizational sources of said resistance</u>			
ASSURANCE			
Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the Orange County Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Reports and materials shall be supplied as specified.			
Requester's Signature <u><i>Benjamin Judd Bristo</i></u>		RECEIVED SEP 16 2009	
Approval Granted: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ^x <input type="checkbox"/> No		Date: <u>9-18-09</u>	
Signature of the Senior Director for Accountability, Research, and Assessment <u><i>Lee Bolchini</i></u>			

NOTE TO REQUESTER: When seeking approval at the school level, a copy of this form, signed by the Senior Director, Accountability, Research, and Assessment, should be shown to the school principal who has the option to refuse participation depending upon any school circumstance or condition. The original Research Request Form is preferable to a faxed document.

* Approved for Apopka High School.

APPENDIX G: PARTICIPANT CONTACT EMAILS

Initial Contact E-Mail



Dear <PARTICIPANT'S NAME>:

My name is Judd Bristo, and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida. I am currently researching change leadership behaviors and perceptions among teachers and principals. My research is targeted to Florida high schools that received a federal grant to implement Small Learning Communities (SLCs).

In a few days, you will receive another email with a link to the questionnaire for this study. The email will also contain instructions for completing the questionnaire, as well as a unique ID number and an informed consent document. At that time, you will have the option to opt out of the study if you so choose.

It is my hope that this study will help us understand how principals act to implement reforms in their school and how teachers perceive those actions. Your input will be extremely valuable to the completion of this research. I really appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Second Contact E-Mail: Instructions



Dear <PARTICIPANT'S NAME>:

A few days ago, I sent you an e-mail regarding my study of perceptions of change leadership practices. I have included a link to the study questionnaire, your confidential identification number, and have attached an informed consent document to this e-mail.

Please read the attached informed consent document and click on the link below to open the questionnaire. Enter your identification number in the space provided in Item 1. Item 2 will provide you with the option provide your informed consent to participate in the study or opt out.

Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries in which no individual's answer can be identified. When you complete questionnaire, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and will never be connected to your answers in any way. Participation is voluntary. However, you can help greatly by taking a few minutes to share your experience.

If you have any questions about the survey, you may contact me with the information provided in the informed consent document. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Questionnaire Link: <URL FOR APPROPRIATE QUESTIONNAIRE>

Confidential ID: <XXXXXX>

Third Contact E-Mail: First Reminder



Dear <PARTICIPANT'S NAME>:

Last week a questionnaire seeking your participation in a research study of change leadership behaviors and perceptions was e-mailed to you. I am writing again to ask for your participation in this study, as your input will be extremely important and helpful.

Please take a few minutes to read the attached informed consent document and complete the linked questionnaire. If you prefer to not participate, you may opt out of the study by selecting the appropriate option in the survey. You will not receive any further contact regarding the study if you decide to opt out.

Again, I hope you will consider participating in this study. Your input will be extremely beneficial to the success of this study.

Sincerely,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Questionnaire Link: <URL FOR APPROPRIATE QUESTIONNAIRE>

Confidential ID: <XXXXXX>

Fourth Contact E-Mail: Second Reminder



Dear <PARTICIPANT'S NAME>:

Recently, I contacted you regarding my research study of change leadership practices and perceptions. According to my records, I have not yet received a completed questionnaire from you. I am writing again to ask for your participation in this study, as your input will be extremely important and helpful.

Please take a few minutes to read the attached informed consent document and complete the linked questionnaire. If you prefer to not participate, you may opt out of the study by selecting the appropriate option in the survey. You will not receive any further contact regarding the study if you decide to opt out.

Again, I hope you will consider participating in this study. Your input will be extremely beneficial to the success of this study.

Sincerely,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Questionnaire Link: <URL FOR APPROPRIATE QUESTIONNAIRE>

Confidential ID: <XXXXXX>

Fifth Contact E-Mail: Final Reminder



Dear <PARTICIPANT'S NAME>:

I hope this e-mail finds you well. I am writing once again to ask for your participation in my research study of change leadership practices and perceptions. The study will be closing soon, and your participation would be extremely valuable.

Please take a few minutes to read the attached informed consent document and complete the linked questionnaire. If you prefer to not participate, you may opt out of the study by selecting the appropriate option in the survey. Since the study is closing soon, you will not receive any further contacting regarding your participation.

Again, I hope you will consider participating in this study. Your input will be extremely beneficial to the success of this study.

Sincerely,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Questionnaire Link: <URL FOR APPROPRIATE QUESTIONNAIRE>

Confidential ID: <XXXXXX>

APPENDIX H: QUESTIONNAIRE RELIABILITY TABLE

Questionnaire Item	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
4	124.60	506.719	.596	.966
5	124.32	507.237	.594	.966
6	124.83	511.260	.459	.967
7	124.05	502.218	.706	.965
8	123.87	503.914	.685	.966
9	124.20	501.553	.683	.966
10	124.07	510.267	.598	.966
11	124.00	505.153	.694	.966
12	124.17	513.260	.407	.967
13	124.33	504.599	.985	.966
14	124.50	502.627	.715	.965
15	124.37	504.406	.611	.966
16	124.08	507.468	.726	.966
17	124.18	500.525	.686	.966
18	125.00	492.203	.735	.965
19	124.32	498.491	.808	.965
20	124.28	505.054	.651	.966
21	124.18	509.644	.627	.966
22	124.70	496.485	.705	.966
23	124.97	504.440	.658	.966

Questionnaire Item	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
24	124.28	502.986	.768	.965
25	125.23	498.894	.670	.966
26	123.90	514.464	.556	.966
27	124.52	493.576	.829	.965
28	124.70	515.197	.415	.967
29	124.87	512.287	.606	.966
30	124.72	513.393	.484	.967
31	124.70	502.451	.765	.965
32	124.32	498.051	.765	.965
33	124.32	501.271	.725	.965
34	123.92	508.823	.657	.966
35	124.60	503.329	.640	.966
36	124.13	507.473	.705	.966
37	124.23	507.473	.705	.966
38	124.90	495.985	.781	.965
39	124.50	499.068	.718	.965

APPENDIX I: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

<SCHOOL NAME>
<ADDRESS>
<CITY, STATE, ZIP>

Dear Educator,

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this important study about change leadership behaviors in Florida high schools that have received a federal Small Learning Communities grant. You are among approximately 4,400 educators who have been invited to provide input for this research. My hope is that this study will contribute to our understanding of how meaningful change leadership is managed and perceived.

What you should know about a research study:

- Someone will be available explain this research study to you.
- A research study is something you volunteer for.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You should take part in this study only if you want to.
- You can choose not to take part in the research study.
- You can agree to take part now and later change your mind.
- Whatever you decide it will not be held against you.
- Feel free to ask all the questions you want before you decide.

The study is confidential. The help ensure the confidentiality of your identity you will be assigned a numeric code. This code, along with all the information gathered through the study questionnaire, will be held confidential and discarded upon completion of the research study. Viewing of any personally identifiable information will be limited to myself, my dissertation committee, and the Institutional Review Board at the University of Central Florida.

There are no anticipated risks or benefits to participating in this study. Since the research is conducted electronically, you will be able to participate from anywhere you so choose. All that is required is internet access. There is a one month window in which to complete the online questionnaire in order for your input to be included in the study. The questionnaire should take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. Upon completion of this study, you will have the opportunity to receive a copy of the published results, as well as a copy of the results for your school.

If you have any questions about this study on change leadership, please contact me at changeleadstudy@yahoo.com. My faculty advisor, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, may be contacted by phone at (407) 823-1469 or by email at rtaylor@mail.ucf.edu. Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida, Office of Research and Commercialization, 12201

Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246. The phone numbers are (407) 823-2901 or (407) 882-2276.

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901. You may also talk to them for any of the following:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

You may opt out of this study by clicking the appropriate response to the first item of the questionnaire. You will receive no further contact regarding this study.

By completing the questionnaire, you are consenting to participate in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate at anytime without consequence. If you choose to withdraw your consent, please contact me using the provided email address.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your time and effort are greatly appreciated.

Best Regards,

Judd Bristo
Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida

APPENDIX J: INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire Item	Study 1 Principal Response	Study 2 Principal Response
4. The faculty of this school have bought in to the Small Learning Communities (SLC) model.	4	4
5. The SLC model helps support best practices in the classroom.	4	4
6. Implementation of the SLC model has forced me to change my leadership style.	3	3
7. I am up-to-date on the progress being made towards full implementation of the SLC model at the school.	4	4
8. I have provided opportunities for my faculty to learn new techniques and practices to help the transition to the SLC model.	3	4
9. I proactively look for ways to challenge the status quo at my school.	4	4
10. My faculty understands my philosophy of educational practice and how it relates to our SLC model.	4	4
11. I regularly meet with faculty leaders to discuss the progress and needs of our SLC change.	3	5
12. My faculty understands the benefits of moving to a SLC model.	3	3

Questionnaire Item	Study 1 Principal Response	Study 2 Principal Response
13. I am willing and able to provide guidance to individual teachers regarding content, assessment, instructional practices, and other classroom issues that may arise through our SLC transition.	4	4
14. I provide timely feedback to administration, staff, and faculty regarding the execution of their roles in SLC implementation.	4	4
15. I am the driving force behind our SLC change at my school.	4	4
16. I actively encourage professional learning communities within the school as a method of improving our SLC implementation.	4	4
17. My faculty believes I am competent in best instructional practices and how they relate to our transition to SLCs.	5	4
18. I know how to motivate my faculty for the SLC change.	4	3
19. I share research/best practices of SLCs with my faculty in appropriate formats.	4	4
20. Our school is moving forward rather than staying stationary or regressing regarding SLCs.	4	4

Questionnaire Item	Study 1 Principal Response	Study 2 Principal Response
21. Teachers know that administration will regularly visit their classroom to monitor progress in the SLC implementation.	3	4
22. Teachers feel comfortable making suggestions or providing constructive criticism about our SLC transition.	4	4
23. My administrative team works within the framework of my overall plan for school operations.	5	4
24. I discuss my opinions about educational issues and how they relate to our SLC change with the faculty.	4	4
25. I ensure faculty members feel “in the loop” regarding plans for SLC implementation.	4	4
26. I have access to the latest research regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment.	4	4
27. It is my responsibility to motivate my faculty to work toward successful implementation of our SLC model.	4	5
28. My school has implemented a formal, accountable system of professional learning communities within our SLCs.	3	4

Questionnaire Item	Study 1 Principal Response	Study 2 Principal Response
29. I have established clear, sequential benchmarks for successful implementation of the SLC model.	3	3
30. Teachers are held accountable for implementing new practices for collaboration within their SLC.	5	4
31. I create plans to address problems that arise throughout the course of the SLC transition.	4	4
32. My faculty believes my decisions regarding SLCs are driven by what is best for the school.	4	3
33. Part of my job is to get people motivated to try new ideas within our SLC framework.	4	4
34. It is important for the faculty to see me as a proponent of the SLC model.	4	4
35. In planning for the SLC implementation, I try to examine all possible outcomes before deciding on a course of action.	4	3
36. I look for opportunities to have my faculty try new instructional practices in the context of our SLC model.	4	4
37. I actively encourage my faculty to seek out pertinent and engaging professional development opportunities to help build SLCs.	4	4

Questionnaire Item	Study 1 Principal Response	Study 2 Principal Response
38. I try new motivational techniques when I notice the transition to SLCs has become stagnant.	4	3
39. I believe the school is successfully progressing toward full implementation of the SLC model.	4	4

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Arbuckle, M. (2000). Triangle of design, circle of culture. In P. Senge, N. Cambron-McCabe, T. Lucas, B. Smith, J. Dutton, & A. Kleiner, *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education* (pp. 325-341). New York: Doubleday.
- Barker, R. G. (1965). Explorations in ecological psychology. *American Psychologist*, 20(1), 1-14.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brockner, J., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 189-208.
- Brockner, J., Konovsky, M., Cooper-Schneider, R., Folger, R., Martin, C., & Bies, R. J. (1994). Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(2), 397-409.
- Brockner, J., Tyler, T. R., & Cooper-Schneider, R. (1992). The influence of prior commitment to an institution on reactions to perceived unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(2), 241-261.
- Connell, J. P., & Klem, A. M. (2006, Fall). First things first: A framework for successful secondary school reform. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 111, 53-66.
- Dilman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impressions in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 659-665.
- Elaad, E., Ginton, A., & Shakhar, G. (1994). The effects of prior expectations and outcome knowledge on polygraph examiners' decisions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 7(4), 279-292.
- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 321-330.
- Felner, R. D., Seitsinger, A. M., Brand, S., Burns, A., & Bolton, N. (2007). Creating small learning communities: Lessons from the project on high-performing learning communities about "what works" in creating productive, developmentally enhancing, learning contexts. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(4), 209-221.

- Fine, M., & Somerville, J. (1998). *Small schools, big imaginations*. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.
- Fink, D., & Brayman, C. (2006). School leadership succession and the challenges of change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 62-89.
- Florida Department of Education. (2009). Retrieved February 23, 2010, from 2008-2009 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Public Accountability Reports: <http://doeweb-prd.doe.state.fl.us/eds/nclbspar/year0809/main0809.cfm>
- Folaron, J. (2005). The human side of change leadership. *Quality Progress*, 38(4), 39-42.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Furst, S. A., & Cable, D. M. (2008). Employee resistance to organizational change: Managerial influence tactics and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 453-462.
- Gibson, E., & Billings, A. (2003). *Big change at Best Buy*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Gilley, A., Gilley, J. W., & McMillan, H. S. (2009). Organizational change: Motivation, communication, and leadership effectiveness. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 21(4), 75-94.
- Goodson, I., Moore, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2006). Teacher nostalgia and the sustainability of reform: The generation and degeneration of teachers' mission, memory, and meaning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 42-61.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 474-487.
- Joyner, E. T. (2000). No more "drive-by staff development": The five learning disciplines as a path toward comprehensive school change. In P. Senge, N. Cambron-McCabe, T. Lucas, B. Smith, J. Dutton, & A. Kleiner, *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education* (pp. 385-394). New York: Doubleday.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- La Cava, G. S. (2009). *A study of the relationship between second-order change leadership behaviors and school grades of Florida title I elementary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.
- Lee, M., & Friedrich, T. (2007). The 'smaller' the school, the better? The Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) program in US high schools. *Improving Schools*, 10(3), 261-282.

- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Little, J. W., Erbstein, N., & Walker, L. (2001). High school restructuring and vocational reform: The question of "fit" in two schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(625), 17-25.
- MacDonald, H. A., Sulsky, L. M., & Brown, D. J. (2008). Leadership and perceiver cognition: Examining the role of self-identity in implicit leadership theories. *Human Performance*, 21, 333-353.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results*. Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Masci, F. J., Cuddapah, J. L., & Pajak, E. F. (2008). Becoming an agent of stability: Keeping your school in balance during the perfect storm. *American Secondary Education*, 36(2), 57-69.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Nadler, G., & Hibino, S. (1998). *Breakthrough thinking*. Rocklin, CA: Prima.
- Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2007). *Organizational Behavior in Education*. Boston: Pearson.
- Oxley, D. (2001). Organizing schools into small learning communities. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(625), 5-16.
- Oxley, D. (2005). Small learning communities: Extending and improving practice. *Principal Leadership (High School Edition)*, 6(3), 44-48.
- Printy, S. M. (2008). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(2), 187-226.
- Rice, M. P., O'Connor, G. C., & Pierantozzi, R. (2008). Implementing a learning plan to counter project uncertainty. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(2), 54-62.
- Rodell, J. B., & Colquitt, J. A. (2009). Looking ahead in times of uncertainty: The role of anticipatory justice in an organizational change context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 989-1002.
- Schultz, J. R. (2007). Eight steps to sustain change. *Quality Progress*, 40(11), 25-31.
- Scileppi, J. A. (1988). *A systems view of education: A model for change*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Senge, P. M., & Fulmer, R. M. (1993). Simulations, systems thinking, and anticipatory learning. *The Journal of Management Development*, 12(6), 21-33.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.

- Shapiro, D. L., & Kirkman, B. L. (2001). Anticipatory injustice: The consequences of expecting injustice in the workplace. In J. Greenberg, & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 152-178). Lexington, MA: New Lexington.
- Siegall, M. (1992). The effect of rater expectations on the evaluation of a hypothetical subordinate. *The Journal of Psychology*, *126*(5), 453-463.
- Sin, H. P., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader-member exchange (LMX) agreements. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(4), 1048-1057.
- Stasny, K. M. (1996). *The effects of dimensions of transformational leadership on the conditions for organizational learning and sources of knowledge utilization in restructuring school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans.
- Supovitz, J. A. (2002). Developing communities of instructional practice. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(8), 1591-1626.
- Supovitz, J., & Christman, J. (2005). Small learning communities that actually learn: Lessons for school leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*(9), 649-651.
- Ulrich, D. (1998). *Champions of change: How CEOs and their companies are mastering the skills of radical change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wall, T. D., Michie, J., Patterson, M., Wood, S. J., Sheehan, M., Clegg, C. W., et al. (2004). On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*(1), 95-118.
- Ye, J., Marinova, D., & Singh, J. (2007). Strategic change implementation and performance loss in the front lines. *Journal of Marketing*, *71*(4), 156-171.
- Zimmerman, J. (2006). Why some teachers resist change and what principals can do about it. *NASSP Bulletin*, *90*(3), 238-249.