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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the existence of relational trust as defined by Bryk and Schneider (2002) in an urban school with an identified effective principal. Specific attention is given to principal-teacher relationship dynamics. Bryk and Schneider (2002) posited that relational trust exists between principals and teachers when teachers feel respected as professionals by their principals, see their principals as competent school managers, perceive their school-site administrators as having integrity, and when teachers believe that their principals have a genuine interest in their personal well being.

A literature review on leadership in general, effective educational leadership, and appropriate headship for schools undergoing restructuring is presented. Moreover, included is a distinction between urban schools and their rural and suburban counterparts, highlighting the unique and complex challenges faced by students in inner-city public educational centers.

Employing a mix-method approach within a case study design, teachers completed a questionnaire on their perception of their principal. Observations were conducted for a seven month period as well as relevant documents were analyzed. Drawing from the review of the literature, survey findings, notes from observations and from the gathered relevant files, questions were developed for a teacher focus group.
session and a principal interview. The points made in the focus group discussion also informed the principal interview instrument. Findings revealed that teachers in the study had high relational trust in their principal and that he conveyed trustworthiness in numerous ways. Furthermore, respecting the integrity of qualitative research, other themes that substantiate the literature on effective leadership for urban education and trust establishment emerged and are discussed. The findings imply that the tenets of relational trust are viable and effective constructs that can be materialized in the behaviors of principals in urban educational districts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

The 1983 report issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, criticized American schools as being overwhelmed by complacency and mediocrity (Carlin, 1992). Although the report covered issues facing all schools, it emphasized the need to specifically improve schools in urban communities (Miller, 1995). Thus, educators, policy makers, and researchers have called for radical changes in American urban schools. One of the major issues that has captured the interest of the public is the gap in academic achievement between students in urban schools and their suburbia and rural counterparts; with a particular apparent gap among black, Hispanic, and white students (Rothstein, 2004a; Singham, 2003). In response to the growing concern over the poor performance of major, urban public school districts, a variety of reform strategies have been implemented to resolve the problems in inner-city schools (Green & Carl, 2000). Moreover, a common theme among and an imperative component in reform initiatives is effective leadership (Chopra, 1994; Harris, 2002; Bizar & Barr, 2001).

Leadership is a complex and elusive (Pfeffer, 1977) phenomenon that is an integral part of the social, economical, and political fabric of American culture. In any
context, it is demonstrated in people's daily actions and the behaviors of persons in leadership roles are seen, noted, and felt by their subordinates; therefore, any inconsistencies in behaviors diminish trust in leadership (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Since the beginning of the twentieth century, leadership has been the object of extensive study (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). There is sufficient research that attempts to characterize effective leadership. Defining it in terms of influence, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) maintained that successful leadership works with others to foster a shared sense of purpose and direction. Similarly, Covey (1991) asserted that effectual leadership induces others to move toward a specific goal. Also in concurrence, Durbin (1995) defined leadership as working with and through others to achieve organizational ambitions. Kouzes and Posner (1995) characterized leadership as persuading, influencing, and getting people to reach goals. Likewise, Hogan, Gordon, and Hogan (1994) contended that leadership is persuasion, not domination that only occurs when others willingly adopt collective goals. In contrast, Rost (1991) named leadership as management-oriented, technocratic, and procedure-driven. In the same vein, Fiedler (1967) argued that leadership consists of interpersonal relationships in which “power and influence are unevenly distributed so that one person is able to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others… (p. 11).” Taking a different approach to defining leadership, Kouzes and Posner (1989) claimed that effective leadership is contingent upon the followers’ perception of leaders rather than the leaders’ abilities. Therefore, they further asserted that followers, not leaders, are the determinants of the qualities of strong leadership.
Specifically in educational leadership, particular attention is given to building principals. Anderson (1989) noted that there is growing body of research that supports principals’ leadership as one of the most vital elements of school success. Supporting Anderson, Daresh et al. (2000) theorized the one of the most imperative factors that promotes high quality school programs is the behavior of educational leaders. Since school site administrators have the legal designated exercise of responsibility by the state, it is their responsibility to effectively run schools and produce successful results. Thus, a major solution to the issues plaguing urban schools is most likely to be realized through the leadership exercised by school principals (Nelson, Carlson, & Palonsky, 1996). Reiterating this point, Nelson et al. (1996) asserted,

In the final analysis, it is the administrators who are responsible for the schools, and they must exert the leadership and accept the consequences for the outcomes of schooling. Schools need effective leaders who can encourage learning, support and reward good teaching, make the schools satisfying places for students and teachers, and ensure that the community is served and the state’s mandates are followed (p. 340).

Reviewing the literature on effective leadership for schools, Marzanno (2003) summarized that effective leaders monitor school performance, communicate with staff, create safe environments, have a clear vision, and know quality instruction (Blum, Butler, & Olsen, 1987). Marzanno cited Hallinger and Murphy (1987) as stating that strong leaders frame and communicate goals, evaluate instruction, coordinate curriculum, monitor progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, select and participate in professional development, as well as establish explicit instructional goals. The author summarized the work of Levine and Lezotte (1990) by stating that effective leaders supervise instructional practices, support teachers,
have high energy, monitor school activities, and acquire necessary resources.

Furthermore, Marzanno found Nefueled and Freeman (1992) as claiming that effective leaders treat teachers as professionals, give educators a clear vision, invite divergent points of view, and trust subordinates. Finally, Marzanno (2003) recapitulated Sammons, Hillman, and Mortmore’s (1995) characterization of effective leadership as being firm and purposeful.

For more than two decades, a variety of reform efforts have been implemented to address the inequities plaguing urban schools and the constant under achievement of its students (Span, 2002). Within the school reform literature, a compelling body of research stresses the importance of effective leadership as vital for educational change in urban schools (Peterson & Deal, 2002; OfSTED, 2000). Chopra (1994) supported this point by asserting:

The revitalization of public schools has become a national quest, and the formulas for excellence have included everything from increased graduation requirements, to merit pay for teachers, to parent involvement, to increased course rigor and site-based management. All these elements are essential as we strive for excellence; however, the contributions of an effective principal must not be under-stated. The formula for educational excellence and change must include a clear focus on the principal as the front-line, educational leader in a school (p. 36).

Bryk and Schneider (2002) noted that currently many school reform initiatives emphasize instructional reform. Advocates for instructional reform argue that it should be the primary focus of school improvement. Supporters of instruction and curriculum reform maintain that policy should pay attention to the facets of education that are directly related to school improvement such as standards, new curricula, assessments, teacher development, and instructional leadership (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Thus, there
is a large body of research supporting the notion that leaders in schools should focus primarily on curriculum and instructional matters (Blum, Butler, & Olson, 1987; Levine & Lezotte, 1990). Likewise, Hallinger (1992) claimed that effective school leaders concentrate on developing and improving curriculum and instruction and not on the management of human relations.

Although technical reform initiatives such as an emphasis on curriculum and instruction are vital in school improvement, Bryk and Schneider (2002) averred that a focus on social reform is equally imperative “for technical resources such as standards, assessments, and new curricula to take root and develop into something of value (p. 135).” In *The Social Organization of Schools*, Schneider (2005) argued educational reformists are increasingly acknowledging the value in understanding the social context of schooling. “Whether concerned with implementing a new mathematics curriculum or adopting legislation for teacher accountability, researchers are confronted with identifying mechanisms that can stimulate and sustain change in individuals and institutions (p.1),” Schneider maintained. Recognizing the value of relationship building as an imperative leadership trait, while reiterating this position, Tarter et al. (1995) noted the main responsibility of educational leaders is to maintain a supportive environment and manage interpersonal relations. Moreover, in *The 21 Indispensable Qualities of a Leader*, Maxwell (1999) determined that the abilities to work with people and to develop relationships are “absolutely indispensable to effective leadership (p. 106).”
Statement of the Problem

There is a substantial body of research that covers the challenging issues faced in American urban schools (Harris, 2002). Urban school districts have a complex identity embedded with many challenges that distinguish them from their rural and suburban counterparts. In addition, inner-city public schools have been subject to a plethora of reform efforts that emphasize high standards and accountability as avenues for school restructuring. Since principals are the head authorities of school buildings, accountability for student achievement has become primarily their responsibility. Thus, the issues encompassing and the demands facing inner-city schools call for principals who possess a multi-faceted style of leadership to meet expectations.

Furthermore, for schools to be effective in the restructuring process and to sustain new reform initiatives, trust must exist among all stakeholders (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Kochanek, 2003). Specifically, an integral ingredient in any successful school is a leader who is trustworthy (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). In Trust Matters, Tschannen-Moran (2004) stated, “When we turn a nostalgic eye…it seems…that schools enjoyed the implicit trust of their communities (p. 7).” Elaborating on this point, the author further averred, “Teachers were regarded as having valuable professional knowledge about children…parents accepted and reinforced the judgment of school officials (p. 8).”

However, we currently live in a society where schools are under extreme scrutiny. The unethical and selfish actions of many school leaders have eroded the unquestionable trust once given to school personnel (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Expressing the same
sentiment, Kozol (1991, In Tschannen-Moran, 2004) stated that the failure to meet the increasing expectations of parents, community members, and government have damaged the trust in American public schools. Along the same lines, Bryk and Schneider (2002) held that the negative and profound economic and social changes that have swept American communities such as loss of businesses, churches, banks, social service agencies, community organizations, residential mobility, and forced desegregation, account for the distrusting relationships many inner-city families have with social institutions such as schools.

Moreover, collaboration has become increasingly embedded in educational reform initiatives. Studies support that strong leaders for urban school reform are those who can effectively engage all stakeholders in the educational process (Gardner & Miranda, 2001; Cooper, 1989; Lewis, 1997; Heckman, Scull, & Conely, 1996). Thus, principals have the responsibility of involving teachers, parents (Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and community members (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) in school matters.

Collaboration makes possible the social capital essential for schools that are in the reinvention process (Tschannan-Moran, 2001). However, for schools to benefit from greater collaboration, trust is needed. Schools that have high levels of trust among stakeholders show greater mutual efforts (Tschennan-Moran, 2001). Specifically, research has shown that if high cooperation exists between principals and their teachers, students are likely to have high academic achievement (Bryk, Schneider, & Kochanik, 1996; Gonder & Hymes, 1994; Tschennan-Moran, 2004).
Taking into the consideration the aforementioned, this study focused on the leadership practices and characteristics of principals. Particularly how both assist school site leaders in establishing and sustaining trusting relationships with their teachers, as it is an integral component of transforming schools into successful learning communities.

Explicit attention is given to the trusting relationships principals have with their faculty for two pertinent reasons. First, in the last decade of research on effective schools, there is a significant body of literature focusing on attributes associated with the educational success of students in urban schools (Griffith, 2003). Within that literature, there are substantial studies that find an atmosphere of trusting and cooperative relationships between teachers and principals vital for student achievement (Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Bryk, Schneider, & Kochanik, 1996; Bryk & Schneider, 2000). Secondly, since teachers are directly related to student achievement (Desmond, 2000; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005), are the implementers of the instructional initiatives of the principal (Bryk & Schneider, 2000), and are the persons directly held accountable to the principal in relation to all other stakeholders involved in student achievement (e.g., superintendents, school boards, parents, community members, etc.) (Carlin, 1992), it is imperative that a trusting relationship is formed and sustained between teachers and their principals.

Limitations of Study

Given the nature of the study a few pitfalls arose. The overall sampling strategy of the study presented a problem in the extent to which judgment could be relied to arrive at a particular sample. Because there was no assurance that the units judged to be typical
Although a very prominent, often used, and quite revealing method in qualitative inquiry, case studies are not free of criticism. The main analysis of the case study method is the lack of generalizability. Hancock (1998) noted because cases under study are not representative of similar cases, they are not generalizable. In concurrence, Stake (2000) posited that the purpose of the case study is not limited to the advance of science. Moreover, one or a few cases are “poor representation of a population of cases and questionable grounds for advancing grand generalization (Stake, 2000, p. 448).”

However, generalizability was not the intent of the researcher in this specific situation; It is an issue for the reader who aims to apply the findings elsewhere (Hancock, 1998). Stake (2000) averred that one of the ideals of the case study is to establish limits of generalizability. It is the obligation of the readers to determine if the case being delineated is relative to their particular situation. Succinctly, “the purpose of a case report is not to represent the world, but to represent the case (Stake, 2000, p. 448).” The school principal in the urban mid-western school district solicited for this study do not represent all school-site administrators within that district, nor does this study imply that the principal represent urban school principals in general. Moreover, the findings are not to suggest that the behaviors and actions of this school administrator can be packaged and seen as a one-size-fit all leadership style for all principals in urban schools.

The data collection methods employed had limiting influence on the validity of the information gathered from the research. The questionnaire method, although common
in educational research, is not without its weaknesses (Berends, 2006). Although easy to do and simple to interpret for the researcher, with the exception of interviewing, much of the burden of providing the data falls on the respondent. To answer questions accurately and honestly required respondents to conduct their own research. Teachers may have also had little interest, knowledge, or concern to express judgments on their relationship with the school administrator. Also, the time it took to respond to the questionnaire and to participate in the focus group was a hindrance to some of the teachers who opted not to participate (Ebel, 1980).

Like other research methods, interviewing is subject to criticism. In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Fontana and Frey (2000) cited several ethical criticisms of the interview process. First they noted the issue of using covert methods to gain information. The authors then brought attention to the degree of involvement of the researcher with the research subjects and how certain levels of involvement are detrimental to the study. The final criticism spoke to the veracity of the group under study.

Specifically related to focus groups, several drawbacks have been identified in the literature and were encountered in this research project. For example, the ethical dilemma of confidentially arose and hindered the researcher from bringing up certain topics (Glesene, 2006). Secondly, but not employing individual interviews, the researcher was not able to get an in-depth perspective from teachers. Also, the setting up of the focus group session was complex and its facilitation was exhaustive. Finally, the existing power structures may have prohibited some teachers from expressing their ideas. Madriz (2000)
asserted that social interactions allow for power relations to surface among the participants, power relations that are natural and “in their own constructed hierarchies (p. 840).” Because of these anticipated hierarchal structures, some participants in the group may have dominated and directed the tone of the discussion. Also others may not have spoken honestly due to fear of social isolation. Moreover, small group discussions may have a polarization effect, meaning the attitudes and perceptions of the participants may become more extreme after the group discussion (Sussman et al., 1991). Finally, the presence of the researcher ran the risk of the teachers altering their behaviors (Wolcott, 1999). Participants in the group may not have expressed their true sentiments in an attempt to satisfy what they believe the researcher wanted to hear. Also in terms of stating their concerns, research subjects may not have been honest in fear of their sentiments being taken out of the research context by other teachers.

Participant observation as a research method came with its limitations as well. Similar to the focus group method, one major criticism is the issue of respondents acting in an unnatural manner in the presence of the researcher. In explaining the relationship between researchers and subjects, Vidich (1955) wrote that the respondent forms an image of the researcher thus, acts and responds on the basis of that perception. Another critique of participant observation noted by Vidich (1955) is that researchers cannot observe and record events of a phenomenon absent from their own perspectives. Vidich (1955) asserted, “The data secured by the participant observer, except in so far as he reports personal experiences, cannot be independent of his subjects’ ability and
willingness to report. He is obliged to impute meaning to both their verbal and their nonverbal actions (p. 358).”

Supporting Vidich’s assertion, Geertz (1973) claimed “anthropologist writings are themselves interpretations (p. 15).” Moreover, Jackson (1983) noted several analyses of the participant observation methodology. The author first argued that subjects’ anonymity is at risk even when pseudonyms are used and locations are disguised. Jackson then declared that participant-observation normally involves complex data handling.

Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, and Sorensen (2006) noted several limitations to document analysis as a method in qualitative research. According to the authors, researchers cannot assume that all documents provide accurate accounts. Thus they suggest using other methods with data analysis. Another drawback of document analysis is that many documents under study are not created for research; consequently, they may be incomplete or unrepresentative.

Benefits of Study

This study adds to the literature of leadership for urban education as well as advances the research on relational trust theory in education. For example, the teacher focus group and the principal interview provide an in depth understanding of how the principal manifests relational trust.

A leader in urban education is one who understands that a leadership of urban schools must be grounded in the tenets of critical discourse with regard the social construction of American schools (Dantley, 1990). This in mind, this study contributes to the field of social justice education. Educational leaders who understand and effectively employ
policies and practices to combat the social inequities, is essential for schools in urban areas. Drawing on the works of Apple (1992 & 1995), Frierie (1972), Anyon (1980), Gordon (1982), Murrell (2002), and other scholars who provide critical analyses of the conditions that have perpetuated historical inequities in school and who work to change institutional structures and culture, the study provides a foundational perspective and vivid illustrations of the educational injustices for educational leaders.

Another benefit of the project is that it can serve as professional development opportunity for the principals and their staff. The case study may provide a framework for school-site administrators in discerning how they are perceived by their teachers. This is valuable information as research indicates positive relationships between school-site administrators and their teachers are essential for school improvement and student achievement. The knowledge can serve as a mechanism for principals to sustain or enhance their relationships with their teachers.

Definition of Relevant Terms

The study explored the existence of relation trust between a principal and his teaching staff in a Midwestern urban school. A clear description of many of the terms used in the study is embedded in the literature. However, for consistency throughout the research, the following definitions are offered:

1. School culture: Everything that happens in school. The “ethos” of a school; meaning the values, style of dress, customs, attitudes, interactions, and belief systems that bond disparate individuals into a school community (Grant, 1988).

2. Characteristics: Discernable and distinctive traits and qualities.
3. **Principal:** The head leader of a school building. This excludes assistant and associate principals as well as other administrative personnel.

4. **Urban schools:** Schools which are located in inner-cities. The student population has a relatively high rate of poverty and a relatively high proportion of students of color, namely African American.

5. **Stakeholders:** All directly and indirectly involved in the education of students in a school building: principals, teachers, students, parents, and community members.

6. **Effective:** Perceived from an institutional perspective. Not a static or absolute quality that is only determined through measurable items such as achievement scores, literacy rates. Although they are significant indicators of some level of success, effectiveness is an intricate concept that also takes into consideration the ethos of the school such as people structures, relationships, ideology, goals, intellectual substance, motivation, and will (Lightfoot, 1983).
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this section is to present a review of literature that pertain to effective school leadership. This chapter begins with a general review of leadership, and ends with an explanation of the common themes in effective leadership for urban education.

Defining Leadership

Leadership, a highly valued phenomenon in human society, has been defined in a variety of ways (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004; DuBrin, 1995; Cuban, 1988). It has been described in terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and occupations of an administrative position (Yukl, 2002). An early definition of leadership by Tannenbaum and Massarik (1957) captured the essence of all its subsequent explanations; they described it as “interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed through the communicative process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals (p. 3).” The authors further noted that “leadership always involves attempts on the part of a leader to affect the behavior of a follower or followers in a situation (p. 3).”
Along with defining leadership, Tannenbaum and Massarik (1957) outlined four major components of the phenomenon. According to the researchers, the first facet of leadership is *interpersonal influence*. This involves capability of leaders to influence the behavior of followers through communication. Thus, leaders’ success is contingent on their ability to persuade. The second feature is *exercised in situation*, meaning the capacity of those who lead to sway the behavior of others by controlling elements in the environment that can have an impact on their capability to influence: physical phenomena, persons not attempting to influence, the organization, the broader culture, social norms, stereotypes, and the goals of the leader, followers, or organization.

The third feature of leadership identified by the authors is *the communication process*. They perceived communication as the sole process in which leaders are able to function. According to the researchers, leaders use communication as the medium through which they attempt to affect their followers’ attitudes so the follower will be ready to move or will actually move in the direction of the specified goal (p. 6). The final aspect of leadership defined by Tannenbaum and Massarik is *directed toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals*. In this domain leaders employ influence to achieve desired goals; such goals may be that of the organization, a group, personal goals of the leader, or of the follower.

Burns (1978) defined leadership as the ability to motivate “followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations--the want and needs, the aspirations and expectations--of both leaders and followers (p. 19).” Bennis (1989) declared that leaders are persons who have the capacity to create and bring life to visions
and are the managers of dreams. DePree (1989) asserted that leaders (a) are servants, (b) are debtors, (c) are responsible for effectiveness by enabling others to reach their highest potential, (d) define reality, (e) show gratitude, (f) identify, develop, and nurture other leaders, (g) encourage contrary opinions, (h) provide and maintain momentum, (i) leave behind legacies and assets, and (j) take role on developing, expressing, and defending civility and values. From a social perspective, Bryk and Schneider (2000) defined good leaders as persons who are competent in their field, have integrity, as well as have respect and regard for their constituents. Also looking at leadership socially, Lipham and Hoeh (1974) defined it as “behavior of an individual which initiates a change in the goals, objectives, configurations, procedures, inputs, processes, and ultimately the outputs of social systems (p. 182).”

After evaluating over two hundred definitions of leadership found in the literature, Rost (1991) posited that leadership is male, rational, management-oriented, technocratic, quantitative, cost-driven, hierarchal, short-term, pragmatic, and materialistic. This male-gendered, specific identification of leadership is primarily because most leadership research prior to the 1980’s were carried out by men and dealt exclusively with male leaders (Klenke, 1996). Providing a “feministic” view of leadership, in their exploratory investigation of women business owners and mangers Stanford, Oates, and Flores (1995), found leadership to be team-oriented, operating from reward and referent, visionary, and fostering mutual respect between leaders and subordinates.

Moreover, many scholars, researchers, educators, etc. have created romanticized definitions of leadership holding that leaders should be capable of manipulating and
influencing the fates of persons or organizations under their direction. Klenke (1996) provided a vivid example when the author stated:

Leaders are spellbinders and dreamers, pathfinders and trail blazers: they are champions such as Isabelle of Spain and Napoleon, saviors such as Florence Nightingale and Moses, servants such as Mother Theresa and Martin Luther King, and revolutionaries such as Rosa Luxemberg and Fidel Castro...(p. 8).

The manner in which leadership is defined is contingent upon how it is studied, measured, the metaphors and symbols applied to it, and how it is used in practice. Succinctly, leadership or effective leadership skills are contextual (Klenke, 1996).

Several definitions of leadership have been specifically related to the field of education. For example, in School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence, citing others, Bush and Glover (2003) placed educational leadership in four domains. They first noted that leadership entails a process of influence where leaders exert intentional authority over the people or organization under their direction (Yulk, 2002). Secondly, they saw leadership as grounded in firm personal and professional values. In relation to school, those core values should (a) be concerned that all members of the school community are learners, (b) be to serve students and the school community, (c) value every member of the school, and (d) focus holistically on persons in the school community (Wasserberg, 1999). Citing Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989), Bush and Glover (2003) noted that leaders have a vision that is institutionalized and communicated meaningfully. The fourth way in which they defined leadership was through management (Bush & Glover, 2003). Similarly, Cuban (1998) defined effective leadership as efficiently running schools’ organizational arrangements.
Moreover, Blum, Butler, and Olsen (1987) posited that effective school leaders, monitor school performance, communicate with staff, create safe environments, have a clear vision, and know quality instruction. Similarly, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) identified quality school leaders as those who frame and communicate goals, evaluate instruction, coordinate curriculum, monitor progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, select and participate in professional development, as well as establish explicit instructional goals.

In their research, Levine and Lezotte (1990) determined that strong educational leaders supervise instructional practices, support teachers, have high energy, monitor school activities, and acquire necessary resources. Enfield and Freeman (1992) claimed that effective leaders in education treat teachers as professionals, trust subordinates, give teachers a clear vision in decisions, and invite divergent points of view. Moreover, Sammons, Hillman, and Mort (1995) noted that effective leaders, are firm, are purposeful, and are viewed as the leading professional. In another study, Lambert (1998) defined valuable educational leaders as persons whose compelling ideas and initiatives are sustained, even when they are no longer affiliated with the school.

Despite the many ways of defining leadership for educational administration, they all share the assumption that it involves an “influence process concerned with facilitating the performance of a collective task (Yukl, 2002, p. 19).” Moreover, regardless of the multiple definitions, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) categorized educational leadership into two factors: (a) providing direction, and (b) exercising influence. They further declared, educational leaders (a) do not impose goals on their constituents but work cooperatively
with their followers to accomplish objectives; (b) work with and through people while creating environments conducive for others to be effective; and (c) see their position as a function more than a role; thus recognizing at times they may have to serve as a follower.

Since leadership is contextual and is defined in various ways, grasping a concrete meaning is often difficult. Stogdill (1974) stated, “There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept (p. 7).” Furthermore, Cuban (1998) noted that although leadership is defined in numerous ways, “there is no clear and unequivocal understanding as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders (p. 190).” Thus, the problem of leadership is not in the lack of definitions but in the ambiguity and often contradiction in the definitions applied to it (Klenke, 1996).

Another critique of leadership is that it is a concept so general that there is no point of reference, while contrarily, others claim that is too specific to cover “the full range of complexities and possibilities that characterize leadership (Klenke, 1996, p. 9).” However, Klenke argued that placing a strict definition on leadership constrains a depth understating of the phenomena, precludes persons to critically decipher what is an appropriate leader in their context, and hinders individuals from critically analyzing leadership situations.

General Leadership Theories

Since the beginning of the twentieth century the topic of leadership has been examined considerably in many contexts and theoretical foundations (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004; Horner, 1997). The theorization of leadership has taken on multiple interpretations, each providing some insight in the role of leader (Jago, 1982).
Horner (1997) categorized trends of leadership into six distinct categories. The author noted that the first thrust of leadership theory paid attention to the individual attributes with which leaders were born taking into consideration their personality, mental capacity, and physical abilities. Trait theorists adhered to the “leaders-are-born” concept while believing that genes determined great leaders (Klenke, 1996). Next, leaders were examined by their behaviors focusing on what they do and not how they were perceived. Klenke (1996) noted that this approach is associated largely with the extensive research done at The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. In this domain attention was giving to what leaders do and not how they were perceived.

The third approach of studying leadership identified by Horner (1997) focused on the interaction among the leaders’ traits, behaviors, and the context in which they led. Followers of this paradigm of leadership postulated that leadership effectiveness was contingent upon the interaction between certain leader attributes and characteristics of the context (Klenke, 1996). The last two and most recent theories noted by the Horner (1997) were transactional and transformational. The former stems from a more traditional view in which leaders use rank for task completion and the latter theorized that leaders could create effectiveness by building strong relationships with their followers while supporting and encouraging their individual development.

Supporting Horner’s (1997) leadership theoretical grouping, in a comprehensive review of leadership theories, Van Wart (2003) showed the development of leadership by placing theories in the different time periods and categories. Each is discussed briefly.
Great Man Era (Pre-1900)

In this era, there was an emphasis on the emergence of a great figure such as Napoleon, George Washington, or Martin Luther, who has substantial influence on society. Notions of rational change by uniquely talented and insightful individuals influenced this period in leadership history (Van Wart, 2003).

Trait Era (1900-1948)

In this era there was a current resurgence of recognition in the importance of natural talents. Emphasis was placed on the individual traits (physical, personal, motivational, aptitudes) and skills (communication and ability to influence) that leaders bring to all leadership tasks. Scientific methodologies in general, especially industrial measurement, and scientific management in particular (the definition of roles and assignment of competencies to those roles) influenced the characterization of leadership in this era (Ibid).

Contingency Era (1948-1980s)

Emphasis in the contingency era was on the situation variables leaders must handle. During this time period there was a shift away from looking at the traits and skills to observing the behaviors or leaders. For example, leaders’ energy level, communication skills, and ability to motivate staff were examined. This time in leadership was influenced by the rise of human relations theory, the use of small group experimental designs, psychology, and behavioral science in areas such as motivation theory. The contingency theory continues to be the basis of most rigorous models but with vastly expanded situational repertoire (Ibid).
Transformational Era (1978-Present)

A form of leadership termed by Bass (1978), transformational leadership stressed the importance of leaders who create change in deep structures, major processes, or overall culture. Leader mechanisms include, but are not limited to, compelling vision, brilliant technical insight, and charismatic quality. The loss of American dominance in business, finance, and science, and the need to re-energize various industries, which had slipped in complacency, influenced this era (Ibid).

Servant Era (1977-Present)

This form of leadership emphasized the leaders’ ethical responsibilities to followers, stakeholders, and the over-all society. For example, business leaders stressed service to customers, political theorists emphasized citizens, and public administration analysts focused on legal compliance and citizenship. The Servant Era was guided by the social sensitivities that were raised in the 1960s and 1970s (Van Wart, 2003).

Multi-faceted Era (1990s-Present)

In this era of leadership, there was an emphasis on integrating the major schools. Particular interest was the integration of transactional and transformational schools of leadership. The former focused on traits, behaviors, and issues largely representing management issues while the later stressed leaders to be visionary, entrepreneurial, and charismatic. The highly competitive global economy and the need to provide a more sophisticated and holistic approach to leadership motivated this form of leadership style (Ibid).
Leadership Theory for Education

Though the call for leadership is universal, it means different things to different people and organizations. The setting in which leadership is emerged and exercised, determines the theoretical framework that guides the leadership style. “Just as different times call for different leaders and different types of leadership, so do different context (Klenke, 1996, p. 18).”

Thus, in relation to school leadership many have theorized the common forms (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). The vast literature on educational leadership has generated contradictory and often competing models. Researchers and practitioners have attempted to place the many conceptions into broad themes and types (Busch & Glover, 2003). After reviewing the literature relating to leadership in education administration Leithwood and Duke (1999), placed it in six major categories which dominated the contemporary discourse: (a) instructional, (b) transformational, (c) moral, (d) participative, (e) contingency, and (f) managerial. The first category of leadership focuses primarily on the behaviors of teachers that were immediately consequential to student achievement. Reiterating this point, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) asserted that “instructional leadership…typically assumes that the critical attention by leaders is the behavior of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students (p. 8).” The next type of leadership in education administration identified by the researchers is transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is about building a common interest among all stakeholders (Leithwood, 1992). Leithwood and Duke
(2003) declared that the focus on transformational leadership is to attend to the capacities of the members of an organization.

Moral leadership was the next form described. In this style of leadership, the critical focus is on the values and ethics of leaders themselves. Authority and influence are derived from indispensable conceptions of what is good and right (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Under this theoretical perspective of leadership, excellent schools are those who have “central zones composed of values and beliefs that take on sacred or cultural characteristics (Serigiovanni, 1984, p. 10).” The fourth leadership type discussed, participative, stresses the importance of democratic decision-making. Often called group, shared, or teacher leadership, this normative model is based on three criteria: (a) participation increases school effectiveness; (b) participation is justified by democratic principles; and (c) in the context of school site based management, leadership is available to teachers and principals (Bush & Glover, 2003).

Contingency leadership, another style mentioned by Leithwood and Duke (1999), pays attention to how leaders respond to their unique organizational circumstances or problems they encounter. According to Bush and Glover (2003), the contingent model recognizes the diverse nature of school contexts and the advantages of adapting multiple styles of leadership. The final category of educational leadership noted by the authors is managerial. This leadership style focuses on the tasks, functions, and behaviors of leaders (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Followers of this type posit that if these functions are carried out competently, then the goals of the organization are effectively met. Leadership and management are often assumed to be synonymous (Bush & Glover,
Making a differentiation between the two concepts, Lunenburg and Ornstein (2004) discerned:

The distinction between leadership and management usually entails allocating management with responsibilities for policy implementation, maintaining organizational stability, and dealing with day-to-day routines of the job such as providing and distributing financial and material resources, managing the student body, maintaining effective communications with education stakeholders, reducing disruptions to the instructional program, mediating conflicts, and attending to political demands of the school or school district. Leadership, in contrast, entails responsibilities for policy making, organizational change, and other more dynamic processes of work (p. 137).

As shown, multiple perspectives have attempted to define and characterize leadership in education administration. The six dimensions of leadership described by Leithwood and Duke (1999) reveal that the concepts of school leadership are complex and diverse. Also, there are major implications of the typologies given by the researchers. First, there is no clear and agreed definition on school leadership. Next, although six categories were listed, they are not pure. The final issue speaks to the similarities among the styles. For example all of the forms of leadership are concerned with student achievement, ethics, values, democratic principles, and social justice (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Despite these concerns, the models provide a guide for a normative assessment of leadership in education administration (Bush & Glover, 2003).

Characteristics of Urban Schools

Educational researchers, educators, and practitioners have noted several characteristics that distinguish urban schools from schools in rural and suburban communities. The first distinction found in research is that urban schools operate in high-
density areas, where the population density is at least one thousand per square mile (Kincheloe, 2004).

In relation to rural and suburban schools, the literature reveals that urban schools are much larger and tend to serve more students. Situated in this context, it may be difficult for students in urban schools to feel a sense of community. Thus, this potential alienation leads to high dropout rates and low academic performance (Kincheloe, 2004). Along the same lines, Ehrenberg et al. (2001) noted that learning is a complex phenomenon which involves cognitive processes yet to be completely understood, consequently the number of students in a class can affect how much and how many ways something is learned, teacher effectiveness, and the level of personal interaction between teachers and individual students. Moreover, the researcher asserted that smaller classrooms contribute to higher achievement, including enhanced teacher-parent contact, better relationships between teachers and parents, and quality classroom instruction.

Another distinction is that urban schools tend to serve impoverished communities, thus housing a large number of students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds. Ludwig, Ladd and Duncan (2001) found that between 1970 and 1990, the number of people in the United States living in high-poverty census tracts, with poverty rates of 40 percent or more, nearly doubled. Although schools in rural areas have a substantial number of poor people as well, urban schools are “characterized by high concentrations of poverty existing in close proximity to affluence (Kincheloe, 2004, p. 5).” Moreover, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1996) found that students in urban schools compare less favorably than students in rural areas on about one-half of academic
achievement and educational attainment indicators. Furthermore, urban schools suffer from lack of funding and resources. Kincheloe (2004) stressed this point when he stated, “financial inequalities mar these schools and school districts, undermining efforts to repair dilapidated buildings, supply textbooks for all students, and provide teachers with instructional materials and equipment (p. 5).”

In densely populated urban areas, people from various backgrounds live in close proximity of each other (Kincheloe, 2004). In addition, nearly two-thirds of students in urban schools are neither white nor middle class. Thus, another distinction is that schools in urban areas have a higher rate of ethnic, racial, and religious diversity.

Although very diverse, urban schools serve a large number of minority students. In *The Condition of Education 1999, Issues in Focus: Educational Progress of Black Students*, NCES found that 53 percent of all black students in elementary through high schools reside in central urban areas. Also, over 80 percent of high-density poverty areas in the United States are located in the nation’s one hundred largest cities. Connecting these two points, Kincheloe (2004) stated “a disproportionate percentage of minority students and their families are plagued by this concentrated urban poverty… (p. 5).” Likewise, Ludwig, Ladd, and Duncan (2001) asserted that children who live in poor urban neighborhoods are disproportionately likely to be members of racial and ethnic minority groups. Moreover, Stringfied et al. (1997) stated that because of the close relationship between race and socioeconomic class in America, minorities are especially likely to be educationally disadvantaged.
Goldring and Greenfield (2002) reported that in 1998, 36.4 percent of blacks and 33.6 percent of Latino families with school-aged children lived in poverty compared to 14.4 percent of white families. Due to the high levels of poverty rates, black and Latino students are at greater risk for school failure (Ludwig, Ladd, & Duncan 2001; Goldring & Greenfield, 2002). In addition to educating a majority, minority population, urban schools house a large number of immigrant students, making them linguistically diverse as well. Complimenting this finding, Crosby (1999) expressed, “The new wave of immigrants…from Hispanic countries, from Middle East, and from Asian countries has washed over the urban schools like a tidal wave bringing with it additional challenges, this time cultural and linguistic (p. 104).”

The manner in which business is conducted is noted to be another distinguishing factor of urban school districts (Kinchenoe, 2004). Urban educational centers are more likely to be undermined by ineffective business operations than rural and suburban schools. Haberman (2003) argued, “everyone one of the major urban school districts suffers from a disease that might appropriately be termed dysfunctional bureaucracy…Even when states takeover particular urban school districts, the best they can do is put the disease into remission…dysfunctional bureaucracies reappear in altered forms even more resistant to change strategies… (p. 1).” For example, in *A Reform for Trouble Times: Takeovers of Urban Schools*, Green and Carl (2000) reported that large inner-city school systems such as the District of Columbia, Cleveland, and Detroit have been granted state authority due to their financial mis-management and other negative performance indicators. Crosby (1999) also argued that the bureaucratic decision-making
process in urban schools contributes to their failure. In *Urban Schools Forced to Fail*, Crosby elaborated:

> Because the decision-making process is what drives the institution or the organization, the bureaucracy is quite powerful. Because it is an anonymous and faceless collective, it is difficult to control, sidestep, or subvert. Because it seeks to perpetuate itself and its processes, it frequently serves as the brakes that bring innovation and change to a halt. How does this bear upon the urban schools? They are run by institutional bureaucracies that resist change. Yet the urban schools must change in response to the growing complexities and demands of our society that have made the existing networks and organizational structures obsolete. When the bureaucracy blocks meaningful change, it is inevitable that the urban schools will fail a large number of their clients, the students (p. 299).

Another differentiating characteristic of urban schools is that they have a higher mobility rate among students, teachers, and administrators. Research reported in *Quality Counts 1998 The Urban Challenge: Public Education in the 50 States*, showed that students in urban schools were more likely to have changed schools frequently than students in other areas. Also, as noted in Brown (2004) and Farkas (2003), the attrition rate of teachers in urban settings is high. Providing a rationale for high teacher mobility in urban educational settings, Imazeki (2004) reported that teacher turnover rates are particularly high in urban districts that serve the most low-income students because they compete with other professions and with wealthier proximal school districts. In relation to school site administrators, since the 1980s, there has been a growing body of research raising doubts about the field of education administration; specifically, regarding concerns about school principal quality, recruitment, turn-over, and work conditions (Fenstermacher, 1999).

Finally, research has shown that teachers who are less likely to live in their school communities mainly teach in urban schools. It is widely recognized that the cultural gap between children and teachers in urban schools is large and growing. Crosby (1999)
described this dilemma when he exerted that inner city schools were

Often staffed largely by newly hired or uncertified teachers…These teachers, who were trained to teach students from middle-class families and who often come from middle-class families themselves, now find themselves engulfed by minority students, immigrants, and other students from low-income families – students whose values and experiences are very different from their own (p. 302).

Moreover, Citing the National Center for Education Statistics (1999), Sleeter (2001) reported that in 1996, the enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools was 64 percent white, 17 percent black, 14 percent Hispanic, 4 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaskan Native. In contrast, the teaching force in 1994 was 87 percent white, 7 percent black, 4 percent Hispanic, 1 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 percent American Indian. (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999).

In Savage inequalities: Children in America’s Schools, Kozol (1991) provided a vivid illustration of the unique issues facing schools in urban settings. In this piece, Kozol exposed the inequalities built into America's public education system. His findings revealed a separate and unequal school system where schools in inner cities were under-equipped, under-staffed, and under-funded. One of the schools described in the text, Public School 261, dealt with major facility issues. For example, although Public School 261 had a capacity of nine hundred students it housed approximately thirteen hundred. Moreover, the average classroom size was thirty-four students for upper level grades and twenty-seven for lower levels. Public 261 was also located in a heavy traffic area of the city near an elevated public transit line making noise a problem. In terms of school design, its facilities were a converted skating rink, a place not conducive to the smooth operation of the educational process.
Also in his research, Kozol (1991) brought to the attention that students see this inequity and receive a message of how society sees them. “Children hear and understand this theme-they are poor investments- and behave accordingly. If society’s resources would be wasted on their destinies, perhaps their own determination would be wasted too (p. 99).” He further contended, “Statistics cannot tell us what it means to a child to leave his often hellish home and go to a school- his hope for a transcendent future- that is literally falling apart (p. 100).”

“There is nothing simple about urban education (Kincheloe, 2004, p. 4).” Researchers have documented the urban-suburban disparities among many lines that contribute to the large achievement gap between low-income, and students of color on one hand and their white, suburban, and affluent counterparts on the other (Porter & Soper, 2003). However, while bearing these complexities and despite the manner in which students come to school it is still the obligation of administrators and teachers in urban districts to produce high achieving students (Brown, 2004). Along the same lines, it is inexcusable to let “the gross inequities outside…schools…excuse gross inequities within…schools (Education Trust, 2008, p. 1).”

The Achievement Gap: From a Social Perspective

One of the more pressing and common problems in urban schools is the achievement gap. The achievement gap separating poor and minority students from less disadvantaged students has been the focus of discussion, research, and controversy in America for nearly forty years (Weiss, 2003; Ferguson & Mehta, 2004; Rothstein, 2004a, 2004b). Thernstorm (2004) asserted that the racial gap in academic achievement between
whites and Asians, on one hand, and blacks and Hispanics on the other hand, is an educational crisis. The fiftieth anniversary of the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Brown versus Board of Education* has increased the national awareness of the continual disparity in achievement students.

Although the black-white performance gap includes the difference between the achievement of lower-class students and their middle class counterparts, there is an additional and apparent disparity between black and white students (Rothstein, 2004a; Jones, 2002). Supporting this assertion, the National Governors Association (NGA) (2003) posited that the achievement gap is a matter of race and class. The NGA (2003) asserted that across the United States, a gap in academic achievement persists between students of color and other disadvantaged students and their white counterparts. The NGA also determined two manners to measure the achievement gap. The first and most common method, they declared, is to compare academic performance among African-American, Hispanic, and European-American students on standardized assessments. An example of this approach is the reading results of the 1998 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) (Romas, 2002). According to Ramos, the bottom tier of the CMT, which was called “intervention,” consisted of 16% of the non-minority students and 49% of the minority students who took the assessment. Another approach to measure the achievement gap, according to the NGA, is to juxtapose the highest level of educational attainment of several of racial groups.

After narrowing the academic performance gap in the 1970’s and 1980’s, the gap has worsened in recent years as well as widened further as blacks matriculate through the
American educational system (King, 2003; Ferguson & Mehta, 2004). According to King (2003) recent studies show that the education of African American students in urban schools is in a dire situation. In *The Status and Trends in the Education of Blacks*, a study conducted by Hoffman and Llagas (2003) for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), it stated that the performance gap between blacks and whites had widened between 1988 and 1999. It specifically noted that gaps in reading achievement showed no narrowing during the 1990’s.

Validating King’s (2003) position that the educational system is proven dismal to black students are data collected by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Their research showed that reading scores for high school juniors and seniors narrowed dramatically for both African American and Hispanic students from 1975 through 1988. However, from 1990 to 1999, these gaps grew in both reading and mathematics. Comer (2001) postulated that the disparities between blacks and whites appear as early as kindergarten and widens throughout their academic career. Moreover, according to Comer, by the end of fourth grade, black students are about two grades behind their white counterparts in reading and math. Following the same sentiments, after review of the NAEP data, the Education Trust organization concluded that, for those students of color who successfully matriculate through the educational system, by the time they reach grade twelve, they are about four years behind their white counterparts (NGA, 2003). For example, seventeen year-old African American and Latino students have skills in English, mathematics, and in science similar to those of thirteen year-old white students. Regarding high school graduates, college matriculation rates for African-
American and Hispanic high-school students remain below those of white high-school graduates. Furthermore, of those students enrolling in college, Hispanic and black young adults are only half as likely to earn a college degree as their white counterparts (NGA, 2003).

Several studies conducted provide social and cultural reasoning to explain the disparity in achievement between students of color and their white counterparts. For example, Brooks-Guinn and Markman (2005) examined the rearing differences among black, Hispanic, and white parents as they related to school readiness. According to their findings, white parents better prepared their children for the culture of schooling. Bailey and Boykin (2001) too studied the home contextual factors that informed students’ preferences, motivation, and achievement outcomes. Looking at wealth, the work of Duncan and Manguson (2005) revealed that the disparate socio-economic circumstances of families in white, black, and Hispanic children accounted for the racial and ethnic academic gaps in schools. Supporting this study, Mayer (2002) looked at the negative effects economic inequality had on children’s education attainment. Specifically looking at mathematics achievement, Lubienski (2002) saw that the intersection of race and socio-economic status had a major impact on the academic success of fourth, eight, and twelfth grade students. Similar findings are in a study by Orr (2003). The researcher found that monetary wealth and richness in human capitol affect school achievement as well as explained the gap in black and white test scores. Another study conducted by Ginwright (2002) demonstrated how social class plays a signifigant role in how problems
are defined, interpreted, and addressed with regard to education between black, working, and middle class.

Moreover, a number of studies about the achievement gap have also looked at the act of schooling. For example Songl’s (2006) research showed a relationship between urban school teachers’ perceptions of their students and the level of achievement by students. Similarly, looking at teachers’ practices and responses to such practices by black elementary-aged students, Tyson (2003) found that certain methods of teachers facilitate social reproduction in schools. In an earlier examination, Tyson (2002) concluded that black children begin school with the expectations of high achievement and are actively engaged in the schooling process. The findings of the study showed that school experiences play a pivotal role in the development of attitudes toward schools.

Viewing the achievement gap from a social and cultural perspective, there are plenty research projects that provide suggestions to narrow and close the academic disparities. In Equity Pedagogy, McGee and Banks (1995) argued that an empowering pedagogy liberated students. Supporting Orr’s (2003) position, Savage’s (2002) study examined the importance of cultural capitol in education and its relevance to the achievement of black students. Similarly, Tate (1995) observed mathematics teaching practices that were culturally relevant to children of color. The work of Darling and Irvin (2005) advocated the importance of acknowledging culture for closing the achievement gap of minority students. Likewise, inquiry by Morrell and Duncan-Andrade (2002) found that using culturally relevant music increased students’ reading effectiveness.
The United States has achieved substantial progress in the education of blacks and other marginalized groups since the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. However achievement gaps between blacks and whites that narrowed in the 1970s and 1980s appear to be widening (Lubenski, 2002). There has been extensive research and commentary blaming schools for the achievement disparity that exist among its students. Attempts to solve this issue have focused primarily on instruction and school tasks. There are misconceptions that if teachers know how to teach a subject and if schools place emphasis on these tasks there would be no disparities. However such practices do not acknowledge that social-cultural factors (e.g. child rearing differences, communication styles, learning styles, etc.) embedded in the achievement gap issue (Rothstein, 2004a). Unless these matters are attended to, disparity in academic achievement among black, Hispanic, and white students will persist. Thus, although minor wins have been accomplished through *Brown*, there is still progress to be made (Ferguson & Metha, 2004).

Reform in Urban Education

“Urban schools, which serve 53% of all African American students attending grades one through twelve, are in dire need of school reform (Middleton, 2001, p. 427).” Urban education is very complex (Kincheloe, 2004); its schools in sit in a perilous juncture of cities with lack of jobs, no or minimal tax base, lack of state funding, and in neighborhoods deteriorated from the increase in violent crimes (Christman, Cohen, & MacPherson, 1997). Christman et al. (1997) declared that “demoralized by high failure rates, un-widely bureaucracies, and entrenched adversarial relationships, urban school
populations struggle in harsh conditions (p.146).” As a result, urban school districts have a myriad of issues and distinct characteristics that create for them a unique identity: student diversity, delinquency, funding inequity, lack of academic success, high drop-out rates, AIDS, students with children of their own, class and social disconnect among parents and students on one hand and teachers and administrators on the other (Nelson, Carlson, & Palonsky, 1996). This intricate identity calls for a leader with a multi-styled approach.

Moreover, because of the perceived inadequacies, over the past two decades, expectations for progressing urban schools have been a focus of educators, policy makers, and researchers (Middleton, 2001; Cooper, 2000). Wan (2002) claimed, “A flurry of school reforms has characterized urban education in the last two decades, leading to reform as the status quo for urban schools (p.1).” Bryk and Schneider (2002) noted that currently many school reform initiatives place emphasis on instruction. For example, emerging in the late 1980s and early 1990s was the accountability movement. The accountability reform movement expanded the use of test results for responsibility purposes.

Additionally, school districts began to rely heavily on standardized testing to hold both schools and students accountable by identifying passing and failing schools, and providing incentives as well as setting consequences accordingly (Wei, 2002). Although there is research that supports that schools do best when they pay close attention to standards and performance (Fullan, 2000), Darling-Hammond and Falk (1997) stated that this is contingent upon how standards are shaped and used; they could support greater
levels of success in students or they could create higher rates of failure for students “who are already least well served by the education system (p. 190).”

Advocates for instructional reform argue that it should be the primary focus of school improvement. Supporters of instruction and curriculum reform maintain that policy should pay attention to the facets of education that are directly related to school improvement such as standards, new curricula, and assessments, teacher development, and instructional leadership. Thus, there is a large body of research supporting the notion that effective leaders in schools should focus primarily on curriculum and instruction (Brown, 2004; Blum, Butler, & Olson, 1987; Levine & Lovett, 1990). Also supporting this position, Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992) claimed that effective school leaders focus on developing and improving curriculum and instruction and not on the management of human relations.

Claiming that there has been an evolution in the role of principals, Marsh (2000) asserted:

It is clear that the old role of the principal as the solitary instructional leadership is inadequate for the new directions in educational reform over the last decade. That view—which emphasizes the directive and clinical view of instructional leadership—no longer fits the realities of time and work load of principals. That view also blocks the development of the collective leadership, culture, and expertise needed for success in reforms, and assumes that reforms can be aligned and packaged in outdated and rigid ways (p. 129). Marsh defended his position while exploring the common themes in educational reforms that are likely to emerge globally over the next decades. He noted that (a) student performance will become better assessed while satisfaction of students’ performances will matter more to stakeholders as student competition and choice increases; (b) there
will be a shift from rule-driven to result-driven; and (c) the future of reform is characterized by political, economic, and social issues of “stunning complexity and tenacity (p. 129).”

Therefore, although technical reform initiatives such as an emphasis on curriculum and instruction are vital in school improvement, as Bryk and Schneider (2002) posited, focusing on social reform is equally imperative “for technical resources [such as standards, assessments, and new curricula] to take root and develop into something of value (p. 135).” Recognizing the importance of relationship building as an imperative leadership trait, Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) noted that the main responsibility of leaders is to maintain a supportive environment and manage interpersonal relations. Moreover, in *The 21 Indispensable Qualities of a Leader*, Maxwell (1999) determined that the ability to work with people and develop relationships is “absolutely indispensable to effective leadership (p. 106).”

Despite the many theories of leadership and the efforts of scholars and practitioners in the field, no universal theory exists that predicts leader effectiveness across a wide range of tasks, situations, organizations, and cultures (Klenke, 1996). Moreover, the question of whether theory has practical implications with regard to school leadership for reform is sometimes raised. The (a) great range of daily activities, problems, and duties, (b) different perceptions of how leaders should act by their stakeholders, and (c) the organizational environment in which educational leaders are situated may produce a maze of conflicting demands and pressures upon principals (Nystrand, 1981). Moreover, because of the unique complexities of urban schools and the authority given to school site
administrators by states, it is imperative principals in urban schools are equipped with the necessary traits and proficiencies to effectively run and reform their buildings.

Principal Leadership for Urban Education

Literature on educational leadership is often fragmented and contradictory (Calder, 1977; Chemers, 1983; Fiedler & House 1988). Therefore, finding a single model expansive enough to reflect the complex phenomenon of leadership for urban education reform is not feasible. Furthermore, recent paradigm shifts in conceptualizing leadership have encouraged educational researchers to derive a new perspective of leadership models (Ayman, 1993; Chemers & Ayman, 1993).

The literature on school effectiveness has shown a positive relationship between school performance and strong administrative leadership in urban schools (Edmonds, 1979; Carlin, 1992; Peterson & Deal, 2002). Traditionally, solely instructional matters identified effective school site managers. This included (a) setting school achievement goals, (b) knowing quality instruction, (c) coordinating curriculum, and (d) protecting instructional time (Blum, Butler, & Olsen, 1987; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Lee, 1991). Likewise, Murphy and Pimental (1996) stated that an effective principal is one who creates a safe place for teaching and learning and develops an academic program that serves all students well. In the same vein, Hallinger and Murphy (1992) identified effective leaders as principals who maintain a strong task orientation relating to curriculum and instruction rather than on management of human relations activities.

Nonetheless, in and of itself, this significant characteristic of effective principal leadership is not equal in all contexts. A compelling body of research has shown that
strong instructional leadership alone had a non-existing or negative impact on school climate, parental involvement, and student achievement in schools with large populations of minority students (Scheerens & Creemers, 1996). The complex and evolving role of principals and the intricate characteristics of urban schools call for a more contemporary style of leadership (Bush & Glover, 2003). Expanding the role of leaders beyond instructional matters, Hughes and Ubben (1994) claimed that (a) staffing and instructional improvement, (b) curriculum development, (c) pupil service, (d) resource management, budgeting and maintenance, and (e) public relations are integral to successful schools.

Giving the many theories of general and educational leadership, the characteristics of urban schools, the pressure of urban school reform, as well as the complex and evolving role of the principals, an ideal model for leadership in urban schools is a multi-faceted, integrated approach to leadership (Bush & Glover, 2003), which has become common in the literature for effective school leadership (Yukl, 2002).

Specifically for leadership for urban school reform, an appropriate amalgamated model is one that incorporates both instructional and transformational leadership styles. “Transformational leadership is a form of consensual or facilitative power that is manifested through other people instead of over people (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9).” Supporting a make-up of this nature, Marks and Printy (2003) found that of the many leadership theories germane to education administration, instructional leadership and transformational leadership have prevailed in recent decades.
The first form of leadership argued to guide change for urban schools is instructional leadership. Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992) maintained that effective school leaders sustain a strong task orientation where there is a significant emphasis on the development of curriculum and instruction. Similarly, Sergiovanni (1987) identified successful school leadership as activities that are directly related to improving teaching and learning.

Burns (1978) is noted as the first person to discuss leadership as transforming and on occasion as transformational. Since then, it has become a popular subject of inquiry in school contexts (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). Hallinger and Leithwood (1998) said, “Predominate notions of principal’s roles have evolved from manager, to street-level bureaucrat, to change agent, to instructional manager, to instructional leader, to transformational leader (p. 137).” Transformational leadership has four major components: (a) charisma or idealized influence (attributed or behavioral), (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration (Bass, 1998).

Furthermore, Bass (1985) posited that transformation is achieved in three related ways. It is first accomplished by raising the level of awareness about the importance and value of designed outcomes, and ways of reaching them. The next manner in which transformation is achieved is by getting followers to transcend their own self-interest and focus on the interest of the group or organization. Finally, Burns held that transformation is succeeded by altering the need level of Maslow’s hierarchy or expanding followers’ perception of needs and wants.
Also embedded in transformational leadership are moral practices. In *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Stephen Covey (1989) claimed that transformational leaders require a moral compass. Bass and Steidelmeier (1999) averred:

Authentic transformational leadership provides a more reasonable and realistic concept of self—a self that is connected to friends, family, and a community whose welfare may be more important to oneself than one’s own. One’s moral obligations to them are grounded in a broader conception of individuals within community and related social norms and cultural beliefs (p. 186).

Despite the challenges in characterizing appropriate leadership for urban education and education reform (Bush & Glover, 2003) several themes that embody instructional and transformational practices continually emerge in the literature. Transformational leadership practices function in several capacities, namely the principal as visionary, manager, community builder within and outside of the school, trustworthy and socially just. Each will be discussed briefly.

**Principal as Strong Instructional Leader**

Although not the only form of leadership needed for change in urban schools, strong instructional leadership is inevitable for successful schools. Moreover, effective school reform seeks those principals who still maintain their role of instructional leader (Carlin, 1992). Reiterating this point, Keller (1988) asserted, “When researchers examined good schools they did not look for heroes, but they did observe that good schools usually have good principals. In response, policy makers looked for strong leadership, a term that quickly gave way among educators to “instructional leadership…(p.25).”

Research has frequently reported that efficient instructional leadership is a primary ingredient of strong schools (Gardner & Miranda, 2001; Wright, 1991; Weber, 1917;
Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). After examining studies on effective urban schools, Irvine (1988) observed that quality instruction was a common factor. Furthermore, Fullan (1991) reported that schools with greater score gains in achievement in math and reading were schools where teachers perceived their principals as strong instructional leaders. Speaking on behalf of other researchers in educational leadership, Haughey and MacElwain (1992) emphasized that instructional leadership is a fundamental component of increasing school effectiveness.

In *Instructional Leadership: Looking through the Schoolhouse Windows*, Wright (1991) identified instructional leadership as all matters that focus on improving teaching and learning. Similarly, Bossert (1982) posited that successful principals create situations to achieve school agreement on instructional programs, goals, and academic standards. Noted as one of the first researchers to study black students in poor, urban communities, Edmonds (1979) asserted that the principal is the person that all instructional personnel should look to for leadership. In an earlier study, Weber (1971) reported that effective urban schools had principals who were instrumental in setting the instructional tone of the school, helping to decide instructional strategies, and were responsible for allocating resources. In concurrence, Reeves (2000) reported from his research on urban schools that a focus on academic achievement, clear curriculum choices, frequent assessments of student progress, an emphasis on writing and external scoring were common characteristics across high poverty, minority, and high achieving schools.

Edmonds (1979, in Sweeny, 1982), distinguished strong instructional leaders as those who (a) promote an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being
oppressive, and generally conducive to the business at hand; (b) frequently monitor the success of students; (c) ensure that staff understands it is their obligation to conduct effective instruction; (d) clearly state academic goals and learning objectives; (e) develop and communicate a plan for dealing with achievement problems in reading and mathematics; and (f) demonstrate strong leadership with a mix of management and instructional skills. Citing Larsen (1987), Wright (1991) placed leadership for instruction into six domains: goal setting, coordination, supervision and evaluation, staff development, school climate, and school community relations. Furthermore, Wright (1991) identified ten specific behaviors of effective instructional leaders in which these domains are conveyed. Accordingly, efficient principals (a) ensure that school instructional goals are developed and congruent with school district policies, (b) make certain that instructional goals are clearly communicated to everyone, (c) communicate to staff high expectations for student academic performance, (d) participate in discussions concerning instruction as it impacts student achievement, (e) make certain that staffing use a systematic procedures for monitoring student progress, (f) assist teachers in securing available resources for program implementation, (g) make regular visits to classrooms, (h) evaluate curricular programs, (i) observe innovative curricular programs, and (j) establish a safe and orderly school environment with a clear discipline code.

Giving a more transformational approach to instructional leadership, Sheppard (1996) conceptualized the responsibilities and activities that are broadly referred to as instructional leadership: (a) framing school academic goals; (b) communicating school academic objectives; (c) supervising and evaluating instruction; (d) coordinating the
curriculum; (e) monitoring student progress; (f) protecting instructional time; (g) being highly visible; (h) acknowledging effective teachers by providing incentives; (i) advocating and promoting professional development; and (j) providing incentives for learning. Supporting Sheppard’s assertion while referencing her empirical observations of research on effective urban schools, Irvine (1988) stated, “Principals in these [high achieving] schools accomplished this objective [increasing and sustaining achievement] by careful and systematic monitoring of student achievement, frequent staff development sessions, and by implementing a system of meaningful rewards and incentives (p. 238).”

Sergiovanni (1999) as well as Marks and Printy (2003) noted that the traditional sense of instructional leadership characterizes the principal as being in direct command or control of all processes related to instruction. However, with the complexities associated with school restructuring for urban schools, to be effective there needs to be a shift away from the traditional method to a more shared instructional leadership between principals and teachers (Leithwood, 1994; Cosner & Peterson, 2003; Lambert, 2002; Elmore, 2000; Marsh, 2000). In concurrence, Elmore (2000) identified teachers as one of the five key players in instructional leadership by asserting that they are responsible for translating curriculum into meaningful learning experiences for students. Likewise, Gibb (1994) posited that instructional leadership cannot be dictator-like nor can it be non-assertive; some level of respect rather than an imposition on teachers best nourishes the relationship between teachers and principals regarding instructional matters. Similarly, Fullan (1991) defined effective instructional leadership as collaboration where principals work with their faculty “to shape the school as a work place in relation to shared goals, teacher
collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and student learning (p. 161).” Thus, a quality instructional leader is one who understands and value teachers’ input on curricula matters.

Although leadership in instruction is not their sole responsibility, it is a critical role for principals (WoolfOlk-Hoy & Hoy, 2006), specifically in the urban setting (Edmonds, 1979). Hallinger and Heck (1996) posited that principal leadership that makes a difference in student achievement is leadership aimed at the internal processes that are directly linked to student learning. Several studies have shown the effectiveness of strong instructional leadership on inner-city schools. For example, Levine and Ornstein (1989) conducted research on school effectiveness as it relates to inner-city schools. They reported that improvement in urban schools were successful through careful planning, curriculum alignment, and delivery of instruction. Regarding shared instructional leadership, Printy & Marks (2006) found that students perform at high levels when principals are strong instructional leaders who regard teachers as professionals and full partners on matters of instruction.

Principal as Visionary

Another recurring theme in the literature on effective leadership for urban schools is the principal providing vision. “Vision is everything for a leader (Maxwell, 1999, p. 150).” In excellent schools, strong leadership is “forceful, holding, communicating, and effectively pursing a vision (Chubb, 1988, pp. 33-34).” An accumulating body of knowledge suggests that leaders have the responsibility of creating a vision, communicating it to others, and influencing others to create and sustain a collective
mission (Black, 1998; Green, 2001; Lambert, 2002). McEwan (2003) contended that vision is defined as the driving force, which reflects the leaders’ values, beliefs, and experiences. Supporting the notion that vision comes from within the leader, Maxwell (1999) commented, “You can’t buy, beg, or borrow vision. It has to come from the inside (p. 150).” In addition to asserting that vision starts within, Maxwell listed three ways in which the phenomenon plays out in leadership: vision comes from leaders’ past and the persons around them; vision meets others’ needs; and vision assists in gathering resources (p. 150-151).

In *Principal-Centered Leadership*, Covey (1991) defined leadership for education as having to do with vision, direction, values and purposes, and moving others to work collectively to achieve a common purpose. Relating vision to education, Black (1998) and Green (2001) posited that school leaders are charged with the responsibility of having a vision, communicating it to others, and fostering collaboration for a shared vision that will lead to school achievement. Similarly, Sergiovanni (1988) claimed that effective school leaders:

- Visualize what the members of the school can do.
- Articulate a vision and build a shared covenant for the school.
- Embody the vision in the school’s structure, policies, and procedures.
- Provide a mechanism for change (pp. 202-213).

In the same vein, Dyer and Carothers (2000) asserted that quality leaders maintain a vision of what their schools could be and recognize and create opportunities for the visions to be achieved. Moreover, Schein (1985) held that effective leaders convey the
vision by certain actions and behaviors. The researcher held that a vision is manifested through effective principals by (a) what they pay attention to, measure, and manipulate; (b) how they react to critical incidents and organizational crisis; (c) how they observe criteria by which resources are allocated; (d) role-modeling, teaching, and coaching; and (e) their recruitment, selection, promotion, and excommunication processes of school personnel (p. 231). As Neuman and Fisher (2000) succinctly stated, in schools aiming to restructure into a high achieving communities, the principals’ main tasks are to provide direction and guidance for the implementation of a vision, to keep it evident in their words and actions, and to make certain that the school community remain faithful to the vision through their daily practices.

Principal as Competent Building Manager

An accumulating body of compelling research supports that leaders in urban schools need to be transformative in order to restructure schools; however, since it is still the responsibility of principals to oversee the current, daily operations of schools, effective leaders must also be competent in handling managerial matters for transactional leadership practices are necessary for organizational maintenance (Leithwood, 1992, 1994; Avolio & Bass, 1988, in Leithwood, 1994). Although educational research criticizes managerial leadership as being too technical, it is an important component of successful leadership primarily because it ensures the implementation of a school’s vision (Bush & Glover, 2003). In his research, Edmonds (1979) found that effective leadership for schools serving poor, black students in urban communities included strong management skills. An important role of a principal is that of a maintenance manger that
comprehends the over-all educational procedure and is responsible for the overall process of schooling (Bredeson, 1985). Cotton (1995) asserted that quality leaders manifest their role as manager by (a) scheduling school events that does not or minimally disrupt instruction time, (b) emphasizing the importance of protecting learning time when interacting with teachers, parents, and students, (c) organizing the school calendar to maximize learning time, (d) ensuring that the school day begins and ends on time; (e) establishing and reinforcing firm policies regarding absenteeism, tardiness, and appropriate classroom behavior for instruction, and (e) participating in in-services to improve managerial skills.

Moreover, Stronge (1993) as well as Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) supported that the principal’s role as manager should also be concerned with student discipline. Likewise, Cotton (1995) listed that (a) providing a written code of conduct, (b) developing and implementing projects to prevent crime and drug use, (c) administering discipline procedures immediately after infractions, (d) providing a written code of conduct to teachers, parents, and students, and (e) assisting students with behavioral problems to develop social interactions, and anger management skills are all managerial practices of effective school leaders.

Distinguishing managerial (Leithwood, 1999) from transformational leadership, Miller and Miller (2001) asserted:

Transactional leadership is leadership in which relationships with teachers are based upon an exchange for some valued resource. To the teacher, interaction between administrators and teachers is usually episodic, short-lived and limited to the exchange transaction. Transformational leadership is more potent and complex and occurs when one or more teachers engage with each other in such a
way that administrators and teachers raise one another to higher levels of commitment and dedication, motivation, and morality (p. 182).

Despite the distinctiveness of the two styles, transactional leadership, which is synonymous with managerial (Van Wart, 2003), is still an important form of leadership in schools. Bredeson (1985) concurred with this assertion by identifying the school leader as a maintenance manager. Bredeson held that an effective leader sees, understands, and is responsible for the educational process of a school site. Likewise, Stronge (1993) observed the principal as a maintenance manager, who is primarily concerned with the allocation of resources and student discipline. Keller (1998) found that managing a school effectively often is seen as highly favorable by central offices in education. Recognizing the confusion of the role of principals, Smith and Andrews (1989) noted, “How principals should perform their roles has been a subject of debate. The profession has struggled with whether the principal is an instructional leader or building manager… (p. 21).”

Because of the complexity of the principalship, the best of leadership is both transactional and transformational for transformational leadership practices do not replace but augments the effectiveness of transactional leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). Recognizing the value of both transformative and managerial practices, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) described effective school leaders as those who act in both capacities. Similarly, Leithwood (1999) acknowledged that most models of transformational leadership are flawed by its under representation. “Such practices [transactional] are fundamental to organizational ability (p. 454).” Thus, building on previous research (Leithwood, 1992;
Leithwood, 1994; Poplin, 1992 and Sagor, 1992), Leithwood (1999) identified ten dimensions of transformational leadership behaviors, which include transactional practices: (a) symbolizing professional practices and values; (b) developing structures to foster participation in school decisions; (c) offering individualized support; (d) giving intellectual stimulation; (e) demonstrating high performance and expectations; (f) building school vision and goals; (g) establishing effective staff practices; (h) providing instructional support; (i) monitoring school activities; and (j) providing a community focus (pp. 475-476).

Furthermore, Leithwood (1994) listed two managerial dimensions of effective leadership that had transformative practices embedded. The first was to provide contingent rewards to staff. In this dimension, the leader informs teachers and staff of the criteria for receiving incentives. Feedback is also provided about performance to enhance capacity beliefs thus making it transformative in nature. The next area was to manage by exception. This encompasses the manner in which leaders respond to problems arising from the behaviors of others in the school. Furthermore, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) suggested that effective leaders monitor and adjust the structural organization of the school such as how tasks are assigned and performed, the use of time, the acquisition and the allocation of equipment, supplies, and other resources, and all routine operating procedures of the school.

Principal as Community Builder in the Schoolhouse

Another vital leadership function that must be considered in the principal’s role in changing the culture of a school into a positive learning community is the responsibility
of creating and fostering a community-oriented school atmosphere. Prevalent in the literature is the concept of school culture as a key variable in student achievement and central to academic success (Purkey & Smith, 1983; Hargreaves, 1995; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Witziers, Bosker, Kruger, 2003; Marazno, Waters, McNutly, 2005). Studies have shown that the creation of an effective school culture and the academic attainment of students are highly correlated and that principals play a key role in establishing school practices (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Deal and Peterson (1998) defined school culture as, “Everything that goes on in schools: how staff dress, what they talk about, their willingness to change, the practice of instruction and the emphasis given to student and faculty learning (p. 28).” They further identified culture as “the underground stream of norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals that has built up over time as people work together, solve problems, and confront challenges (p. 28).” Using the term “ethos” in lieu of culture, Grant (1998) identified the ethos of schools as the shared attitudes, beliefs, and values that tie school members.

Fietler and Gudgel (1994) identified nine components of school culture that positively affect student achievement. The first area, teamwork and cooperation concerned with the shared language about instructional practices, peer observations and critiquing, and joint studying and planning (Little, 1982; Leonard & Leonard, 1999). In the decision-making domain, collaborative decision-making and shared participation was found to promote school effectiveness (Chengm 1993; see also Tschannen-Moran, 2001). A third factor in productive schools was high trust. Schools with high levels of trust and confidence among all stakeholders are more likely to make improvements (Bryk &
Schneider, 2002; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2003). With regard to responsibility and commitment, according to Fietler and Gudgel (1994), a shared strong identification and commitment to goals by school members promoted quality school cultures. The next element, general organizational practices, was found to contribute to positive learning communities when principals facilitated personal and professional growth. Another key ingredient to quality schools is having a shared vision and goals that are clear, and comprehended by the entire school community. Risk-taking, another factor in well functioning schools, deals with the degree to which school members believe they can take risks. The final part of an effective learning school community identified by Fietler and Gudgel (1994) was change and innovation. In this domain, the degree to which change is valued and the level of involvement school members have in the change process determine the affect on student achievement (Gudgel, 1997).

A learning community is one where all members feel valued, respected, and encouraged to fully participate in the school’s growth (Green, 2001). Fink and Resnick (2001) posited that the goal of a learning community is to continuously improve its capacity to teach children, to create shared responsibility and to develop collaborative inquiry for the entire school community. Moreover, Gardner and Miranda (2001) suggested that building positive school environments also required a focus on the social aspect of school.

Likewise, Peterson and Deal (2002) stated that teachers and students succeed in a school culture that fosters hard work, has a commitment to values, pays attention to problem solving, and focuses on learning for all students. From their observations of
ideal learning communities, they outlined several commonalties: (a) staff were dedicated to student success and achievement; (b) school environment reinforced hard work, mutual development, and friendly and warm relationships; (c) teacher innovation, parental involvement, and student success were praised; (d) a social network provided school news, help when needed, and background information; and (e) school was a happy, productive, and fun place with which to be affiliated.

Principal as Builder of Parental and Community Relationships

Many issues have evolved around parental and community involvement in urban schools. “Traditional bureaucratic models of schools have stressed the separate responsibilities of schools and families and emphasized inherent incomparability, competition, and conflict between families and schools (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 311).” Also, attention has been called to the loss of community and community involvement in urban schools since desegregation (Aldridge, 1999). Moreover, particularly in poor, urban schools parents are often non-participatory. This is mainly because a break in communication exists between the school personnel and parents that prevent them from understanding their interdependency for student achievement (Gardner & Miranda, 2001).

However, changes in urban schools cannot happen in isolation. It has been recognized that leaders must draw upon several environmental factors such as teachers, homes, the classroom social group, and the community to overall restructure and bring meaningful change to urban schools (Cooper, 1989). There is a compelling body of literature that view school and its surrounding neighborhood as part of an interdependent social ecology
that must be understood as a whole identity to remedy its problems and develop solutions
(Heckman, 1996; Cibulka & Kritek, 1996; Lewis; 1997; Epstein, 2002). Reiterating this point, Fullan (2000) named parents and the community as a powerful external force with which schools must contend. He stated, “The walls of the school have become more preamble and transparent. Teachers and principals operate under a microscope in a new way that they have never had to do before (p. 582).” Fullan further expressed that the new school environment is “complex, turbulent, relentless, uncertain, and unpredictable. At the same time, it has increased the demand for better performance and greater accountability (p. 582).”

Supporting this assertion is a substantial body of literature on urban education reform that draws a connection among schools, families, and communities (Heckman, Scull, & Conley, 1996; Cooper & Sherk, 1989). Strong parental and community partnerships are an important aspect of urban school success. Similarly, Irvine (1988) claimed that principals in effective, black, urban schools acknowledge the importance of viewing parents as critical partners in education and solicit assistance from community groups. Citing Comer (1995), Gardner and Miranda (2001) suggested that when schools and communities work cooperatively, students benefit and their achievement becomes a reality. Likewise, Holdzkom (2001) held that families and communities play an important role in carrying-out the school’s mission.

Thus, effective urban school principals know the importance of and cultivate relationships with community power structures and maintain appropriate relations with parents (Bossert, 1982). Such relationships foster involvement and establish resources
such as trust, information channels, and shared norms among all stakeholders essential in transforming schools (Coleman, 1990). For example, urban school districts serve a myriad of neighborhoods that can play a significant role in making the environment around the school conducive to learning. This role requires neighborhood citizens to work positively with school personnel (Bartz & Evans, 1989).

Epstein (1986; 1987, in Tschannen-Moran, 2001) listed five types of parental involvement in schools: (a) parents provide students with a general well-being and readiness for school; (b) school personnel keep an open communication with parents, informing them of school’s activities and their children’s progress; (c) schools set places for parents to volunteer as well as encourage their attendance to performances and participation in school workshops; (d) parents become involved in learning activities at home; and (e) schools include parents in the decision-making process.

Additionally, Cotton (1990) held that parental involvement also occurs by giving parents instructional techniques for helping students learn; developing written policies for involvement, which legitimizes its importance; and providing ongoing support for participation efforts. In regard to community members, Cotton (1995) suggested that effective leaders in urban schools (a) involve community members in school-wide and classroom activities; (b) collaborate with community agencies and volunteers to provide athletic and other activities for schools; (c) enlist community members in designing school programs; (d) assist needy families to access appropriate health and social facilities and providers; (e) engage community participation in school-based management programs; (f) publish standards and indicators of school quality and distribute to
community members and (g) involve business, industry, and labor in helping identifying learning outcomes and in providing opportunities for school learning in work-place settings. Acknowledging the importance of synergy for school effectiveness, Kincheloe (2004) averred,

Connectedness is central dimension of a critical vision of urban educational and social change. There is no limit to what can happen when urban teachers possess the intellectual and interpersonal savvy to forge relationships based on a vision of educational purpose, dignity, respect, and political solidarity, and cooperation with the local community (p. 16).

Principal as Leader for Social Justice

Aaronshon maintained,

All education is political. Traditional education serves the status quo. You risk your job when you encourage students to find their own voices, to engage in dialogue with you and with each other about the issues that affect their lives; but you risk their lives if you do not (p.44).

Thus, “a leadership of urban schools that is grounded in the tenets of critical discourse is essential. It is a necessary precursor to the development of urban schools that work (Dantley, 1990, p. 593).” Although an early text, the work of Cater G. Woodson (1993/1933) succinctly explained the need for a social just leader in urban education. In *The Mis-Education of the Negro*, Woodson asserted,

The same educational process which inspires and stimulates the oppressor with the thought that he is everything worthwhile, depresses and crushes at the same time the spark of genius in the Negro by making him feel that his race does not amount to much and never will measure up to the standard of other people (xiii).

He further declared,

We have very few teachers because most of them with whom we are afflicted know nothing about the children with whom they teach or about their parents who influence the pupils more than the teachers themselves. When a boy comes to school without knowing his lesson he should be studied instead of being punished (p. 145).
Urban school leaders are being called to take on the role of “transformative intellects…critical intellects…who engage in critical analysis of the conditions that have perpetuated historical inequities in school and who work to change institutional structures and culture (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy 2005, p. 202).” According to Astin and Astin (2000, in Shields, 2004), transformative leaders believe that “the leadership should be to enhance equity, social justice, and quality of life (p. 123).” Through various studies, researchers have shown that strong leaders in poor school communities recognize rather than ignore the life of the students and communities they serve (Larson & Murtadha, 2002).

One area where leadership for social justice is critical is curriculum. “The issue of what constitutes curriculum…the knowledge selected and disseminated in classrooms is of no small consequence (Gordon, 1993, p. 220).” In the *Politics of a National Curriculum*, Apple (1995) posited,

> Education is deeply implicated in the politics of culture. Its curriculum is never simply a neutral assemblage of knowledge, somehow appearing in texts and classrooms of a nation. It is always a part of some group’s vision of legitimate knowledge. It is produced of the cultural, political, and economic conflicts, tensions, and compromises that organize and disorganize a society (p. 345).

Furthermore, Apple noted that many social texts continue to speak of the “Dark Ages” when referring to the “age of African and Asian Ascendancy” and identify civil rights leader Rosa Parks as a woman who was simply too tired to relieve herself of her seat rather than discussing her as part of an organized entity with an intent of boycotting. Moreover, Apple (1995) averred, differential power intrudes into the very heart of curriculum, teaching, and evaluation. He conceived,
What counts as knowledge, the ways in which knowledge is organized, who is empowered to teach it, what counts as an appropriate display of having learned it, and—just as critically—who is allowed to ask and answer all of these questions are part of how dominance and subordination are reproduced and altered in society (p. 346).

In *Ideology and Curriculum*, Apple (1990) asserted that schools contributed to inequality by being “tacitly organized to differentially distribute specific kinds of knowledge (p. 43).” Apple held that this was done by the “tacit teaching to students of norms, values, and dispositions that goes on simply by their living in and coping with the institutional expectations and routines of schools, day in and day out… (p. 14).”

Thus, effective leaders understand the politics of curriculum and how it relates to the lack of achievement of students in urban schools, mainly students of color. Particularly in urban schools, quality leaders, those who empower students, “pay attention to the ‘stuff’ of curriculum, where knowledge comes from, whose knowledge it is, what social groups support it, and so on (Apple, 1990, p. 14).” “The leadership in such efforts to ‘reform’ our educational system and its curriculum, teaching, and evaluative practices is largely exercised by the rightist coalition, we need always to ask ‘whose reforms are these’ and ‘who benefits?’ (Apple, 1995, p. 360).”

Moreover, instruction for low achievers generally appears to be pace instruction, and mechanical rote learning rather than cognitive growth and thinking (Levine, Levine, & Eubanks, 1985). Supporting this notion while arguing that American public schools provide different educational experiences and curriculum knowledge to students in different social class, Jean Anyon (1980) conducted a study using various schools across class lines. Her findings showed that students in the working class school had repressive
teaching, rote learning, and little creative and analytical thinking opportunities; contrarily, students in upper class schools were taught to think critically, solve complex problems, and develop skills of linguistic, artistic, and scientific expression.

Researchers posited that changing this pattern of instruction in urban schools requires a reorganization of leaders’ roles. Summarizing research that generalized instructional-related policies and their implementation for effective urban schools, Levine et al. (1985) reported that instruction at effective inner-city schools was outcome based; they used unusually effective arrangements for low achieving students; gave coordinated instruction within and across grade levels; avoided dangers and pitfalls commonly encountered in implementing outcomes-based education; had faculty that expressed allegiance to operationalize; shared values and goals through instructional and organizational arrangements that improved students’ learning; implemented organically rather than bureaucratically; and components of the overall instructional approach were carefully selected to form a unified whole, particularly with reference to whether the general goal is to be incremental improvement or fundamental reform for instruction (p. 324).

Also, on many occasions schools are not contextually sensitive, making a need for a social just leader apparent. Clark (1983) stated that the pedagogical behaviors of some teachers in urban schools sometimes lead to a “values mismatch” with students in the classroom. Consequently teachers may make inaccurate, prejudicial, and stereotypical assessments about students’ abilities, and behaviors (Gardner & Miranda, 2001). Likewise, Murrell (2002) posited that the current and contemporary teaching practices in
urban schools lack a pedagogy that fully considers the cultural and social dimensions of
the mental development of African American learners. Providing an example in the field
of psychology, White (1972) expressed the same sentiment when he narrates,

A simple journey with the white researcher into the black home may provide us with
some insight into how such important, but somewhat erroneous, conclusions are
reached…During his visit…the researcher may not find familiar aspects of white
culture such as Book-of-the-Month selections, records of Broadway plays, magazines
such as Harpers…or the New York Review…He also might observe a high noise
level, continuously reinforced by inputs from blues-and-rhythm radio stations, TV
programs, and several sets of conversations going at once. This type of observation
leads him to assume that the homes of black children are very weak in intellectual
content…Somehow he fails to see the intellectual stimulation that might be provided
by local black newspapers…and the Motown sound (pp. 43-44).

Gordon (1982) too supports this position in Towards a Theory of Knowledge

Acquisition for Black Students. The author noted that black children are more oriented to
a socially interactive environment and can learn better in classrooms of this nature. In
contrast, Gordon contended that schools promote minimal social interaction, and
individualized and competitive work, all characteristics of the dominant society. Thus,
black students are often bored and inattentive in school, it is also relatively unstimulating,
constraining, monotonous and comparable to suburbia culture (Gordon, 1982). Likewise,
Edwards, Gonslaves, and Willie (2000) claimed that “The School Reform Movement…is
being shaped by networks of predominately White business, legislative, and educational
elites…and schools now seem to be focusing more on instruction…the instructional
frameworks they employ are often incompatible with black cultural and pedagogical
traditions…(p. 252).” The authors further asserted, “the school reform movement has
imposed a technocratic, de-personalized, and unnecessarily punitive instructional
framework in the process of education, thus suppressing the humane and relational
approaches to learning that are traditional within African American educational, cultural and social experience (p. 253).” Relating this notion to all ethnic minorities, Harrison et al. (1990) posited that minority ethnic children are taught to think, feel, and act in ways that are cooperative rather than competitive.

Shields (2004) asserted that principals who are transformative and effective in building close relationships within schools: (a) overcome pathologies of silence; (b) acknowledge ethnicity; (c) recognize class; and (d) become inclusive. Furthermore, the researcher developed three avenues in which leaders create urban schools that promote social justice. The first approach was to develop a guiding framework to ensure that action and intentions maintain a social justice focus. The next manner was to exam the practices of the school. The final suggestion was to take responsibility for student achievement albeit their circumstances outside of school (Shields, 2004).

Speaking on issues that students in urban communities encounter, Gardner and Miranda (2001) asserted, “When educators look at the world from the adolescent’s perspective they see the harsh realities that the children contend with daily…These realities can negatively impact both social and academic behaviors of students (p. 258).” However, if school personnel fail to see students’ lives contextually, Kunjufu (1986) explained, the social and cultural disconnections, particularly between black students and their white teachers, become reflected in the disproportionate suspension rates and special education placement of black students. For example, African American students are more likely to be placed in classes for students with mental disabilities and less likely to be placed in gifted education (Gardner, Ford, & Miranda, 2001; Kozol, 1991). “The reality
is that an unequal education process continues in America, despite legal and moral mandates (Gardner, Ford, & Miranda, 2001, p. 241).” Consequently, strong leaders of urban schools acknowledge the conditions their students are faced with, recognize the inequities of the American public educational system, and perform accordingly.

**Principal as Trustworthy**

For reiteration, an accumulating body of research has shown that principals set the culture of the school (Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Peterson & Deal, 2002). Moreover, studies reveal that trust is an important component of effective organizations (Tschannen-Moran, 2002 & 2004; Bryk & Schneider 2002; Couch & Jones, 1997; Kramer, 1999). Thus, as Tschannen-Moran (2004) stated,”Trustworthy leaders are the heart of successful schools (p. 184).” Effective leaders for urban education reform assist their schools in developing authentic and optimal confidence, which emerges when people develop deep and abiding trust in one another (Tschennan-Moran, 2004). This being the case, if schools are to benefit from the effects of a trusting environment where school personnel, students, parents, and communities members (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) work collaboratively, it is the responsibility of principals to build and foster genuine relationships, beginning primarily with their trusting and trustworthy behavior (Whitener et al., 1998, in Tschannen-Moran, 2004); for schools stand little chance of restructuring without strong bonds of trust among members (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Although social scientists have given considerable attention to the phenomenon of trust, just like leadership, a clear, universal definition remains elusive (Kramer, 1997). Thus, trust has been defined in diverse ways. For example, Rotter (1967) named it as a
generalized expectancy. Hosmer (1995) defined trust as the expectation of actions being morally and ethically grounded. Moving away from a global perspective of trust (Couch & Jones, 1997), some researchers characterize it as related to specific relationships. For instance, Remple et al. (1985) described trust as the confidence level a person has in a relationship with another. Likewise, Robinson (1996) termed trust as the expectations, assumptions, or beliefs that the actions of another will be consistent and not detrimental to personal interests. Moreover, after reviewing the literature on trust, Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined it as, “one’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent (p. 17).”

Tschannen-Moran (2004) outlined the need for trusting leadership for all stakeholders in education. She argued that teachers rely on trust in order to cope with the complexities, stresses, changes, and the demands of the teaching profession. Students, according to Tschannen-Moran, need trust to actively participate in the educational process and to take full advantage of their afforded opportunities. She further contended that schools need trusting relationships with parents and the broader community to garner additional resources, develop partnerships, and to increase parental involvement in their children’s educational process.

Building on the work of Sizer (1988), Putnam (1993), Gonder and Hymes (1994), and Fukuyama (1995) while correlating trust levels and academic performance, Bryk and Schneider (2002) found social trust as a major attribute to school effectiveness. Their 1997 study of Chicago’s schools found that schools with high levels of trust were far more likely to make improvements over time than those with low levels. Recognizing the
complexity of urban education, they noted that trust alone did not solve the problems individual schools faced, but the absence of trust made school restructuring more difficult.

Furthermore, based on their own empirical observations and external research Bryk and Schneider (2002) held that leaders create and cultivate trust in four domains. First, principals respect the input of teachers, parents, students, and community members in the educational process. In this capacity, the principal genuinely listens and values the sentiments of other stakeholders. For example, trust is apparent when teachers feel liberated in speaking on matters regarding their work and have confidence that subsequent actions executed by their principal will take their concerns into account.

Unlike the work of teachers whose practice typically occurs in the privacy of their classroom, the managerial competence of principals is easily ascertained (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Thus, the next area in which the authors hypothesized that principals convey trust is through their competence: the ability to effectively carry out their obligations. Having a personal regard for others is another domain denoted by the authors. Bryk and Schneider (2002) claimed that when principals express personal regard for their constituents, they “tap into a vital lifeline and, consequently, important psychological rewards are likely to result (p. 25).” Furthermore, when school community members feel they are cared for, “they experience a social affiliation of personal meaning and value (p. 25).” Integrity in this context means the principals’ actions are congruent to what they say. One of the ways this is manifested is when principals speak out against central office policies that are inconsistent with advancing the best interest of the
students, the primary principle of school. Actions of this sort publicly affirm principals’ commitment to the school community (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Complimenting the work of Bryk & Schneider (2002), Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined five facets in which principals convey trust. The first being benevolence, which is concerned with the faith that a person’s well being or personal interest will be protected by another party. The researcher asserted that school leaders display benevolence by showing consideration and empathy to the needs of teachers, protecting their rights, and not exploiting them for self interests. Tschannen-Moran (2004) also identified honesty as being a fundamental facet of trust. She held that honesty is related to a “person’s character, their integrity, and authenticity (p. 22).” Similar to Bryk & Schneider’s (2002) concept of integrity, honesty reflects the correspondence between what principals say and how they behave. For example, honesty is achieved when principals unveil a new vision or new programs and implement as well as uphold the principles of their own initiatives (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Openness, which is concerned with people making themselves vulnerable to others by disclosing personal information, influence, and control, is another domain of trust defined by the author. School leaders show openness in information by “disclosing facts, alternatives, judgments, intentions, and feelings (p. 25).” An example of openness to influence is when school-site administrators permit others to initiate change. Manifestation of openness in control occurs when principals include others to participate in the decision making process and allow them to execute important tasks. Reliability, the ability that a person can depend on another consistently, is another manner in which trust
functions in schools claimed Tschannen-Moran (2004). Principals garner trust by showing consistency in their actions, and providing continual dependability to their school community. The final discernment of trust noted by Tschannen-Moran (2004), which is also an identical domain in Bryk & Schneider (2002), is competence. Along the same lines of Bryk & Schneider, competence specifically relates to the ability to perform a task as expected.

“Virtually all recent studies on urban schools arrive at the same conclusion; change must occur (Bartz & Evans, 1989, 73).” The characterization of quality leadership practices described above show that this change is possible. The leadership ability of the principal is a major determinant in the success of transforming schools into high achieving learning communities. Effective leaders in urban education are not only competent in technical matters of managing a school, but know the primary intent is to provide quality education to all students, despite their circumstances, as well as recognize the synergistic power of involving, empowering, respecting, and understanding all stakeholders pertinent to the reform process.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Framework

Lunenburg and Ornstein (2004) defined social systems as “the activities and interactions of group members brought together for a common purpose (p.73).” Thus, by this definition schools can be seen as social systems (Charters, 1952). In accordance, Deci et al. (1991) suggested that, “In their formative first two decades, individuals spend about 15,000 [hours] in school. Thus schools represent a primary socializing influence that has enormous impact on the course of people’s lives and, in turn, on society (p. 325).” In the same vein, Schneider (2005) asserted that those interested in educational reform have come to realize the importance of understanding the social context of schooling and how it affects the actions and attitudes of its stakeholders. Thus, educational sociologists rely on theories and knowledge of social systems to examine the conditions that drive changes in organizations, instruction, curricula, and learning (Schneider, 2005).

As noted by Charters (1952), a valuable conceptual framework for understanding school as a social system is found in Talcott Parson’s theory of social system. According to Parsons social systems have mutually dependent parts; these parts contribute to the functioning of a system; and they maintain equilibrium until a disturbance induces a
counter-reaction. Furthermore, the Parsonian theory posits that social action or interaction is a system that responds to other interdependent conditions (Perdue, 1986).

Delineating his theory, Parson (1971, in Lemert, 2004) considered social systems to be the more general system of action with the other primary constituents being behavioral organisms, personality systems, and cultural systems. The distinctions among the four are functional, namely adaptation, goal attainment, pattern-maintenance, and integration. The behavioral organism is conceived as adaptation. This action involves people processing information and interacting behaviorally with the physical environment. Goal attainment, attributed to the personality of a person, is concerned with the motivation behind gratification. Next, pattern maintenance, which functions as the cultural system, deals with the decoding of the symbolic meanings that construct human traditions and customs where culturally influenced action promotes continuity. The final facet of Parson’s theory is integration. Attributed to the social system function, this entails the coordination and bonding of members by means of normative constraints.

Using the premise of schools as social organizations, a number of theoretical perspectives guide this study. Each will be discussed briefly.

Relational Trust Theory

The primary framework to guide this study is Relational Trust Theory (RTT). Trust is an important construct in personality and in understanding development, communication, personal relationships, organizational behavior (Couch & Jones, 1997), and is an important factor in relationship development (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1983). RTT argues that trust needs to be conceptualized not only as a calculative orientation
toward risk, but also a social orientation toward other people (Kramer, 1999). Thus, it is concerned with systematically incorporating the social and related underpinnings of trust related choices (Kramer, 1999; Tyler & Kramer, 1996). Moreover, it focuses primarily on specific relational partnerships (Remple, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985).

RTT refers to a person’s level of confidence in the strength of a relationship and the positive feelings afforded to it (Couch & Jones, 1997). As social interactions occur, individuals simultaneously observe the behavior of others, pay attention to the processes being deployed to maintain a desired outcome, determine how they personally feel about these interactions, and question their beliefs about the underlying intentions that motivated the other party to act. Moreover, relational trust diminishes when people perceive that others are not behaving in a manner that is inconsistent with their role obligations. Furthermore, fulfillment to obligations is not just doing what is expected and right, but also doing it in a manner that is reverent and performing for the right reasons (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Applying RTT to schools, Bryk and Schneider (2002) saw social exchanges of schooling as situated around a distinct set of role relationships among principals, teachers, parents, and students where parties in a role relationship understand their position and have expectations of the roles of the other parties. In addition, maintenance and growth of relational trust in any given role set embodies harmony in mutual expectations and obligations (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Their interpretation of relational trust theorizes that schools work well when this synchrony is achieved.
In their work, the authors defined three approaches to trust. Their first theoretical perspective of trust is organic trust. This type of trust is predicated on the unquestioning beliefs of individuals in the moral authority of a social institution. Individuals grant their trust unconditionally and believe in the rightness of the system, the moral character of the leader, and others who commit to the community. In this form of trust a strong sense of identity with the social organization is fostered, daily social exchanges provide members with a broad range of personal rewards, and members enact in their daily lives a core set of beliefs that embodies moral value (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). The next form of trust is contractual. The bases of social exchange in this domain are material and instrumental. Moreover, a contract, which explicitly delineates the scope of work or service, guides the occurrences of the parties involved. Because a contractual agreement is the premise of interaction, legal actions can be taken if any party is not satisfied with an outcome.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) claimed that neither organic trust nor contractual trust is appropriate for schools. Organic trust does not work because schools are now more open and diverse. Consequently, there are few core beliefs that can be agreed upon by all members. Contractual trust does not fit within the framework of school because (a) the aims of schools are multiple and interrelated; (b) the specific mechanisms that contribute to student learning are complex and diffuse; and (c) to monitor best practices is logistically not feasible.

The final form of trust identified by Bryk and Schneider (2002), relational trust, recognizes the value and shortcomings of both organic trust and contractual trust. Relational trust is an intermediate case between the unquestioning of beliefs found in
organic trust and the material and instrumental exchanges directing contractual trust. Contrast to contractual trust, in this form of trust, legal redress is not the consequence of trust being broken; in relational trust, people simply redraw their trust when expectations are not being met, thus, weakening or even severing relationships between parties.

Formally, Bryk and Schneider contended that relational trust has essentially three levels. The first is intrapersonal, where complex cognitive activity is utilized to discern that intentions of others. The next facet is the interpersonal level. This is where the intrapersonal discernments occur within a set of role relations that are formed by the institutional structure of schooling and by the specific cultures of an individual school and school community. The final facet is consequential, which is concerned with the affects on the parties and organizations involved of these trust relations (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Relational trust has four interconnected considerations in which relational trust is formed: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity. Respect in this regard involves the recognition of the important role each party (principal, teachers, parents, community, and students) plays in the success of schools. The second criteria, competence, relates to the principals’ ability to effectively execute formal role responsibilities. Identified as a the most powerful dimension of trust discernment, personal regard for others is noted as the actions taken by a member of a role set to reduce another’s sense of vulnerability. In this domain, interpersonal trust deepens when people see that others care about them and are willing to extend themselves beyond their role. The final criterion identified by the authors is integrity. Integrity has to do with
consistency between what people say and do and implies that a moral ethical perspective
guide one’s work (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Contingency Theory

Fielder’s (1971) Contingency Theory (CT) has some relevance to this research. This theory argues that the most effective organizational structure depends on the nature of the work being undertaken and by the environmental demands the organization has to negotiate (Lunenburg & Orinstein, 2004; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004).

Specifically, contingency theorists maintain that the group atmosphere, the task structure, the leader’s power position (Fielder, 1971), the complexity of the environment, the age of the organization (Muijs, et al., 2004), the conditions of work, the tasks to be completed, and the preferences of subordinates (Lunenburg & Orinstein, 2004) determine the effective approach to leadership. In the context of schooling, to run effectively, school leaders must acknowledge both the culture of their internal organizations and policies and the situational factors with which they must contend in order to be successful (Muijus, et al., 2004).

Self-determination Theory

Similarly, another important theoretical stance pertinent to this research is the motivational perspective of Deci and Ryan (2000): Self-determination Theory (SDT). SDT theorizes that it is part of human nature to “engage in activities, to exercise capacities, to pursue connectedness in social groups, and to integrate intra-physic and interpersonal experiences into a relative unity (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 229).”
Although humans are endowed with intrinsic motivational tendencies, an accumulating body of research has shown that the maintenance and fostering of intrinsic motivation requires supportive conditions (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2000). Thus, SDT not only pays attention to the biological endowments that ignites motivation, it also acknowledges and stresses the importance of the social contexts in which people are situated that results in their self-motivation, positive energy, and seamless integration into situations, domains, and cultures. In short, SDT specifies factors that nurture innate human potentials entailed in growth, integration, and well being, and explores the processes and conditions that foster the healthy development and function of individuals, groups and communities (p. 74).

Followers of SDT postulate that individuals have three innate psychological needs -- competence, autonomy, and relatedness -- which, if satisfied, promote self-motivation and a positive well being (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci et al. 1991). The basic premise of self-determination theory is that social contexts that support peoples’ requisite for competence, autonomy, and relatedness will promote self-motivated, intentional behavior. Along the same lines, a direct corollary of the SDT perspective is that people will tend to pursue goals, domains, and relationships that will accommodate their need satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

With relation to SDT, competence is concerned with understanding how to attain various external and internal outcomes while being effective in performing the actions (Deci et al., 1991). Simply, it means excelling at challenging tasks and being able to attain desired outcomes (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004). Autonomy embodies experiencing
choice of and feeling like the initiator and regulator of one’s own action (Deci et al., 1991; Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004). Relatedness is concerned with establishing a sense of mutual respect and reliance with others (Baard, Deci, and Ryan, 2004) as well as people developing a secure and satisfying connection to their social environment (Deci et al., 1991).

Along with looking at how social environments influence the process of self-motivation, SDT is also concerned with the method through which non-intrinsic (external) behavior becomes genuinely self-determined (intrinsic) (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Citing, Schafer (1968) Deci et al. (1991) defined internalization as a “proactive manner through which people transform regulation by external contingencies into regulation by internal processes (p. 328).” Building on the notion on of internalization, SDT identifies four types of extrinsic motivation: external, introjected, identified, and integrated forms of regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). External regulation, which is found to be the most undermining of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000), is performed to satisfy an outside demand or reward contingency (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Introjected regulation is control accepted but not as one’s own. This form of regulation involves internalized rules or demands that cause one to avoid guilt or to obtain self-pride or self-aggrandizement (Deci et al., 1991). Identification is concerned with the process through which people recognize and accept the underlying value of a behavior (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The final domain of extrinsic motivation is integration. In this capacity people value the goal or regulation in such a way that action is accepted as personally important (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
Theorists of the SDT tradition contend that people are inherently motivated to internalize and integrate within themselves activities that are uninteresting for the effective functioning of a social world (Deci et al., 1991). However, this can only be achieved if opportunities to satisfy competence, autonomy, and relatedness are present in an environment. Catering to these three psychological needs facilitate self-motivation and effective functioning because they promote internalization of external values and regulatory processes (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004). SDT posits that when the internalization process functions optimally, people will identify with the importance of social regulations, incorporate them into their integrated sense of self, and fully accept it as their own. Moreover, they will become more integrated intra-physically as well as socially (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Critical Theory

The final theory to direct this study is critical theory. Freire (1972) defined critical thinking as “Thinking, which discerns an indivisible solidarity between the world and men (In Crotty, 2004, p. 148).” Critical theory is social theory oriented toward critiquing and changing society as a whole. Theorists in this tradition illuminate the connection between power and culture while viewing culture with great suspicion (Crotty, 2004). Moreover, it pays close attention to power relationships to expose relations that promote social injustice and hegemony. Similarly, Kincheole, and McLaren (1994) contended that critical theory disrupts and challenges the status quo. Furthermore, critical theory is not a piece of action that achieves it objectives and comes to a close; it is an ongoing process, which requires continual critique (Crotty, 2004).
Kincheloe and McLaren (1994, pp. 139-140, in Crotty, 2004) listed several theoretical assumptions that guide the social and cultural criticism of theorists in this tradition. The first assumption is that power relations that are social in nature and are historically constituted guide all thought. Furthermore, critical theorists assume that facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from ideological inscription. Next is a belief that the relationship between concept and object, and between signifier and signified, is unstable and frequently mediated by capitalist production and consumption. Also, critical theorists posit that language is central to the formation of subjectivity. Related to hegemony, followers of critical theory contend that certain groups in any society are privileged over others, creating an oppression that is more potent when subordinates accept their position as natural. Finally, critical theorists maintain that oppression comes in many forms and are interconnected.

Research Questions

After reviewing current literature on effective leadership, educational social reform, and issues in urban education the over-arching questions this study seeks to answer are:

*Overarching Questions*

Given the research showing the benefits of relational trust transforming urban schools into positive learning communities, and the dependency of teachers to implement change for student achievement, does relational trust exist between principals and teachers in urban schools where the school site administrators have been identified as
effective? Also, how are principals developing and creating trusting relationships with their teachers?

**Sub Questions**

The following sub questions will guide the research: According to the review of the literature, my empirical observations, data collection, and interviews…

1. What issues are pertinent and prevalent in an urban educational setting?
2. Why is social reform, specifically establishing trust, equally important as technical reform (e.g. policy, curriculum, and instruction efforts), in changing school culture in urban areas?
3. What are the specific skills and traits needed by a leader to establish trust among stakeholders?
4. How do principals establish respect?
5. How do principals maintain their integrity?
6. How do principals exhibit personal regard for others?
7. How do principals interact with teachers, school personnel, students, parents, and other community members?
8. How do principals recognize and accommodate for the socially constructed oppression faced by their students and families they serve?
9. What are principals doing that go beyond their call of duty?
10. What routines are established at the school?
11. How do principals communicate with teachers?
12. How do principals enlist teacher involvement?

13. What incentives are in place to reward good teaching behaviors and practices?

Methodology

The study has multiple purposes. Primarily, it presents an argument for social reform as a manner in changing school cultures, with specific attention given to Bryk and Schneider’s (2002) concept of building relational trust. The authors hypothesized that in order for principals to have effective schools and positive social relationships with their faculty they must have (a) respect, (b) competence, (c) personal regard for others, and (d) integrity. The four tenets of relational trust were used as a guide to survey, observe, interview, analyze, and describe the principal-teacher relations of an identified effective leader.

Sample

The research topic and design called for a selection of an urban school principal who was identified as effective a leader, a portion of the school’s teacher population and subsequently a selection of that population for the purpose of a focus group. In conjunction with being an effective leader in an urban setting, I was particularly interested in a principal situated in school setting with a large number of African American students. Due to the graduate committee members’ extensive work with the local urban school district, several noted principals within the district were referred. In quantitative research this type of non-probability sampling is called purposive sampling. In this form of subject selection, sample elements are assumed to be typical, or
representative of the population (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006). Similarly, in qualitative research this form of subject selection, called snowball, chain or network sampling, is not unusual. Glesne (1999) defined this sampling method as the researcher obtaining knowledge of potential cases from persons who meet the research interests. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) noted that “in qualitative research, selection requires that the researcher delineate precisely the relevant population of phenomenon for investigation using criteria based on theoretical or conceptual considerations, personal curiosity, empirical characteristics, or some other considerations (p.64).”

Two principals were contacted and agreed to participate in the study. Due to schedule conflicts only one principal was able to participate in the study. Once a principal was identified, he was contacted via electronic mail to obtain his participation in a research project for a doctoral dissertation that aimed to explore if relational trust exist between his teachers and he. Following the principal solicitation, teachers were asked to participate in a survey. Subsequently, eight teachers participated in the focus group.

The principal involved in the study led an urban school in a large, Midwestern city. The teaching staff reflected the literature on urban teacher demographic, being majority white and female. In the same vein, students at the school mirrored the research on urban school student population, serving predominately African Americans.

Research Design

The methodology adopted in this study is a mixed-method model within a case study design. An integrated method design is one that includes at least one quantitative and one qualitative practice (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The former is designed to
collect numerical information and the latter is created to solicit narrative data (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Borkan, 2004; Smith, 2006). Detailing the intent of a multiple-model design, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) asserted that it is a “class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (non-positivist) research techniques, methods, and approaches, concepts, or language in a single study (p. 17.).”

*Positivist Paradigm*. Researchers in the quantitative paradigm follow a positivist perspective. From their point of view science is characterized by empirical research, there is only one truth, and all phenomena can be reduced to empirical indicators that represent that truth (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). Moreover, quantitative purists assume that social science is objective and social observations should be treated as entities in much the same way that physical scientist treat physical phenomena (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Reiterating this point, Falconer and Mackay (1999) noted that positivists seek to explain and predict what takes place in the social world by searching for regularities and casual relationships between constituents and elements; thus, research designs in this paradigm place emphasis on early identification and development of a research question, set of hypotheses, choice of site, and establishment of sampling strategies, and specification of research strategies and methods of analysis that will be implemented (Falconer & Mackay, 1999).

*Non-Positivist Paradigm*. In contrast, the qualitative paradigm, which is guided by non-positivist assumptions, is based on interpretivism, relativism, and constructivism. Under these lenses the social world is relativistic and can only be comprehended from the
point of view of the individuals who are directly associated with the phenomena understudy. Thus, according to followers of this school, there are multiple realities for reality is socially constructed (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). Moreover, non-positivists research is characterized by the detail observation and involvement of the researchers in the natural setting. Researchers in this school avoid a commitment to theoretical constructs and the formulation of hypotheses prior to gathering data (Falconer & Mackay, 1999). Qualitative research techniques include focus group interviews and participant observation, where the subjects in the study are not selected to represent large populations; the small purposeful samples are used to provide rich information (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002).

Integrating methods in a research design has come with criticism (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). Typically the dispute between qualitative and quantitative purists has been presented as two competing paradigms (Winchester, 1999). For example qualitative researchers criticize their quantitative counterparts for being superficial and lacking validity. In the same vein, quantitative researchers label qualitative studies as being unrepresentative, impressionistic, subjective, and unreliable (Fry, Chantavanich, & Chantavanich, 1981). Similarly, Peshkin (1988) contrasted the qualitative and quantitative modes of inquiry by noting that quantitative researchers look hard but seldom more than once while qualitative researchers tend to observe repeatedly and in varying modes and times. Purists on both sides claim that research methods are tied to paradigms and the paradigmatic distinction make integrating qualitative and quantitative methods incommensurable; therefore, according to purists “to use more than one method
is to enter contested territory (Smith, 2006, p. 460).” Johnson and Onwegbuzie (2004)
noted that both quantitative and qualitative purists view their paradigms as “ideal for
research, and, implicitly if not explicitly, they advocate the incompatibility thesis (p.
14).” In the same vein, purists on both sides argue that the attributes of their respective
paradigm cannot be segmented or divided; making a mixed-method design where
qualitative and quantitative methods are integrated, conceptualized, and implemented
neither possible nor sensible (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989).

In the literature on integrating both research approaches, criticism beyond
theoretical differences exist. Supporting this position, Sale, Lohfeld and Brazil (2002)
asserted that,

The underlying assumptions of the qualitative and quantitative paradigms result
in differences, which extend beyond philosophical and methodological debate. The two paradigms have given rise to different journals, different sources of
funding, different expertise, and different methods. There are even distinctions in scientific language used to describe them (p. 45).”

Similarly, Borkan (2004) stated that the differences in audiences, reviewers, and journals
for methods may result in separate publishing of the data derived from an integrated
model. Another criticism for using mix-methods is its novelty. Borkan (2004) noted that
a major impediment for conducting integrated method studies is that the practical and
theoretical paths are still relatively new, making their execution complex to accomplish.
Agreeing with the novelty argument while citing more drawbacks, Johnson and
Onwegbuzie (2004) argued that mixed method research (a) remains to be worked out
fully because of its novelty; (b) may be difficult for a single researcher to conduct given
its possible complexity; (c) forces the researcher to learn about multiple methods and
approaches to understanding how to integrate appropriately; (d) can be more expensive; and (e) is more time consuming.

Albeit the large body of literature contesting combining quantitative and qualitative practices into a single study, the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods has synergistic effects (Madey, 1982). Clarke and Yaros (1988) noted that combining research methods is useful in many areas of research, because of the complexity of some phenomena requires data from a large number of perspectives. Making an argument for combining methods in educational research, Smith (2006) posed the following inquiries,

What is the nature of teaching? How does learning work? Why classrooms are organized the way they are? How can schools for children of poverty be made more effective and just? If researchers seek the answers to such important questions…why would they not engage in all the means available (p. 457)?

Contesting the belief that the attributes of their respective paradigm cannot be segmented or divided held by both qualitative and quantitative purists (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989), many researchers have taken a position that methods are theoretically neutral and that mixing methods is largely a practical matter. Moreover, some argue that qualitative and quantitative research are not distinct but part of the whole thinking process, thus making integrating models a formalization of what researchers already do (Smith, 2006).

In total contrast of the purist perspective, several have argued for mixed-methods using a pragmatic perspective. According to followers of this theoretical standpoint, the pragmatic rule fits together the insights provided by both types of research into a workable solution (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) as well as informs how research can
be mixed fruitfully (Hoshmand, 2003). According to Maxcy (2003, in Smith, 2006), pragmatists assert, “inquiry cannot be reduced to mechanical, technical procedures, but instead constitutes a problem-solving using a variety of methods including ‘imagination, reasoning, or statistical calculation’… (p. 460).” Arguing pragmatically, Reichart and Cook (1979, in Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989) suggested that paradigm attributes are logically independent and therefore can be integrated to achieve the combination most appropriate for a given inquiry or problem. Inquiry flexibility and adaptiveness are needed to determine what is best for the problem understudy, for the practical demands of the problem are primary.

Borkan (2004) argued that using mixed-method designs not only expand the research tool box, “they also provide the opportunity for synthesis of research traditions and give the investigator additional perspectives and insights that are beyond the scope of any single technique (p. 2).” Along the same lines, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) declared, “many research questions and combinations of questions are best used and most fully answered through mixed research solutions (p. 18).” After discussing some of the basic philosophical assumptions of both positivists and non-positivists, Sale, Lohfeld, and Brazil (2002) listed several viewpoints as to why qualitative and quantitative research can be complementary. According to their assertions (a) the two forms of research can be integrated because they share the goal of understanding the world; they share a unified logic, and the same rules of inference apply to both; (b) both use tenets of theory-ladness of facts, fallibility of knowledge, indetermination of theory by fact, and a value-laden inquiry process; (c) they are united by a common goal of disseminating knowledge for
practical use, and a shared commitment for rigor, conscientious, and critique in the research process; (d) finally, they argued that researchers should not preoccupy themselves with philosophical debates because the qualitative-quantitative debate will not be resolved in the near future and epistemically purity does not get the research accomplished.

Another argument for combining methods is made by multiplicists (Smith, 2006). They believe that mixing research methods helps alleviate the apparent deficiencies found in both forms types of research. Multiplicists hypothesized that “all methods have deficiencies (method errors) and that all researchers operate with perspectival bias, the researchers theories interact with data analysis, perfect detachment and objectivity are impossible, knowledge from studies is never definitive…(Smith, 2006, p. 460).” Thus, according to researchers with multiple perspectives, mixing methods is a manner to cancel out deficiencies of each one.

Delineating some of the deficits of both research methods, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) noted that in qualitative research (a) knowledge produced may not be generalizable to other people or other settings; (b) it is difficult to make quantitative predictions; (c) it is more difficult to test hypothesis and theories; (d) it requires more time to collect and analyze the data; (e) the research is more easily influenced by the researcher’s personal bias. With regard to the weaknesses found in quantitative research, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) found that (a) the researcher’s categories used may not reflect local constituencies’ understanding; (b) the theories implemented by the researcher may not have relevance to the local subjects; (c) the researcher may miss out
on phenomena occurrences because of the focus on theory or hypothesis testing; and (d) knowledge produced may be too abstract and too general for direct application to specific local situations, contexts, and individuals.

Although surveying will be used for exploratory data analysis and as a mechanism to develop the interviewing instruments based on the themes that emerge from the survey, the qualitative theoretical perspective primarily guided the collection, organization, and analysis of the data obtained in the study. Greene, Cacarcelli, and Graham (1989) noted this form of integrated design as developmental. According to the authors, a developmental design is when one method is implemented first, and the results are used to select the sample, develop the instrument, or inform the analysis for the other method. In this design, the implementation is interactive and the different methods are used to assess the same or similar phenomena. Although seemingly purists, Sale, Lohfeld, and Brazil (2002) supported this design as well as provided an illustration on how it can be appropriately executed. They explained,

…the fact that the approaches [quantitative and qualitative] are incommensurate does not mean that multiple practices cannot be combined in a single study. Each method studies different phenomena. The distinction of phenomena in mixed-methods research is crucial and can be clarified by labeling the phenomena examined by each method. For example, a mix-methods study to develop a measure of burnout experienced by nurses could be described as a qualitative study of the lived experience of burnout to inform a quantitative measure of burnout. Although the phenomenon ‘burn out’ may appear the same across methods, the distinction between ‘lived experience’ and ‘measure’ reconciles the phenomenon to its respective method and paradigm (p. 50).

Specifically, using a questionnaire for exploratory data analysis in conjunction with qualitative methods is an ideal model of integrated research (Beherens & Smith, 1996). Smith (2006) posited that exploratory data analysis is a quantitative method that
“respects the capacity of researchers to construct inferences by mining the data rather than mechanistically testing hypothesis deductively derived from theory (p. 459).”

Support of this form of integration is found in Winchester (1999). Using both questionnaires and interviews in her research on the experiences of lone fathers in New Castle, Australia, Winchester explained, “The questionnaires undertaken with a larger group of lone parents (n=?) provided more standard socio-demographic and economic information…this information sets the context in which the study was undertaken and provides a snapshot of the lone father population within the city of New Castle, Australia (p. 64).”

The manner in which principals create a trusting relationships with their faculty, like any other form of human interaction is a complex phenomena shaped by a variety of factors. The complexity of observing, recording, and analyzing data in qualitative research is inherent because the process involves a series of cognitive, linguistic, and social strategies, which the subjects attend to in different ways (Glesne, 1999).

Qualitative research methodology is highly recommended for the investigation of complex interactions and processes and for research whose relevant variables have to be identified (Marshall, 1989). Moreover, Foster (1996) speculated, “While quantitative methods can be used in research conducted from a social/cultural or political perspective, qualitative methods--including participant observation, ethnographic interviews, and analyses of text and visual images-- are better for the task (p. 10).” Supporting Foster’s position, Glesne (1999) noted “qualitative studies are best at contributing to a greater understanding of perceptions, attitudes, and processes (p. 24).” Peshkin (1988) concurred
with this notion when he asserted that, “qualitative inquiry finds its ultimate strength in the vast opportunity that the holism of being there makes possible (p. 418).”

Although qualitative research means different things at different times Denzin and Lincoln (2000) provided a general definition that identified it as:

A situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretative, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representation, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos of the self (p. 3).

Specifically, Isaac and Michael (1981) defined descriptive research as:

To describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately. It is the accumulation of a database that is solely descriptive; it does not necessarily seek or explain relationships, test hypotheses, make predictions, or obtain meanings and implications (p. 46).

Taylor & Bodgan (1984) detailed several attributes of qualitative research and characteristics of qualitative researchers. With regard to the research method, they first noted that it is inductive, meaning researchers begin their studies with vaguely formulated research questions and develop concepts and understandings from patterns that emerge in the collected data. Moreover, they posited that it is descriptive in nature, meaning the data are collected in words; and it is concerned with process rather than outcome.

Regarding qualitative researchers’ characteristics, Taylor & Bodgan (1984) identified them as humanistic in that they seek to understand the richness of the human being, their concepts of truth, beauty, and the forces that motivate them. The authors further stated that qualitative researchers stress validity in their research by seeking a fit between data collected and the reality of what people say and do. There are no
preconceived notions or ratio scales. Finally they noted that qualitative researchers analyze data inductively with minimum preconceived assumptions.

The primary objective of the study is to be naturalistic. It aims to understand and interpret the social phenomenon of building trusting relationships and not to manipulate their actions in the study; the appropriate epistemological framework to guide the research is interpretivism. Supporters of interpretivism believe that the purpose of human sciences is to understand human action (Schwandt, 2000). In concurrence, Geertz (1973) stated:

That man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law, but an interpretive one in search of meaning (p. 5).

The interpretive paradigm is most appropriate because the study is both emic and etic in nature. The former means the point of view of the subjects while the latter is the point of view of the researcher (Vidich & Lyman, 2000). Glesne (1999) noted several purposes, assumptions, approaches, and traits of researchers using the paradigm. According to Glesne, the objectives of qualitative research are to contextualize, understand, and interpret. Assumptions are that reality is constructed and that the variables are complex, interwoven, and difficult to measure. The approach is naturalistic, is inductive, is to search for patterns and themes, results in hypotheses and theory, as well as seeks to pluralism and complexity. In terms of characteristics of the interpretive researcher, Glesne (1999) conceived them to be empathetic, and personal with the subjects.
To fully understand how principals form and sustain trust with their teachers, the researcher must interpret and make sense of their words and actions. Schwandt (2000) explained that in order to find meaning in action, or express that there is a comprehension of what an action means requires that one interpret in a particular way what the actors are doing. The author further asserted that this process is represented differently in philosophies of interpretivism. Thus, the theory that guided this study is phenomenology. Bodgan and Biklen (1982) believed that all qualitative researchers reflect a phenomenological perspective. “Phenomenological analysis is principally concerned with understanding how the everyday, inter-subjective world is constituted (Scwhandt, 2000, p.192).” In *Becoming Qualitative Researchers*, Glesne (1999) noted that phenomenological studies place emphasis on descriptions of how people experience and how they perceive their experiences of the phenomena studied. In the social sciences, the phenomenological paradigm inductively and holistically understands human experiences by using naturalistic query in contextual settings. Thus, it takes into account the value of studying of phenomena within its natural backdrop (Patton, 1990). Although phenomenological research does not provide definitive answers, it does raise awareness and increase insight. The inquiry is designed to acknowledge and respect the diversity of subjects with regard to their unique characteristics and experiences. Moreover, the phenomenological model makes evident that “the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit (Patton, 1990, p. 78).”
The Case Study Model

Qualitative inquiry is commonly used as an over-arching term for various modes of interpretivist research (Glesne, 1999). A research method is a strategy that moves the underlying philosophical assumptions to the research design and data collection. The case study model was the chosen design for the study and used to investigate the research questions. Bryk and Schneider’s (2002) concept and four components (respect, integrity, regard for others, and competence) of building relational trust are used as initial parameters to portray how those characteristics were discernable in an effective principal. Their research provided a guide to conduct a study on this topic.

Although not new to qualitative research, case studies have become a popular method in conducting qualitative inquiry (Stake, 2000). The case study process has been defined in numerous ways. For example, Yin (2002) defined the case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. Although there are many forms of case studies, Stake (2000) noted that they generally inquire about the issues that “facilitate the planning and activities of inquiry, including inspiring and rehabilitating the researcher (p. 440).” Moreover, issues will be chosen relative to the intent of the study and will vary in selection by each individual researcher (Stakes, 2000). Understanding the complexity of a single case, Stakes (2000) declared:

With its own unique history, the case is a complex entity operating within a number of contexts—physical, economic, ethical, aesthetic, and so on. The case is singular, but it has subsections (e.g., production, marketing, sale departments), groups (e.g. students, teachers, parents), occasions (e.g. workdays, holidays, days
near holidays), a concatenation of domain-many so complex that at best the can only be sampled (p. 440).

Specifically relating using case study method in education Lightfoot (1983) asserted:

We needed more information about the culture of secondary schools and the daily experiences of the people who inhabit them, that we needed descriptions of life in schools that conveyed pictures of them, and that these portrayals needed to be relatively unencumbered by theoretical frames of rigid perspectives (p. 9)

Using the case study mode of inquiry allowed the researcher to obtain a thick description of the findings. Geertz (1973) defined thick description as a depiction that looks beyond the act (thin description) and describes and probes the meaning, contexts, intentions, situation, and circumstances of the action. Supporting Geertz’s notion of thick description as it relates to case studies, Hancock (1998) asserted that as a research design, the case study claim to offer a richness and depth of information not usually offered by other methods.

Data Collection

To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, this study employed multi-data collection methods (Stake, 2000). The methodology adopted is a multi-method (Brewer & Hunter, 1989) within a case study design with the school as the case. Specifically, the information was gathered through: (a) a review of the literature related to characteristics of effective school leaders, (b) questionnaire, (c) interviewing, (d) participant observation, and (e) document collection, which are all appropriate modes for obtaining data (See Verde and Cooper (2000) for an excellent example of this integrated model).
Stake (2000) noted that this multi-method approach, referred to as triangulation, is the process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning by verifying the repeatability of the observation or interpretation and by identifying the various ways the phenomenon is seen. According to Patton (1986), multiple methods and triangulation of observation contribute to methodological rigor. Moreover, triangulation served to contribute to the validity of the data accumulated from the study (Glesne, 1999).

Questionnaire. The initial form of data collection was through the survey method; specifically the questionnaire developed and administered by Bryk and Schneider (2002) used to detect the presence of relational trust in Chicago public schools selected for their study. The staff survey, created by Bryk and Schneider, was a 71 item instrument that measured ten facets of school climate: teacher-principal trust, teacher-teacher trust, teacher-parent trust, teacher orientation to innovation, teacher outreach to parents, teacher commitment to school community, (teacher) peer collaboration, reflective dialogue, collective responsibility, focus on student learning, and teacher socialization. Reliabilities for items on these subscales were high ranging from .082 to .092, with the exceptions of the teacher-parent trust and the teacher socialization scales, which were 0.78 and 0.60 respectively.

The survey employed in the study extracted 42 questions from the original instrument the covered aspects of principal-teacher relationships, teachers’ perception of the school principal, and general school culture. Items were categorized under the four constructs of relational trust: respect, competence, integrity, and personal regard. Also, items were scaled under school culture. A 4-point response scale was used throughout the
study: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Reliability indices for these scales were satisfactory ranging from 0.82 to .094, with the exception of integrity, which had a reliability index of 0.59, compromising its interpretability.

Berends (2006) posited that in educational research, there has been a dramatic increase in the use of survey methods, which aim is to describe relevant characteristics of individuals, groups, or organizations. Expanding on the definition, Ary et al. (2006) claimed that survey research investigators “ask questions about peoples’ beliefs opinions, characteristics, and behavior (p. 400).” Moreover, it has become seen as one of the most important basic research strategies of the social sciences, particularly in the fields of sociology, business, psychology, political science, and education (Ary et al., 2006).

Data from surveying allow researchers to monitor important trends in society and test theoretical understandings of social processes (Berends, 2006). In this study, the use of survey research discovered current relationships of the principal and teaching staff and describe the circumstances between both parties (Ebel, 1980). Specifically, a directly administered questionnaire was used to gather census information of the teachers as well as obtain their sentiments regarding their principal’s trustworthiness.

Some of the benefits of using directly administered surveys in the study were the high response rate, the presence of the researcher was able to provide assistance to the subjects when needed (Ary et al., 2006), and the researcher was assured that person answering the questions was the intended party (Berends, 2006).

*Interviewing.* The richness of the data primarily came from the focus group discussion with teachers and the principal interview. Inquiries from both interviewing
instruments were influenced by the questionnaire analysis, literature on effective urban school leadership and relational trust, the researcher’s notes serving as a participant observer, and collected documents. Moreover the principal interview instrument was also created using notes from the teacher focus group.

Interest in the interview method in the social sciences has embedded and flowed over the past decades (Glesne, 2006; Kemberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005; Morgan, 1996; Wilson, 1997). This form of qualitative research typically centers on a particular issue (Ary, et al., 2006) and are similar to other research methods in that it gives researchers access to the ideas, opinions, view points, attitudes, and experiences of their subjects under study (Madriz, 2000). Similarly, Wilson (1997) characterized a focus group as a small group of four to twelve people who meet with a trained researcher to discuss a specific topic in a non-threatening environment in an attempt to explore participants’ sentiments, ideas, and perceptions while encouraging and utilizing group interactions.

Wilson (1997) argued that the interviewing, method works well with other qualitative approaches as well can serve as a stand-alone research practice. Seeing its value in mixed-method research, interviewing in conjunction with the questionnaire deepened the researcher’s understanding of trustworthiness as it related to this particular case.

The unstructured character of interviewing had many benefits in the study. It provided a great depth and breadth of data compared (Fontana & Fey, 2000). The use of unstructured interviews allowed the researcher to understand the world as seen by the teachers and the principal (Patton, 1986). Moreover, the unstructured interview method
permitted the researcher to explore the participants’ thoughts and feelings to get the essence of their experience. It also permitted the participants to answer with liberty in length or with brevity (Ary, et al., 2006).

Executing the focus group method opened possibilities of listening to the voices of the study participants as constructers of knowledge, rather than giving them one (Madriz 2000). Therefore, the unstructured interview method is best used to inform the study of what the researcher failed to observe through personal observations. It permitted an opportunity to learn about what was not seen and to explore the alternative explanations of what was observed (Glesne, 1999).

Another particular advantage of the focus group method was that it minimized the self-other distance often found in qualitative research between researchers and their subjects (Madriz, 2000). Supported by Madriz (2000), the multivocality of the teachers in the conversation and its unstructured nature limited the control of the researcher; and its design allowed for interaction between participating teachers. Furthermore, the communication between the subjects was especially significant because it allowed the researcher an opportunity to see and utilize social interaction among participants (Madriz, 2000). Supporting this assertion, Glesne (2006) posited that discussions in focus groups depends on the interaction within group stimulated by the researcher’s questions. The social interaction found in focus groups provided insight into the sources of complex behaviors and motivations; such interface offered valuable data on the extent of census and diversity among teachers (Morgan & Kreuger, 1993 in Morgan, 1996). Finally, the ability for the teachers to intermingle allowed the researcher to ask participants
themselves for comparisons among their experiences and views which is reflected in the
data analysis section of the document (Morgan, 1996).

Participant observation and document collection were used as secondary
qualitative practices to enhance the study. Each will be discussed briefly.

*Participant observation.* Participant-observation was conducted to increase the
depth of the study. The researcher was allowed to observe during regular school day
activities, special school programs, sit in faculty meetings, and other related functions.
This extensive involvement permitted the researcher to gather over fifty hours of
observation time.

As a technique, participant observation is central to and the foundation of all
research (Vidich, 1955; Angrosino & Perez, 2000). Moreover, qualitative researchers are
observers of human behavior and actions and of the physical settings in which they take
place. Such actions may occur in a lab, clinic, or the “‘natural” loci of those activities (p.
673).” Glesne (1999) conjectured that people’s lives are observed daily, however,
“participation observation in a research setting…differs in that the researcher carefully
observes, systematically experiences, and consciously records in detail the many aspects
of a situation (p. 46).” An earlier definition and one in concurrence with Glesne is written
by Kluckhohn (1940), who defined participant observation as a conscious and systematic
sharing, in so far as circumstances permit, in the life-activities and, on occasion, in the
interests and effects of a group of persons.

Being a participant-observer allowed the researcher to gather data within the
context that had meaning to the teachers and principal; this prohibited the imposition of
alien meanings upon the case chosen to study (Vidich, 1955). To grasp the meaning within the context of study, several suggested strategies were employed. The researcher recorded any and everything. Subsequently, observations were of nothing in particular and notation included things that stood out and appeared unusual (Wolcott, 1981 in Glesne, 1999). Strategies listed by Glesne (1999) were also utilized to ensure effective participant-observation. The researcher took note of the participants in their settings, (b) examined events, and (c) carefully observed and analyzed the actions within the events under study (p. 49). Thus in relation to the study, the researcher observed principal-teacher relations in staff meetings, office visits, classroom observations, and on generals school grounds, studied school daily and special events such as daily duties, and school programs as well as discerned the actions and behaviors between the principal and teachers at those occasions. The processes within participant-observation allowed for a thick description, which is ideal for an accurate representation and understanding of how the school leader forged trusting relationships with his teachers, a complex phenomenon.

*Document collection.* Collecting relevant documents was the final method used within the case study. Ary, et. al. (2006) defined document analysis as a research method “applied to written or visual materials for the purpose of identifying specified characteristics of the material (p. 464).” Documents refer to a wide range of written, physical, and visual materials including personal documents such as letters, files, reports, meeting minutes, and memoranda, etc. (Ary, et. al, 2006.) “Documents and other unobtrusive measures provide both historical and contextual dimensions to your
observations and interviews. They enrich what you see and hear by supporting, expanding, and challenging your portrayals and perceptions (Glesne, 1999, p. 59).”

Analyzing the correspondence between principals and teachers allowed the researcher to see if relational trust was manifested through principal-teacher related documents. Documents collected included agendas as well as other information disseminated in faculty meetings, letters from the principal to teachers, school orientation packets given to teachers, the schools faculty and student handbooks. Reports that reflected data such as student demographic, district and school standardized test scores, attendance, and graduation, and current designated status were also obtained.

Data Analysis Process

As described by Glesne (1999), data analysis involves “organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned (p. 130).” For functional, fast, and accurate (Wiermsa, 1995) data analysis, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to acquire the frequencies, mean, and Cronbach Alpha of the survey responses. In addition, to shape the study as it proceeded, the researcher conducted an on going data analysis and analyzed findings through themes and concepts that emerged (Glesne, 1999). The gathered records were viewed from different perspectives to allow a better understanding of the material. Familiarity with the data was gained by the strategies for data analysis suggested by Taylor and Bogdan (1984). They posited that in order to perform good data analyses, researchers should (a) read data more than once; (b) keep track of themes, hunches, interpretations and ideas; (c) look for
emerging themes; (d) construct typologies; and (e) develop concepts and theoretical propositions (p. 130-131).

Goetz and LeCompte (1984) succinctly summarized the data analysis in qualitative research when they asserted that,

The researcher first establishes broad outlines of the phenomena studied. These derive from an examination of the data. The next step is to assemble the chunks of data, fitting those pieces together so that they are a coherent whole. The researcher withdraws for minute, details and looks for the larger picture that emerges. It facilitates a process, Guba (1978) calls convergence: figuring out which things fit together—either because the investigator feels intuitively that they should or because the participants say that they do. The next step is the process of pulling apart field notes, matching, comparing, and contrasting, which constitutes the heart of the analytic process. From this process, patterns emerge (p. 192).

Codes were used to sort and define the collected data from questionnaires, the focus group and the interview, observation notes, documents, and notes from relevant literature. This assisted the researcher by seeing what was being illuminated in the case, determining how the stories connected, by discerning what themes and patterns shaped the data (Glesne, 1999).

Bryk and Schneider’s (2002) four tenets of relational trust schools were the initial codes used in the study: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity. Although, they were applied to classify data, new themes emerged and were presented as well.

Validity and Reliability of Findings

Quantitative rigor. “Without rigor, research is worthless, becomes fiction, and loses its utility. Hence a great deal of attention is applied to reliability and validity in all research method (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Molson, & Spiers, 2002, p. 2).” The validity of
the survey is confirmed for several reasons. Anthony Bryk and Barber Schneider did the survey design for their ten-year research and longitudinal study of four hundred Chicago elementary schools. The validity of the survey instrument is provided through the researchers’ expertise in the subject, their substantial amount of literature produced regarding this topic, the publication of their study, which included the instrument, and their support from the reputable Consortium on Chicago School Research. Moreover, according the Chicago Consortium, the survey was developed through an extensive stakeholder consultation and review process. The survey items were collected from across country. Bryk and Schneider met with groups of teachers, principals, and central office staff. In addition, consistent with Consortium procedures, two consortium standing committees also provided advice: The Steering Committee, which is composed of faculty from local universities, research staff from the Chicago Teachers Union, researchers in education advocacy groups, staff from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, and the Illinois State Board of Education. The other standing committee, Constituent Advisory Board composed of teachers, principals, parents, and civic and political leaders.

Qualitative trustworthiness. Recently there has been great dialogue regarding the difficulty of establishing validity criteria in qualitative research. Developing validity standards in qualitative research is difficult because of the necessity to incorporate rigor and subjectivity as well as creativity into the scientific process (Whittemore, Chase, & Mandle, 2001).
Guba and Lincoln (1981) noted that while both qualitative and quantitative research methods must have “truth value,” “applicability,” “consistency,” and “neutrality” to be valid, the nature of knowledge of both methods are different; therefore, the approach to validity and reliability should be as well. Citing Creswell (1998, pp. 201-203), Glesne (1999) proposed several strategies to ensure “trust-worthiness,” the parallel word to “rigor” in quantitative research. Some of the strategies suggested were (a) triangulation, (b) clarification of researcher bias, (c) to provide a rich, thick description of the study, (d) to search for negative cases, (f) prolonged engagement, (g) to conduct audit trails, and (h) to perform member checks. To increase validity and reliability, these were used in the study. Although many of strategies have been noted and defined in the above paragraphs, each will be briefly discussed and shown how it will be implemented in the study.

First, triangulation was used to increase validity. According to Mathison (1988) good research demands triangulation for it enhances the validity of the research findings. As mentioned earlier, a review of the literature, surveying, interviewing, observing subjects in their natural settings, and collecting related documents were employed to increase the validity of the study.

The next strategy utilized to increase trustworthiness was checking for researcher bias. As Vidich (1955) and Geertz (1973) mentioned, with the researcher as the data collecting instrument, biases and personal interpretations are inevitable. To combat this, Glesne (1999) suggested that researchers reflect on their own subjectivity and determine how it will be used and monitored in their research. In relation to this study, since there is
a special interest in urban leadership and it how it affects student achievement, the researcher always questioned what was noted and observed.

Another method used to ensure validity was providing a thick description. A thick description allows the reader to be placed in the context of the study (Glesne, 1999). In this study, the researcher wrote extensively on the observations so that the reader will not only have a detailed image of the context, but also so that he or she can understand the meaning of the observed and recorded actions.

Negative cases were also sought to increase validity. The conscious effort to seek negative cases or alternative arguments assists researchers in refining their hypothesis (Glesne, 1999). There is ample research that speaks to instructional reform and policy reform as more important than social reform (building trust) in creating school cultures of learning communities. To check researcher bias, literature that raised counter arguments on the importance of social reform, and that focused on instructional and policy reform were read and written about in Chapter 2. Moreover, the researcher conversed with persons who share these sentiments.

Also to ensure trust-worthiness, the researcher conducted persistent and prolonged observations. This was done to develop a trusting, personal relationship with the subjects and learn more about their culture (Glesne, 1999). To get a true understanding of how principals developed trust from use of this method, and to get a sense of their natural behavior, the study was conducted for seven months and each particular event or activity was observed at a minimum of seventy-five percent of the event’s time.
External audits, the next method used, were ideal for establishing validity of the research project. Members of the researcher’s doctoral committee checked notes, coding schemes, and journals as often as possible. The final approach to ensure rigor was member checks. Glesne (1999) defined it is sharing collected materials with the participants for accuracy. The researcher shared the collected data with the principal and teachers to ensure accuracy in noting their meaning. Utilizing these techniques served as an adequate means of increasing trustworthiness. Although validity of the study was regulated to these strategies, “verification and attention to rigor (p. 15)” were also evident in the quality of my text (Morse, Barret, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002).

Conclusion

Many researchers are increasingly combining quantitative and qualitative practices to fully understand the world of research subjects (Coyle & Williams, 2000). Although relatively new in research, thus having yet forged a strong theoretical and practical path, integrating methods expands the researcher’s toolbox and provides synergistic benefits by giving researchers different perspectives and insights in which to view the phenomenon under study. Research has shown that the effectiveness of principals, specifically how they build trusting relationships, is a complex phenomenon, making the mixed-method ideal to provide a rich description of the findings.

Moreover, although combing methods comes with criticism, there has been exception when integrated appropriately. For example, exploratory data analysis as a quantitative method respects the capacity of researchers to construct inferences by mining the data rather than testing hypothesis (Smith, 2006). In the same vein, Madey (1982)
posed that when questionnaires are conducted prior to qualitative practices, the data
gathered from the quantitative instrument might provide leads for later interviews.

Although integrating methods, this study was primarily conducted from a
qualitative perspective. Peshkin (1988) noted that qualitative research responds to the
fullness of its subjects, events, and settings under study. Thus, qualitative is the best
method for understanding how urban school principals create school environments of
trust, with specific attention on their relationship with teachers.

While not immune to criticism, the case study method was best in capturing an in-depth understanding of the complex phenomena under study (Patton, 1986). Using a
variation of methods within a case study design allowed for a greater understanding of
the case and increased the reliability and validity of the study. Using a questionnaire
provided a snapshot of the sentiments of the teachers in the study as well as assisted in
developing the subsequent focus group and interview instruments. The unstructured
interviews were appropriate for the study because it provided a framework for which the
teachers and the principal could respond in a way that accurately and thoroughly
conveyed their points of view about their lives and experiences (Patton, 1986).

Participant observation allowed for an in-depth study of the case. Document
analysis was fitting because it permitted the researcher to look at all files related to the
principal and teachers and how those documents reflected relational trust. In sum, using
a multi-method approach was optimal for the researcher to gain greater insight and better
understanding of the case. Fontana and Fey (2000) stated that, “human beings are
complex, and their lives are ever changing; the more methods we use to study them, the
better our chances to gain some understanding of how they construct their lives and the stories they tell us about them (p. 668).”

The study was allowed to take form in its progression through analyzing the information while in the collection process. Using the tenets of relational trust assisted the researcher with having preliminary coding constructs. However, respecting the tradition of qualitative research, the flexibility of the design allowed for other subject matters to arise. The trustworthiness and validity of the project was ensured by employing varied methods from both the qualitative and quantitative traditions.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

This chapter gives background information of the school used to explore the existence of relational trust between its principal and teachers. A substantial description of the school, its principal, staff, and students are also provided. In addition, presented are the results from the survey instrument used in the study. Finally included is a brief synopsis of the teacher, focus group discussion and the interview with the principal.

Background Information on Gooding High School

Gooding High School is located on the south side of a large Midwestern city. This area of the city was heavily migrated by families from the South who traveled toward to the Midwest for job opportunities. Thus, the neighborhood surrounding Gooding High is dominated by single-family homes. Graduating its first class in 1955, it opened its doors in 1953 as a six-year high school created to serve its local township. In the 1957-1958 school-year the neighboring urban community widened its school district and acquired Gooding High in the process. Subsequently, the school re-opened as a traditional four-year high school.

The school district that houses Gooding High is similar to other large urban school areas. According to the district’s 2007-2008 Fact Sheet, it serves over 55 thousand students and has 125 school buildings. Of this, it has 17 high school facilities to
accommodate its over 15 thousand high school aged population. With regard to gender it has a male population of 50.8 percent and a female student body of 49.2 percent. Black students are the majority comprising 61.5 percent of the student body while white students make up 27.6, Asian students consist of 1.8 percent, Hispanic students represent 5.5 percent, Native American students cover 0.8 percent, and students who are identified as multi-cultural comprise 2.8 percent of the student body. 15 percent of its students receive special educational services, 8.5 percent receive ESL services, and 78 percent of are on free or reduced lunch.

The neighborhood in which Gooding High is situated has an estimated median household income and an estimated average household income of 46,000 dollars. An estimated community population is 40,500, in which males and females are roughly even and the average population of 1,640 per square mile. 15 percent of the community members have college degrees. Along the same lines the closest two-year college is seven miles away, and the closest four-year public college is a technical school which is four miles from Gooding. A major research-one public university is an estimated fifteen miles from the school. Gooding’s surrounding neighborhoods are also highly vulnerable to crime. Compared to the national average, the community is above average in personal crimes, homicide, rape, robbery, property infringements, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.

Gooding High’s current school mission is based on the premise that all students can learn and that schools make a difference. Its school spirit is divided and manifested into three facets. The first is courtesy towards everyone within the school community.
The second is pride in its accomplishments. The final category under which school spirit is expressed is sportsmanship: the ability to win and lose gracefully.

Currently, Gooding High has a considerable staff team. Administratively it has one principal and three assistant principals. Sixty plus teachers instruct general education courses and a host of electives such as theater, fine arts, and business. Gooding High’s auxiliary staff includes administrative assistants, a testing coordinator, an internship coordinator, guidance counselors, security officers, a librarian, a treasurer, custodian, nurse, an intervention specialist, a grant-funded supplemental educational representative, and a psychologist.

Table 4.1 depicts enrollment figures of Gooding High’s current student demographic, as of October 2007:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-ethnic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,134</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>59.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free &amp; Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>62.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Gooding High 2007-2008 Student Demographic & Enrollment

The designations assigned to schools by the state are “Excellent,” “Effective,” “Continuous Improvement,” “Academic Watch,” and “Academic Emergency.” In the 2006-2007 School Year Report Card provided by the state’s department of education,
Gooding High was under “Continuous Improvement” missing the “Effective” status by 1.3 percent. That same year, it also ranked 88.3 on the state’s Performance Index Score, which reflects the achievement of every student taking the state’s standardized test. This is an increase from the 2005-2006 and the 2004-2005 school years when the Performance Index Scores were 85.6 and 81.2 respectively. According to the federal government’s No Child Left Behind designations, in the 2006-2007 academic term, Gooding High “Met” its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). To meet AYP requirements, student subgroups (e.g. African Americans, females, etc.) must be at or above determined annual goals or make improvement over the last year in reading, mathematics, attendance, and graduation rates. Solidifying its reputation for improvement, an effort-based school improvement organization, ranked Gooding High in its top 100 of 1100 schools nationwide for effective high schools based upon the efforts of school administrators and teaching staff.

In the 2006-2007 school term, Gooding High’s percentage of tenth and eleventh grade students either at or above the state’s determined proficiency level in reading and mathematics were equal to or higher than the average of the schools within its district. However, tenth and eleventh graders at Gooding who were either at or above proficiency level in reading and mathematics were considerably lower than the state’s average. Although the school’s graduation rate exceeded that of its district, it was slightly lower than the district with regard to student attendance. Along the same lines, the state’s graduation and attendance rates were higher than Gooding’s in that academic year (see Table 4.2).
### Table 4.2: Gooding High 2006-2007 School Year Report Card

A host of activities are accessible for opportunities for student involvement categorized in either athletics, academic, interests, music, and performance. Table 4.3 highlights the numerous opportunities to students, who are also called the Gooding High Chargers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic:</td>
<td>Football; Cross Country; Golf; Soccer; Tennis; Volleyball; Basketball; Wrestling; Baseball; Track; Tennis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic:</td>
<td>AEP; Chess Club; Robotics; Science Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest:</td>
<td>Yearbook Staff, National Honor Society, I Know I Can; Student Council; [City] Leaders of Tomorrow; [State] Mock Trail; Youth to Youth; Service Above Self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music:</td>
<td>Marching Band; Concert Band; Orchestra; Concert Choir; Choir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance:</td>
<td>Cheerleaders; Chargerettes Drill Team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Gooding High Extra-curricular Activities for Student Involvement

Moreover, academically Gooding High students are recognized in numerous ways for their scholastic achievement. Juniors and seniors who excel in academics, leadership,
personal character, and service are inducted by faculty in its chapter of the National Honor Society. An Honor Roll Breakfast is conducted each grading period to recognize all students who met certain academic requirements and those who achieved perfect attendance. Annually, outstanding students are acknowledged at the Academic Banquet held at the end of the school year. Some accolades awarded during this event are academic departmental awards, senior scholarships, the “Cumulative G.P.A. of 3.0-4.0 Award,” “Student of the Year” awards, “Academic Hall of Fame Award,” National Honor Society awards, and “GOYA,” a Spanish honorary.

Parents also have formal ways of becoming involved at Gooding High through organizations like the Gooding High Chargers Boosters (Athletic and Academic), The Parents of the Chargerettes (P.O.C.S), and the Vocal Musical Boosters. In addition, parents may also serve as volunteers in the capacities of hall monitor, parking lot monitor, concession stand workers, special event hosts/hostesses, office helper, as well as aides in tutoring, library, lunchroom, open gym aide, recycling, home work assignment, landscaping, and typing.

Presentation of Findings

As noted previously, this study examined the cultural dynamics of an urban high school in a major mid-western city. Moreover, there was a specific interest in the existence of relation trust as theorized Bryk and Schneider (2002). Relational trust, as defined by the authors, is formed when competence, personal regard, integrity, and respect are considered in the interactions of educational stakeholders. Their research focused on the roles and relationships of primary educational stakeholders: principals,
teachers, students, and parents; however, for the purpose of this study, specific and considerable attention is given to the nature and quality of principal-teacher relations. To give an adequate account of the relationships, teachers who participated in the study had at least one full year under the principal’s direction. Although the school chosen for the in-depth analysis appropriately represents the student and teacher demographics within the school district, it has its own distinct identity, thus applying a mixed-method approach was most appropriate for data collection.

Questionnaire Findings

The questionnaire employed in the study is the instrument used in Bryk and Schneider’s (2002) research to detect the presence of relation trust among principals, teachers, students, and parents in Chicago inner-city schools. Surveys were completed at two faculty meetings. For those who were not in attendance at either meeting, emails were sent to solicit their participation. Involvement was also solicited by personal request during classroom visits, or by letter of invitation with the survey attached placed in faculty mailboxes. The questionnaires were retrieved during on-site visits. 43 of the 55 teachers, who were eligible to participate in the study, completed and returned questionnaires, giving a response rate of 78 percent. Tables 4.4 through 4.8 provide demographical information of participants who completed the survey instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Respondents’ Gender: (n=43)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Age of Respondents on Last Birthday: (n=43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Respondents’ Years of Teaching Experience: (n=43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Respondents’ Ethnicity: (n=43)
Table 4.8: Respondents’ Highest Degree Obtained: (n=43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4.9 through 4.12 represent the findings with regard to the tenets of relational trust theory (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) and Table 13 shows the questions that generally related to school culture. The questionnaire instructed subjects to answer strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. To create more meaningful categories in Tables 4.9 through 4.13, the “agree” and “strongly agree” categories were combined to obtain a percentage of agreement. When presenting findings, this integration of both types of responses is an appropriate and commonly used technique in the quantitative practice (Arsham, 2005).

According to Bryk and Schneider, there are four interconnected considerations in which relational trust in education is formed: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity. Personal regard for others (Table 4.9) is noted as the principal’s actions to reduce teachers’ sense of vulnerability. Respect (Table 4.10) in this regard, involves the principal’s recognition of the important role teachers play in the success of schools. The third criterion, integrity (Table 4.11) has to do with consistency between what the principal says and does.
The final principle, competence (Table 4.12), speaks to the ability the principal has in effectively executing his formal role responsibilities. In other words, interpersonal trust deepens when teachers can discern that their principals care about them and are willing to extend themselves beyond their role.

Although not a tenet of educational relational trust theory, another vital leadership function that must be considered is the principal’s role in sustaining a positive, cooperative, and academic school culture. School culture, reflected in Table 4.13, is defined as, “everything that goes on in schools: how staff dress, what they talk about, their willingness to change, the practice of instruction and the emphasis given to student and faculty learning (Peterson & Deal, 1998, p. 28).” Convincing and extensive studies have shown that the creation and preservation of an effective school culture and the academic attainment of students are highly correlated and the key role principals play in establishing such environments (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Gardner & Miranda, 2001; Tschannen-Moran; 2001; Fink & Resnick, 2001; Peterson & Deal, 2002; Gudgel, 1997; Fietler & Gudgel, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It’s OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries and frustrations with the principal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the faculty members</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal takes a personal interest… teachers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Survey Results Regarding Personal Regard: (n=43, α=.87)

Note. Tables 4.9 through 4.13 used a 4-point Linkert scale. Presented on the tables are a combination of the agree and strongly agree responses in frequency and percentage.
### Table 4.10: Survey Results Regarding Respect: (n=43, $\alpha=.82$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principal has confidence in the expertise of teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers are encouraged to “stretch &amp; grow”</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in making important decisions in this school</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have a lot of informal opportunities to influence what happens here</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal presses teachers to implement what they have learned in the professional development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected by my principal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this school, teachers are continually learning and seeking new ideas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 85%

### Table 4.11: Survey Results Regarding Integrity: (n=43, $\alpha=.59$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust the principal at his or her word</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making important decisions, the school always focuses on what is best for student learning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal places the needs of children ahead of personal and political interests</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 88%
Table 4.12: Survey Results Regarding Competence: (n=43, $\alpha = .94$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I really respect my principal as an educator</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school day is organized to maximize instructional time</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school has well-defined learning expectations for all students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal makes clear to the staff his or her expectations for meeting instructional goals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal communicates a clear vision for our school</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal sets high standards for student learning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal understands how children learn</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal sets high standards for teaching</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal carefully tracks students academic progress</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal knows what’s going on in my classroom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal actively monitors the quality of teaching in this school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal pushes teachers to communicate regularly with parents</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I usually look forward to each working day at this school</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principals, teachers, and staff collaborate to make this school run effectively</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I feel loyal to this school</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This school really works at developing students’ social skills</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I wouldn’t want to work at any other school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers at this school design instructional programs together</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would recommend this school to parents seeking a place for their child</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Survey Results Regarding School Culture: (n=43, α =.85)

Qualitative Methods Employed

To attend to the uniqueness of Gooding High, it was appropriate to employ qualitative methods. While the relational trust questionnaire afforded sound general data, to thoroughly examine and to understand the specificities of the relationships between the principal and staff at Gooding High, it was important to utilize qualitative approaches; namely interviewing, participant observation, and document collection.

The Teachers’ Voice: Focus Group Session
A focus group session was conducted in the morning before school began. Given the hectic schedule of the teachers and their contractual restrictions with regard to time, an hour and a half was the maximum they could give. Every teacher who completed the survey instrument was invited to participate in the focus group meeting (See Table 14 for background information of the participants). Teachers were invited at faculty meetings, during casual conversations, and through email invitations. In the end, fourteen teachers expressed interest and eight of those volunteered to discuss the survey findings. One of the eight teachers, Penny, had a schedule conflict and could not make the designated meeting time. However, the short answer questions were emailed to her and were returned to me directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Tchn Exp.</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Focus Group Demographic Information

Note. Number in parentheses reflect number of persons representing subgroup.
The questions posed in the focus group derived from a number of sources. One area that informed the inquiries was the literature on effective educational leadership and appropriate school culture. The research on relational trust in education was another domain that formed the inquiry makeup. Lastly, but most importantly, the questions were inspired by the results of the survey instrument and from observations from on-site visits. In-depth responses to the questions are presented in the subsequent data analysis chapter in the form of themes. However, Tables 4.15 through 4.26 give a snapshot of the focus group participants’ sentiments. Since the questions were written in the positive, in the beginning of the focus group session and on the short answer form completed by Penny there was a scripted disclaimer which stated, “All of the questions are written in the form of assumptions, if you believe the contrary please express” was used.
Question: In your opinion, what are specific skills and traits needed by a leader to establish trust among teachers and does Principal Smiley convey these attributes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Needed Skills</th>
<th>Conveyance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>• Caring. • Honest. • Competent. • Dependable.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>• Knowledge of field. • Personal. • Caring. • Respectful.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>• Directed. • Efficient. • Able to delegate. • Effective communication skills</td>
<td>Yes, but for a select few of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>• Positive attitude. • Sense of care and concern. • Ability to stay calm and in control.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>• Open lines of communication. • Values staff. • Recognizes individual contribution.</td>
<td>No. He is unapproachable to voices of dissent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>• Be an example, role model. • Implement a clear vision.</td>
<td>Yes, he sets an example but not certain of the clear vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>• Follow-through with tasks. • Integrity.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>• Organized. • Effective time management skills. • Good listening skills.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: Synopsis of Effective Leadership Inquiry
**Question: How does Principal Smiley show respect for teachers as professionals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ellen   | • Allows us to make decisions.  
          | • Trusts my loyalty to the students. |
| Kelly   | • Permits me to be innovative in my teaching. |
| Ira     | • Always asks for our opinion on matters. |
| Penny   | • He doesn’t respect or trust his teachers. |
| Ali     | • He considers and strongly encourages our input. |
| Michelle| • Puts us in leadership roles such as department chairs. |
| Gary    | • Always finds professional development opportunities for us. |

**Table 4.16: Synopsis of Respect (for Teachers) Inquiry**

**Question: How does Principal Smiley establish respect among teachers?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>• Very appealing personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>• He’s very cordial in which I respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ira     | • Makes good school-related decisions.  
          | • Has an evident clearly articulated agenda.  
          | • Not afraid to show his vulnerability. |
| Brandon | • By giving respect to staff. |
| Penny   | • He doesn’t. |
| Ali     | • Teachers see that he remains level headed in situations.  
          | • His dedication is seen through his extensive, unorthodox work hours. |
| Gary    | • Understands each staff member’s value.  
          | • He motivates his teaching staff. |

**Table 4.17: Synopsis of Respect of Teachers Inquiry**
Table 4.18: Synopsis of Integrity Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How Does Principal Smiley Maintain His Integrity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>• Adheres to school policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sets the example and lets the students see that he is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>• By being better at enforcing policies than other district principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>• His good decision making which is reflective of putting students’ first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>• Not sure “how” but he does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>• He doesn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>• This is his biggest failing; he doesn’t…however he runs an orderly school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>• Places the needs of students first.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19: Synopsis of Personal Regard Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How Does Principal Smiley Exhibit Personal Regard for You and Other Teachers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>• Was there for me when there was a death in my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personally financed items for a student event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>• Visited, sent gifts and well wishes during the birth of my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Was empathetic to me needing time off when I was injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>• Greets me daily and pays regular visits to my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>• Always saying hello and asking about our weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>• He doesn’t express personal regard to me at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>• He does this very well, he is a people’s person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>• He uses his own life experiences to be empathetic to the situations of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Give examples that confirm Principal Smiley goes beyond his call of duty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Works with students who are no longer affiliated with school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Assists parents and staff with personal matters when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>The amount of time he spends at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Providing dinner for teachers on occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>He works hard and works long hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attends all sporting events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works on his days off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Time spent in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>He puts in extra time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Financial assistance to students when needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20: Synopsis of Dedication/ Going Beyond the Call of Duty Inquiry

Question: How does Principal Smiley enlist teacher involvement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>He either asks or simply dictates. He knows which teachers will do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>By modeling a positive attitude and being involved himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Has us to volunteer, but respects our contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>He asks or constantly enlisting he knows will help/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Through volunteering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21: Synopsis of Teacher Involvement Inquiry

Question: What incentives are in place to reward good teaching behaviors and practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22: Synopsis of Teacher Incentive Inquiry
Table 4.23: Synopsis of Collect Decision Making Inquiry

| Collective | State demands and push for standardized testing prohibits do what’s best for the students. |

Table 4.24: Synopsis of School Culture/Pride Inquiry

| Statement: I would recommend this school to parents… |
| Ellen | Yes. They will get a genuine, dynamic principal who cares. |
| Kelly | Yes, depending on the student. The curriculum is not that demanding. |
| Ira | No. Limited curriculum and too much violence. |
| Brandon | Yes. This school is good given the student body and their shortcomings they bring with them. |
| Penny | No. There are no outstanding academic opportunities for students. |

Table 4.25: Synopsis of Collective Decision Making Inquiry

| Statement: Teachers have a lot of informal opportunities to influence what happens here. |
| Ellen | Yes. He values and respects the opinions of everyone. |
| Kelly | He asks and respects my input even as a novice teacher. |
| Ira | A select few are really asked or are listened to with any serious. |
| Brandon | Teachers have ample opportunities to influence what happens. |
| Penny | The communication and management is definitely top-down. |
Table 4.26: Synopsis of Parental Involvement Inquiry

*Contextualizing Penny.* Because many of Penny’s sentiments were sometimes quite different than other comments within the focus group, it is important to contextualize her as she relates to Gooding High’s principal, Mr. Smiley. Much of Penny’s dissatisfaction with Principal Smiley comes from a situation in which she was denied by Principal Smiley to perform a task with students. She explained that he feared something bad would come from the activity. She further assumed, “this is a prime example of how he not only doesn’t trust the students, but he doesn’t trust the teachers…”

*In His Own Words: An Interview with Principal Smiley*

To inform the study as well as to compare the perceptions of the principal’s idea of his actions and leadership qualities to that of the sentiments expressed by the teaching staff, it was important to interview the principal. A formal interview was conducted although throughout the study, there were plenty discussions between Principal Smiley and I. The conference was at 9:30 in the morning in Principal Smiley’s office and lasted about an hour. Just as any other time during observations, we were interrupted on numerous occasions. One teacher walked in to get logistical information on the sports
event in which the marching band was performing. Another teacher disrupted to see inform Principal Smiley he was headed to the district office. The final interference from staff came from the school’s resource officer and two teachers asking for Principal Smiley’s advice on a student matter. When a student came to get a letter of recommendation for a scholarship, the interview paused for several minutes. Principal Smiley had the student express to me his academic accomplishments, and his contribution to the drama club having the honor of competing nationally.

Similar to the focus group session, Table 27 provides a synopsis of some of the questions posed and answers given. Further review of the interview is within the following chapter and is analyzed in a thematic manner.
1. How did you get into the education field?  
   Inspired by after serving in the Peace Corps.

2. Why urban education?  
   Never gave much thought to the question.

3. How do you connect with staff?  
   Getting to know every staff as a professional and person.

4. What are some of your best leadership traits?  
   Articulating and implementing a philosophy; showing vulnerability.

5. What leadership traits need to be strengthened?  
   Ability to internally listen to people.

6. How would you describe effective leadership for urban schools?  
   Getting results.

7. How are students from urban districts different from those in suburban areas?  
   They care about the collective, not the individual. They face more issues.

8. In what ways do you convey your confidence in the expertise of your teachers?  
   Communicating effectively; encouraging them to take risks.

9. What are challenges faced by Gooding High students?  
   Being equipped to compete in a global market.

10. Do you feel some teachers disagree with your leadership style, if so, why?  
    Given district and economic restraints you cannot always satisfy teachers.

Table 4.27: Synopsis of Principal Interview
Observation: From the Eyes of the Researcher

Recognizing observation as a key and fundamental method in qualitative research, although the study’s findings primarily came from surveying and the information gathered from the interview sessions, it was imperative to serve as a participant-observer. For eight months, August to March, I became a staff member of Gooding High. In the participant-observer capacity, information came from many sources. My primary source of empirical information was a participant in nine faculty meetings. Staff meetings were held bi-monthly for an hour and a half after school. Attending these assemblies was vital because it allowed me to see Principal Smiley actively engaging with his entire teaching staff in one setting.

Another area where information was fruitful was serving as an active member of the school community. As a member of the school family, I was able to attend school events, serve on lunch and bus duties alongside Principal Smiley. He permitted me to sit in two meetings with parents and serve as principal for a day. I also had my own mailbox and often times had access to a vacant room in the main office. Finally, data from use of this method was derived from informal conversations with Principal Smiley, teachers and other Gooding High affiliates. The purpose of these conversations was to gather information pertaining to general leadership qualities and those specifically conveyed through Principal Smiley. Moreover, such informal conversations were beneficial in assisting me in understanding teacher satisfaction and the culture of Gooding High.

Through these interactions, there was an ability to acquire a certain level of trust and familiarity with the Gooding High community, which was evident by one teacher
seeing me in a local mall and greeting me as if I were her co-worker. Initially students thought I was long-term substitute teacher or lawyer (as one young man assumed due to my style of dress), eventually they became accustomed to my presence and purpose. Many staff members regularly asked me about my academic and personal life with genuine concern. Ms. Ellen (See Table 9) really took an interest in me as a person. In addition to Principal Smiley, it was her nurturing disposition that helped ease my nervousness. In sum, the substantial amount of time I spent at Gooding, amassing over 50 hours, allowed me to enrich my study, to become an insider, and to develop a rapport with the Gooding High community.

*Gooding High School’s setting: For as student’s embrace.* Gooding High is a well-maintained and massive two-story school building nestled in a seemingly quiet neighborhood on the south side of the city. It is hidden in the community so well, that it is way from any major streets. The community surrounding Gooding prides itself on always being racially diverse.

It is a vibrant school where as much activity happens before and after school as it does during school hours. Although an older building, it is well maintained and has a modern appeal. The lightly colored and exposed brick walls as well as the clean and brightly tiled floors create a warm, open, and home-like setting. In addition, they allow for an immediate sense of welcome and cordiality. Above the doors of the main entrance is a banner, which words describe the focus and the tone of Gooding: “Through through these doors pass the most courteous students in the nation.” Upon entering the building, a mosaic that was created by students who attended Gooding in the 1950s greets
you. Above the entrance are banners celebrating Gooding High’s graduating classes from 2004 to 2012. The halls of the first floor are decorated with student pictures, student accolades, and other recognitions. For example pictures of the “Top Ten Scholars” from the classes of 2000 to current and pictures of members from Gooding’s chapter of the National Honor Society hang from the wall titled The Academic Hall of Fame. Similarly, portraits of teams and individual athletic achievement shared a space titled The Athletic Hall of Fame. Inspirational quotes such as, “I can accept failure, but I cannot accept not trying” by Michael Jordan, and “It’s not enough to do your best, you must know what to do, and then do your best” by W. Edwards Deming, command attention as they hang boldly, and largely on the walls of the first floor.

Immediately facing the entrance is the school gymnasium. To the direct right of the gymnasium is the cafeteria. The cafeteria is a very open space and the furniture is situated for students to mingle. Outwardly, it appears to be arranged in an unorganized manner, but the design makes for a community-oriented atmosphere. Monumental size head portraits of famous persons are painted on the beige walls of the cafeteria in a strong, black color. Between two of the figures is a list of all the persons honored on the wall: Louis Armstrong; William Shakespeare; Maya Angelou; George Washington Carver; Albert Einstein; Louis-Jacques Mande Daguere; Babe Ruth; and Quanah Paker. Also on the painted on the wall is the famous line from William Shakespeare’s Hamlet, “To be or not to be.”

Classrooms dominate the rest of the space on that side of the building. On the opposite wall to the immediate right are the main office, the library, and more
classrooms. The left of the same wall is occupied by the school’s auditorium and music room, and more classrooms. It too is decorated with student recognitions. The main office holds many rooms including that of Principal Smiley, an assistant principal, a resource officer, and the teachers’ work area. It is a very open and inviting space, which has steady traffic of students, staff, and parents. There are no physical barriers to access Principal Smiley’s office upon entering the main administrative center. Many students and staff took advantage of this as they frequently stopped in to visit for numerous reasons, either school related or personal. The second floor is dominated by classrooms and other administrative offices. Similar to the first level, the hallways are tidy, the walls are clean, and the lighting creates an appealing atmosphere.

The Teaching Staff: For the Good of the Students. Reiterating the demographic research on teachers in urban educational settings, Gooding High’s teaching staff is predominately white and female faculty. The faculty and other staff are cordial and open. Prior to gaining a substantial sense of familiarity, I was greeted regularly by teachers and staff as I roamed the halls. Although appropriately professional, the staff dressed in a comfortable manner that allowed for a connection with the students. Typically, male faculty wore polo or long-sleeved shirts and slacks and women wore either dress pants or business skirts. Moreover, their way of dress respected their status as professionals while, allowing them to integrate their own personal styles.

From observations, it appeared that teachers at Gooding got along fairly well with each other. At faculty meetings, I discretely but diligently scanned the room when teachers would talk to detect a change in body language and or facial expressions from
their peers; on rare occasion this happened. When faculty members were in communal places, they engaged in various conversations about school, personal, political, or local matters. Although cordiality existed among teachers, those relationships did not seem forged or overly nice.

Moreover, it appeared that faculty members were bonded by their invested interest in the students of Gooding High. When they were often asked to express opinions related to students, many gave valuable and insightful input. In the same vein, faculty seemed to have a good rapport with the students. Students felt freely to talk about personal matters, to engage in respectful humor, and to hold simple, causal conversations with teachers.

Along the same lines, when I strolled the halls between class change or when I served as hall or bus monitor, I noticed students often attempting to get away with simple school policies such as not wearing hats, being on cell phones, using personal musical devices, and not having belts around the waist (males). However, when approached by a teacher, students considerately and swiftly resolved these matters.

*Students: Gooding High is our second home.* Students at Gooding High are a direct reflection of American, inner-city youth. Their fashion of dress, hair styles, language, and disposition are heavily influenced by hip-hop and pop culture. Because the district does not have a school uniform policy, they are allowed to express their individuality through their attire.

Students appeared to have a sense of pride in Gooding High. They wore the school/name frequently on t-shirts and key chains. They respected the aesthetic beauty of
the school, I observed little evidence of and Principal Smiley and other staff members reported no cases of graffiti, excessive littering of the halls, and students doing other acts to alter Gooding High’s aesthetic appeal. Moreover, in conversations with students they conveyed their pride in and connection to Gooding High by referring to it as “my school.” Along the same lines, students seemed to always be in the building before and after school resumed. They wandered the halls, sat on the floors of the hallways either doing school assignments or just conversing with each other. They also took full advantage of the extra-curricular activities afforded to them. All students groups had an active membership. Gooding High has a reputable student athletic program, nationally recognized drama organization, and a popular marching band that performs in local events as well as nationally.

Gooding High students are also committed to their education. In 2007 nearly two million dollars in scholarships were awarded to students. About sixty seniors attended the 2008 Alumni Day Program, an event where recent graduates return and speak with seniors about their higher education experiences. For the 2008 program, twenty-five alumni came back to share their experiences with current students. Participants asked questions about the culture of higher education, the academic rigor, and financial assistance for college. Moreover, many students participated in a co-op program the district has with the local community college and the four-year technical school that allowed students to earn college credits or obtain certification in a trade.

*Principal Smiley: The caring leader.* Principal Smiley is a rarity. In the changing times in education where most urban schools are led my women or by a person of color,
he is one of the few remaining white, male principals in this urban setting. He is a middle-aged white man from a rural community in the state. His teaching career in 1973 started as a Peace Corps member in Liberia. In 1974 he began teaching in his current district as has been affiliated with it since. He served as principal at Gooding High between the late eighties and early nineties. At the request of the superintendent he came back to Gooding in 2003 after it had gone through five principals since his previous tenure.

He stands six-feet and five inches tall what an intimidating posture. Albeit his seemingly threatening size and frame, Principal Smiley is a nice and sincere person. He was commonly described as nurturing, welcoming, caring, and as a supportive principal. His ability to transform school buildings into positive, high achieving communities is so profound within the district that he has been transferred a number of times for the sole purpose of “fixing” schools.

Principal Smiley’s office is a reflection of the atmosphere contained throughout Gooding. His wall décor reflects his character, and the student-centered tone echoed in the school. Student accolades, many from athletics, pictures of Principal Smiley with students and Gooding High teachers, and portraits of him with district staff, and famous athletes from the area cover his walls. A bulletin board directly behind his desk is filled with pictures given to him by students, many which are from school events such as prom and other dances. Other pictures are of students taken with personal cameras or from professional studios. Former students are also represented on the board with their new families, or in their military uniforms. The final things occupying the board as well as
are placed throughout the office are letters, cards, and other tokens of appreciation given to Principal Smiley by current and former students and faculty.

Wood cut-outs of Gooding’s mascot hang like huge ornaments from his ceiling. Sharing wall space is a plethora of honors from the state, the school district, and local organizations awarded to Principal Smiley. One award in particular that captures attention is an honor which read, “1996 Education of Excellence in Honor of Exemplary Educational Leadership.” This was prized to Principal Smiley by a prestigious, local chapter of a predominately African-American fraternity. This chapter of the organization does extensive service and is highly regarded in the city. Another honor that demands notice was “The 2005 Educator of the Year Award for Commitment to the Students & Community Groups of the Southside,” awarded to Principal Smiley by the Council of Southside Organizations, a local organization within his school community.

Lastly, on the wall are inspirational, leadership quotes from famous persons such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Tuskegee Airmen. A huge inspirational message which reads, “Opportunity: The future belongs to those who find opportunity in the beauty of their dreams” greets guests upon entrance of his office. His room is also filled with school paraphernalia such as t-shirts, key chains, and pom-poms. His desk is covered with papers, district documents, and other items that reflect his busyness.

His personal bookshelf housed various texts, many speaking specifically about urban education. His personal library include but is not limited to, Salome Thomas’ *I Choose to Stay*, Joseph Check’s *Politics, Language, and Culture: A Critical Look at Urban School Reform*, Nobody wants Your Child by Milton Creagh, Alan M.

It was apparent throughout observations that Principal Smiley was not a “glued-to-the-seat” administrator. Often times, he would have to be contacted via walkie-talkie to be informed of my presence. There were occasions when I shadowed him as he paced the halls, visited classes, or tended to other school related matters.

Although he changed schools about four times in the district, Principal Smiley takes time to get to know his school’s community. During a visit, he and I went on a tour of the surrounding neighborhood. He was very knowledgeable of its history, its distinctiveness, and of the history of Gooding’s feeder elementary and middle schools. For example, he knew that due to the community’s equally proportioned black and white community, a lot of his students were biracial, yet the majority of them identified themselves as either black or white. He was also aware of the connection the community had with a former American president, the wealth it had at one point due to a vibrant industrial era. Because of his familiarity with the neighborhood, as said by Kelly (Table 14) in the focus group meeting, he found a former student from the fifties who helped
created the mosaic seen upon entering the school. This alum came to the school, helped refurbished the artwork and assisted in placing it where it is currently located.

Parents and students of the school appeared to be drawn to Principal Smiley, despite the cultural differences between both parties. His empathy with parents is easily summarized in a statement he asserted during a conversation, “Johnny may be bad but he’s the best mom’s got.” He further elaborated that he did not know of any parents who did not want what was best for their child. “Parents want for their children better than what they have and it is our job to make sure this happens.”

I was able to speak with a parent after she met with Principal Smiley. Once I was introduced and she was informed of my study’s intent, she simply replied, “He is a good man.” She then began to mention the extra things he does to reach out to his students and parents, such as preparing meals for school events. During a different visit, a parent stopped in to jokingly scold Principal Smiley for not receiving a shirt from an event.

Students frequently visited his office often times for no particular reason. Moreover, it seemed that Principal Smiley knew the name of every student who came through his office. In most instances, he even knew their club membership, personal information, and or academic standing. One student came in just to let Principal Smiley know she had made the honor roll. At another time a female student entered the office to inform Principal Smiley that she resolved a matter with a classmate without resorting to violence as she apparently typically did. Principal Smiley responded that he was not surprised that she handled herself accordingly. He praised the student and encouraged her to maintain that behavior. Two conversations on two different occasions also affirmed
Principal Smiley’s commitment to his students. A junior male exclaimed that this school was his second home and Principal Smiley “got the back” [supports the students] of Gooding High students. Similarly, a sophomore female stated that Gooding High is a “cool” place to attend because Principal Smiley and the teachers care about and pushes students.

His welcoming, caring, and clam disposition also manifested itself in his actions with teachers. Many of the teachers had worked with Principal Smiley prior to him coming to Gooding High School. At least seven teachers have been with Principal Smiley between six and twenty-three years and at least thirty-eight of his staff have been under his leadership between three and five years. A first year, African-American female teacher expressed to me her regret for not being able to participate in the study because it was her first year at Gooding High. She spoke in high regard of his leadership, his character, and expressed her appreciation for being under his direction.

Principal Smiley worked along-side his faculty as a team member. They served on school committees and took leadership roles accordingly. For example, three faculty members, along with a parent assisted Principal Smiley with the 2007-2008 Gooding High School All School Improvement Plan. Participation in faculty meetings allowed for numerous examples to materialize. Principal Smiley had no issue with letting teachers lead discussions on important matters. Teachers felt comfortable with expressing their opinion on all concerns. At committee meetings, where Principal Smiley served as a contributing member, he sat with the committee (teachers) in a posture and disposition that conveyed that the team is on the same level and that every opinion carried the same
weight. Along the same lines, they were comfortable complaining about district policies with Principal Smiley. For example, Jason, a mathematics teacher, walked into the office to discuss the district’s lack of organization on I.E.P. matters. He responded in manner that acknowledged Jason’s concerns without engaging in criticism of the district.

Principal Smiley saw nothing beneath or outside of his job responsibility. He performed lunch, hall, and bus duties with his teaching staff. As we paced the halls he would pick up the occasional litter found on the floor. Moreover, during our dialogues, teachers came in his office freely, for casual conversations, or for school-related matters. Monitoring the hall alongside “Tim” the band teacher, he explained that I could have not found a better principal to study.

His effective leadership qualities were apparent throughout my empirical observations. Principal Smiley’s ability to connect with all stakeholders created a welcoming and opening school environment. The apparent violent neighborhood that surrounded Gooding, the crushing poverty, and the vast cultural differences between the Gooding High staff and its community, could have easily created a tension between school officials and the community; however, a tone of respect, focus on student achievement and growth, as well as personal regard for each other was set by Principal Smiley and carried within the interactions among Gooding’s teachers, students, and parents.
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data were analyzed in a descriptive and thematic manner to provide an in-depth perception of how Principal Smiley was building trusting relationships with his teaching staff. In addition to the themes theorized by Bryk and Schneider (2002) the analysis revealed several other subjects. All emerging topics are discussed with teacher explanations from the focus group and the interview with the principal. Although the study focused specifically on the relationship between Principal Smiley and his teaching staff as perceived by teachers, to understand of the totality of his leadership qualities and his ability to develop trusting relationships, the survey instrument findings, information from or regarding students and parents, notes from observations, and information from collected documents appear within the explanation of themes as well.

Personal Regard for Teachers: Recognizing Person in the Teacher

The primary and most emphasized characteristic of Principal Smiley was his genuine concern for his teachers. This was also the domain, which had the highest mean percentage (Table 10). With the exception of Penny, who believed that he did not know who she was a person, all of the focus group participants felt that Principal Smiley had a personal interest in his staff. When asked to give examples in which he conveyed personal regard for others, Kelly excitedly responded, “well I have a lot of them, he came
to my wedding…when my baby was born he called me at the hospital to check and see how everything was going. He sent me a card, sent me a gift…”

Referencing Kelly’s story, Ellen explained, “He treats all teachers like that…when my son was killed he was there, 24/7. He was at the funeral. I mean just all kinds of things like that to let you know the he cares about you as a person and not just as an employee under his wings…”

Other focused group participants who seemed not to have as personal a relationship with Principal Smiley as Kelly and Ellen expressed that Principal Smiley stops by their rooms on regular basis, always asked about their weekends, and spoke every time he crossed their paths. Similar sentiments are shared by Principal Smiley in his interview when he asserted, “The biggest thing is to know every [staff] member as a professional and as a person, and then something about them, their personal interests…” He further explained, “I use food, I speak to everybody.” Explaining his use of food as a mechanism for conveying personal regard he continued, “…if you have a chance to break bread together you have uninterrupted time together where you eat, enjoy and it’s a very easy time to interact and get to know somebody.”

Speaking in terms of professional development, Ellen explained that in staff meetings, Principal Smiley always finds to ways to inform the staff of new research about urban education.” She asserted, “He reads these books and then he tells us what’s in it and the kind of things you can draw from it.” Also related to professional development, Gary brought to the attention that Principal Smiley got the author of a famous book on the education of African American males to come and speak to the staff.
As an observer, there were abundant cases where he exhibited a personal interest in his teachers. For example, Principal Smiley sponsored an annual trip to historically Black colleges and universities for Gooding High juniors. He allowed teachers to bring their own children for many reasons chief among them was hoping to inspire his staff’s children to pursue higher education as well. Moreover, in faculty meetings, he has given staff gifts on holidays and acknowledged upcoming birthdays.

Principal Smiley conveyed personal regard for his staff in numerous ways. From the simple acts of visiting classrooms, having casual conversations to the more involved engagements like being there for teachers in their most challenging times are all seen by his staff as being genuinely concerned about who they are outside of teaching. Moreover, he showed he cared for their growth through providing and seeking out professional development opportunities.

Although some of the teachers in the focus group appeared to have more of a personal relationship than others, it seemed that Principal Smiley’s care was not exclusive. Michelle summarized Principal Smiley’s character in this facet when she states, “He doesn’t step back from different roles saying ‘I’m the principal’ never that…I feel like I can talk to him about anything…He does this very well, he’s a people’s person.”

Competence: Running the School Grounds

One of the most important aspects of effective educational leadership is being a competent manager. There were collective sentiments within the results of the survey and in the focus group that Principal Smiley was competent in managing the daily
operations of Gooding High. He expressed this in many capacities. First and foremost, the urban school district in which he works transferred him on occasion to transform the culture of challenging schools. Moreover, under his direction, Gooding High is designated as “Continuous Improvement” and is gradually increasing. Speaking on his competency, Ira explained, “A leader needs to be directed, efficient, and able to effectively delegate important work…Principal Smiley is certainly directed, efficient, and does effectively delegate.” Similarly, Brandon asserted, “the specific skills needed to establish trust and run a good school include a positive attitude, a sense of caring and concerning about employees and the ability to stay calm and in control no matter the situation. Principal Smiley demonstrates these traits through his impromptu, daily interactions with us [teachers].” Supporting Brandon’s assertion, Ali stated that Principal Smiley remains level-headed through the most trying times at the school. “When things get out of sync, he manages to pull it together and it seems he does it effortlessly, he runs this building pretty well.” Gary noted that he was organized, “had dynamic effective time management skills,” and was “excellent with follow-up on important matters.”

Despite the high score in competence and the multiple positive remarks in the focus group Penny brought a voice of dissension. She stated, “A leader needs to establish communication between administrators and staff so that voices can be heard and responded to. An effective leader values his staff… Principal Smiley does neither of these things.” Similarly, Ali inputted that a “leader needs to set great examples and implement a clear vision of the direction for work. Principal Smiley does set an example but I am not sure what our vision is at times.” Ali’s statement was most surprising, because in the
competence domain of the survey 91 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that he communicated a clear vision for Gooding High. Thus, in a subsequent conversation she explained that Principal Smiley often spoke of big ideas that were not realistic and seemed to be more of an ego booster and not with the primary interest of students.

Another area where Principal Smiley’s competence is conveyed is in the transitioning of students from one class to another. When one afternoon bell rings, students are either leaving lunch, transporting from one class to another, or on certain days a handful of them are preparing to leave to take co-op classes at the neighboring technical school or community college. Despite the seemingly chaos, once the second bell rings, signifying tardiness, students are in their respective places. The coordination of these transitions was done by Principal Smiley.

Moreover, although his desk looked very busy, he was good at multitasking as well as handling matters that are normally the responsibility of others. On one visit he worked on the school’s improvement plan, handled issues regarding I.E.P matters via phone with a district official as well as resolved matters brought in by teachers and students unannounced. Another instance that speaks of his competence was his ability to concurrently serve as principal and academic specialists, until one is assigned to the school.

Teachers perceived Principal Smiley as very effective in managing the school. Many saw and spoke of his competence through personal characteristics such as being level-headed, having good listening skills, his positive attitude, and his sense of care and
Others associated his ability to effectively run the school through behaviors such as his ability to follow through, his capacity to conduct himself as role model, his open-door policy, and his time management skills. Thus, both his personal attributes and actions contributed to teachers seeing him as experienced in school-site management. 

*Respect for Teachers as Professionals: Acknowledging the other Educational Expert*

Another tenet of Bryk and Schneider’s theory of relational trust (2002) reflected in the data was Principal’s Smiley regard for teachers as professionals. Respondents of the survey and the focus group participants felt that he respected their input on matters of the school. Ali supported this when she stated, “teachers have ample opportunity to influence what happens at [Gooding High].” In concurrence Brandon asserted, “I can honestly say that teachers influence what happens here. If we have a suggestion on a matter or if we feel we can make something more efficient, it is easy to go and express ourselves to [Principal Smiley], especially on matters concerning teaching and instruction.”

Kelly contributed that Principal Smiley was very supportive of an “innovative idea” she had to use a review tool for the state’s standardized test. “Although it wasn’t in our curriculum I know it worked…he was like ‘that’s fine, give it a shot’…Again, he wants the kids to do as best they can even if what we want to do for them is not technically what the district wants right away…He’s very supportive of that…” In the same vein, Gary expressed, “He doesn’t hide the fact that he has an agenda, and that you [teachers] better get on board with the agenda. If you honestly work to achieve school goals, you will be treated as a professional and left to do your job.” Speaking on his
firmness as a reflection of his competence Ellen added, “…and if he doesn’t want to do anything he’ll tell you. You know it’s not like you are going to have to guess what he means. That’s what’s needed for such a big school with so many things going on within it.”

Expressing how he conveyed confidence in the expertise of his teachers, in the one-on-one interview Principal Smiley explained, “I always try, give first, show the way, and model behavior…Model instructional strategies. I have a simple educational philosophy and that is ‘help the teachers teach…highlight teacher successes, and encourage teachers to take risks.” Also in the conversation, Principal Smiley noted that at graduation ceremonies, he allows students to let select the teacher who most inspired them to honor them with their diploma. “I am just a facilitator, it’s my job to set the stage,” he acknowledged.

In the observed faculty meetings, Principal Smiley allowed teachers to lead discussions. When he was unclear on certain matters he surrendered to teachers who were familiar with the topic at hand. Discussions in the meetings were very democratic and allowed for everyone to share their opinion. One example was an issue of the fire codes and the new policies implemented by the district; he asked all teachers to provide input on how they could meet the new standards. Principal Smiley allowed the discussion to continue until every person who wanted to contribute did so. Moreover, he summarized what was said to assure that he was listening.

Principal Smiley also showed respect for his teachers as professionals by not asking them to do anything that he would not do. For instance, he served the same duties
as they did such as hall duty, and bus mentoring. Moreover, he attended school activities, work with parents, and served on committees. Also, as he traveled the halls he retrieved trash from the floor and deposited it in the trash containers when necessary.

Respecting the work and dignity of the teachers is essential for principals to establish trust. Principal Smiley conveyed his value for his teachers as professionals by seeing them as an integral part of the success of Gooding High students. He made allowances for their input and did not let his leadership title or his years of experience assume he was the only authority in the school. He also saw his position as school leader as multifaceted, encompassing the work of his auxiliary staff and teachers; thus he did not ask teachers to perform any duty he himself would not conduct. Although Penny asserted that Principal Smiley does not respect his teachers, an average of eight-five percent of the questionnaire respondents (with one hundred percent agreeing that he has confidence in their expertise and roughly ninety percent claiming they feel respected by the him) (see Table 9) and the focus group participants saw Principal Smiley as a team player who acknowledged their contributions.

*Integrity: Talking the Talk and Walking the Walk*

A characteristic essential in any leadership role is integrity. Particularly in the field of urban education where there is often tension and distrust between school officials and the communities they serve. An average of eighty-eight percent of the survey respondents, felt that Principal Smiley had integrity, this being the second highest scoring area next to his personal regard for teachers. In support of the survey findings, where ninety percent of the respondents felt that Principal Smiley places the needs of children
ahead of personal and political interests (see Table 12), Kelly explained, “he does what’s best for the students even if it counters what the district demands.” Along the same lines, Michelle added,

I rarely talk to Principal Smiley, for he is a very busy man but I can say that I am very observant and not much goes unnoticed by me and I would like to say this: In the years I have been here at [Gooding High], I feel that the many great things that [Principal Smiley] does go unnoticed and should be recognized but he is a modest man and he knows what the ultimate goal is: the students and their individualized success.

Similarly, Principal Smiley noted that “one of the key things is to have a philosophy that you honestly believe that kids can learn and then everything you do is driven by that.”

Ellen described his integrity quite differently by using simple examples. She spoke of the “No Hat Policy” in which he strictly enforces with his staff and students. Ellen explained, “Well even him…when he is outside, he’ll have his hat on…as soon as he walks in the building he takes his hat off.” She continued in the same manner with regard to the “No Cell Phone Policy” he imposes. “I’ve never seen [Principal Smiley] getting on his cell phone in front of the kids…he practices what he preaches and the kids see that I think that’s a good thing.”

Penny and Ali felt that integrity was an area in which Principal Smiley needed more work. In addition, Penny responded, “I have had several experiences with him where I’ve brought to his attention that were inappropriate… and instead of dealing with these, he tried to step out of the way so he doesn’t get involved.” Ali believed that he says a lot but “when it comes to action I think he sometimes falls short.” She continued, “If his talk was of running an orderly school he would be showing he could do that, for he runs the school very well, but when it comes to educating young people I am always
feeling the pressure.” Ira’s response to this question gave rational to Ali’s sentiment by asserting that Principal Smiley “makes decisions good of the school and I think he is clear about when circumstances are out of his control.” She further explained, “…there bureaucracies that may make [him] appear to be all talk and no action.”

Principal Smiley exhibited his integrity mostly through his work for Gooding High. However, what is important is that the teachers saw this as an extension of his integrity with them. Majority of the teachers within the focus group spoke positively of his integrity in some form. A few spoke of the subtle things that are seen as him possessing integrity and how they carry as much weight as his major endeavors. Some saw his integrity through his ability and courage to do what was best for Gooding High even when it countered the district’s expectations. Although Penny and Ali expressed concerned about the integrity of Principal Smiley it is apparent that he carried it.

Dedication: Going Beyond the Call of Duty

One of the most obvious emerging themes throughout the study was Principal Smiley’s dedication and his ability to go beyond his call of duty for the betterment of Gooding High. All the teachers, even Penny, gave credit to the amount of hours he spends at work. Penny explained, “he works very hard, he attends all sporting events… and he comes to work between 5 and 6 am each day and often works on weekends.”

Along the same lines, Ira explained, “The man gets to work at an ungodly hour and stays to an ungodly hour.” Principal Smiley, himself, spoke of his time as a manner of dedication when he declared,

So much of it is a belief system, organization, and how hard you are willing to work. Often I open the building before the custodians get here and I often close it
after the custodians had gone. So it’s more than a calling for me it’s an opportunity.

In addition to long hours many teachers gave examples that reflected his interactions with the teaching staff. For instance Brandon mentioned that Principal Smiley does little things to show his dedication and appreciation like bringing in food at staff meetings and on school conference days, “he really doesn’t have to do that but he does.” Many saw his devotion to students as an extension of his dedication to them. Ellen detailed, “…for the prom, the dinner didn’t come with drinks, so he went out and just made sure we had all this pop..he made sure the pop was there and told me not to worry about it…it doesn’t matter what the seniors need, he’s like, ‘don’t worry about it, I got it’…” Another example expressed by Kelly and acknowledged by the focus group was Principal Smiley’s commitment to the students who are no longer attending Gooding High but did not graduate due to not passing the state’s standardized exam. These students now attend a virtual high school offered by the district. According to the focus group participants, Principal Smiley makes frequent calls to the students to check their academic progress, to make sure they are attending their tutorial sessions, and to just reiterate to them that they are still part of the Gooding High family.

Another collective demonstration of his dedication and of him going the extra mile shared in the focus group was Principal Smiley’s support during the death of a Gooding High student athlete. Ellen added,

The man [Principal Smiley] was at [local hospital] when they pronounced him dead. [Principal Smiley] was right there with his family, the basketball players, with all the athletes and he really took everyone, all the staff, all the students that knew him [the student], he became almost like a dad.
Along the same lines, Michelle added how Principal Smiley made sure the parents of the deceased athlete and of two other deceased students who were scheduled to graduate that year, received their students’ diplomas during a special ceremony, in which he got the superintendent of the district to attend. Grant furthered, “It was real emotional for them [students] to watch those parents get those diplomas. I think it speaks volumes about his humanity, going outside the box to make sure the kids know that they matter.” Other cases that illustrated Principal Smiley’s commitment to the students expressed by the teachers was his initiative to construct a wall dedicating Gooding High alum who died while serving the military, and one for students who were outstanding in sports.

Others examples of him going the “extra mile” was seen through his actions for the school in general. Focus group participants mentioned that Principal Smiley really took the time to learn the Gooding High neighborhoods and its history. “He learned the building. He learned the history of the school, and invited the Gooding High’s first lunch ladies from the fifties…they came and fed him all his history of everything,” Ira explained. Gary noted that he also found artifacts and placed them on display.

In observations, Principal Smiley’s dedication to education in general and to the Gooding High community specifically was evident. His tendency to go the “extra mile” appeared effortlessly and without conscious. Along the same lines, an excerpt from his 2007 commencement address to Gooding High graduates reflected how he saw his role as beyond the stated contractual obligations. In his presentation, he expressed, “I am a Parent…I am a Mother…I am a Father…I am a Preacher…I am a Cook…I am a
Coach... I am a Bus Driver... I am a Counselor... I am a Custodian... I am a Secretary... I am a Teacher... I am a Friend...” See Appendix F for the passage in its entirety.

With particular regard to my research, he made certain I got the information needed to inform my study. He volunteered to give me a tour of the community. He made me feel a part of the Gooding High community by assigning me a mailbox, presenting me with school paraphernalia, and by providing me with books from his personal library, etc.

Without question, teachers perceived Principal Smiley as a dedicated leader. No matter in which capacity, be it through his actions with them, the students, or what he does for the school, teachers saw his behavior as a manifestation of his personal dedication to them. Moreover, modeling his actions, they too were extremely dedicated to Gooding High students.

Support for Teachers: Creating a Sense of Security

Throughout the study, Principal Smiley had given support for his teachers. Not only in the sense of having personal regard for them or in the manner of respecting them as professionals, but in a way in which they felt secure and sustained by Principal Smiley. “I have a simple educational philosophy and that is help teachers teach…” he posited. Agreeing with Principal Smiley’s assertion, Michelle stated, “Though it has never been verbally discussed, there is a confident atmosphere contained within the building the he is watching out for his staff members.” Providing another example, Kelly said, “He has done so much for me... for example, I had surgery my first year of teaching, he understood and helped me. I was supposed to go to classes in my first year..., and they erased me off of the list. He called people, counseled me...” She then provided another
instance when Principal Smiley advised her through a decision to either stay with or leave the school district. Gary added, “He knows this job can be stressful, dealing with students, parents, and [the school district] so he allows us to vent. I can do this with him without feeling I am judged about my professional ability.”

During my visits, I have witnessed how he creates this security with his teaching staff. Teachers come in his office regularly for assistance on district matters and other professional concerns. I recall one teacher coming in asking for a letter of recommendation for some teaching award. In my presence, Principal Smiley once made a call on a teacher’s behalf to district’s office. At another point, he called two seemingly “hostile” parents to diffuse a situation between the parents and a teacher.

Agreeing with Michelle, Principal Smiley did not need to voice his support for teachers because it was manifested through his actions. Feeling supported by Principal Smiley motivated the teaching staff, and permitted them to come to him when they needed advice, or assistance in resolving matters within the school, or handling the bureaucracy often found in urban school districts.

*Visible/Open: On Being Seen*

Principal Smiley was highly visible on the school grounds. Having a walkie-talkie allowed him to stroll freely yet still be accessible when needed. He monitored the halls during duties as well as when classes were in session. Many teachers noted and appreciated how he frequently visited their classes and how he was familiar what was going on their classrooms. When not serving lunch duty, he would often eat alongside the students. When he was in his office, his door was rarely closed. The act of having an
open door conveyed the message that I am “open” and you are welcome to enter. This allowed for parents, students, and teachers to stop in without reservation for small conversations, etc.

Although he had assistant principals and other administrative personnel, Principal Smiley participated in many of the after school programs. Ellen, as the advisor to the senior class validated this when she explained how Principal Smiley attended and actively participated in the senior events.

High visibility is a vital action of urban educational leaders. It sends the important message to staff and students that the principals care what is going on within the school beyond the confinements of their office. Coupled with implicit and explicit openness, visibility on school grounds, establishes familiarity with the teachers and students. Principal Smiley is both visible and open with the Gooding High community. His actions suggested that he is concerned about the welfare of the school and its constituents.

*Employing Authority: Not a Dictatorship*

With respect to authority, Principal Smiley saw the need for an intimate alliance with his teaching staff. His style of leadership countered the stereotypical style of leadership usually attributed to men. The social organization of Gooding High was based on clear patterns of authority that respected the teachers’ ability to make sound judgments on authoritative matters regarding students. Gooding High’s administrators and teachers used power accordingly to create order and coordinate means of action. Though student’s behavior often tested the limits of school policies, they were met with sound
authority and structure by both Principal Smiley and the teaching staff. “He lets us deal with the students…” Ellen explained.

From my on-site observations, I can attest to the tone of authority set in the school by Principal Smiley. On rare occasions, teachers would come to his office for disciplinary matters, or were there students in his office for policy infringements. On one visit a teacher came to Principal Smiley to get help with resolving a student matter. During their discussion, one could tell that Principal Smiley respected the teacher’s opinion on how to handle the situation.

Principal Smiley did not see his authority from a paternal perspective. His temperament and authoritative style set a tone of shared-decision making with regard to enforcing school policies. Teachers were able to demonstrate their understanding of adolescent behavior and were allowed to develop a range of strategies that respected the individual differences among Good High students. Moreover, students recognized this command structure and respected the teaching staff just as they gave reverence to Principal Smiley.

*Socially Conscious: Understanding its Complexity*

Another premise surfaced in the study was the notion of social consciousness. Principal Smiley appeared to understand the issues that were specifically related to Gooding High students and the community in which he serves. His personal library reflected his critical look at the educational system and how it advances certain students and hinders others. Many of the books in his personal collection critiqued the American
public educational system and covered how to adequately serve marginalized populations, etc.

At the opening faculty meeting of the school year, Principal Smiley distributed a packet of information that included statistical data from the previous school year, goals for the current academic term, and other orientation, school related matters. Embedded in the packet was Langston Hughes’ poem, *A Dream Deferred*. Using this poem as framework, he charged the teachers with sustaining the dreams of Gooding High students. Principal Smiley emphasized that particularly in urban areas, educators must work diligently in motivating, fostering joy and happiness within, and engaging students as well as setting the stage for students to manifest their aspirations. He then posed the question: what are you doing to defer dreams? This very act demonstrated his understanding of the complexity of being an educator in an urban school. Moreover, his poem choice, which was written by a famed African American poet, indicated his ability to use culturally relevant material to express his sentiments about that student demographic. Finally, through this endeavor, Principal set the tone of commitment for Gooding High’s students.

Evidence of Principal Smiley social consciousness is also materialized at several points throughout his interview. At one time he added,

Our thing is how to empower [students] to compete in a world…So what I have to do is to help the [students] with a focus, with a direction, and with the mindset on how to be competitive in the world of work even when [they] are competing with whose lives and experiences have included far more enrichment than [theirs] has. [They] have the potential, [they] have the skills, but [they] have to jump through the business hoops and that’s what I am trying to help the [students] see and know and be able to do… the other thing is how do you help students see other options, opportunities so that they can develop that skill set.
When speaking on the concept of time as it related to students in urban areas Principal Smiley held that “life has so much violence and tragedy [for urban students] that if you make it to whatever, that should be valued…you ought to value that the individual was able to circumvent any violence, transportation, housing, personal needs…and still get there.” Moreover, he expressed the institutionalized cultural bias within the state’s standardized assessment. “Change the vocabulary, and students will do well,” he explained about how language and the use of certain words prohibited certain students from doing well on such exams.

Principal Smiley also imparted this understanding on his staff. Some of the professional development offered centered issues that specifically related to students in urban education, primarily African Americans males. A comment made by Kelly in the focus group reflected her understanding of this issue in education. When talking about the pressures of preparing students for the state’s standardized assessment she stated, “I am a tenth-grade teacher so I feel it most...we have to do so much, to no fault of their own [students] they are…so far behind…”

It is imperative for a leader in urban education to be consciously aware of the issues faced by its students and make accommodations to ensure that all students succeed. Furthermore, research has shown trust develops between school personnel and the people they serve when students and parents feel that school officials understand their situation, and can assist them in articulating barriers. Additionally, when urban educational leaders can assist their faculty in understanding their student population, help them be able to
“reach” their students and connect with their parents, as well as make sense of the “disconnect” between students in urban schools and education, trust fosters as well.

Principal Smiley is a leader who understands and accommodates the issues faced by students at Gooding. Moreover, his teaching staff is aware of his expertise with working with students from this demographic. They respect his ability to connect with the community through this empathetic manner and the teachers model his techniques. The teaching staff depended on him as they navigated the social systems in place. This reliance emphasized the teachers’ need for relation trust with him.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The latter half of the 20th century marked high momentum and expectations for public schools in urban districts. However, in the new millennium, failing urban school districts have become “intricately interwoven into the fabric of our social, economic, and political institutions (Haberman, 2003, p. 1)” and there has been little evidence of national progress. Thus, school restructuring, school reform and school improvement have become synonymous with the American public educational system. Increasing pressure to improve urban schools specifically has led to a host of reform efforts (Green & Carl, 2000). Nearly, every debate about standards, assessments, governance, busing, vouchers, social promotions, class sizes, and accountability are about urban education in America’s cities (Snipes & Casserly, 2004).

Urban school districts face a plethora of challenges. The multiple issues students bring to school mirror the decaying urban areas in which they live. Studies have shown that urban school districts have comparatively greater problems than their rural counterparts, who are also high poverty, and their neighboring suburban districts. Moreover, Johnson (1990) summarized the complexity of urban education when he stated, “There are no slow days in public education, particularly in urban education. Like
junk mail, problems are deposited daily: drugs, dropouts, depression, teen pregnancy, gangs, racism, violence, homelessness, poverty, suicide, child abuse… (p.1).”

In *The World We Created at Hamilton High*, Grant (1988) gave an illustrative distinction between urban schools and its suburban counterparts. He asserted,

Like a watermelon, the high school…has a thick rind of federal and state policy, a greatly expanded and diverse student body, and often no well-defined center. The teachers and specialists, like watermelon seeds, are dispersed throughout, and commands -often in conflict-issue from a variety of locations…If we think of the watermelon rind as an accretion of bureaucracy, court orders, union contracts, and new measures of accountability-nearly all of which were by-products of efforts to correct injustices-the metaphor is most apt for urban schools (p. 124).”

In contrast, Grant (1988) metaphorically compared suburban schools to a cantaloupe. He claimed it was a “middle-class fruit…where the student composition is remains fairly homogenous and community consensus acts as a buffer to litigation prone interest groups (p. 125).”

Furthermore, the enrollment of students of color in urban schools has steadily increased (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006). Along the same lines, Ladsing-Billings and Tate (2006) explained that although African Americans represent 12 percent of the national population, they are majority in 21 of the 22 largest urban school districts.

Sharing the same sentiment, in *Improving Outcomes for Urban African American Students*, Gardner and Miranda (2001) noted that students who attend less affluent urban schools are more likely to be from families of color. The researchers further expressed, “In many poor inner-city areas, African Americans constitute a significant percentage of the resident population if not an overwhelming majority (p. 255).” Thus, the failure to resolve the problems within schools in urban communities has fallen disproportionately on
African American students as well as Hispanic students, students with disabilities, children from poverty-stricken areas, and students with English as their second language.

Despite the issues and complexities faced in urban schools, school personnel are still charged with making sure their students achieve (Brown, 2004). Specifically regarding leadership for education, over twenty years of research strongly suggest that principals make a big difference in shaping education, what goes on in school buildings, and the success of school change efforts (Keller, 1998; Lambert, 1998; Sebring & Bryk, 2000; Leithwood, 1994; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Deisome, L., 2002). Like other complex human activities, leadership is difficult to specify. (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Even in the field of educational leadership there is no clear understanding on what a leader looks like. Thus, it has extensive and often times competing definitions that attempt to characterize educational leadership, and portray its purpose, and functions (Dantley, 1990).

Although there is no definitive definition of successful urban school leadership, several themes are frequent in the body of research. The literature on effective leadership for education reform shows that a quality principal is a leader who is strong in instructional matters and knows the value of and practices shared instructional leadership. Another recurring topic in the research of leadership for school restructuring is a leader who creates, personifies, articulates, fosters, and implements a shared vision. In the context of urban school, the vision must embody a broader more expansive idea of schooling (Dantley, 1990). In addition to creating change in the school, it is imperative that principals are competent in managing the daily operations of the school site.
Along with effectively managing operations, it is essential for leaders to create and sustain positive educational communities where quality teaching and learning occur by fostering positive and respectful relationships among all school members. In *Learning by Heart* Barth (2001) argued that complex patterns of norms, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, values, ceremonies, traditions, and myths in schools can work for or against their improvement or reform. Emphasizing relevance of culture in school reform, Barth (2001) explained, “Probably the most important-and most difficult-job…is to change the prevailing culture of the school…Ultimately, a school’s culture has far more influence on life and learning in the school house than the state…, the superintendent… the school board…can ever have (p. 7).”

Summarizing the research on effective educational leadership, Henderson and Hawthorne (2000) identified common features of professional educational culture and collaborative arrangements: (a) Interpersonal relations and trust among all participants; (b) Shared leadership about curriculum, teaching, students, school climate, and assessment; (c) Inquiry into the conduct and meaning of schooling, teaching, and learning is way of life; (d) Collaborative visions, problem solving, and decision making permeate all facets of professional work; (e) Shared authority is based on practice, knowledge, expertise, and an ethic of caring; and (f) Participants have the courage to voice what they believe is in the best interest of students, the school, and the district (p. 162).

As Coleman (1990) noted, the foundation of any successful reform initiative for urban education, is positive relationships among school personnel, parents, community leaders and public relations. Effective leaders for urban schools are cognizant of the
interdependency among schools, parents, and the surrounding community and are active in creating and sustaining collaborative efforts. The Comer’s School Development Project illustrated this position when findings demonstrated that strong connections between urban school professionals and the parents of low socioeconomic status improved students’ academic achievement (Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Ben-Avie, 1996).

In addition, leadership for urban education requires a more critical perspective that accepts a far more expansive concept of schooling. It recognizes the unique situations faced by its students, and the social constructs in addition to the political barriers that may prohibit student achievement (Brown, 2004; Gardner & Miranda, 2001; Wink, 2005; Webb-Johnson & Carter, 2007; Slaughter-Defoe & Clarson, 1996; Apple, 1995; Gordon, 1990). For example, although both class and gender intersect with race, they do not explain all the educational achievement differences between whites and their black counterparts, as studies reveal an apparent disproportional achievement between middle-class whites and blacks (Jones, 2002). Along the same lines, since schools are institutions within a larger social structure that transmits dominant culture for the purpose of reproducing the status quo, it is vital that an emergence of social justice discourse appears in urban educational leadership. Urban school principals must question the assumptions that drive school policies and practices to create more equitable schooling (Gordon, 1982; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005).
Finally, research has repeatedly shown the importance of forging trusting relationships as it relates to creating effective organizations (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Kramer, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2001 & 2004). Effective educational leaders recognize the value trust has in the context of urban schools, models trusting and trustworthiness by their own actions, and promote and cultivate trusting relationships among all school affiliates.

Social trust among school leaders, teachers, parents, students, and the community improves much of the routine work of urban schools and is a key source for reform (Education Digest, 2004). Supporting to the work of Bryk and Schenider (2002), in Building Trusting Relationships for School Improvement: Implications for Principals and Teachers, a 2003 report published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, it stated that principals build trusting relationships by (a) demonstrating personal integrity; (b) being accessible; (c) involving staff members in decision making; (d) making sure that teachers have the basic necessities and resources; (e) facilitating and modeling effective communication; (f) celebrating experimentation and supporting risk; (g) expressing value for dissenting views; and (e) by being prepared to replace ineffective teachers.

Over the recent years, ample studies have shown that the level of student achievement highly correlates to the quality of the teacher in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Haycock, 1998; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997; Polansky & Semmel, 2006). Stotko, Ingram, and Beaty-O’Ferrall (2007) noted that “in the debate about urban school effectiveness and teacher quality, one proposition has emerged as indisputable: The
success of urban schools depends heavily on the quality of the teachers who serve the schools and the administrators who support the teachers (p. 30).”

As the school-aged population continuously increase, schools and districts must work diligently to recruit bright new teachers and retain their most effective teaching staff. Moreover, it is common knowledge that the cultural gap between children in urban schools and teachers are large and growing (Sleeter, 2001). This is also suggested by Guranio, Santibanez, and Daley (2006), who found that urban schools with high percentages of minority students were difficult to staff and that teachers tend to leave when more attractive opportunities present themselves (p. 201).” After reviewing a substantial collection of literature on teacher recruitment and retention in the United States, the researchers discovered that, among other things, the amount of administrative support teachers received played a vital role in their job satisfaction and retention. Thus supporting faculty, fostering a culture of cooperation and high achievement, and developing trust with their staff and other school community members are important actions of principals for soliciting and retaining qualified teachers.

Among a myriad of traits and practices that define effective urban educational leadership, principals must see relationship building with all stakeholders as an important aspect of transforming schools. Particularly as it relates to principal-teacher relations, both implicitly and explicitly, the literature on leadership for urban education frequently shows that a rapport between school administrators and their staff directly affect student outcomes. Supporting this position, in On Goodness in Schools: Themes of Empowerment, Lightfoot (1986) eloquently stated,
The expression of empowerment in schools need to be felt at every level—students, teachers, administrators…if teachers feel strong, responsible, and influential, and feel that they are key decision makers and their wisdom is valued, then it is likely that they will encourage those qualities in their students (p. 10).

Trust is a foundation for fostering relationship building, setting a school culture of cooperativeness, and transforming schools in high achieving communities. Thus, leaders in urban educational centers need to develop trusting associations with their teachers, students, and parents as it is fundamental for student achievement.

Principal Smiley: A Good Leader

At the core of an effective school is an effective leader. Principal Smiley exhibited numerous qualities of sound leadership that is reflected in the body of research on quality headship for urban education. At high levels, the four tenets of relation trust were exhibited in the actions as reported by Principal Smiley’s teaching staff through the survey. Moreover, respecting the integrity of the qualitative research practice, through interviewing, observations, and document collection the tenets of relational trust became more informed and other themes that spoke to his effectiveness materialized as well.

Principal Smiley saw teachers as multi-dimensional, having concern for their well-being outside of their status as teacher. He employed many tactics to convey his interest in the personal welfare of his teaching staff such as preparing food for staff functions for the primary intent of being able to “break bread” with them, by attending personal, special occasions and being present for them at their most vulnerable times, and by creating opportunities for teachers’ career development. His ability to manage the daily operations of the school was echoed throughout the study. Teachers, parents, students, and district personnel spoke highly of his effectiveness as a building manager.
Principal Smiley recognized the value teachers brought to Gooding High and revered his teachers as professional. The teaching staff actively participated in all facets of decision-making, was invited to take leadership roles, was encouraged to take risks as it related to new educational initiatives, and was assigned the same duties as he.

Along with the rest of Gooding High’s stakeholders, teachers had plenty of opportunities to see Principal Smiley align his words with his practices. Moreover, he frequently proved his dedication by going the “extra-mile” for students. The message of a student-centered environment was implicitly and explicitly articulated and visibly enacted by Principal Smiley in many capacities. While the concerns and issues of teachers were taken into consideration and tended to, Principal Smiley’s primary priority was the advancement of Gooding High’s students. Moreover, his focus on students’ first established the tone of and created a unifying value for Gooding High.

His support was not limited to Gooding High’s students. Teachers felt that Principal Smiley was there for them as well. He allowed teachers to state their dissatisfaction with the politics and bureaucracy of the district. Teachers also could express their inability to connect with students and parents. At school sponsored events, where teachers served as advisors, he was there making certain that teachers had all the assistance needed.

The manner in which he exerted authority allowed teachers to make decisions and handle student disciplinary matters when necessary. Principal Smiley empowered his staff and did not practice a top-down leadership. Another persisting theme in the urban education research that was represented in this study was high visibility and openness.
Principal Smiley was rarely in his office and when he was, his door remained opened allowing for students and staff to visit frequently.

One of the most important qualities of educational leaders who serve students from inner-cities is an understanding of the specific issues those communities face. Without question, Principal Smiley was empathetic of the social constructs that could serve as barriers to the success of Gooding High students. He educated himself through reading texts, professional developments, and by intimately engaging with parents, students, and the neighboring community members. Moreover, he imparted the critically-centered and socially-conscious perspective on his staff.

According to the body literature of urban education, Gooding High has strong variables that would cause high attrition rates among teachers: (a) large, urban school, (b) poverty-stricken student demographic, (c) majority students of color, and (d) being located in a high-crime neighborhood. However, at Gooding High, teachers were satisfied, had a pride for the school, and a dedication to its students. They felt connected to the school through a collective mission to see students succeed. This tone was inevitably set by Principal Smiley and it manifested itself through the actions of all Gooding High members.

Since no effective leader is absent of fault, it is imperative that the concerns Penny are considered, although they appeared quite different from the survey findings and the sentiments expressed in the focus groups. One of the qualities needed of an effective leader is to be open to voices of dissension. The nature of the study precluded an in-depth analysis of the relationship between Principal Smiley and Penny. However,
despite the true basis of her dissatisfaction, it is the responsibility of school principals, to the best of their ability, to diffuse any tension within the school building.

Another matter that deserves attention is the seemingly lack of formal incentives provided by Principal Smiley to his teaching staff. The research on effective school leadership and the literature on establishing trusting relationships within school communities assert that good principals create opportunities for recognition and praise for their students and teachers. Although occasions for student tributes were plentiful at Gooding High, it appeared that the diligence of teachers went unnoticed. In the focus group discussion, there was a general consensus that no incentives were in place for good teaching practices and behaviors. However, after analyzing the data from the study, it was evident incentives were set in place for the teaching staff. Teachers were recognized in unorthodox ways such as having the honor of awarding students their diplomas, if students chose them to do so. Thus, the method in which teachers were acknowledged reflected the student-centered tone of Gooding.

Moreover, it is important to note that teachers at Gooding High did not let the seemingly lack of recognition affect their dedication to students; they were internally motivated to serve. For example, Penny’s commitment to students is manifested in her disappointment in the disapproval of an activity. Although there was neither extra compensation nor any other official incentives for this added duty, Penny was eager to assume the responsibility and felt passionately dissatisfied when it was not consented. This internal will to serve can be attributed to the tone set in Gooding sustained by Principal Smiley, who himself sought no extrinsic praise for his extraordinary service.
Similar to Principal Smiley, teachers at Gooding High internalized the charge of being committed to the students, making external gratitude not a hindrance to their work in seeing students succeed.

Although Principal Smiley was a white, male administrator serving a predominately African American student population, racial politics was not a factor in his interactions. It was apparent that he worked on his rapport with the entire school community. Parents, students and teachers revered Principal Smiley. His verbal commitment to student achievement was reflected in his actions, and in his interactions with members of the Gooding High family. He was able to establish trust by showing his obligation to students and parents, and holistically supporting his staff.

Implications

Several implications arise from the outcome of this study. First and foremost, school-site leaders should respect the value of relationship forming within their buildings. Opportunities should be made available where all stakeholders can develop trusting relationships. Teachers should have the chance to work intimately with principals and other teachers on school-related matters. Occasions for social engagement between principals and teachers should also be made available. Principals and teachers should have opportunities to gain a rapport with students and parents in formal and informal ways such as serving collectively on committees, having socials, and working together at school functions.

Also inferred in the study is that teachers and other stakeholders can offer insight to principals on the characteristics of effective leadership. They can assist principals in
developing a greater understanding of expectations from those involved with the school. This is vital because principals can then align their behaviors and practices to what is perceived by their school community as effective. This connection with what stakeholders recognize as successful leadership will allow them to be more open. It will foster trust, and a sense of understanding.

Similarly, relational trust is a practical theory with viable tenets that can be materialized into actions and behaviors. Moreover, its tenets are played out in the relationships in schools among principals, teachers, students, parents, and other community members. Once relational trust is broken, it is problematic to regain. Thus, principals must work seriously and diligently to maintain relational trust with all stakeholders.

According to the study, principals must be mindful of the unspoken messages conveyed throughout schools. If the mission and vision of the school are student-centered so should its décor. Student achievements should be reflected throughout the schools. Bulletin boards in classrooms and hallways should highlight student accomplishments, hold inspirational quotes and passages that inspire educational attainment. The unspoken messages manifested throughout school buildings should align with the practices and objectives of the members within them.

Findings from the research also implied that school leaders must pay attention to their simple actions and carry them in the same regard as their major endeavors. For example, teachers see personal regard in many capacities from simply speaking upon meeting to the more engaged as leaders participating in their personal events of teachers.
Along the same lines teachers see principals’ dedication through the number of hours they commit to work and by the act of personally financing school events when needed. It is imperative that principals convey their messages from various dimensions to assure it is being perceived as such by all intended parties.

Given teachers power to exert authority is another inference implied from the study. Teachers are empowered when they feel their principals trust them in making disciplinary decisions and handling students’ behavioral matters. Trust is developed when teachers experience that principals respect their ability to resolve student issues. School building administrators must also make certain that this tone of shared-decision making is understood by students and parents of their schools.

A final implication noted is that school-site administrators must be able to connect culturally to the community in which it serves. Despite the often racial and class differences among principals and families in inner-cities, School building administrators must make an asserted effort to gain a rapport with the community and be empathetic toward to the complex, and challenging situations that demographic faces. Moreover, it is vital the principals impart this understanding on their teaching staff, who often come in urban schools with a lack of cultural understanding of its students and communities.

Recommendations

The research study provided a wealth of knowledge on effective educational leadership, urban education, and relationship building. Thus, several suggestions derived from the outcome of the study; each will be discussed briefly.
The findings of the study reinforce the literature on value of relation trust in education. Thus, the first recommendation is that relational trust should be considered as a vital part of school culture and its constructs used in school reform efforts. The concepts of relational trust should be implemented in the curriculum of educational leadership graduate programs. For current school administrators in urban areas, professional development opportunities related to this subject matter should be afforded. Existing principals should be introduced to the constructs of relational trust and then participate in a self-analysis as well as allow their stakeholders to partake in an assessment to determine if it exists within their school buildings.

Secondly more studies should be conducted with a primary focus on relationship building as a mechanism for transforming schools. Although trust is major aspect in generating successful schools, it is not given its deserved importance in the literature on urban education. Particularly with regard to schools with a large number of African Americans, who culturally work from a communal perspective, relationship building and establishing trust is essential. Thus, to speak of effective school restructuring for urban education, social reform must be regarded just as academic reform. Therefore, state and district policies that address school improvement must value the role relationship forming plays as catalyst for change.

Although there is body of literature on success stories in urban education it is not as substantial as the research on the issues plaguing schools in urban areas. More studies should be done on urban education that focuses on what is right. Instead of describing the illnesses that plague inner-city schools, future research should cover what are the healthy
things they are doing. Instead of just highlighting all the problems of crime, truancy, lack of parental involvement, student disengagement, teacher-burnouts, as well as poor attendance and graduation rates, research should focus on the goodness and successes as well. Exemplary urban schools can inform educational researchers about the numerous definitions of educational success and how it is achieved. A premise of identifying good schools, examining what works in them and determining if it is replicable or transportable to other urban educational centers should be a commanding focus on in the literature.

A final recommendation is to broaden the definition of “effective schools” in the literature of urban education. As Lightfoot (1983) argued in *The Good High School*, effectiveness is a complicated phenomenon with various components. In a subsequent article, differentiating how social scientists and educational practitioners view effectiveness, Lightfoot (1986) contended that educational researchers view school effectiveness narrowly as instructional effectiveness, whereas people in schooling use multiple constructs in identifying effective school. She explained, “they [also] refer to the complex interaction of variables-the ways in which organizational structure, pedagogical process, individual temperament, collective action, ritual, symbol, and myth combine in myriad ways to create a workable environment (p. 13).” Thus, while measurable items such as attendance and graduation rates, standardized test scores, and truancy rates are ways of determining schools’ success, so should immeasurable items like the “ethos” of the school. An expanded definition of “effectiveness” respects schools holistically.
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PARTICIPATION CONSENT FORM
The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title:

“The Presence of Relational Trust in an Urban School with an Identified Effective Leader"

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose:
You are invited to participate in a research study that is designed to learn more about your school’s climate. Studies in educational research have shown the relationship among a positive school climate, teacher satisfaction, and student achievement. Since as teachers you have the most and direct contact with students, your opinions regarding school climate are highly important. Thus, I believe that your sentiments and ideas about your school culture matter and will be of great value. This research is being performed by James Dabney, a doctoral candidate in the Educational Policy and Leadership Department at The Ohio State University to partially satisfy my requirements for degree completion.

Procedures/Tasks:
Your participation in the study requires you to complete a brief survey and possibly be a participant in a focus group of your peers, with a maximum of ten persons. Notes will be taken by the facilitator in the discussions to ensure accuracy of your statements and to minimize biases. To further guarantee validity of your comments, the discussions will be tape-recorded.

Duration:
The estimated time ranges between 30 minutes to complete the survey and two hours for the focus groups. A person participating in both will be required to commit two and a half hours. You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.
Risks and Benefits:
Since this topic can be sensitive, although not severe, the risk of discomfort may occur when expressing your opinions on the questionnaire and in the focus group discussion. Particularly, if you decide to participate in the focus group discussions, the risk of being socially isolated may occur when expressing views that are not the same as the other participants. However, I assure you that I will do my best to provide a safe, and a non-hostile environment. Guidelines will be set among participants to establish a respect and personal regard for others.

The benefits for participation in the study outweigh its minimal risks. This research advances the knowledge base in the field of education, particularly in the area of urban education. With regard to your particular school, the knowledge obtained will allow participants to develop or sustain positive relationships in their schools. Also, it permits you to express your sentiments about your school climate in a safe environment and have your concerns expressed anonymously to your school leadership. Along the same lines, your engagement will provide the school’s leadership invaluable insight of teachers’ perception of the school’s cultural practices, and can serve as professional development program.

Confidentiality:
Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):
• Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
• The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
• The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Incentives:
Refreshments will be served during the faculty meeting in which the survey is conducted and at the focus group discussions. If there is at least a 50% response rate, a report will be provided to each school to facilitate planning.

Participant Rights:
You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.
If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact James Dabney, at dabney.12@osu.edu or via phone at 614-292-3540.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

If you are injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact James Dabney, at dabney.12@osu.edu or via phone at 614-292-3540. Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to learning from you.

Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
<th>Signature of subject</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the subject</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

James Dabney

Printed name of person obtaining consent

Signature of person obtaining consent

______________________________  AM/PM

Date and time
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SURVEY INSTRUMENT COMPLETED BY TEACHING STAFF
Survey on School Climate

The purpose of this questionnaire is to get your opinion regarding your school climate. Your participation in this survey will help me to better understand how principals build trusting relationships with their teachers. Thus, I would greatly appreciate your candid and honest responses to each question or statement. Your responses will be kept confidential. Information obtained from this survey will be analyzed and reported collectively so that individuals are not identified. The survey number that appears at the top of the survey will be used only by the researcher to determine the number of surveys completed. The survey should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please check the response that is most accurate.

1. Gender: Male____ Female____

60-69____ 70-79____ 80-89____ 90+ ____

3. Years of teaching experience:
   1-5____ 6-10____ 11-20____ 21-25____ 26-30____ 30+____

4. Ethnicity: Black____ White ____ Hispanic____ Asian/Pacific Islander____ Native American___
   Other (please indicate) ____________________________________________________

Please check the highest degree that you have obtained.

5. Bachelor's____ Master's____ Doctoral____

Please respond to each of the following statements by placing a checkmark in the blank underneath the response that represents your answer: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), D (disagree), or SD (strongly disagree).

1. The principal has confidence in the expertise of teachers
   SD D A SA

2. I trust the principal at his or her word
   SD D A SA

3. It’s OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations with the principal
   SD D A SA

4. The principal takes a personal interest in the professional development of teachers
   SD D A SA

5. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the faculty members
   SD D A SA

6. I feel respected by other teachers
   SD D A SA

7. Teachers respect other teachers who take the lead in the school improvement efforts
   SD D A SA

8. I really respect my principal as an educator
   SD D A SA
9. I usually look forward to each working day at this school  
   SD   D   A   SA
10. Teachers in this school trust each other  
    SD   D   A   SA
11. It’s OK in this school to discuss feelings, worries, and frustrations, with other teachers  
    SD   D   A   SA
12. Most teachers in this school are cordial  
    SD   D   A   SA
13. The principal places needs of children ahead of personal and political interests  
    SD   D   A   SA
14. The principal, teachers, and staff collaborate to make this school run effectively  
    SD   D   A   SA
15. I feel loyal to this school  
    SD   D   A   SA
16. Teachers at this school design instructional programs together  
    SD   D   A   SA
17. Teachers at this school make a conscious effort to coordinate their teaching with instruction at other grade levels.  
    SD   D   A   SA
18. In this school, teachers have a “can do” attitude  
    SD   D   A   SA
19. All teachers are encouraged to “stretch and grow”  
    SD   D   A   SA
20. The school day is organized to maximize instructional time  
    SD   D   A   SA
21. Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents  
    SD   D   A   SA
22. In this school, teachers are continually learning and seeking new ideas  
    SD   D   A   SA
23. When making important decisions, the school always focuses on what’s best for student learning  
    SD   D   A   SA
24. Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who are expert at their craft  
    SD   D   A   SA
25. I feel respected by my principal  
    SD   D   A   SA
26. I would recommend this school to parents seeking a place for their child  
    SD   D   A   SA

Please respond to each of the following statements by placing a checkmark in the blank underneath the response that represents your answer: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), D (disagree), or SD (strongly disagree).

27. Teachers are involved in the making the important decisions in this school  
    SD   D   A   SA
28. The school has well-defined learning expectations for all students  
    SD   D   A   SA
29. Teachers have a lot of informal opportunities to influence what happens here  
    SD   D   A   SA
30. Teachers in school regularly discuss assumptions about teaching and learning  
    SD   D   A   SA
31. Teachers talk about instruction in the teachers’ lounge, faculty meetings, etc…  
    SD   D   A   SA
32. Experienced teachers invite new teachers into their rooms to observe, give feedback  
    SD   D   A   SA
33. A conscious effort is made by faculty to make new teachers feel welcome here
   SD D A SA

34. This school really works at developing students' social skills
   SD D A SA

35. I wouldn’t want to work in any other school
   SD D A SA

For questions 36-40, please mark the extent to which you disagree or agree with each of the following...

The principal at this school...

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Makes clear to the staff his or her expectations for meeting instructional goals</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Communicates a clear vision for our school</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Sets high standards for student learning</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Understands how children learn</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Sets high standards for teaching</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Presses teachers to implement what they have learned in professional development</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Carefully tracks student academic progress</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Is an effective manager who makes the school run smoothly</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Know what’s going on in my classroom</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Actively monitors the quality of teaching in this school</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Pushes teachers to communicate regularly with parents</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!!!!!
APPENDIX C

FOCUS GROUP DEMOGRAPHIC FORM
The Existence of Relational Trust in Schools with “Effective Leaders”

Pseudonym (You can name yourself): ________________________________

Please check the response that is most accurate. (only for demographic purposes, will not be attached to specific responses)

1. Gender: Male___ Female___

2. Age: 20-29___ 30-39___ 40-49___ 50-59___
       60-69___ 70-79___ 80-89___ 90+ ___

3. Years of teaching experience:
   1-5___ 6-10___ 11-20___ 21-25___ 26-30___ 30+___

4. Ethnicity: Black___ White ___ Hispanic___ Asian/Pacific Islander___ Native American___
   Other (please indicate) __________________________________________________

Please check the highest degree that you have obtained.

5. Bachelor’s___ Master’s___ Doctoral___
APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPATION SCRIPT
Focus Group Participation Guidelines

“The following is a list of ground rules used for the discussion important issues. They will be used in an attempt to establish a safe and comfortable space for discussion. Please let us do our best to adhere to the guidelines so that we all may feel comfortable in expressing our views. Thank you.”

**Ground Rules (List Ground Rules First)**

- Risk Taking
- Support
- No Put-Downs
- Respect
- Confidentially
- Right to Pass
- Others?

**Script:**

- **Risk Taking:** To best learn about your school climate, sometimes it is necessary for us to step out of our comfort zone. Please speak on issues that are important to you.

- **Support:** If we are asking people to step out of their comfort zones, we need to be there to support them. Support in this context includes...
  - **No Put-Downs:** All feedback and comments should be made with the desire to inform, not to hurt.
  - **Respect:** Each individual’s perspective is valued and considered legitimate for that person.

- **Confidentially:** It is important for everyone to agree what is said in the group, stays in the group. Statements taken out of the context of the session can be completely misunderstood.

- **Right to Pass:** Participants at all times have a right to pass on sharing although we do hope that you fully participate.

- **Others?** Are any ground rules they would like to add to make them feel more comfortable in the group. Be sure to add suggested ground rules to your list.
APPENDIX E

FOCUS GROUP INQUIRY INSTRUMENT
Focus Group Questions

“All of the questions are assumptions, if you believe the contrary please note.”

1. In your opinion, what are the specific skills and traits needed by a leader to establish trust among teachers and how is [Principal Smiley] conveying those traits?

2. How does [Principal Smiley] establish respect among his staff?

3. How does he maintain his integrity (aligning his words and actions)?

4. How does he exhibit personal regard (caring about you as person and not just for your work as a teacher) for you and other teachers?

5. Give examples that confirm [Principal Smiley] goes beyond his call of duty?

6. How does your principal enlist teacher involvement?

7. What incentives are in place to reward good teaching behaviors and practices by your principal?

The following statements (8-13) are specific to [Gooding High]’s survey findings:

[Gooding High] staff responded to the survey. Of these at least 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the following. Please address to the best of your ability:

8. (#16) The staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents

9. (#21) Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with parents

10. (#23) When making important decisions, the school always focuses on what’s best for student learning

11. (#26) I would recommend this school to parents seeking a place for their child

12. (#29) Teachers have a lot of informal opportunities to influence what happens here

13. (#46) The principal pushes teachers to communicate regularly with parents
APPENDIX F

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Interview Questions

1. How did you get into the education field and how long have you been an educational profession?

2. Why urban education (as your chosen area)?

3. How do you connect with your staff?

4. What are some of your best leadership attributes?

5. What are some of your leadership traits you feel need to be strengthened?

6. How would you describe effective leadership for urban schools?

7. How long have you been at [Gooding High] and what makes this school unique (I recall you telling me that this school has always been diverse, with regard to black and white)?

8. How are students from urban schools different from those from suburban and rural districts?

9. How are teachers selected to work in your school (what are the qualities in which you look for)?

10. In what ways do you convey your confidence in the expertise of your teachers?

11. What are some of the challenges faced by students at [Gooding High]?

12. Do you feel that some teachers here disagree with your leadership, if so, why?
APPENDIX G

PRINCIPAL’S 2007 COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
Principal’s 2007 Commencement Address

You are the Best!

I am a Parent dreaming the best for each of my children, always resolving the issue and along the way with the greatest of satisfaction on graduation day.

I am a Mother with the ability to love and chastise at the same moment but willing to give me being for you to have a greater chance at life.

I am a Father pushing to excel in sports. Relationships, and classrooms, believing you are the best and never hoping for anything less.

I am a Preacher of goodwill, the golden rule and the morals of a difficult world even in the event of loss and tragedy.

I am a Cook when you are hungry even though your food choices are less than desired but you continue to grow, even when you ask to go out to lunch after we say-NO!

I am a Coach with my eyes on the prize always believing in your potential, practicing to win against all odds and focusing our strength as a team to victory.

I am a Bus Driver negotiating the tough streets with my back turned to adolescent teenagers with normal feelings and issues of our modern world.

I am a Counselor scheduling, testing, and completing college applications at the same time listening to your hopes, dreams, and fears as you transition out to graduation.

I am a Custodian creating a clean facility even when you forget to deposit the trash, throw away that can and willing to listen when small things are not working.

I am a Secretary who meets you for the first time, answers your simple but complex questions, and always courteous when others forget their manners.

I am a Teacher bringing life to concepts, breath to standards and the ultimate gift of becoming a lifelong learner.

I am a Friend even when you do not realize and hope enough opportunities present themselves so you will give me a chance.

You are the best we’ve got, graduate, go, and excel.
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