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ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between administrative styles and teachers' Stages of Concern (SoC) about an educational innovation. This dissertation examined differences in mean scores on the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) for elementary teachers implementing an elementary art program. The independent variable in this study was the administrative style of the second change facilitator, the elementary principal. The data were analyzed using MANOVA, post hoc ANOVA and Scheffé Tests. Analysis of variance was used to identify differences in the mean scores of the seven stages of concern among the teachers under the different administrative styles.

The study was conducted in 17 elementary schools in a suburban school district in a midwestern state. Two hundred and thirty-four elementary teachers completed the SoCQ, one of three diagnostic dimensions of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model. The SoCQ measures seven stages of concern about the implementation of an innovation. A second instrument, the Administrative Style Questionnaire (ASQ), was completed by the teachers. The results from the ASQ were used to divide the principals into three
categories of administrative style: responder, manager, and initiator. These categories served as the three levels of the independent variable.

Analyses were performed on the SoCQ and ASQ. Analysis of the simple effects for this grouping showed a statistically significant difference on one (refocusing) teacher stage of concern. Subsequent post hoc analysis by a Scheffé Test did not identify a statistically significant difference between any of the administrative styles. The descriptive data resembled the profile of non-user for all three administrative styles.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction to the Problem

The sun. . .
In dim eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
on half the nations, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs (Milton, 1962)

Change is a constant in the human condition. Schools, as a reflection of society, have been put in a perplexing position. They must conserve and preserve while being responsive to new expectations and knowledge. Widely divergent perceptions regarding what should be preserved and what should be changed have been the focal points for many discussions (Fullan, 1982; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1986). Not only what to change but how to change has been a central theme throughout volumes of research (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, 1978; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Fullan, 1982; Sizer, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Hall & Hord, 1987; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

The change cycle of introduction/evaluation/rejection has become commonplace in education. Too often innovations are introduced through popular educational periodicals, the concept expands rapidly, and then carefully controlled evaluations are conducted. Rejection begins when innovations are
replaced with newer innovations and/or complaints surface in professional publications (Slavin, 1989, pp. 752-758).

Much has been written about educational change in the last fifteen years (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, 1978; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Hall, Hord, & Griffin, 1980; Fullan, 1982; Hall, Rutherford & Griffin, 1982; Huling, Hall, Hord, & Rutherford, 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Hord, Huling, & Stiegelbouer, 1983; Rutherford, Hord, Huling, & Hall, 1983, 1987; Hall, Rutherford, Hord & Huling-Austin, 1984; Sizer, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Hall & Hord, 1987). Change is complex; it involves individuals, innovations, and the context (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall, 1987). A teacher’s ability to understand how an innovation was used, why an innovation was used, or how an innovation failed to be used can aid in a professional educator’s future growth. Educators are often not given enough in-service training and preparation time to be able to handle change.

Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin (1978) prepared a report for the United States Office of Education in which they reviewed and synthesized the findings of a four-year, two-phase study conducted by the Rand Corporation to examine and evaluate a national
sample of education innovations funded by federal programs. In addition to analyzing the effects of federal policies, they examined characteristics of new educational projects and how school districts managed educational innovations. They studied the projects' educational methods, resource levels, scopes, and implementation strategies. The district characteristics they analyzed were school climate and leadership, teacher attributes, and district management capacity and support (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, pp. vii-viii). Berman and McLaughlin's report had seven conclusions:

1. The choice of educational methods and resources available determined the projects' outcomes and continuation to only a small and limited extent.

2. Expensive projects were generally no more likely than less expensive ones to be effectively implemented, elicit teacher change, improve student performance, or be continued by teachers.

3. Ambitious and demanding innovations promoted teacher change and teacher continuation of project methods without causing unmanageable
implementation problems or diminishing gains in student performance.

4. Locally chosen implementation strategies strongly influenced both the project's short-run outcomes and its longer-run fate.

5. Leadership was a vital factor at both the school and the project level.

6. Teachers' attributes, years of teaching experience, sense of efficacy, and verbal ability significantly affected project outcome. The number of years of experience had a negative effect.

7. A supportive district environment was necessary for an innovation to be effectively implemented and sustained. (p. 34)

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) found that leadership was vital to success at both the school and the project level and that teachers' attributes such as years of teaching experience, sense of efficiency, and verbal ability significantly affected project outcome. The number of years of experience had a negative effect. The research reported here focused on styles of administrative leadership and teachers' concerns about the implementation of an educational innovation as well
as on how demographic variables such as teachers' years of experience affect the concerns of teachers.

Problem

The purpose of this research was to ascertain how the change facilitator style of the principal, the second change facilitator, affected the stages of concern of the teachers who were implementing an educational innovation. The change facilitator style (responder, manager, and initiator) was the independent variable. The dependent variable, stages of concern, was measured by the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) that yielded seven subscale scores.

The Setting for This Study

The educational innovation chosen for this study was a Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) program at the elementary level. Until six years ago this school district had a limited one-year art program, The Marj Gamble Art Program, built around a single elementary classroom teacher who facilitated art instruction at the fourteen elementary attendance centers. The art teacher during this time visited one school a day and taught demonstration lessons on request in this non-mandated art program that she had designed.

Prior to the use of the Marj Gamble Art program, classroom instructors were responsible for instruction
in art. The majority of elementary classroom educators had taught little or no art. Often crafts and/or duplicated coloring sheets comprised the "art program."

This Marj Gamble Art Program was evaluated at the end of the year, three additional art consultants were employed and they implemented a discipline-based art program (DBAE) (Getty Foundation for the Arts, 1987). Today the school district has grown by five elementary schools to house nineteen elementary attendance centers. All elementary schools are visited by the art consultant for one, one-and-a-half, or two days per week depending on the number of students in the attendance site. The number of art consultants has again been increased by three so that there are now seven art consultants. All art consultants are certified elementary art educators.

DBAE was the art program selected by the first four elementary art consultants. This educational innovation was new to this school district. DBAE was developed by the Getty Foundation for Education in the Arts. The Getty Foundation concluded that humankind has four major concerns in the arts: (1) they want to make it, (2) they want to look at it, (3) they want to understand its place in culture over time, and (4) they
want to make judgments about its quality (Getty Foundation for the Arts, 1987).

The DBAE art program was implemented by four art consultants who were assigned three or four schools each. The consultants visited each school each week and taught DBAE art lessons and wrote an art guide consisting of DBAE lesson plans for each grade level during the first year of the program. An art curriculum guide was distributed and introduced the second year. The number of elementary schools increased throughout the six-year period of the new art program implementation. Two of the original art consultants quit and have been replaced. There are now nineteen attendance centers and seven art consultants.

Principals did not assume an active instructional role in this new program. Principals had no more art training than the classroom teachers. The principals were told to support the program by district level administrators. A few principals learned along with their teachers, but most of them chose the position of "permission givers" for purchasing supplies, approving directed workshops, approving art supplies management, and such tasks.
Terms

There are only a few terms used in this research that may be unfamiliar. In addition to Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) and art consultant, several terms involved in educational change are discussed: change facilitator (CF), first change facilitator (FCF), second change facilitator (SCF), Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), Innovation Configuration (IC), initiators, managers, and responders.

Art Consultant: The professional educator who implemented the art curriculum with the elementary classroom instructors. This educator taught demonstration lessons, conducted workshops, consulted with administrators and/or classroom teachers, produced instructional bulletin boards, purchased and managed art materials, and implemented the district art curriculum. The art consultants were the teachers' primary source of information and instruction in art. In this study the art consultants have been identified as the first change facilitators.

Change Facilitator (CF): Teachers, principals, curriculum consultants, outside consultants, assistant principals, and others who, for brief or extended periods, assist various individuals and groups in
developing the competence or confidence needed to use a particular innovation (Hall & Hord, 1984, p. 11).

**First Change Facilitator (FCF):** The main person in charge of implementing an innovation (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 349-450). The art consultants in this study have been identified as the first change facilitators.

**Second Change Facilitator (SCF):** The secondary person in charge of implementing the innovation (Hall & Hord, p. 261-262). The principals were identified as the second change facilitators in this study.

**Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)** (Hall, Wallace, & Dossett, 1973) has three parts: Stages of Concern (SoC) (Hall & Rutherford, 1976), Levels of Use (LoU) (Hall Loucks, Rutherford, Newlove, 1975), and Innovation Configurations (IC).

**Levels of Use (LoU):** The behaviors of the users of the innovation: non-use, orientation, preparation, mechanical use, routine, refinement, integration, and renewal. Describes behaviors of innovation user and does not focus on attitudinal, motivational or other affective aspects of the user. It does not attempt or explain causality. It attempts to define operationally what the user is doing (Hord, Rutherford, Hulig-Austin, & Hall, 1987, p. 54).
Innovation Configuration (IC): The operational forms an innovation can take. Using IC it is possible to identify and describe the changes that are in use and plan for intervention (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 116).

Stages of Concern (SoC): There are seven stages of concern that an educator progresses through as an innovation is introduced and implemented. These seven stages can be grouped into three categories that include self, task, and impact concerns. The stages are identified as awareness, information, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 30-32).

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE): Consists of four major parts: art history, art production, art criticism, and aesthetic judgment. Employs the same standards maintained in other academic subjects—written, sequential curriculum; student assessment; and adequate instructional time (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987).

Administrative Styles: Three administrative styles were considered in this study. They are described below.
Initiators

Initiators hold clear, decisive, long-range goals for their schools that transcend, but include, implementation of current innovations. They have a well-defined vision of what their school should be like and of what teachers, parents, students, and the principal should be doing to help the school move in that direction. They tend to have strong beliefs about what constitutes good schools and teaching. They listen to their teachers, then make decisions. The decisions are based on input from those who will be involved. Each decision is made in relation to the long-term goals they hold for the school and what they believe to be best for students. Initiators push: they have strong expectations for students, teachers, and themselves, and they push to see that all are moving in goal-oriented directions. They convey and monitor these high expectations through frequent contact with teachers and clear expectations of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of the school, particularly in the students' interest, initiators will seek changes in district programs.
or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. They will be creative in interpreting policies at times and strive to capture as many resources and as much capability for their schools as possible. Initiators tend to be adamant, but not unkind (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 230).

Managers

Managers exhibit a different set of behaviors and orientation. They demonstrate responsive behaviors to situations or people, and they also initiate actions in support of a change process. Variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and the central office staff, as well as to how well they understand the purposes of a particular innovation. They are efficient in administering their schools and work without fanfare to provide basic support to teachers. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. A particularly significant characteristic is that they protect their teachers from what they perceive as excessive demands. They question changes at the beginning and tend to dampen their entry. Once they understand that outsiders, such
as the central office, want something to happen in their school, they become very involved with teachers in making it happen; yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed. Managers try to do everything themselves. They try to do all the different tasks associated with the principal’s role rather than delegating jobs and responsibilities. When they do assign jobs, they monitor very closely what the designated person is doing rather than work with him/her or letting go (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 230-231).

Responders

Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationship with teachers and others. They are concerned about how others will perceive decisions and the direction the school is taking. They therefore tend to delay decisions, to get as much input as possible, and to be sure that everyone has had a chance to express their feelings. They view teachers as strong professionals who are able to carry out instruction with little guidance from them. As a consequence, they will allow others to make decisions, if they wish. They believe their
primary role is to maintain a smoothly running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content, and treating students well. Another characteristic of responders is the tendency toward making decisions based on immediate circumstances rather than on longer range instructional or school goals. This tendency seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and to their more limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future. As a consequence, decisions tend to be made one at a time and to be most heavily influenced by the last person(s) they talk to. Another characteristic of responders is that, once a decision is made, it is set in concrete. A great deal of new information and extended discussion are required to bring about major modifications (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 231-232).
CHAPTER 2
Review of the Literature

Change in Education

There have been in the United States numerous memorable years: 1941, the Japanese invasion of Pearl Harbor; 1957, Sputnik; and 1983, the year the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its report, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" (United States Department of Education, 1983). The Chairman of the Commission, David P. Gardner, urged wide dissemination, full discussion of the report, and encouraged appropriate response to it throughout the nation. The Government Printing Office reported that over 70,000 copies of "A Nation at Risk" had been purchased, and private groups have printed at least another 500,000 copies on their own. Extensive excerpts from the report have been reprinted in newspapers and journals (United States Department of Education, 1984, p. 7).

The "A Nation at Risk" report was the first of many reports critical of education that called for change in our current educational system. The cry for change in the American schools was on the lips of researchers, educators, parents, and patrons. Something must be done. But what?
John I. Goodlad and Theodore Sizer have written extensively about change. Goodlad in his book *A Place Called School* (1984) suggests numerous ideas for change, such as: 1) for states, clear articulation of a comprehensive set of goals for schools, 2) for school districts, greater decentralization of authority and responsibility to the local school site, 3) for teacher education, a two-part program that includes behavioral and humanistic studies relevant to schooling and teaching and guided observation and practice only in key and demonstration schools working in collaboration with the teacher preparing institutions, 4) for teachers, distributing time and instruction so the curricula has sufficient scope and balance to reflect the expectations of state goals, 5) for schools, the elimination of ability grouping and tracking and greater emphasis on methods of mastery learning, 6) for research and development centers, focusing on curriculum design, on the content of the major domains of the curriculum, and on teaching and evaluation, and 7) for school districts, a new design for close articulation of our elementary, middle, and senior high schools; more rigorous selection and preparation of principals; alternative ways of staffing elementary schools; and the division of large secondary schools
into smaller, semiautonomous units (pp. 318-319).
Sizer in his book *Horace's Compromise* (1984) pinpoints five imperatives for better schools. He believes 1) in giving a room to teachers and students to work and learn in their own, appropriate ways, 2) in having students clearly exhibit mastery of their school work, 3) in using incentives correctly for students and teachers, 4) in focusing the students' work on the use of their minds, and 5) in keeping the structure of the school simple and thus flexible (p. 214).

Michael Fullan (1982) in his book *The Meaning of Educational Change* defines the term "innovation" to include all educational changes. Slavin (1989) claims innovation occurs in a cycle. This cycle includes

...early enthusiasm, widespread dissemination, subsequent disappointment and eventual decline - the classic swing of the pendulum (pp. 755-756).

Robert Slavin (1989, pp. 752-758) suggests that the process of change be considered in two phases, the upswing and the downswing. The upswing includes the program proposal, the program piloting, the program introduction in innovative districts, the program becoming a "hot topic" among staff developers, the program expanding rapidly, and controlled evaluations. The downswing then begins, complaints surface in professional publications, preliminary evaluations are
disappointing, interest in the program flags, and, finally, controlled evaluation studies are published.

To stop the pendulum, according to Slavin, two major shifts must occur. First, school districts have to demand high-quality evaluation programs before they adopt innovation. Second, school districts must focus their efforts on extended training and follow-up for a smaller number of programs and practices with proven effectiveness. One-shot workshops do not meet educators' needs. Systematic implementation must replace scattershot presentations.

The need for systematic implementation was clear. For a decade, research in implementation was conducted at the University of Texas in Austin at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE). The team--Shirley M. Hord, William L. Rutherford, Leslie Huling-Austin, and Gene E. Hall and their colleagues--engaged in a collaborative effort. They also worked with schools, school administrators, and researchers in Australia, Belgium, Canada, England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. The focus of the project by this research team was the school improvement process: what it was, who it involved, what were its effects, and how it might be managed. Their findings integrated
research studies on teachers and administrators (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 1-7).

Concerns-Based Adoption Model

The research team verified a number of assumptions about change. The change process was called the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). The model is client-oriented; the special needs of the individuals are heeded. This model allows the facilitator to make adjustments to insure success and to minimize the innovation-related frustrations (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 7).

The CBAM has three major components. First, the Stages of Concern (SoC) describes the concerns of the teachers during the change process. The stages comprise: refocusing, collaboration, consequence, management, personal, informational, and awareness. Figure 1 shows the Stages of Concern about the innovation.

The Stages of Concern (SoC) of the teachers were measured by the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) (Appendix A). The SoC was one of three dimensions of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 8-9). The SoCQ focuses on the concerns of individuals involved in change (Hall, 1979, p. 202). Seven kinds of concerns have
FIGURE 1

Stages of Concern about the Innovation

6 REFOCUSING: The focus is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.

5 COLLABORATION: The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.

4 CONSEQUENCE: Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on students in his/her immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes.

3 MANAGEMENT: Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling, and time demands are utmost.

2 PERSONAL: The individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands, and his/her role with the innovation. This includes analysis of his/her role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision-making and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

1 INFORMATIONAL: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.
AWARENESS: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated (Hall & Hord, 1984, p. 60).

been identified by research: those of awareness, information, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973, p. 15). The seven stages are grouped into the three areas of self, task, and impact (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973, p. 14). The seven stages are distinct but not mutually exclusive. However, they can be measured independently. It was not uncommon for an individual to have some degree of concern at all stages at any given time.

Self concerns occur early during stages of the change efforts. Teachers had concerns about themselves (stage 1, informational; stage 2, personal) (Hall, 1979, pp. 205-206). Personal concerns may not be expressed as openly as informational concerns. The teachers may be concerned about their ability to execute the new innovation properly and about making mistakes that make them look foolish (Hall, 1979, p. 206).

Task concerns (stage 3, management) usually become more intense as final preparations are made for the teacher to begin using an innovation and during the
early period of use (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 31). These concerns include time management, getting teaching materials ready, and arrangement of students. Important concerns exist when the teachers are the most intense about the effects of the innovation and what can be done to improve the effectiveness of the innovation (stage 4, consequence; stage 5, collaboration; and stage 6, refocusing) (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 32). Many teachers never reached the collaboration and refocusing stages. During the collaboration stage the teacher was involved with others to improve the outcomes of an innovation. Teachers who have used an innovation with efficiency for a period of time may want to find better ways to teach their students using innovation. Few teachers ever reach the refocusing stage (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 32).

Second, Levels of Use (LoU) can identify those teachers actually employing the new practices efficiently, those who are experimenting with them, and those who have yet to start. It defines operationally what the user is doing. The eight levels are 1) non-use, 2) orientation, 3) preparation, 4) mechanical use, 5) routine, 6) refinement, 7) integration, and 8) renewal (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987,
p. 53). Understanding the LoU dimension, the question becomes not one of use or nonuse, but of what level of use.

Third, Innovation Configuration (IC) was another component of CBAM. It focuses on describing the operational forms an innovation can take. Teachers may adapt or initiate the innovation as they become involved in its use. Using IC it was possible to identify and describe the changes that are in use and plan for intervention. Change facilitators, staff developers, evaluators, curriculum developers and others are involved with collecting and summarizing data of the basic components of an innovation. They are also involved with identifying the variations of the components of the innovation that teachers might use in the classroom. These components and variations differ from innovation to innovation. These components include 1) materials used, 2) grouping teachers, 3) kinds of tests used, 4) use of test data, 5) roles of team players, 6) sharing responsibilities, and 7) grouping of students. Figure 2 depicts the Concerns-Based Adoption Model.

Hall and Hord (1987) agree that one of the main premises for change was this: principals and other facilitators can be more effective and change can be
In Figure 2, note the position of the change facilitator (CF) in the framework and this person's central importance. The CF is a major factor in the CBAM model and is a person or persons who deliver actions based on the needs of the individuals (denoted by "i" in the drawing) or groups of individuals involved in change and improvement. Facilitators have a resource system available to help individuals change. The resources may be rich or quite thin. Which resources and how and when to use them is grounded in a "concerns-based diagnosis."

For the diagnosis, the CF uses various techniques for probing the people involved in order to understand them and their needs; such diagnosis can be accomplished through use of Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configurations. The hypothesis underlying the CBAM model suggests that with diagnostic information the CF can make decisions about how to use resources and provide interventions to individuals to facilitate the school improvement process (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 9-10).
more successful if they address the concerns of teachers. Policymakers, administrators, and others had points of view that must be considered; but in the end, teachers' feelings about and perceptions about change did in large part determine whether or not change actually occurs in classrooms. The ability of change facilitators to understand the dynamics of the teachers' perceptions of change was crucial. In addition, the change facilitator must be able to adjust his/her behaviors so that he/she addresses change from the teacher's point of view (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 52-53).

**Factors Affecting Change in Education**

Change is a multi-faceted process. It involves the implementation process, innovation, and participants. Implementation refers to the actual use of an innovation or what an innovation consists of in practice. It was important in this dissertation to focus on implementation for four reasons (Fullan & Pomfert, 1977, pp. 335-342): First, one cannot know if a change has occurred unless it has been conceptualized and measured directly. Second, it was important to understand some of the reasons why many educational changes fail to become established. Third, failure to study implementation may result in it being ignored or
confused with other aspects of the change process such as adoption (decision to use an innovation), or in confusing the determinants of implementation with implementation itself (Fullan & Pomfert, 1977, pp. 338-340). Fourth, unless implementation was examined separately, it may be difficult to interpret the learning outcomes and to relate these to possible determinants (Fullan & Pomfert, 1977, pp. 335-397).

Implementation

One of the most elaborate evaluation projects was reported by Berman and McLaughlin in 1976. They and their colleagues at the Rand Corporation reviewed over a five-year period certain federally supported innovative educational programs and their underlying assumptions. They addressed four questions: 1) How should innovations and dissemination of new practices be assessed? 2) How do school districts select, implement, incorporate, and spread different kinds of innovations? 3) How do differences in federal programs, in project characteristics, and in local settings affect how projects are carried out, continued with local funding, and disseminated? 4) What should federal policies be toward educational innovation in light of the political, financial, and organizational
constraints that the federal government faces in its dealings with the public schools?

Berman and McLaughlin reviewed 293 projects liberally supported by the U.S. Office of Education. These were the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Titles III and VII; the Vocational Educational Act, Part D; and the Right-to-Read Program.

In cases of successful implementation, the districts had already begun to attack the problem before federal money became available. Unsuccessful implementation seemed to be associated with districts that simply augmented the district budgets with federal money. Six other characteristics of implementation were noted: 1) a rejection of too tightly packaged proven solutions to permit local adaptation, 2) the development or adaptation of materials instead of the use of materials developed elsewhere, 3) continuous planning and revising rather than sticking to the original plan at all costs, 4) training identified by project participants to meet on-going needs, 5) strong support from key school and district administrators, and 6) consistent and committed technical assistance (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976).
The Principals' Role

The principals' cooperation and administrative skills are indispensable to the success of projects involving innovative changes in classroom organization, (which entail new routines and practices) such as the art program. Comprehensive innovations demand that the principal actively support them and run interference with disapproving nonproject teachers: "Important as the project director is, it was unlikely the classroom organization projects could be implemented without the principal's active support" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, p. 128). The principal was chiefly responsible for establishing the school's educational policies and philosophy (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, p. 125). The principal plays a key role in school improvement (Hall, Hord & Griffin, 1980, p. 3).

Change Facilitator Style

A change facilitator is a person working directly with people who are expected to change (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 3). Researchers for the Research and Development Team for Teacher Education and the University of Texas at Austin have identified three change facilitator styles (Hall, Rutherford & Griffin, 1982, p. 12). They are described in operational terms and are referred to as initiators,
managers, and responders (Hall, Rutherford, Hord & Huling-Austin, 1987, pp. 23-24). Strong relationships were found between the change facilitators' styles and the implementation success at the classroom level (Hall, Hord & Griffin, 1984, p. 24). The Principal-Teacher Interaction Study (PTI) (Hord, Huling & Stiegelbauer, 1983) indicated that the initiator was the most successful at implementing an educational innovation. The managerial type of change facilitators were the next most successful, and the responders were the least successful.

Each of the three change facilitator styles makes a unique contribution to the implementation success. The labels "first change facilitator" or "second change facilitator" appear in the research literature. For the sake of clarification, the author denoted them as first change facilitator (FCF) and second change facilitator (SCF). The concept of a SCF has just recently emerged in the research literature (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 260).

The PTI study was significant. It involved an investigation of first change facilitators, second change facilitators, the Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configuration about an educational innovation. Identified in this study were almost two
thousand interactions between teachers and principals. In the nine schools involved in this study numerous people played significant roles in the implementation phase; principal, innovation personnel (either district or school site), site resource personnel, the individual teachers, the assistant principal, district decision makers, and resource leaders. A wide range of personnel are involved in the process in various roles.

In the PTI study data were collected from May 1980 to May 1981 in nine elementary schools and involved principals and other change facilitators. The focus of the research was the first change facilitator, but the concept of the second change facilitator emerged. Three principals were selected from each of the school districts involved in Colorado, Florida, and California. The principals served as the primary subjects and informants on the interventions in this study.

Researchers contacted the principals and assistant principals bi-weekly by telephone throughout the 1980-81 school year to collect data on interventions related to the innovations being studied. Each study site had three to four on-site visits. During the on-site visits intervention data were collected from
administrators and teachers. The analyzes of these interactions resulted in seven conclusions.

1. The quality of day-to-day incident interventions are critical to overall implementation success.

2. Change facilitators need to use various techniques and procedures to monitor their intervention behavior.

3. A complete set of intervention functions must be performed.

4. Various types of interventions are needed if a change process is to be successful but do not need to be provided by the principal or any other single change facilitator.

5. There needs to be an assessment of teachers and other targets before intervention occurs.

6. All incident interventions are not pre-planned.

7. It is fun to think about everyday names for certain classes of interventions (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 172-174).

Facilitator Role in the Change Process

In Gene Hall and Shirley Hord’s (1987) book Change in School: Facilitating the Process one of the main premises is that principals and other facilitators can
be more effective and change can be more successful if the concerns of teachers are addressed. The personal side of change is crucial. Change facilitators play a critical role. Hall and Hord’s book also focuses on the role of CF’s, both FCF’s and SCF’s.

SCF can be a variety of people in the change process. They may be teachers, principals, curriculum consultants, outside consultants, assistant principals, and so forth. The important consideration was not the job title but how the SCF works with the instructor (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 261-262). In the study being conducted here the actions of the principal most closely fit the description of the SCF. The art consultant fits the role of FCF better. Further explanations of these roles will be presented later in this chapter. The SCF was important in the change process (Hord, Huling & Stiegelbauer, 1983, pp. 261-262). Understanding the role of the SCF in reference to the principal can be useful for school personnel.

Hall and Hord (1987) in their book Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process analyze the data on the characteristics of interventions of SCF’s and FCF’s. There are several optimal characteristics of successful FCF’s and SCF’s. In Hall and Hord’s study, neither the FCF’s nor the SCF’s primary assignment was
the classroom. The classroom teacher in their study had the primary assignment in the classroom. The FCF spent a considerable amount of time with the educational innovation, but the SCF spent more time and the innovation is a major part of his/her job. The FCF had more formal authority in line or staff position. The SCF had less formal authority than the FCF. The FCF saw the innovation as important but the SCF believed the innovation less important but still good and useful. The FCF pushed for the use and led the change facilitator team. The SCF was a day-to-day coach and helper. The FCF was knowledgable about and skilled in manipulating resources to support the innovation. The SCF was expert in the technical details of the innovations. In this research the SCFs were not expert in the technical details because the innovation was new to the SCF.

The FCF was impatient to have results so he/she could move on to other concerns. The SCF was patient. He/she dealt with problem-solving, cajoling, and coaching. The FCF saw the innovation as successful when it was implemented and appropriate outcomes were obtained. The SCF concerned himself/herself with internal problems and was not as interested in extra recognition but wanted ongoing support to do what
he/she believed had to be done to help the users. The FCF led, listened, and decided. Supporting, sharing, and communicating were the focus of the SCF (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 349-350). Figure 3 summarizes the difference in the CF’s.

The Principal as Second Change Facilitator

The principal was identified as the Second Change Facilitator (SCF) in this dissertation. The art consultant was identified as the first change facilitator (FCF). The optimal definition of the characteristics of successful change facilitators for school-wide change includes two parts that are not completely congruous with the definition of a SCF and the FCF (see Figure 3). The FCF and the SCF share roles on two of ten optimal characteristics. The two characteristics are primary assignment and innovation expertise.

In the area of innovation expertise the FCF is usually considered to be the more knowledgable about and skilled in manipulating resources to support the innovation (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 349). The SCF is usually considered to be an expert in the technical details of the innovation’s use. The art consultant as the FCF was the expert in the technical details and was more knowledgable and skillful in the manipulation of
**Figure 3**

**Optimal Characteristics of Successful Change Facilitating Teams for School-Wide Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation Related Characteristics</th>
<th>First CF</th>
<th>Second CF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Assignment</strong></td>
<td>Not in classroom.</td>
<td>In school, but not in classroom with special CF role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Allocation</strong></td>
<td>Spends much time.</td>
<td>Has a major part of job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Has formal authority in line or staff position.</td>
<td>Has less authority than first CF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Sees use of innovation as being important.</td>
<td>Truly believes that the innovation is good and should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Related Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Push for use, leads CF team.</td>
<td>Day-to-day coach, helper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Expertise</strong></td>
<td>Knowledgeable of and skilled in manipulating resources to support the innovation.</td>
<td>Expert in technical details of innovation use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time Perspective and Tone

| Impatient to have results so can get on to other things. | Has patience to do day-to-day problem-solving, hand-holding, cajoling and coaching. |

Recognition

| Success comes from having implementation and successful outcomes. | More internally oriented, not so interested in extra recognition or glory, but wants ongoing support to do what s/he believes has to be done to help users. |

Relationship Between Team Members

| Leads, listens decides. | Communicates, shares, supports. |

Team Dynamics

| Ongoing cross member exchange, mutual support and complementary of emphases, characteristics and functions. |


resources and support of the innovation. The art consultants were hired for their expertise in art at the elementary level. The principal had little or no information about the educational innovation. The federally funded Rand study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976) found that the principals' unique contribution to implementation does not lie in the "how to do it" advice better offered by project directors. The
principals' role is in giving support to the staff and in creating an organizational climate that gives the educational innovation legitimacy. Many factors affect implementation. The leadership of the principal appears to be one of the most important factors in the success or demise of an educational program that offers an alternative way of approaching a subject area such as the art program in this research (Thomas, 1978, p. xiii).

The principal as the SCF has different formal authority in a line or staff position than the art consultant as the FCF. In some cases the FCF and SCF have similar authority structures. Both the FCF and the SCF have direct lines of communication to central office personnel. The FCF has more authority over the curriculum development but the SCF has more control over the expenditures on supplies and supervision of personnel. The author does not believe these two variations on the optimal definitions substantially affected the results.

Summary

Change is a process that involves people with various roles and concerns. The change process is complicated and must be viewed from a multitude of angles to clearly understand it. The change process
must be understood and monitored: "Not to monitor was not to know; not to know dilutes what to do" (Hord, Huling & Stiegelbauer, 1983, p. 23).

Change facilitators play an important role in the change process (Hall & Hord, 1984, p. 11). Strong relationships are found between the change facilitator’s styles and the implementation success at the classroom level (Hall, Hord & Griffin, 1984, p. 24). Change facilitators have three styles of management; they are referred to as initiators, managers, and responders (Hall, Rutherford, Hord & Huling-Austin, 1984, p. 12). Finally, the concerns of the people implementing the changes should not be forgotten:

Concerns do not exist in a vacuum. Concerns are influenced by participants’ feelings about an innovation, by their perception of their ability to use it, by the setting in which the change occurs, by the number of other changes in which they are involved and, most of all, by the kind of support and assistance they receive as they attempt to implement change (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 43).
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Introduction

This study examined the relationship between SoC of teachers and administrative styles. The dependent variables were measured by subscale scores on the SoCQ. The independent variable was administrative style of the principal: responder, manager, or initiator.

This chapter will describe the methodology employed. The first section includes a description of the sample of elementary teachers, principals, and art consultants who participated in the study. In the next section, there is a detailed description of the instruments used to collect information about the independent and dependent variables. The third section describes the research procedures, the research and null hypothesis addressed, and the data analysis procedures. A summary concludes the chapter.

Sample

The sample included 17 elementary principals and 423 elementary classroom instructors from a single suburban school district that included 19 elementary schools. Of the 423 questionnaires issued, 234 were returned providing a 55% return rate. One principal and her staff were eliminated because she was in her
first year as an administrator and less than one year's exposure to an administrator style would not have served as a firm basis for research. One attendance center did not return principal or teacher data.

The portion of the sample that responded to the questionnaire item pertaining to education level included 16 teachers with bachelor's degrees, 90 with master's degrees, 6 with specialist's degrees, 3 with education doctorates and 1 with a doctor of philosophy degree in education. The remaining 118 teachers chose not to respond. The instructors had various amounts of exposure to the art program—ranging from 1 year (5%) to 6 years (42%). Most of the respondents (75%) were females. The number of years of experience as an elementary instructor was tallied—1 year, 3%; 2 years, 4%; 3 years, 6%; 4 years, 4%; 5 years, 5%; 6 years, 2%; 7 years, 2%; 8 years, 4%; 9 years, 2%; 10 years, 5%; 11 years, 3%; 12 years, 3%; 13 years, 4%; 14 years, 3%; 15 years, 5%. The remaining staff had 16 to 36 years of experience with 1% to 3% represented at each yearly increment. Twenty-four percent of the respondents did not respond to this item. This school district was chosen because it had concluded its sixth year with an educational innovation.
Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study—Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) and Administrative Style Questionnaire (ASQ). The reliability and validity of both questionnaires are reported below.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire

The Stages of Concern (SoC) of the teachers were measured by the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) (Appendix A). The SoC was one of three dimensions of the Concerns Based Adoption Model (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 8-9). The SoCQ focuses on the concerns of individuals involved in change (Hall, 1979, p. 202). Seven kinds of concerns have been identified by research: awareness, information, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973, p. 15). The seven stages are grouped into the three areas of self, task, and impact (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973, p. 14). The seven stages are distinct but not mutually exclusive. However, they can be measured independently. It is not uncommon for an individual to have some degree of concern at all stages at any given time. Hall, Hord and Griffin (1980, pp. 27-28) have concluded that the degree of concern for each stage
varies according to the administration style of the change administrator.

The above concerns were measured with a 35-item, eight point Likert-style instrument with seven subscales that takes about 35 minutes to complete. Using a zero to seven scale on the SoCQ, the respondents indicated the degree to which each concern was true. A zero indicates a very low concern or a completely irrelevant item, a low number indicates a low concern, and a high number indicates a high concern. Five statements represent each of the seven SoC’s. The sum of the responses to the five statements for each subscale were reported as raw scores and were then converted into percentile ranks for graphing on the SoC Profile. The SoCQ has been developed to provide a quick-scoring measure of the Stages of Concern. The SoCQ was tested for reliability and validity with several different samples and eleven different innovations (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 9).

Reliability of SoCQ

In the fall of 1974, a stratified sample of 830 teachers and professors participated in a two-year longitudinal study of concerns. The data were used to develop the SoCQ. For an item to be included on the
instrument the item needed to be more highly correlated with responses to other items measuring the same stage than with responses to items on other scales. The alpha coefficients estimating internal consistency for each of the seven SoC scales are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Coefficient Alpha Estimates of Internal Consistency for the Subscales of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  \( n = 830 \)
(Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 11)

One hundred and seventy-one of the 830 original teachers and professors were asked to complete the questionnaire the second time two weeks after their first response to the SoCQ. One hundred and thirty-two completed and returned the SoCQ and the test-retest reliability estimates are displayed in Table 2.
Table 2

Test-Retest Correlations on the Stages of Concern Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson-r</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 132

(Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 11)

Validity of SoCQ

Validity was not as easy to demonstrate as reliability. There was not another instrument with which SoCQ could be easily compared. Cronbach and Meehl (1955) outlined a strategy to assess construct validity, and the construct validity of the SoCQ scores were established by inter-correlation matrices, judgment of concerns based on interview data, confirmation of expected group differences, and changes over time.

Identifying potential items for the SoCQ was the first step. The staff at the University of Texas at Austin’s Research and Development Center for Teacher Education generated five hundred and forty-four items.
A Q-sort was conducted, and a pilot checklist was generated. Through the analysis of a 195-item pilot checklist and the Stage 0 (non-user) concerns in 1974 came the first indications that the questionnaire might measure the concerns.

Six subscales (stage 1 through stage 6) comprised this prototype instrument. No items were designed to reflect Stage 0 concerns on the basis of input from external consultants. The consultants did not believe Stage 0 was relevant to the theory (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 13). Stage 0 later proved to be relevant to the SoC theory (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 15). The questions were sorted into the six stages using a Q-sort by the staff members with each stage having 14 to 68 items per stage. Three hundred and fifty-nine persons completed a 195-item questionnaire that indicated that 83% of the items were correlated more highly with the score on the stage subscales to which they had been assigned than with the total score on the instrument. In addition, 72% of the items correlated more highly with the stage sub-scale score to which they had been identified than to any other stage (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 12).
A correlation matrix was computed using the same data. A summary of scale intercorrelations is displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

**Intercorrelation of the Six Subscales of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  n = 359

(Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 13)

Approximately half of the staff (N = 22) of a single attendance center in an Austin Independent School District participated in a five-week summer workshop addressing a new reading program. To accommodate those not in the workshop (n = 25) a one
day in-service was held for all the instructors. Both groups were asked to take the SoCQ to measure their concerns about educational innovation. Higher scores on Stages 3, 5, and 6 were exhibited by persons who experienced the five-week workshop ($p < .05$). Persons who did not attend summer workshops had higher scores on Stages 0, 1, and 2 ($p < .05$). There were no significant differences on Stage 4 concerns between the two groups. Stages 1 and 2 concerns are self-concerns. Stage 3 concerns are management related. Stages 4, 5, and 6 are connected to the impact on students. The teachers who had attended the summer workshop had already addressed the self-concerns and had progressed to the task and impact concerns (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, pp. 17-18).

In a longitudinal study on team teaching involving the faculty of a single school over a two-year period, the concern of instruction shifted from being high on the lower (0, 1, 2) stages through a high on management concerns (3), and finally to fairly low intensity on all concerns stages. Another way of viewing the data are profiles. Profiles are raw data converted to percentile ranks. Profiles add support to the validity of the concern theory as well as the SoCQ (Hall, George
Rutherford, 1977, p. 17). Figure 4 shows the hypothesized development of the SoC.

Profile Interpretation

As individuals move from unawareness and nonuse of an innovation into beginning use and more highly sophisticated use, it is hypothesized that their concerns develop from being most intense at Stages 0, 1, and 2, to most intense at Stage 3, and ultimately to most intense at Stages 4, 5, and 6. Particularly if the innovation is a positive one and there is support for its implementation, an individual's concern profile plotted over time should have the form of a progressive wave motion from left to right as illustrated in Figure 4. Where the individual is in this "growth" sequence can best be assessed through interpretation of the complete concerns profile.

Analysis of concerns profiles, either through looking at the tabular listing of percentile scores or the plots of these percentile scores on a graph, provides the most complete clinical interpretation and assessment of both individual and group data. By use of clinical interpretation techniques, an interpreter can develop a great deal of insight, not only into the type(s) of concern that is(are) most intense and least intense, but also into the affective stance that the respondent is taking towards the innovation (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 34).

Administration Style Questionnaire Development

Dr. Howard Ebmeier's (1989) research has shown that the most accurate information about a supervisor can be gleaned from the people whom he/she supervises. Calder believes that leadership is a disposition or trait that exists only as perceived by others (1977). Classroom teachers completed the ASQ, and art
Figure 4
The SoCQ Profile
Hypothesized Developments of Stages of Concern

Key
- = Nonuser
- - = Inexperienced User
- - - = Experienced User
- - - - = Renewing User

Note: n = 156
consultants' and principals' administrative styles were identified by classroom teachers' responses to the ASQ. The Administrative Style Questionnaire (ASQ) includes sixteen administrative style statements on a five-point Likert-like scale. Summing across all items, the raw scores were divided by the total number of statements (16). On this five-point Likert-like scale the score of 1 to 2.33 designated the administrator as a responder, 2.34 to 3.67 as a manager, and 3.68 to 5 as an initiator.

Hall and Hord (1987), in their book Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process, present the Indicators of Change Facilitator Style Chart concerning the three administrative styles. For this study, a five point Likert-type scale was added to the chart in designing an administrative style instrument (see Appendix A). Of the 36 indicators of change facilitator styles designated by Hall and Hord (1987, pp. 233-242) 16 applicable indicators were selected because they related to the change process. A panel of experts agreed that these statements were applicable to the change process in the spring of 1990. The panel consisted of three Ph.D. candidates: one in Curriculum and Instruction, one in Educational Administration, and the third in Educational Psychology and Research.
Three areas of the three change facilitator styles were explored—managing change, guiding, and supporting and structuring the leadership roles. These were selected because they are an integral part of administrative style (See Appendix A).

**Reliability of Administrative Style Questionnaire**

The modified ASQ was given to 19 graduates in an educational policy and administrative class at The University of Kansas. Responses from three of the 19 students were eliminated because they were not complete. The alpha coefficients estimating internal consistency ranged from .63 to .88 ($p = .01$). The overall alpha coefficient was .81 with Managing Change equal to .81, Guiding and Supporting equal to .88, and Structuring Leadership Roles equal to .63.

**Validity of Administrative Style Questionnaire**

Content validity was established by a panel of experts. Each expert gave an independent assessment of the appropriateness, relevancy and relationship of the associated construct for each area of content. All items included in this instrument had 100% agreement among all expert panelists. According to Ebmeier (1989), the validity of the majority of administrator evaluation instruments whether formative or summative were simply unknown.
Procedures

The SoCQ and ASQ were distributed to the principals who gave them to the teachers in their buildings during a faculty meeting in May. The number of questionnaires returned was low (less than 30 percent), and the principals were asked to distribute them again in September. In the fall, the teachers were asked to respond as they would have at the conclusion of May. Social security numbers were checked on the questionnaire to ensure that the instructors filled out the questionnaire no more than once.

The SoCQ and ASQ combined took 45 minutes to complete. The demographic information requested included number of years exposure to the elementary art program, number of years of working with the current principal, and number of years as an elementary teacher. The highest degree of college/university degree attained, whether or not the teacher was working on a higher degree, age, experience, and gender were asked. While the instructors completed their questionnaire and demographic forms, the principals completed forms containing similar demographic questions. The questionnaires were completed during faculty meetings and at the teachers' and principals'
leisure over the period of a month. The results were returned through school mail. There was a 55 percent return rate.

**Data Analysis**

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the hypothesis that follows below. Wilks-Lambda was used as an index of statistical significance. The significant MANOVA was followed with univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA). The significant ANOVA was followed by post-hoc Scheffé Test.

**Null Hypotheses**

There will be no significant difference (p = .05) between mean scores on each of the seven different subscales of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire for teachers exposed to three different administrative styles (initiator, manager, and responder).

Analysis of variance (both multivariate and univariate analyses) was used to test for differences in mean scores for the seven SoCQ subscales for teachers across three different groups exposed to different administration styles.

The results from the ASQ were used to divide the principals into three categories of administrative style: responder, manager, and initiator. Principals
were put into one of these three styles by summing across all categories and dividing the total score by the number of items (16). A score, on this Likert-like scale, of 1 to 2.33 designated the administrator as a responder, 2.34 to 3.67 as a manager, and 3.68 to 5 as an initiator. These categories served as the three levels of the independent variable (see Table 4).

SoCQ results were displayed using tables or graphs. The mean raw score for each stage was converted into a mean percentile score (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977, p. 27). Graphic representation of the percentile ranks are also displayed. Group profiles were plotted by marking each vertical axis at the point representing the percentile score.

Summary

A multivariate analysis of variance design was used for data analysis with administrative style as the independent variable and the seven subscale scores of the SoCQ as the dependent variables.
### Table 4

**Administrative Styles and Percentage Returns of Reporting Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>N of Returns</th>
<th>% Returns</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>% for Designated Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 0 responses from one school. 1 school had a first year administrator and was eliminated. 3 schools had less than 27% returns and were eliminated. a = Style could not be determined because of equal cell size.
Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of the data collected. The differences in mean raw scores for SoC for teachers exposed to principals with three different administrative styles (initiator, manager, and respondent) served as dependent variables. Instructors in the schools described their principals as representing one of the three administrative styles. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for differences in mean scores for the seven SoCQ subscales for teachers exposed to different administrative styles.

Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis

On each of the seven different subscales of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire there will be no significant difference ($p \leq .05$) between mean scores of teachers exposed to three different administrative styles, initiator, manager, and responder.

Hypothesis Results

Cell size was reduced to 48 randomly selected cases for each administrator style to meet the homogeneity of variance assumption for the multivariate
analysis of variance. The multivariate analysis of variance showed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of teachers exposed to the three different administrative styles (initiator, manager, and respondent) on at least one of the subscales of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire \( U = .857, \ [F (14,268) = 1.72, p < .05] \). The first order follow-up univariate analysis of variance indicated significant differences in means on SoC 6 (refocusing) between administrative groups. However, the post hoc Scheffé Test indicated no statistically significant mean differences between administrative styles. Table 5 shows the results of the MANOVA. Graphic representation of data displayed in Table 5 is shown in Figure 5.

Although inspection of the percentile ranks on the SoC 6 mean scores shows that teachers experiencing the three administrative styles positioned themselves differently, the relative ordering of the styles shows initiators \( (PR = 81) \) first, managers \( (PR = 77) \) second, and responders \( (PR = 60) \) third.
Table 5

ANOVA Results of Stages of Concern Questionnaire Stages of Administrative Style by Building Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>201.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5081.27</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5282.28</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>122.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>9966.89</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10089.75</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>320.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.48</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>11830.96</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>84.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12151.91</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>127.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.82</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>8598.57</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8706.21</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>154.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>9877.25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>70.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10031.38</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>8517.75</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8520.63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>526.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>263.07</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>8362.85</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>59.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8888.99</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 144 \)

** \( 2 \leq .01 \)
The SoCO Profile. Three Administrative Styles
Table 6 reports the mean raw SoCQ scores and corresponding percentile ranks for each of the three administrative styles.

Table 6

SoCQ Profile: Raw Score and Percentiles by Administrative Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Responder*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Manager*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Initiator*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 48

Visual inspection of the percentile ranks demonstrates little variability in percentile ranks of mean scores. Except for SoC 4 the percentile ranks of mean scores were in the top 50% of the distribution. Only SoC 5 ranked at or below 52nd percentile. SoC 1 stands out as exhibiting the greatest diversity among percentile ranks of mean scores.
Summary of Findings

The hypothesis was tested using a MANOVA (Wilks-Lambda), post hoc ANOVA, and a Scheffé Test. The conclusions drawn for the hypothesis are reported below.

Hypothesis. It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between mean percentile scores of teachers exposed to the three different administrative styles (initiator, manager, and responder) on each of the seven substages of the Stages of Concern. The principals' administrative styles were determined by the majority of teachers from each school. The null hypothesis was not rejected.
Chapter V
Summary, Discussion, and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to see if there was a difference in mean scores on the SoCQ for teachers in buildings where principals had different administrative styles: initiator, responder or manager.

This chapter provides a discussion interpreting the research findings of this study. The results of the ANOVA have been delineated. The conclusions for the research findings are also presented. Limitations of the study are then discussed, and recommendations for future research conclude the chapter.

Summary and Findings of the Study

The SoCQ and ASQ were given to 423 elementary instructors in a suburban school district. The SoCQ identified teachers' concerns about a new art program, and the ASQ denoted their principals' administrative styles. Of the 423 questionnaires issued, 234 were returned providing a 55% return rate. A MANOVA (Wilks-Lambda), post hoc ANOVA and Scheffé Tests were conducted on the data. The ANOVA yielded one statistically significant result on Stage 6 (refocusing). The post hoc Scheffé Test revealed no differences between any two of the three administrative styles.
The SoC Profile in my study produced interesting results. The Profile resembled the classic Profile of a non-user except on the SoC 6 (refocusing). The tail-up SoC 6 resembled the Profile of an inexperienced user. A tail-up SoC 6 expresses the concern of the users wanting to refocus on the innovation for major revisions and/or wanting to reject the innovation totally.

**Conclusions**

Change is a multifaceted process. First and second change facilitators are one part of the change process. The CF style can have an effect, but it is difficult to measure. Style is the gestalt of a leaders' behavior, knowledge, concern, and tone (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 30).

**Implications of Findings**

Principals can affect the implementation process. Based on the data for this sample, the administrative style of the principal was not shown to significantly affect teachers' concerns.

Teachers do not change easily. Change is a constant in school and must be dealt with by all teachers. Understanding and managing change will aid principals and teachers in their professional growth, hence student outcomes improve.

Managers tended to have a greater amount of variability than the other two styles on SoC 5.
(collaboration). Schools number 12 and 2 identified their principals as managers but their SoC scores were quite different on this stage. This could possibly be attributed to some managers and might promote collaborative efforts more than others.

The near significant results \( (p = .07) \) of SoC 1 (information) could be explained by perhaps managers being more concerned about managing a new educational innovation. Whereas, the teachers' of initiator and responder administrators have more intense concerns elsewhere. Informational concerns of the six-year-old innovation have been met most efficiently by the teachers' of initiator principals. Users with responder principals had the lowest concern scores. Responder principals view their teachers as strong professionals and allow them to have more control over their professional lives than do either of the other two types of administrators. Responder principals would not push for implementation by meeting informational concerns. The responder principals would only respond when asked.

**Limitations of the Study**

There are three factors that may have limited the results of this study. These factors are as follows:

1. Effect of the art consultants as the first change facilitator was not considered, and
it should be addressed in future research. It was not possible to design a study that permitted examination of the impact of the art consultants on the change process. The art consultants changed over the six year period; some consultants quit, new ones were hired, and school assignments changed yearly. There was no way to allow for the changes and the resultant administration style in this research. However, the concern should be noted.

2. When a study relies on volunteer returns, as with self-administered questionnaires, one wonders if the people who did not respond would have responded any differently than those who did. However, the number of respondents for this study, 55%, was large enough to be representative of the population.

3. The data were collected at the end of a spring semester and the beginning of the following fall semester. Collecting data at two different time periods may have decreased the internal validity of the study by allowing for errors in measurement to be reflected in the reliability estimate for the measure used to survey teachers' concerns. There were no political, social or
economic upheavals over the summer months that would affect elementary teachers' concerns about an educational innovation.

4. There was a great deal of variability on the percentage of teachers identifying their principals as one of the three administrative styles. The range was from thirty-eight percent to eighty-five percent agreement on style. It would be highly desirable to include cases that had a seventy-five percent agreement or higher of the reporting cases to sharpen the distinction between the three categories of the independent variable.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

In the process of conducting this study, I have discovered six suggestions for future research.

1. The study conducted was limited to an elementary art program. Research needs to be done for other programs of study, at different educational levels, such as middle/junior high school and high school.

2. The study should be replicated because this area of study is new, and the role of the second change facilitator as a recognized change agent has not been thoroughly researched.
3. It may be necessary to utilize alternative operationalized definitions to adequately understand the dynamics of administrative style.

4. This educational innovation was supported by the district office but the use was not mandated. The teachers may not have felt the need to properly implement this innovation because it was not required.

5. This six-year-old innovation was an art program. The teachers concerns were highest in the self and management areas. If the innovation had been an area of study that was subject to standardized testing and the reports made public such as English or math, this researcher believes that the SoC Profile would have less resemblance to a non-user Profile.

6. The research on change is complex. It involves the context, the innovation and the participants. Further research using the naturatistic inquiry focusing on ethnography, concerning the relationship between FCF and SCF, would shed new light on these relatively unexamined areas of research.
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APPENDIX A

Directions for Using the SoCO Quick Scoring Device and Stages of Concern and Administrative Style Questionnaire
DIRECTIONS FOR USING THE SoCQ QUICK SCORING DEVICE

Developed by Eddie W. Parker and Teresa H. Griffin

The Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) contains 35 items. The scoring of the SoCQ requires a series of operations which result in an SoCQ profile.

Instructions

The following steps have been carried out on the attached Quick Scoring Device for subject number 0001, using this subject's responses on the SoCQ.

Step 1: In the box labeled A, fill in the identifying information taken from the cover sheet of the SoC Questionnaire.

Step 2: Copy the numerical values of the circled responses to statements 1 through 18 in the numbered blanks in the Table labeled B. Note that the numbered blanks in Table B are in consecutive order.

Step 3: Box C contains the Raw Scale Score Total for each stage (0-6). Take each of the seven columns (0-6) in Table B, add the numbers within each column, and enter the sum for each column (0-6) in the appropriate blank in Box C. Each of these seven Raw Score Totals is a number between 0 and 33.

SoCQ Quick Scoring Device

A. Identifying Information

Date Site SSN Innovation

B. Raw Scale Scores (35 items)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

C. Raw Score Totals (Stages 0-6)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

D. Percentile Table

5-Item Raw Scale Stages

Score Total 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

E. Percentile Scores (Stages 0-6)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

F. SoC Profile

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Step 4: Table D contains the percentile scores for each Stage of Concern. Find the Raw Scale Score Total for Stage 0 from Box C ("5" in the example; locate this number ("5") in the left-hand column in Table D, then look in the Stage 0 column to the right in Table D and circle that percentile ranking ("53" in the example). Do the same for Stages 1 through 6.
Step 5: Transcribe the circled percentile scores for each stage (0-6) from Table D to Box E. Box E now contains seven numbers between 0 and 99.

Step 6: Box F contains the SoC graph. From Box E, take the percentile score for Stage 0 ("53" in the example) and mark that point with a dot on the Stage 0 vertical line on the SoC graph. Do the same for Stages 1 through 6. Connect the points to form the SoC profile.
STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE
AND ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

1. Do not complete this form if you are a new teacher in the Olatha School District.

2. Write the name of your last year’s school in the name section of the answer sheet.

3. Please fill in your age and sex.

4. In the section provided for special codes fill in the number of years you have worked with your last year’s principal in slots K and L. In the slots O and P fill in the number of years you have worked as an elementary teacher. For example, 8 years would be 08 and 16 years would be 16.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what teachers in the Olatha Elementary Art Program are concerned about. The items were developed in 18 different countries over a decade from typical responses of school and college teachers who ranged from no knowledge at all about various programs to many years experience in using them. Therefore, a good part of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time. For the completely irrelevant items, please circle “0” on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you do have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale. For example:

This statement is very true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

This statement is somewhat true of me now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

This statement is not at all true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

This statement seems irrelevant to me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the items in terms of your last year’s concerns, or how you feel about your involvement or potential involvement with Olatha Elementary Art Program. We do not hold to any one definition of this program, so please think of it in terms of your own perceptions of what it involves. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your last year’s concerns about your involvement or potential involvement with the Olatha Elementary Art Program.

After the Stages of Concern Questionnaire you will find the statements about administrative style. Please rate your last year’s principal and your last year’s art consultant on the 5 point sliding scale.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Concern Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am concerned about students' attitudes toward the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I don't even know what the Olache Elementary Art Program is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would like to help other faculty in their use of the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a very limited knowledge about the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am concerned about revising my use of the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am concerned about how the Olache Elementary Art Program affects students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am not concerned about the Olache Elementary Art Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. I would like to know what the use of the Olathe Elementary Art Program will require in the immediate future. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. I would like to coordinate my effort with others to maximize the Olathe Elementary Art Program's effects. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by the Olathe Elementary Art Program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. At this time, I am not interested in learning about the Olathe Elementary Art Program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace the Olathe Elementary Art Program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. I would like to use feedback from students to change the program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the Olathe Elementary Art Program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. I would like to know how the Olathe Elementary Art Program is better than what we have now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Administrative Style Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Change</th>
<th>Accepts district expectations for change</th>
<th>Meets district expectations for changes that are required</th>
<th>Accommodates district expectations for change and pushes adjustments and additions that will benefit his/her school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. **Art Consultant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Sanctions the change process and attempts to resolve conflicts when they arise</td>
<td>Maintains regular involvement in the change process sometimes with a focus on management and at other times with a focus on the impact of the change</td>
<td>Directs the change process in ways that aim toward effective Olathé Elementary Art Program use by all teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. **Principal**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

39. **Art Consultant**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

39. **Art Consultant**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

40. **Principal**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

41. **Art Consultant**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

41. **Art Consultant**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

42. **Art Consultant**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Relies on information provided by other change facilitators, usually from outside the school for knowledge of the Olathé Elementary Art Program

Seeks out information from teachers, district personnel and others to gain an understanding of the Olathé Elementary Art Program and its demands

Develops minimal knowledge of what use of the Olathé Elementary Art Program entails

Becomes knowledgeable about general use of the Olathé Elementary Art Program and what is needed to support use

Develops sufficient knowledge about use of the Olathé Elementary Art Program to be able to make specific teaching suggestions and troubleshoot problems that may emerge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates expectations relative to change only in very general terms</td>
<td>Informs teachers that they are expected to use the Olathe Elementary Art Program</td>
<td>Gives teachers specific expectations and steps regarding use of the Olathe Elementary Art Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely monitors the change effort through classroom observation, review of lesson plans and student performance</td>
<td>Closely monitors the change effort through classroom observation, review of lesson plans and student performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Information gained through monitoring may or may not be discussed with a teacher</td>
<td>Information gained through monitoring is discussed with teachers and compared with expected behavior</td>
<td>Information gained through monitoring is reported directly to teachers, compared with expected behavior and a plan for next steps including improvement is established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Art Consultant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Believes teachers are professionals and leaves them alone to do their work unless they request assistance or support</td>
<td>Believes teachers are a part of the total faculty and establishes guidelines for all teachers for involvement with the change effort</td>
<td>Believes teachers are responsible for developing the best possible instruction and establishes expectations consistent with this view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding and Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believes teachers are professionals and leaves them alone to do their work unless they request assistance or support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Believes teachers are professionals and leaves them alone to do their work unless they request assistance or support</td>
<td>Believes teachers are a part of the total faculty and establishes guidelines for all teachers for involvement with the change effort</td>
<td>Believes teachers are responsible for developing the best possible instruction and establishes expectations consistent with this view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Art Consultant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Believes teachers are professionals and leaves them alone to do their work unless they request assistance or support</td>
<td>Believes teachers are a part of the total faculty and establishes guidelines for all teachers for involvement with the change effort</td>
<td>Believes teachers are responsible for developing the best possible instruction and establishes expectations consistent with this view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>When requests for assistance or support are received, attempts to respond in a way that is satisfying to one who made the request</td>
<td>Monitors the progress of the change effort and attempts to anticipate needed assistance and resources</td>
<td>Anticipates the need for assistance and resources and provides support as needed (whether or not requested) and sometimes in advance of potential blockages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Art Consultant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>When requests for assistance or support are received, attempts to respond in a way that is satisfying to one who made the request</td>
<td>Monitors the progress of the change effort and attempts to anticipate needed assistance and resources</td>
<td>Anticipates the need for assistance and resources and provides support as needed (whether or not requested) and sometimes in advance of potential blockages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Maintains close contact with teachers and the change effort in an attempt to identify things that might be done to assist teachers with the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collects and uses information from a variety of sources to monitor the change effort and to plan interventions that will increase the probability of a successful, quality implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relies on whatever training is available to develop teacher's knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to the regularly provided assistance, seeks and uses sources within and outside the school to develop teacher knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes the lead in identifying when teachers have need for increased knowledge and skills and will see that it is provided, most likely using personnel and resources from within the building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides general support for teachers as persons and as professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support is directed to individuals and subgroups for specific purposes related to the change as well as to provide for their personal welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides direct programmatic support through interventions targeted to individuals and the staff as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Art Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to minimize the demands of the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change effort on teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifies demands of the change effort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to protect teachers from perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overloads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps ever present demands on teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for effective implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. | Principal | 1 2 3 4 5 |
61. | Art Consultant | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**Structuring Chair Leadership Role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Art Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains low profile relative to day-to-day operation of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is actively involved in day-to-day</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs the ongoing operation of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with emphasis on instruction through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal actions and clearly delegated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. | Principal | 1 2 3 4 5 |
63. | Art Consultant | 1 2 3 4 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Art Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains a general sense of &quot;where the school is&quot; and how teachers are feeling about things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is well informed about what is happening in the school and who is doing what</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains specific knowledge of all that is going on in the school including classrooms through direct contact with individual teachers and students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. | Principal | 1 2 3 4 5 |
65. | Art Consultant | 1 2 3 4 5 |
Responds to others in a manner intended to please them

Responds to others in a way that will be supportive of the operation of the school

Responds to others with concern but places student priorities above all else

66. Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

67. Art Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Demographic Information:

Use only whole numbers and do not count the present year.

68. Number of years exposure to Olathe Elementary Art Program

1. 1 yr.
2. 2 yr.
3. 3 yr.
4. 4 yr.
5. 5 yr.
6. 6 yr.

69. Highest college/university degree attained

1. Bachelor’s
2. Master’s
3. Specialist
4. Ed.D.
5. Ph.D.

70. Are you working on a higher degree?

1. Yes
2. No

Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX B

Elementary School Principal
Demographic Information Form
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Use only whole numbers and do not count this present year.

___ 1. Number of years at this school

___ 2. Number of years exposure to Olathe Elementary Art Program
   1. 1 yr.
   2. 2 yr.
   3. 3 yr.
   4. 4 yr.
   5. 5 yr.
   6. 6 yr.

___ 3. Number of years as an elementary principal

___ 4. Highest college/university degree attained
   1. Bachelor's
   2. Master's
   3. Specialist
   4. Ed.D.
   5. Ph.D.

___ 5. Are you working on a higher degree?
   1. Yes
   2. No

___ 6. Age

___ 7. Male = 1   Female = 2

Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX C

Letters to the School District
and ACHE Form
USD 233
1005 Pitt
Box 2000
Olathe, KS 66061

To Whom It May Concern:

I am investigating the relationship between principal style and the stages of concern expressed about an educational innovation. Previous research has established a link between the two, but I would like to conduct further research in this subject in an unexplored area. My name is Dawn Yonally and I am an Olathe teacher. I am working on my dissertation at the University of Kansas. My topic is educational change. I would like to request permission to conduct research. Confidentiality is assured at all times, the schools, principals, and instructors identities will remain undisclosed.

I will need three responses from the staff at Olathe. First, I will need the district office staff to categorize the elementary principals' style of operation utilizing a short paper and pencil form. The styles include initiator, manager, and responder. Secondly, the elementary instructors will be requested to fill out a 35-item paper and pencil test. The results of the two instruments will be correlated. Both of these instruments are well-established and are research based. Finally, a general demographic information sheet will need to be filled out by the elementary building level principal. I would like to issue these instruments in March. The elementary art program will be the focus.

I have filed the appropriate research requests. I have attached the research instruments. Each instrument will require 10-15 minutes or less to complete. My results may be viewed by interested parties.

The Olathe school district could benefit by realizing the concerns of the staff in reference to the new art program. Instructors who are concerned with mainly self or maintenance concerns in the fifth year of a program may need some assistance. Not to monitor is not to know, not to know is to delute the quality of the program. Administrators need to know the instructors' concerns so they respond accordingly.

I believe my results will be of further interest to the school district. Previously the principal's style and his/her ability to implement an educational innovation have been positively correlated. Research has shown the initiating style to be the most productive. Knowing and understanding administrative styles can aid in administrator training and understanding.

I would like to express my appreciation to you for allowing me to complete my research. Thank you for your time and expertise.

Sincerely,

Dawn Yonally
Dear Elementary Instructors:

I am completing my PhD in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Kansas. I have been an Olathe teacher for six years. My dissertation topic is on educational change. Understanding and managing educational change is of prime concern to educators. I am reviewing the Olathe Elementary Art Program in reference to the implementation. The research review committee for USD 233 has approved my request to conduct research. Each elementary principal has had his/her individual style identified by you. Your involvement will include filling out a questionnaire concerning the implementation of the Olathe Elementary Art Program and administrative styles. The stages of concern part of the questionnaire was developed by a team of researchers at the University of Texas at Austin after a decade of research in 18 different countries and is well-established, well-respected and frequently used. Demographic questions will be asked at the end of the questionnaire. It will take about 15 minutes in total to complete.

The previous information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Your participation is requested although it is strictly voluntary. I assure you that your name, principal’s name or school will not be identified in any way. The information will be denoted only by a code number.

I attempted to collect this data last spring semester and did not receive enough responses. I have simplified, shortened and improved the questionnaire since spring with suggestions from principals and teachers. It is imperative that all instructors and principals respond so meaningful data can be generated. The results will allow the district to know how implementation of the elementary art program has progressed.

This questionnaire is crucial to the completion of my degree. If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it has been completed, please feel free to contact me by mail. Please sign both copies of the consent forms and keep one form.
I would appreciate your time and expertise in completing this questionnaire. Please complete it promptly and return it to your principal at the end of the faculty meeting today. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dawn Yonally
Principal Investigator
ZZ 315 Dover Square
Lawrence, KS 66049
913-842-0859

Signature of subject willing to participate
USD 233
100S Pitt
Box 2000
Olathe, KS 66061

Dear Elementary Principal:

I am completing my PhD in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Kansas. I have been an Olathe teacher for six years. My dissertation topic is on educational change and administrative styles. I will be researching the Olathe Elementary Art Program and administrative styles. Understanding and managing change is a prime concern of today's educators. The research review committee for USD 233 has approved this research. Your administrative style and your art consultant's administrative style will be identified by members of the teaching staff by a questionnaire. Your administrative style will be correlated with the results of a questionnaire about the stages of concern of teachers and the implementation of the Olathe Elementary Art Program. The art consultant's style will be noted. The stages of concern part of the questionnaire is well-established, well-respected and frequently used. It was developed by a team of researchers at the University of Texas at Austin after a decade of research in 18 different countries.

I attempted to collect this data last spring and did not receive enough responses. I have simplified, shortened and improved the questionnaire since spring with suggestions from principals and teachers. It is imperative that all instructors and principals respond so meaningful data can be generated. The results will allow the district to know how implementation of the elementary art program has progressed.

The previous information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. Your participation is requested although it is strictly voluntary. I assure you that your name, teachers' names or school will not be identified in any way with the research findings. The information will be denoted only by a code number.

Please hand the questionnaire, answer sheet, and consent forms out to classroom teachers only at a faculty meeting in September and collect all the forms and responses at the same meeting. The questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to complete. Please fill out the enclosed demographic sheet requesting information about your background. If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it has been completed.
please feel free to contact me by phone or mail. Please sign both copies of the consent forms and keep one form. Return the questionnaires, answer sheets and consent forms promptly to M. E. Grosdidier at Black Bob Elementary School.

Thank you and your staff for your time and expertise.

Sincerely,

Dawn Yonally
ZZ 315 Dover Square
Lawrence, KS 66049
913-842-0859

Signature of subject willing to participate
Appendix D

The SoCQ Profiles for Individual Schools
FIGURE 6

The SoC Profile.
The Profile of Building #1 (Responder)

Note. n = 20 (77% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 7

The SoCo Profile.
The Profile of Building #2 (Manager)

Note: N = 18 (86% of teachers of this school)
The SOCO Profile.
The Profile of Building #3 (Indeterminant)

Note. n = 16 (100% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 9

The SCCC Profile.
The Profile of Building #4 (Manager)

Note. n = 13 (87% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 10

The SOCO Profile:
The Profile of Building #5 (Initiator)

Note. $n = 19$ (79% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 11

The SOCQ Profile,
The Profile of Building #6 (Manager)

Note. n = 19 (70% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 12

The SOCO Profile.
The profile of Building #7 (Initiator)

Note: \( n = 16 \) (67% of teachers of this school)
Note: $Q = 10$ (50% of teachers at this school)
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The profile of building the intermediate Soc profile.
FIGURE 14
The SOCO Profile.
The Profile of Building #9 (Initiator)

Note. n = 9 (45% of teachers of this school)
No. N = 20 (83% of teachers of the school)
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FIGURE 15

THE PORTFOLIO OF BUILDING 6/0 (INITIATOR)

THE SOCIO PORTFOLIO
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FIGURE 16
The SOCQ Profile.
The Profile of Building #11 (Responder)

Note: n = 15 (63% of teachers of this school)
FIGURE 18

The SOCQ Profile.
The Profile of Building #13 (Initiator)

Note. $n = 13$ (57% of teachers of this school)