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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the interdependent relationships of organizational learning and leadership within school cultures and how these three variables facilitate systemic change. This field of research is particularly relevant in today’s turbulent times of educational change as each of these concepts has been viewed in the literature as the “key” to organizational change.

As a comparative case study, this research involved three kindergarten to grade eight schools in a large school board in southern Ontario. Data collection techniques included a focus group interview with members of each School’s Growth Team (SGT), individual interviews with the principal, and individual interviews with eight staff members (three on the SGT and five not on the Team).

Results from the first level of coding identified the form and content of each school’s culture, the leadership practices that were in place, and examples of single and double-loop learning. A second level of coding responded to the three research questions. Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning? Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? Causal maps were drawn to illustrate the relationships among culture, leadership, and organizational learning.
Data indicate that collaborative cultures were predominant in all three schools. Certain cultural conditions fostered collaboration. Specifically, norms of mutual support, risk taking, sharing of ideas and resources, students coming first in deliberations and practices, and professional development were viewed as significant features of collaborative cultures.

Leadership practices which impacted on the schools' collaborative cultures were: providing support, providing a vision, building culture, and modelling expected behaviours. In addition, certain traits and capacities impacted on the schools' cultures. Further, leadership practices which influenced organizational learning were: providing support, resources, and intellectual stimulation.

Although each of the constructs of this research was seen as a critical component of the change process, evidence from the study suggested that one variable alone cannot facilitate change. Instead, a systemic approach to change, where internal coherence exists among all three variables, appeared to be a more realistic explanation for the intricacies of the successful implementation of change initiatives.
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Chapter One

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to shed further light on the nature of the relationships among organizational learning processes (OL) in schools, school leadership as exercised by the school principal, and the form and content of school culture. Senge (1990a) argues that organizational learning is a key ingredient in the restructuring of schools. Khattri and Miles (1993) view culture as a significant factor of school reform and Schein (1985) contends that the role of leaders is to create and manage culture. What is the nature of the relationships among these three concepts and how do they facilitate systemic change in a school setting?

This broad question was explored in three elementary schools identified by their area superintendents and staff development officers as schools successfully involved in change initiatives. These schools each had a School Growth Team (SGT) in place that worked with the principal in helping staff implement new initiatives.

Rationale for the Study

It should be borne in mind that there is nothing more difficult to handle, more doubtful of success, and more dangerous to carry through than initiating changes (Machiavelli, 1983, p. 51).

Organizations throughout the world find themselves in the midst of unprecedented changes. Two waves of educational reform quickly moved us from the agricultural to the industrial age, and
we now find ourselves confronted by the demands of the third wave, the fast-paced technological age (Daggett, 1995). According to Fullan (1993), schools “have been fighting an uphill battle,” (p. 1) for the past thirty years. In the 1960s, open concept schools were the rage. Huge amounts of money went towards national curriculum efforts, and individualized instruction was fashionable. In the 1970s, studies by Goodlad et al. (1970), Gross et al. (1971), and Sarason (1971) told of failed attempts at implementation. Educators and policy makers were dismayed at the results of these studies and they began to question whether the educational system was capable of change.

The effective schools movement, at the end of the 1970s, provided hope that schools could impact on children’s lives. “By 1980 we could say that we knew a fair amount about the major factors associated with introducing single innovations,” (Fullan, 1993, p. 2). Another movement, referred to as “restructuring” (Elmore, 1990; Murphy, 1991), began to take hold in the late 1980s. School-based management was emphasized and the role of principals and teachers was heightened.

The 1990s find education in a state of mass confusion (Fullan, 1993, p. 3). With major funding cuts, new provincial curricula, province-wide standardized testing, recent restructuring of teachers’ federations, and constant demands for accountability, schools do not know which way to turn. How can they begin to cope with all the change forces which confront them?

Sashkin and Egermeier (1993), in their review of the change movement from the 1950s to present day, find that approaches to school change have been too narrowly conceived. They provide a framework for understanding four orientations to school change: "(1) fix the parts [curricula, teaching methods], (2) fix the people [staff development], (3) fix the schools [change the culture so people are better able to solve their own problems], and (4) fix the system [incorporates the other three strategies in a broader context]," (p. 1). These researchers contend that the first three approaches conceived of school change too narrowly.
Louis (1994) supports Sashkin and Egermeier's argument. She views schools as learning systems which function according to the learning patterns that are in place in the school. She claims that change will not occur in schools unless they “address their embedded dysfunctional learning habits,” (p. 17). One pattern of learning that has been unsuccessful “is the emphasis on the teacher as an autonomous learner,” (p. 18). The by-product is different curricula being taught in each classroom, and although incremental growth may occur, this is inferior to school-wide adaptation. A second unsuccessful pattern of learning is “the over-dependence of many systems on ‘quick fix’ solutions from outside experts,” (p. 18). Louis recommends that policymakers “attend to the need for schools to break the futile cycle of continuous innovation-implementation-discontinuation of many small innovations.” She suggests that schools be “required to develop serious learning environments,” (p. 18) and in so doing, they will broaden their approach to change.

In the past, approaches to change assumed that single variables (i.e., organizational learning, leadership, culture) were “key” to restructuring. These “keys” provide a starting point for the development of a framework used in this study to understand change processes.

**Toward a Framework**

**Organizational Learning as the “Key”**

Senge (1990a) advocates organizational learning (OL) as the “key” to reform. From a theoretical perspective, he contends that organizations that are willing to expand their capabilities to learn are the ones which will become learning organizations. And, it is learning organizations that will be able to deal with whatever innovations come their way.

Organizational learning has been linked empirically with school reform. Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) conducted a six school study which concluded that OL was central to
successful school restructuring. Louis (1994), in her two studies of schools engaged in restructuring, argues that the existing model of change management may be appropriate for small scale innovations; however, major transformations require a model of OL.

Mitchell (1995), experimenting with 21 teachers to improve teaching practices, states that "organizational learning calls us to take ... a problem-solving approach to the challenges of contemporary schools," (p. 34). Furthermore, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1995) observe that "centrally generated initiatives to restructure schools ... invariably stop short" because they don't have a far reaching vision. These researchers see "the 'learning organization' as one promising vision for future schools and 'organizational learning' a promising perspective on the processes for getting there," (p. 2).

Leadership as the "Key"

The second construct which has been viewed as "key" to school reform is leadership. Leaders, over the years, have assumed many roles (i.e., instructional leader, Lortie, 1975; creator of culture, Schein, 1985; potter, poet, actor, healer, Deal and Peterson, 1990; one who comprehends culture, Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991). One of the more recent roles is change agent. In an early major study of innovation in schools, Berman and McLaughlin found that "projects having the active support of the principal were most likely to fare well," (1977, p. 124, their emphasis). In 1980, Hall and colleagues stated, "The degree of implementation of the innovation is different in different schools because of the actions and concerns of the principal," (p. 26).

Senge (1990b) envisions a new role for today's leaders, one which finds principals building learning organizations. Leithwood and Aitken would agree and they call this new leadership "transformational".
Leadership in learning organizations is transformational in nature and based on the use of facilitative power. This is a form of power which develops the capacities of others. Development of an organizational vision and mission is a critical transformational leadership function and those assuming leadership roles feel responsible for helping move the organization forward in the direction of its goals (1995, p. 41).

Along with these researchers, Horrine and Bass (1993), Bonstingl (1992), and Sergiovanni (1990), contend that transformational leadership is essential if organizations are to learn how to keep up with the restructuring demands of the 1990s.

Culture as the “Key”

The third construct which has been implicated as a “key” variable in efforts to explain school reform is culture. The significance of this concept, in the field of education, started to come to light beginning with the effective schools' research in the late 1970s, and more recently with Little's landmark study in 1982. Research conducted on culture in schools (i.e., Rosenholtz, 1989; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Deal and Peterson, 1990; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Musella and Davis, 1991; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1992; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Fernandez, 1993; Leithwood and Dart, 1994) offers compelling evidence that strong, collaborative cultures contribute to school effectiveness.

Rutter and associates (1979) were among the first to introduce the notion of culture to schools. They contend that specific practices contribute to the school's culture, and that culture can influence student development. Little's study (1982) indicates that a shared school culture fosters desired student outcomes by stimulating professional growth among the teaching staff.

Deal and Peterson (1990) reviewed five case studies of principals. They found that “the culture of an organization can influence its productivity,” (p. 9). Specifically, “effective schools researchers report that ethos, teamness and school culture were important factors in achieving high
test scores,” (p. 10).

Khattri and Miles (1993), in their study on restructuring maintain that “the culture of the school is a key focus in restructuring,” (p. 25). They view culture “as a central support” (p.6) in the process. Gideonese (1988) supports this position. He argues that the empowerment of teachers within a school culture that is shared and technical will facilitate educational reform. Such cultures not only foster desired student outcomes, but they also stimulate continuous professional growth for members of the teaching staff (Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1989).

**Toward a “Systemic” View of School Change**

More recently, theorists have begun to appreciate the importance not simply of individual organizational components, but of the interaction among the components. This is typically characterized as a “systemic” approach to change. This approach is advocated by many (e.g., Sashkin and Egermeier, 1993; Elmore, 1993b; Fuhrman, 1993; Senge, 1990a; Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Hutchins, 1991). Sashkin and Egermeier explain:

> We have learned from past failures and from research that an approach to educational change must take a broad, systemic approach that involves structural change. This is done by allowing and attaining autonomy at the school-site level and by building strong school cultures that foster professional (and student) growth and development, encourage innovation and constant improvement, and are accountable for their results (Sashkin and Egermeier, 1993, p. 20).

These researchers state that a systemic reform “is based on and incorporates a change approach called ‘restructuring’,” (p. 13).

Restructuring involves changes in roles, rules, and relationships between and among students and teachers, teachers and administrators, and administrators at various levels from the school building to the district office to the state level, all with the aim of improving student outcomes (Sashkin and Egermeier, 1993, p. 14).

Fuhrman contends that systemic school reform includes three major elements:
The first is the establishment of ambitious outcome expectations for all students ... the second is the coordination of key policies in support of the outcome expectations, which would be reflected in curriculum ... student assessment, instructional materials, teacher licensing, and staff development would all be tied to the framework ... Third, the governance system would be restructured to support high achievement by according schools more flexibility in meeting the needs of their students ... Schools would determine the instructional strategies most likely to foster student achievement of outcome goals (1993, p. 2).

She maintains that coherent policy, which focusses on ambitious outcomes can support school level efforts of improvement. “The reform debate changes from a focus on how schools can improve despite policy to how policies can help schools improve,” (p. 27).

Elmore and colleagues “assert that there is no single set of structural changes that schools can make that will lead predictably to a particular kind of teaching practice,” (1996, p. 238, their italics). Elmore concludes that districts’ approaches to implementing policies that could influence teaching tend “to be scattered, piecemeal, and, for the most part, weak in influencing teaching,” (1993b, p. 112). As a result, he supports the systemic approach to change.

Senge also advocates the need for systems thinking. He asserts that people must realize the interconnectedness of ideas. He calls this his fifth discipline, which is:

... a discipline for seeing the wholes. It is a framework for seeing the interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than the static snapshots ... a sensibility for the subtle interconnectedness that gives living systems their unique character (1990a, p. 69).

Watkins and Marsick (1993) advance this idea by suggesting that people perceive the whole, and in addition, develop a sense of connection with it (p. 265). Working towards long range goals and trying to better people’s lives inside, and outside, the organization are part of the process that builds the connection. Land and Jarman (1992) also support the idea of systems thinking. They state, “Everything exists as sets of connections with the world around it,” (p. 103).

The argument in the change literature states that approaching change by fixing the parts,
people, or school does not work because these approaches are too narrowly conceived. Thus, Sashkin and Egermeier contend:

Systemic reform holds real promise for successful change in schools. It represents a synthesis of knowledge about educational change, including knowledge derived from practices as well as from research. While it is too early to cite definitive research on this approach, it seems to us to hold the most hope for successful reform (1993, pp. 16-17).

Systemic change requires most elements of an organization to move forward on the same front. The systemic change hypothesis could be stated as “internal coherence is essential for productive change to occur.” As yet, however, we have very little idea of what “internal coherence” means in practice. The aim of this study has been to offer an empirical picture in and across three schools of the possible meaning of “internal coherence” with respect to three important variables.

The Research Questions

As a way of better understanding the nature of “systemic change”, this study asked about the relationships among school culture, organizational learning processes, and leadership. Specifically,

1. Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?

2. Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture?

3. Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning?
Significance of the Study

Ontario’s educators' experience of change parallels the experience of educators in most other developed countries around the world. All continue to be bombarded by new initiatives. Using Ontario as an illustration, in February of 1993, the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training published The Common Curriculum. Key components of the document were: assessment and evaluation, instructional strategies, partnerships, integration, and outcome-based learning. School boards across the province took on the task of implementing the new document.

The ink was scarcely dry on The Common Curriculum when, in the summer of 1997, a new government introduced The Ontario Curriculum: Language and The Ontario Curriculum: Math. In the spring of 1998, The Ontario Curriculum: Science and Technology and The Kindergarten Program were produced. Then, in the summer of 1998, three more documents were announced: The Ontario Curriculum for The Arts, French as a Second Language: Core French, and Health and Physical Education. Once again, educators throughout the province were directed to change their curriculum and begin immediately to implement the new curricula. How can teaching staffs keep up with the capriciousness of the ruling government? Some students of change believe that organizational learning may be the fundamental mediator between change initiatives and improved educational practices (Fullan, 1993; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1995; Louis, 1994; Mitchell, 1995). In spite of this, little knowledge exists about the school conditions which may foster or inhibit organizational learning. Recent evidence suggests that both leadership and culture are critical factors influencing OL (Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1995; Leithwood, 1994). Yet empirical evidence is lacking. This study is significant to the extent that it attempted to understand the relationships among organizational learning, leadership, and culture in an effort to comprehend
how systemic change occurred because of the internal coherence of three variables in three elementary schools.

**Outline of the Remainder of the Study**

There are seven additional chapters in the thesis. Chapter Two reviews the literature on organizational learning, leadership, and organizational culture in relation to the thesis questions. Chapter Three describes and justifies the methodology adopted for this study, while Chapters Four, Five, and Six describe the results of three case studies. A cross case analysis is provided in Chapter Seven. Chapter Eight concludes the thesis by summarizing and discussing results from the case studies and drawing implications for theory, research, and practice.
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to place this study within the context of earlier work in the fields of organizational learning (OL), leadership practices which influence organizational learning, and organizational culture. The first section of the chapter provides a review of the literature specifically pertaining to the concepts of organizational learning, leadership, and organizational culture. The next section examines the research which links these three concepts, and addresses the research questions: Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning? Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning?

Organizational Learning

Concepts and Alternative Forms of Organizational Learning

Fiol and Lyles suggest that:

Organizational learning means the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding (1985, p. 803).

The concept of organizational learning evokes a number of issues. What does it mean for an organization to learn? How can an organization enhance its capacity to learn? In this section, different approaches to OL will be discussed; definitions of OL will be examined; alternative forms will be described; and a review of evidence of the effects of OL will be provided.
Different Approaches to Organizational Learning

“A review of theories of organizational learning reveals considerable diversity,” (Moingeon and Edmondson, 1996, p. 26). While some theorists focus on how organizations learn, others see learning as something which must be created. Moingeon and Edmondson describe a learning organization rubric which they employ to distinguish research which focuses on creating OL from other literature on OL. They find that “this distinction serves to clarify terms for discussing the relationship between competitive advantage and learning processes in organizations,” (p. 26). In their rubric, they identify two kinds of research, descriptive and intervention.

From the organizational perspective, descriptive research views the organization as embodiments of past learning; the intervention perspective sees organizations as increasing the capacity for change through active, intelligent participation. Further, in their rubric, Moingeon and Edmondson (1996) discuss organizational learning from an individual point of view. In descriptive research, the individual’s learning and development within the organization are the foci, while intervention research views individuals as gaining awareness of personal causal responsibility and interpersonal skill. Researchers who follow the descriptive approach “are primarily analytic, attempting to model adaptive processes and/or document dilemmas, traps, or sources of gain. The desired research product is a robust model of causality or precise description,” (1996, p. 20). Researchers who adopt the intervention approach try to improve organizations by seeking “policies and processes that will enhance organizational effectiveness. The desired product from this kind of research is managerial actions to improve organizational effectiveness,” (p. 20).
Definitions of Organizational Learning

Numerous definitions of organizational learning exist in the literature. For example, Argyris and Schöön (1978) state:

Organizational learning occurs when individuals, acting from their images and maps, detect a match or mismatch of outcome to expectation which confirms or disconfirms the original theory-in-use. In the case of disconfirmation, individuals move from error detection to error correction. Error correction takes the form of inquiry (p. 18).

Hedberg (1981) describes organizational learning in the following way:

... organizational learning includes both the processes by which organizations adjust themselves defensively to reality and the process by which knowledge is used offensively to improve the fit between organizations and their environments (p. 3).

Senge (1990) contends:

Organizations learn only through individuals who learn. Individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning. But without it no organizational learning occurs (p. 139).

Often definitions include “encoding and modifying routines, acquiring knowledge useful to the organization, increasing the organizational capacity to take productive action, interpretation and sense-making, developing knowledge about action-outcome relationships, and detection and correction of error,” (Moingeon and Edmondson, 1996, p. 18). Some definitions focus on individuals, while others take on an organizational level of analysis. Definitions may include components of descriptive theory, or they may be based on the intervention model.

According to Moingeon and Edmondson, “several theorists have defined organizational learning as a process by which an organization expands its repertoire of actions,” (p. 21). However, Huber, taking a behavioral perspective notes, “An entity learns if, through its processing of information, the range of its potential behaviours is changed. This definition holds whether the entity is a human or other animal, a group, an organization, an industry, or a society,” (1996, p. 126,
his italics). In the case of an organization, the processes are usually interpersonal or social, but they may also be mechanical, and "they can often be usefully viewed as logistical processes," (p. 126).

In order to understand the meaning of organizational learning, Huber (1996) recommends that it be characterized in terms of its attributes. He states that four are particularly pertinent: existence, breadth, elaborateness, and thoroughness. When discussing existence, he assumes that "an organization learns if any of its units acquires knowledge that it recognizes as potentially useful to the organization," (p. 126). A second assumption is "that an organization learns something even if not every one of its components learns that something," (p. 126). These two assumptions are widely held by others (i.e., Douglas, 1986; Morgan, 1986; Sims, Gioia, and associates, 1986). With respect to breadth, Huber argues, "that more organizational learning occurs when more of the organization's components obtain this knowledge and recognize it as potentially useful," (1996, p. 126). In the area of elaborateness of organizational learning, "more organizational learning occurs when more and more varied interpretations are developed, because such development changes the range of potential behaviours," (p. 126). Finally, "more organizational learning occurs when more organizational units develop uniform comprehensions of the various interpretations ... what is uniform are the understandings across units of the possibly different interpretations. Thoroughness of organizational learning is the attribute addressed with this assertion," (p. 127).

**Dimensions of Organizational Learning**

In order to understand the concept of OL, four dimensions must be addressed. First of all, the notion of learning will be discussed. Secondly, "organizational learning is not the same as individual learning, even when the individuals who learn are members of the organization," (Argyris & Schön, 1978, p. 9). Thirdly, the distinction between the development of understanding and
changes in action or behaviour requires clarification. Lastly, the various levels of learning, or alternative forms of learning that exist in an organization will be dealt with in a separate section.

In everyday speech, people talk about “learning something new.” Learning has taken on the meaning of acquiring information. Senge suggests that in order to truly understand the meaning of learning, one must grasp the meaning of "metanoia", which means a shift of mind. According to Senge:

Real learning gets to the heart of what it means to be human. Through learning we re-create ourselves. Through learning we become able to do something we never were able to do. Through learning we re-perceive the world and our relationship to it. Through learning we extend our capacity to create, to be part of the generative process of life. There is within each of us a deep hunger for this type of learning (1990a, p. 14).

Weick (1991) concurs with Senge’s stance that the traditional way of defining “learning” is problematic with understanding how organizations learn. In the past, learning was defined as a “shift in performance when the stimulus situation remains essentially the same,” (Weick, 1991, p. 116). However, Weick claims that this seldom occurs in an organization. Thus, he posits either organizations do not learn, the definition for learning may be inadequate, or organizations learn in unique ways.

Watkins and Marsick (1993) express a different perspective on learning. They suggest that talk reflects the way people think, and the key to learning is through our interactions with one another. They view inquiry as “the crucial difference between talk, as an imposition of ideas on others, and talk, as a medium of learning,” (1993, p. 74).

Argyris and Schön (1974; 1978) employ their theory-of-action to address talk and inquiry. They begin by investigating how the mind works. Their viewpoint is that we learn from experiences, by drawing inferences from what people say and do. A ladder of inferences is used to symbolize this process. They visualize observation on the first rung of the ladder. Observation
refers to what is said or done in a situation; it is agreed upon facts. On subsequent rungs, they view personal, social, cultural, and organizational meaning being imposed on observable data. Inferences are then developed which may or may not be true. These researchers recognize that mistakes are often made in organizations because of fast, inaccurate reasoning, which is often coupled with the misconception that everyone shares the same meaning. Nevertheless, out of these errors, learning may occur.

When there is a mismatch of outcome to expectation (error), members may respond by modifying their images, maps, and activities so as to bring expectations and outcomes back into line. They detect an error in organizational theory-in-use, and they correct it. This fundamental learning loop is one in which individuals act from organizational theory-in-use, which leads to match or mismatch of expectations with outcome, and thence to confirmation or disconfirmation of organizational theory-in-use (Argyris and Schöon, 1978, p. 18).

In an attempt to help us understand how an organization learns, organizational theorists sometimes apply cognitive metaphors. Morgan’s (1986) image of the organization as a brain is one such example. While organizations do not literally have brains, he argues that they have “cognitive systems” which allow them to perceive, understand, store, and retrieve information.

Making the distinction between individual and organizational learning is essential to an understanding of the concept of OL. According to Simon (1996), the organization does not learn by itself; learning is accomplished by members of the organization. While organizational learning is dependent on individual learning, individual learning can occur without impacting on organizational learning. Important to note, however, is that organizational learning “cannot be reduced to the accumulation of learning at the individual level,” (Louis & Simsek, 1991, p. 8).

Succinctly stated by Argyris and Schöon:

... there is no organizational learning without individual learning, and that individual learning is a necessary but insufficient condition for organizational learning. We can think of organizational learning as a process mediated by the collaborative inquiry of individual members (1978, p. 20).
Fiol and Lyles support this position. They explain:

Organizational learning is not simply the sum of each member’s learning. Organizations, unlike individuals, develop and maintain learning systems that not only influence their immediate members, but are then transmitted to others by way of organizational histories and norms (1985, p. 803).

The distinction between development of understanding and changes in action or behaviour is fundamental to a definition of organizational learning. Fiol and Lyles (1985) suggest that these processes do not necessarily go hand in hand. Adding to one's understanding may not affect one's behaviour. For example, in a school setting, teachers may attend workshops on cooperative learning and come away with a clear comprehension of this instructional strategy. However, when they return to their classrooms, they may not use any cooperative learning structures. Similarly, a slight change in one's behaviour may not be a result of a new understanding. In keeping with the above mentioned example, a teacher may change the physical make up of his classroom by moving students' desks from rows into a grouped configuration, and he could assign a group project. The teacher may then say that his students are “doing cooperative learning”, when, in reality, all they may be doing is “group work”. In other words, the teacher changed his behaviour, but he did not understand the following five basic elements of cooperative learning: positive interdependence, individual accountability, group processing, face-to-face interaction, social skills (Stevahn, Bennett, Rolheiser, 1995).

Huber (1996) supports the argument made by Fiol and Lyles. He asserts “learning does not always increase the learner’s effectiveness, or even potential effectiveness ... [it] need not result in changes in behaviour,” (p. 126). Instead, Huber claims learning may simply increase understanding.
Alternative Forms of Organizational Learning

A final distinction in the meaning of organizational learning deals with its alternative forms. Huber (1996) claims that organizations acquire knowledge through five processes: congenital learning, vicarious learning, grafting, and searching, and experiential learning (p. 128). The first four forms of OL are discussed in Appendix A, Background Literature, while this section deals with experiential learning.

Once an organization is operational, it acquires some of its knowledge through experience. Knowledge may be acquired because of intentional, systematic efforts or as a result of unintentional or unsystematic activities. Huber finds the literature on experiential learning to be quite extensive, thus he sub-divides the information into five categories: organizational experiments, organizational self-appraisal, experimenting organizations, unintentional or unsystemic learning, and experience-based learning curves (p. 129).

Organizational experiments are an intentional attempt to foster organizational learning. This approach increases "the accuracy of feedback about cause-effect relationships between organizational actions and outcomes. Another [approach] is to ensure the collections and analysis of such feedback," (p. 129). Argyris and Schön (1978) call this level of learning deutero-learning, or "learning to learn," (p. 26). They claim that deutero-learning occurs when the members of an organization learn about past contexts for learning. They reflect on, and question, these previous contexts, as well as on opportunities that lead to OL, or failure to learn. They try to discover what they did that fostered or inhibited their learning and then try to invent new strategies for learning. Once they have developed these strategies, they evaluate and generalize what they have produced. According to Argyris and Schön, "the results become encoded in individual images and maps are reflected in organizational learning practice," (1978, p. 27). This highly sophisticated level of
learning is one to which many of today’s organizations aspire.

Organizational self-appraisal is the category in which Huber places Argyris and Schön’s (1974; 1978) concepts of single and double-loop learning. He does so because the “organizational self-appraisal literature stresses cognitive aspects of learning and focuses on learning new frames of reference (Dery, 1983; Shrivastava & Schneider, 1984),” (pp. 130-131). He views single-loop learning as one in which learning occurs within an established frame of reference, whereas double-loop learning requires learning a new frame of reference.

Single-loop learning is simple learning. It is appropriate for routine, repetitive situations. This kind of learning handles day-to-day problems and gets the job done. According to Argyris (1983):

One type [of OL] involves the production of matches, or the detection and correction of mismatches, without change in the underlying governing policies or values. This is called single-loop learning (p. 116, his italics).

Double-loop learning is a more complicated kind of learning that is related to the organization’s frame of reference. It deals with complex, unexpected issues. Argyris and Schön (1978, p. 24) state that double-loop learning is appropriate to:

... those sorts of organizational inquiry which resolve incompatible organizational norms by setting new priorities and weightings of norms, or by restructuring the norms themselves together with associated strategies and assumptions.

In a school setting, the shift from whole-class, Socratic instruction to cooperative home-based group instruction is an example of such learning. This move questions basic assumptions about learning and the teacher’s role in that process.

Huber’s (1996) third sub-heading, in the experiential learning category, is experimenting organizations. He notes that “organizational experiments and self-appraisals are generally directed toward enhancing adaptation, while maintaining organizational experiments is generally directed
toward enhancing adaptability,” (p. 131). According to Boulding, 1978, “Adaptation to a particular niche ... while it leads to short-run survival, is never adequate for survival in the long run ... Adaptability is the capacity to expand niches or to find new niches,” (p. 111). Boulding’s adaptation is what Senge refers to as “survival learning or what is more often termed adaptive learning,” (1990a, p. 14). March (1991) also makes reference to this low level learning, but he calls it exploitation.

March (1991) observes that exploitation learning is found in organizations which have a habit of exploiting superficial fads without attempting to reach a deeper level of learning. Exploitation works with existing technologies and chooses from alternatives that are already in place. Results may be forthcoming with exploitation; time lines may be shorter; some short-term goals may be reached. However, the gains may be dysfunctional as the organization gets accustomed to its stable, yet ineffective state of existence. According to Watkins and Marsick (1993), “Some Total Quality Management initiatives typically involve exploitation, because these initiatives build on the organization’s previous strategies for quality control and worker involvement in decision making,” (p. 155).

In the same way that Boulding contrasts adaptation with adaptability, March differentiates between exploitive and exploration learning. March views exploration as a more worthwhile, higher level of learning. This type of learning is characterized by search, variation, risk taking, and play (1991). The results of exploration are more varied, time lines are longer, and outcomes are uncertain. Nevertheless, by employing creativity and exploring uncharted territory, organizations are able to create something completely new. March contends that most learning organization initiatives are exploratory in nature. Senge supports these researchers’ position. He discusses generative learning which is basically the same concept as adaptability and exploration. According
to Senge, both types of learning are needed in a learning organization. "Adaptive learning must be joined by generative learning, learning that enhances our capacity to create," (1990a, p. 14). While adaptive learning deals with the routine, day-to-day issues of the organization, generative learning is required if the organization is to promote learning and growth.

Unintentional or unsystemic learning is Huber's fourth sub-heading of experiential learning. This type of learning has been "studied experimentally, analytically, and through interpretation of archival data," (1996, p. 132) and although these studies "provide interesting findings, [they] are decidedly noncumulative," (p. 133). Nevertheless, Huber notes one commonality is that "group or organizational learning is often haphazard and multi-faceted," (p. 132).

The last type of experiential learning is experience-based learning curves. This is an attempt to provide "evidence that an organization's experience enhances its performance," (1996, p. 133). Huber states that "an extensive literature (Dutton, Thomas, & Butler, 1984; Mody, 1989; Muth, 1986; Yelle, 1979) documents the positive effect of experience on performance," (p. 133). He explains that when manufacturing companies acquire experience while producing a new product, their cost of production and production time per unit decreases. The amount of reductions are usually predictable from a mathematical model they called an "experience curve" or a "learning curve" and these predictions may be used in planning. Huber claims that "recent work (Epple, Argote, & Devadas, this volume) demonstrates how nonsimple learning-curve models can be used to investigate possible explanations of organizational learning," (p. 133) and this use of such models may prove useful with empirical studies.

Other researchers have developed labels for alternative types of organizational learning. For example, Bateson (1972) articulated the distinction as Learning I (detecting errors, refining processes and selecting among known alternatives) and Learning II (changing the set of available
alternatives, re-framing the situation and expanding the realm of activity). Hedberg (1981) distinguishes between low-level and metalevel learning; Fiol and Lyles (1985) discuss low-level and high-level learning; McGill et al. (1992) address adaptive and transformative learning; and Kim (1993) describes operational and conceptual learning. All of these levels of learning seem to be variations on Argyris and Schön's perception of single and double-loop learning.

Evidence of the Effects of Organizational Learning

Moingeon and Edmondson (1996) contend that “a growing number of executives, consultants, and scholars advocate the benefits of organizational learning,” (p. 23). Although evidence exists to support this claim, most research has been conducted in the business world. Moingeon and Edmondson explain that by developing both capabilities, learning how and learning why, organizations can discover potential sources of competitive advantage. To illustrate their point, they discuss Intel's ability to manufacture new generations of computer chips. They view this as an example of learning how. At the same time that “learning how processes are underway, others at Intel Corporation are actively learning why - diagnosing current and future market and technological developments in anticipation of making critical changes,” (p. 34). These researchers also provide an example of learning why.

We showed Monitor consultants learning to diagnose and change counterproductive interpersonal dynamics with each other and with clients. Meanwhile, as part of the day-to-day operations, others at Monitor are actively learning how; new recruits are being trained in sophisticated techniques of data analysis, as well as learning how to use the company's strategy models (1996, p. 34).

In conclusion, Moingeon and Edmondson posit that learning how and why usually occur in an organization at any given time, but that “competitive advantage may be more determined by learning how than by learning why and vice versa, depending on the market environment ... and both are
sources of competitive advantage in different environments,” (p. 34).

Watkins and Marsick (1993) also provide illustrations of the benefits of organizational learning in the business world. They state that “learning organizations put systems in place that promote learning and embed both learning outcomes and processes,” (p. 156). They tell a story about Granite Rock, a $9 million California company which makes and sells crushed stone and supplies to a highway paving company which it manages. This company relies on feedback from customers and focus groups to improve its business. Cross-functional teams are used so that employees may make better decisions while learning from each other. Employees may participate in any kind of training they need. In addition, customers are an integral part of the company’s educational system.

According to Watkins and Marsick,

Key features of these embedded systems are information collection, widespread access to that information, rewards and recognition for learning and improvement, and widespread sharing of what is learned collectively and continuously through access to information. Organizations learn when all major systems are changed to enable this kind of learning of the whole organization (1993, p. 157).

These researchers provide other examples where companies are taking on initiatives which enable them to make the transition to learning organizations. For example, they suggest that “four examples of major initiatives that hold promise for enabling the transition are Total Quality Management, Work Out!, Technology Futuring, and Globalization,” (p. 167). Each of these cases illustrate a different version of a learning organization and the various ways that organizations may become learning organizations. Nevertheless, the examples do have the following features in common: “systems thinking, decentralization, continuous learning, and empowerment - keys to a learning organization,” (p. 192). Furthermore,
The examples are all organization wide cultural change programs that measurably change the skill and innovation base in the organization, that alter bureaucratic and hierarchical relationships, and that create collegial, problem-solving teams aligned around a globally understood mission. Most especially, they put in place mechanisms and systems through which the organization has at least the capacity to capture and share learning across the entire organization. (p. 192)

Although these experiments are promising, they each address “only a part of the template and most do not systematically address the learning implications inherent in the approach,” (p. 193). Thus, Watkins and Marsick find “these experiments remain piecemeal, not yet an integrated, total organizational approach to learning and change,” (p. 194). They “fall short of creating a sustained capacity to learn and to change, which is the hallmark of a learning organization,” (p. 193).

Few empirical studies exist which provide evidence of the positive effects of organizational learning in schools. Nevertheless, in a study of six schools, Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) conclude that OL is the key to successful school restructuring. From her investigation of two schools, Louis (1994) contends that OL has implications for practice and school restructuring. An experiment, with 21 teachers, which focussed on learning processes to improve teaching practices was conducted by Mitchell (1995). She views OL as a conscious, reflective approach to practice. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1995), in a five year study of policy implementation in B.C., report that teachers identified the following outcomes of OL: practices, understanding, commitment, and new skills. Furthermore, Fullan (1993) maintains that “we need, in short, a new mindset about educational change,” (p. 3). His suggestion is to look at what it would “take to make the educational system a learning organization - expert at dealing with change as a normal part of its work, not just in relation to the latest policy, but as a way of life,” (p. 4). Needless to say, additional studies which would focus on the positive outcomes of OL in schools would be beneficial.
Leadership

Concepts and Alternative Forms of Leadership

Always, it seems the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it ... and still the concept is not sufficiently defined (Bennis, 1959, p. 259).

Leadership is an elusive yet enticing subject. Yukl states that “leadership literature currently includes over 5000 studies, and the number continues to increase by several hundred each year,” (1989, p. 267). Slowly, but surely, “we are beginning to obtain a more complex but clearer appreciation of the effective principal as a collaborative leader of continuous improvements in the school as an organization,” (Fullan with Steiglebauer, 1991, p. 61). The following sections will include: different approaches to leadership, definitions of leadership, dimensions of leadership, alternative forms of leadership, and evidence of its effects.

Different Approaches to Leadership

The history of educational leadership has been well documented (Hallinger, 1992; Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1990; 1994; Leithwood and Duke, in press). In brief, the principal has moved from being a manager of administrative tasks, to a humanitarian, to an instructional leader, to a transformational leader. According to Leithwood and associates (1994), “Prior to 1985, research on the principalship included efforts to clarify principals’ roles, beginning from two quite different premises,” (p. 16). The first premise was that the role was unidimensional and research attempted to discover the best way to describe the role. For example, Lortie viewed the leader as:

... the ‘instructional leader’ of the school, he is an enhanced senior colleague. Thus he can symbolize professional purpose and competence: he potentially can reassure teachers about the quality of their teaching (1975, p. 197).
The second premise was that the principal’s role was multidimensional. Sergiovanni (1984), for example, identifies five “leadership forces” which encapsulate the range of a leader’s actions. He includes: technical management activities, provision of interpersonal support and encouragement to staff, instructional intervention, modelling important goals and behaviours, signalling to others what is important (symbolic leadership), and developing an appropriate and unique school culture. Since then, Leithwood and Duke (in Murphy and Louis, in press) have attempted to understand school leadership by synthesizing all articles related to leadership in four major educational administration journals over the last decade. Their results indicate that six major categories of leadership dominate the “contemporary, western, English-language, research literature,” (p. 2). The conceptions of leadership mentioned most frequently were: instructional, transformational, contingent, moral, managerial, and cultural. Each of these will be addressed in a subsequent section.

Definitions of Leadership

In 1978, Burns stated that over one hundred serious definitions exist for the word leadership (p. 2). Yet, Yukl notes:

... *leadership* is a relatively recent addition to the English language. It has been in use only for about two hundred years, although the term leader, from which it was derived, appeared as early as A.D. 1300 (Stogdill, 1974 in Yukl, 1989, p. 3).

According to Yukl,

Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, behaviour, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships, occupation of an administrative position, and perception by others regarding legitimacy of influence. (p. 2)

He observes that, “Like all constructs in social sciences, the definition of leadership is arbitrary and very subjective. Some definitions are more useful than others, but there is no ‘correct’ definition,” (1994, pp. 4-5). Nevertheless, some representative definitions of the term are as follows:
Leadership is the "behaviour of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons, 1950, p. 7).

"Leadership is power based predominantly on personal characteristics, usually normative in nature," (Etzioni, 1961, p. 116).

"The leader is the individual in the group given the task of directing and coordinating task-relevant group activities," (Fiedler, 1967, p. 8).

"Leadership takes place in groups of two or more people and most frequently involves influencing group members' behaviour as it relates to the pursuit of group goals," (House and Baetz, 1979, p. 345).

"... [Leadership] involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers ... that it is a group phenomenon involving the interaction between two or more persons," (Yukl, 1989, p. 3).

"Leaders are designers, teachers, and stewards. These roles require new skills: the ability to build shared vision, to bring to the surface and challenge prevailing mental models, and to foster more systemic patterns of thinking ... leaders are responsible for learning," (Senge, 1990b, p. 9).

In looking at the scope of definitions that have been developed to encapsulate leadership, it appears that no single definition is general enough or specific enough to accommodate its many facets. Nevertheless, it is apparent that influence and direction must be incorporated into the definition. Thus, for the purposes of this study, leadership will be defined as the ability to express a vision which is so compelling that followers will voluntarily commit to the suggested direction in an effort to move the organization toward greater effectiveness.

**Dimensions of Leadership**

As mentioned earlier, six different models, approaches or dimensions of leadership exist in contemporary literature (Leithwood and Duke, in press). These leadership approaches include: instructional, transformational, moral, participative, managerial, and contingent. An explanation of each of these models of leadership may be found in Appendix A, Background Literature. Of these
approaches, however, the transformational leadership perspective was employed in this paper. Reasons for adopting this stance are explained in the next section.

**Alternative Forms of Leadership**

After reviewing "A Century's Quest to Understand School Leadership" (Leithwood and Duke, in press), it appears that each model of leadership is somewhat distinct because of its basic foci and main assumptions. However, similarities exist among the models. The idea of values playing an important role in leadership is evident in the moral leadership approach, but the importance of values is also recognized in other approaches (i.e., transformational and participative).

Recently, Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1994) have begun to question the narrow focus of the instructional leader's role. They state the emphasis on instructional leadership was appropriate in the early 1980s, but the term "conveys a meaning which encompasses only a portion of those activities now associated with effective school leadership," (p. 9). In the 1990s, school leaders must also:

... redesign professional work cultures to support teacher growth, ... acknowledge the contribution of non-instructional features of schools (e.g., informal non-instructional relations between teacher and individual student) to their attractiveness to students typically considered at risk of dropping out, ... provide a significant portion of their services through means not readily associated with instruction as presently conceived (an image of the teacher as resource, rather than instructor, might be appropriate for future schools) (1994, p. 9).

Senge (1990b) supports this position. He sees the leaders of tomorrow building learning organizations. Leithwood and Aitken (1995) and Horrine and Bass also support this argument.

As organizational leaders struggle to lead their organizations to become higher performing, quality organizations, there is an increasing recognition that a new leadership paradigm is required to successfully develop and sustain a motivated and committed work force (Horrine and Bass, 1993, p. 1).

The new leadership paradigm to which they are referring is that of transformational leadership.
These researchers, as well as others (i.e., Bonstingl (1992), Leithwood (1992), Sergiovanni (1990)), maintain that transformational leadership is the form of leadership which will enable organizations to cope with the complexities of educational change.

The intent of this research has been to discover which leadership practices impact on organizational learning and culture. Because of the above mentioned arguments for transformational leadership in a learning organization, and Leithwood and Duke’s contention that “transformational approaches are arguably most explicit in their concern for organizational culture,” (in press, p. 23), this research focussed on different forms of transformational leadership.

A leader is considered to be a transformational leader if he or she embodies the following dimensions: provides a vision or mission, provides support, works with staff toward the acceptance of school goals, models appropriate behaviours and values, provides intellectual stimulation, tries to establish and maintain a collaborative school culture, and holds high expectations (Leithwood and Steinbach, 1991). Since a range of combinations of these dimensions is possible, a rubric will guide our understanding of the three forms which are referred to as low, middle, and high levels of transformational leadership. Administrators are considered to be at a high level of transformational leadership if they exemplify all dimensions of transformational leadership and if they engage in authentic transformational leadership practices (i.e., working with the staff to come to consensus on school goals). A middle level of transformational leadership applies to a leader who is characterized by most of the dimensions of transformational leadership, while a low level of transformational leadership refers to a principal who engages in some of the dimensions attributed to this form of leadership. By examining the degree to which each of the leaders exemplifies the various dimensions of transformational leadership, hopefully a pattern will develop which will illustrate the relationship among the various levels of transformational leadership, culture, and OL.
Evidence of the Effects of Leadership

What evidence exists that suggests that principals impact on their schools? According to Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1994),

First, we must acknowledge significant limitations in the research-based knowledge about the nature of current school-leaders' impact. But based on the number of studies alone, one can reasonably conclude that current school-leaders are capable of having a significant influence on the basic skills' achievement of students. A recent review of school effects in the Third World also attributes such impact to school-leaders (Fuller, 1987). As well, current principals seem capable of influencing teachers' adoption and use of innovative classroom practices, and teachers' job satisfaction. Evidence concerning other types of impact is extremely thin, however. (p. 14)

Nevertheless, some researchers have discovered that the principal can have a considerable impact on restructuring efforts. For example, Elmore and colleagues (1996) describe three case studies of schools which explored how schools went about the process of restructuring. They contend:

While the leadership styles of the principals differed, each was a strong figure in her setting and each created an environment within the school that set a positive value on challenging conventional ways of organizing schools. (p. 216)

In addition, "they [the principals] each assumed considerable authority over recruitment and personnel issues in their schools," (p. 216).

In Mortimore's (1991) review of the research on primary school effectiveness, he notes that "there are a number of findings common to studies carried out in different countries and with different education systems," (pp. 12-13). He identifies general factors (i.e., intake, progress, outcomes, home or school influence) and specific factors (i.e., leadership, management of pupils, management of teachers, pupil care, school environment, school climate). In the area of leadership,

The research shows that having a headteacher who is purposeful but neither too authoritarian nor too democratic and who is able to share ownership of the school with colleagues is important. The quality of leadership, however, includes the ability to delegate to a deputy without feeling threatened, and to involve members of the staff in the planning and the management of the school (1991, p. 14).
Corcoran and Wilson's (1989) research indicates that different styles of leadership exist, but their work focuses on active leadership, motivating staff and students, reaching the community, and continually improving the school. In looking at these results, as well as those of Hall and Hord (1987), Fullan (with Stiegelbauer) observes two commonalities.

First, while personal styles differed in the various studies, all effective principals were actively involved in bringing about change. Second, in examining implementation of specific innovations (as Hall and Hord did) more overt action by principals affects implementation of those changes, but when more wholistic reforms are involved a myriad of actions create patterns that affect success in a variety of indirect and direct ways (1991, p. 159).

Furthermore, Fullan maintains, "We are beginning to obtain a more complete but clearer appreciation of the effective principal as a collaborative leader of continuous improvements in the school as an organization," (Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 161).

Leithwood, Lawton, and Cousins (1989), in a review of twenty original studies of effective secondary schools, state that seven studies describe the nature of school administration in exemplary schools. They identify five areas:

... basic beliefs of administrators; the nature and use of administrators' goals; emphases among and knowledge about factors in the school influencing students' experiences, strategies used by administrators to influence factors (the studies reviewed provided most information about this cluster); and administrators' decision-making processes (1989, p. 102).

More recently, Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1994), in exploring school reform, comment "at least understanding the larger context for school improvement allows us to appreciate how significant a force school leaders can be in the development of more collaborative cultures," (p. 137). In fact, in an earlier study (1990) they found that the more a principal illustrates the qualities of a transformational leader, the greater the effect on culture and on organizational learning.
Organizational Culture

Concepts and Alternative Forms of Organizational Culture

We encounter organizational cultures all the time. When they are not our own, their most visible and unusual qualities seem striking... when the cultures are our own, they often go unnoticed - until we try to implement a new strategy or program which is incompatible with their central norms and values. Then we observe, first hand, the power of culture (Kotter & Heskett, 1992, p. 3).

According to Fullan, "There are two basic reasons why educational reform is failing," (1993, p. 46). First of all, "problems are complex and intractable," (p. 46). Secondly, "the strategies that are used do not focus on things that will really make a difference. They fail to address fundamental instructional reform and associated development of new collaborative cultures among educators," (p. 46). The following sections will clarify the complex notion of organizational culture. Specifically, different approaches to culture will be addressed; definitions of culture will be identified; dimensions of culture will be examined; alternative forms will be outlined; and a review of the evidence of the effects of culture will be supplied. Subsequently, four sections present the literature which relates specifically to the research questions. The following combinations of the concepts are addressed: culture and organizational learning; leadership and culture; leadership and organizational learning; and organizational learning, leadership, and culture.

Different Approaches to Organizational Culture

The study of organizational culture has its roots in anthropology. Both the point of view and the methodology employed by anthropologists have impacted on the study of organizations. However, organizational culture has also been greatly influenced by the sociology of organizations. Information on the influence of anthropology, sociology, and social psychology on culture is included in Appendix A, Background Literature. The perspective taken for this paper may be seen
as an extension of the sociologist’s stance on culture. This viewpoint suggests that shared understandings monitor social life.

Current theories of organizational culture fall into one of two categories: macroanalytic or microanalytic. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985, p. 471) explain these terms:

The macroanalytic theories have in common an attempt to understand the culture of a whole group or subgroup, the functions that culture performs in maintaining the group, or the conditions under which the group and its culture and subcultures develop. The microanalytic theories present culture as something that resides within each individual and can be understood through the cognitive processes of sense-making, learning, and causal attribution, or by probing the unconscious mind.

From the macroanalytic perspective, organizational culture may be related to some aspect of the institution's economics. In this vein, the form and content of culture are seen as consequences of the firm’s attempt at efficiency. Jones (1983) notes that the content of an organization’s culture results from specific economic conditions in which organizational members find themselves. He suggests that three types of cultures exist: production, bureaucratic, and professional.

A production culture “is the outcome of the specification of a system of property rights designed to economize on transaction costs,” (Jones, 1983, p. 461). Employees in this type of culture do not have strong incentives to perform because “superior performance will be unrewarded,” (p. 462). The norms and values of the production culture may be “predicted from a transaction costs perspective,” (p. 462). In short, the culture that characterizes the production-line environment will depend “on the mix of property rights the firm uses to economize on the transaction costs associated with its production function,” (p. 462).

In a situation where tasks are non-routine and monitoring is difficult, transaction costs rise. This results in production functions becoming labour intensive and relies on specialized skills of personnel. A bureaucracy emerges due to a different system of property rights. In this type of culture, employees are less likely to shirk responsibilities and there is some incentive to exert extra
effort. Although “property rights are vested in the positions, because they are stronger than in a production culture they increase the attachment of employees to the organization and lead to the development of stable and predictable transaction patterns,” (p. 463). The transaction patterns that result in bureaucratic cultures will be as “varied as the property-rights structures that constitute them,” (p. 463).

In a professional culture, task non-routineness, in terms of variety of task and coping difficulty, is high. The production function depends to a great extent on the skills of specialized personnel. The cost of monitoring input and output behaviour is exorbitant and the cost of enforcing contracts is very expensive. A different system of property rights is required to economize on these transaction costs. “Often, partnerships develop whereby property rights become vested in the person rather than in the position. Consequently, each team member will function as the residual claimant, and profit-sharing systems will develop to distribute residual earnings,” (p. 464). In addition, members’ earnings will depend on the performance of other team members, so the development of a “comprehensive property rights system based on professional norms and expectations will allow each team member to monitor the other members,” (p. 464). In a professional culture, “reciprocal monitoring replaces hierarchal authority, and professional norms and values replace bureaucratic rules and procedures,” (p. 464).

Of these three types of cultures, only one comes close to describing the kind of culture that is in place in schools. Educational cultures are not production cultures. Although superior performance goes unrewarded, in terms of monetary incentives, educators are motivated by intrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975). School cultures are also not bureaucratic. Schools do rely on the specialized skills of personnel (i.e., French and music teacher), and labour is definitely intensive (i.e., 27 junior kindergarten children in a classroom for a full day). However, “stable and predictable
patterns," (p. 463) rarely occur in school settings. Thus, school cultures would fit most closely with Jones's interpretation of professional cultures.

In the professional culture of schools, every day brings with it a myriad of different situations for students, teachers, and administrators alike (i.e., the death of a student's parent, a student disclosing a rape, a teacher dealing with breast cancer, an administrator suspending a student for racism or a violent act). Coping with all the social dilemmas, as well as new curriculum, is indeed challenging. At this point in time, members' earnings do not depend on the performance of other team members, but in Ontario we now have the College of Teachers, an organization responsible for monitoring its members. Professional norms and values ought to replace bureaucratic rules and procedures. Unfortunately, educators are at the whim of whichever government happens to be controlling the province.

In microanalytic theories, Schein (1985) argues that culture is what people learn from their organizational world. This is based on observed consequences of previous actions and the success or failure of attempts to deal with the avoidance of anxiety. The learning results in commonly shared organizational beliefs.

Schein (1985) and others who study business (Ouchi, 1981; Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982), bring a new perspective to the study of organizational culture. Yet how organizational culture manifests itself in school systems is still unclear.

Definitions of Organizational Culture

According to Hofstede (1991), "the attribution of a 'culture' to an organization is a relatively recent phenomenon," (p. 179). In the 1960s, the term "organizational culture" became synonymous with "climate". "Corporate culture" was a buzz word of the 1970s, and this notion
gained prominence with the publications of Deal and Kennedy’s (1982) book, *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life* and Peters and Waterman’s (1982) edition of *In Search of Excellence*. In business, “the purpose of the study of organizational culture is quite explicit: it is to increase the control of managers and the effectiveness of the organization,” (Bates, 1986, p. 4). Bates finds similar notions have been introduced to the school effectiveness literature. For example, Beare (1982) advocates the manipulation of education’s ‘corporate image’ and the reconstruction of a school’s culture in order to become more competitive. Duignan (1985) also supports this position. Bates contends that “advocates of the manipulation of culture in pursuit of excellence, efficiency or high expectations” are missing a key point, “the importance and complexity of cultural politics. This is partly due to their confusion of various definitions of culture,” (Bates, 1986, p. 6).

According to Williams (1961), three general categories in the definition of culture exist:

There is, first, the ‘ideal’, in which culture is a state or process of human perfection, in terms of certain absolute or universal values ... The, second, there is the ‘documentary’, in which culture is the body of intellectual and imaginative work, in which, in a detailed way, human thought and experience are variously recorded ... Finally, third, there is the ‘social’ definition of culture, in which culture is a description of a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour. (p. 57)

Traditionally, educational theories have employed the first two definitions; however, lately, the third idea, which is derived from anthropological and ethnographic studies, has been receiving attention (Bates, 1986, p. 6).

Hofstede (1991) contends that no standard definition of the concept of culture exists, but most authors would agree that “organizational culture” is:

- **holistic** referring to a whole which is more than the sum of its parts
- **historically determined** reflecting the history of the organization
- **related to the things anthropologists study** like rituals and symbols
- **socially constructed** created and preserved by the group of people who together
form the organization
- soft (although Peters and Waterman assure their readers that 'soft is hard')
- difficult to change although authors disagree on how difficult. (pp. 179-180)

Simply stated, Hofstede defines organizational culture as "the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one organization from another," (p. 180).

Numerous definitions of culture have appeared over the years. For example, Erickson defines cultures as:

... a system of ordinary, taken-for-granted meanings and symbols with both explicit and implicit content that is, deliberately and non-deliberately, learned and shared among members of a naturally bounded social group (1987, p. 12).

Smith and Peterson (1988) contend that culture is the "agreed ways of interpreting signs, symbols, artifacts, and actions," (p. 101). According to Peters and Waterman (1982), the concept of culture comes with deeply-held beliefs about what really matters in organizations, such as the subjective, the symbolic, and the normative. Rossman et al. (1988) also incorporate beliefs in their definition. They view culture as the "interplay of individual idiosyncrasy and collective meaning [which] expresses itself in patterns of norms, beliefs, and values," (p. 10). Simply stated, it is "the way we do things around here," (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).

Edgar Schein (1985) has an extremely comprehensive definition of the term.

Organizational culture is the pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

The assumptions to which he is referring are taken from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) and they include: (a) the organization's relationship to its environment, (b) the nature of reality and truth, (c) the nature of human nature, (d) the nature of human activity, and (e) the nature of human relationships.
Although the meaning of organizational culture has been debated at length (Geertz, 1973), definitions which describe teachers' workplace cultures are often based solely on content (Davis, 1989; Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1985; 1990). Firestone and Wilson (1985) capture the common elements of a culture's content in their succinct definition: "The system of publicly and collectively accepted meanings, beliefs, values, and assumptions that a faculty uses to guide its actions and interpret its surroundings," (p. 7). In addition to content, Louis (1985b) incorporated the idea of form in her definition.

First, there is content: the totality of socially transmitted behaviour patterns, a style of social and artistic expression, a set of common understandings. Second, there is a group: a community of population, a society or class, a unit. Third, there is a relationship between the content and the group: content characteristic of the group, content peculiar to the group, or content differing from that of other groups. (p. 76)

The operational definition of culture which will be employed in this research will include both content and form. The concept of culture will refer to the norms, beliefs, values, and underlying assumptions which a group of people utilize in their relationships with one another.

**Dimensions of Organizational Culture**

In order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of organizational culture, two dimensions need to be addressed, content and form. Content refers to the specific norms, beliefs, values, and underlying assumptions which are shared by the members of a community and which provide the basis for common understandings. Norms are behaviours which are accepted, expected, or condoned by a particular group of people. This includes all of the explicit or implicit behaviours that are accepted by the group. In other words, norms are the rules which dictate people's interactions with one another.

Beliefs "are the principles on which the organization is supposedly built. Ideally, they serve
as the foundation for all major decisions,” (Patterson et al., 1986, p. 48). Beliefs form the basis of the ideological content of culture. They link people together by supplying them with a common goal or sense of direction.

Dyer (1985) defines values as “the evaluations people make of situations, acts, objects, and people; they reflect the organization’s general goals, ideals, standards, and ‘sins’,” (Dyer in Leithwood and Musella, 1991, p. 290). Smircich (1983) views values as “social ideals” or “patterns of belief”. She states that values are “manifested by symbolic devices such as myths (Boje, Fedor, and Rowland, 1982), rituals (Deal and Kennedy, 1982), stories (Mitroff and Kilmann, 1976), legends (Wilkins and Martin, 1980), and specialized language (Andrews and Hirsch, 1983),” (p. 344).

Beck (1993) believes that “everyone can explore value questions because values arise in everyday life,” (p. 2, his italics). He states that “values are grounded in human nature” and that “all specific values may be traced back to ‘basic values’ which humans simply do pursue,” (p. 2). Some of his examples of basic values include: survival, health, happiness, friendship, self-respect, fulfilment, freedom, and a sense of meaning in life.

Hodgkinson (1991), on the other hand, defines values (meanings) “as concepts of the desirable with motivating force,” (p. 101). He breaks “apart the basic concept of value into its two components of the ‘right’ and the ‘good”, (p. 97). Hodgkinson makes the distinction between the axiological (good) and the deontological (right). The former term refers to what is enjoyable or pleasurable; the latter refers to what is proper, moral, or what ought to be. In his Value Model, Hodgkinson explains that there are several grounds for value judgments (i.e., preference, consensus, consequences, principle). As one moves upward in the hierarchy, from ‘good’ to ‘right’, the types of values that are in place are labelled as sub-rational, rational, and trans-rational.
Deal and Kennedy (1982) credit values as being at the "heart" of culture. Values establish priorities, define standards, and determine specific criteria for success. Argyris and Schön (1978) maintain that "espoused values" are those which people will say in a situation, but which may not be what they actually do in situations where those values should be operating.

Schein contends that "in a sense all cultural learning ultimately reflects someone's original values, their sense of what 'ought' to be as distinct from what is," (1985, p. 15). According to Schein,

... the domain of values can be divided into (1) ultimate, non-debatable, taken-for-granted values, for which the term 'assumptions' is more appropriate; and (2) debatable, overt, espoused values, for which the term 'values' is more applicable (1985, p. 4).

Wilkins (1983) and Schein (1985) offer that assumptions, the most abstract of the dimensions, are the key elements in organizational culture. Assumptions are those 'taken for granted' ways of doing business. They "are the tacit promises that underlie the overt artifacts, perspectives, and values," (Leithwood and Musella, p. 290). They are found below the surface of organizational life. They are invisible, and often unchallenged, yet they hold a powerful influence over the creation of culture. Schein (1985) notes:

If the espoused values are reasonably congruent with the underlying assumptions, then the articulation of those values into a philosophy of operating can be helpful in bringing the group together, serving as a source of identity and core mission. (p. 17)

If one can come to understand a group's shared assumptions, then a better understanding of the group's culture will ensue.

Although norms, beliefs, values, and assumptions have been defined by the above mentioned experts, I did not distinguish between them in this research. Instead, they were all considered to be features of the culture's content and were coded as such.

According to Hargreaves and Wignall (1989), educators' cultures may not be described by
content alone. They claim that teachers do not necessarily share the same set of values. As a result, a school’s culture may be divided into several sub-cultures, rather than being a cohesive system (Hargreaves, 1986).

A second dimension of organizational culture is form. Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) identify two basic forms of school culture, individualistic and collaborative. These two forms of culture, along with their derivatives, will be explained in the next section.

**Alternative Forms of Organizational Culture**

Individualistic, or isolated cultures, as depicted by Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986), follow traditional norms of interaction where teachers work within an autonomous professional culture. Authority and discipline are paramount in this type of culture and teachers would never ask, or offer, peers professional advice. Parents are expected to support the teacher, but not to interfere in school business.

Since most of these conditions no longer exist in many schools, it is not surprising to discover a new kind of teaching culture emerging (e.g., Little, 1982, 1987; Rosenholtz, 1989; Nias et al., 1989; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991). According to Leithwood and Jantzi (1990, p. 251):

> This culture is student centred and based on norms of interactions with students that are supportive and positive; while discipline is maintained it is obviously to serve the interests of learning rather than an end in its own right. Teachers have a shared, technical culture built on norms of collegiality, collaborative planning and continuous improvement. Staff and the student body are cohesive and have a strong sense of community ... Such a culture appears to be adaptive to increasingly prevalent conditions associated with calls for reform.

Rosenholtz (1989) also notes that in effective schools, collaboration is tied to norms and opportunities for continuous improvement and life-long learning.
It is assumed that improvement in teaching is a collective rather than individual enterprise, and that analysis, evaluation, and experimentation in concert with colleagues are conditions under which teachers improve (1989, p. 73).

In addition to isolated and collaborative cultures, Hargreaves and Fullan warn against three distinct forms of collaboration: balkanization, comfortable collaboration, and contrived collegiality (1991, p. 52). Balkanized cultures, frequently found within subject specific departments at the secondary level, refer to a group of people who collaborate within their teaching sub-group (i.e., the modern languages department, or the science department). However, little, if any, collaboration occurs across such cultures.

Comfortable cultures, sometimes referred to as “bounded”, are criticized by Fullan and Hargreaves because they argue that “collegiality shouldn’t stop at congeniality ... This kind of collaboration is too cosy,” (p. 57). Instead, they suggest that effective collaboration should “operate in the world of ideas, examining existing practices critically, seeking better alternatives and working hard together at bringing about improvements and assessing their worth,” (p. 57).

Contrived collegiality refers to cultures where administrators attempt to control, regulate, or tame collegiality. In this environment, if the control was removed, participants would not likely support interactive collaboration.

Recently, Leithwood and Aitken (1995) observed a new form of culture. This type of culture is one which will be able to respond to change initiatives. It is a culture which promotes organizational learning, and thus, it must be open to ideas from diverse sources. The authors have coined the term cosmopolitan culture to “signify a form of culture that encourages collaboration with ideas and people wherever they may be found,” (p. 72).

In addition to the above mentioned types of cultures, this research recognizes two distinct kinds of collaboration. Collaboration, professional, refers to the interactions among school
personnel, while collaboration, inclusive, extends to the community. Thus, when examining the extent to which the culture impacted on organizational learning in each of the schools, it is important to note which form of culture was prevalent.

The Evidence of the Effects of Organizational Culture on Schools

School effectiveness research “has demonstrated that schools do, indeed, make a difference and that their achievements can be seen to correlate with certain organizational characteristics. School improvement studies have emphasized strategies which create the conditions to help schools become more effective,” (Riddell and Brown, 1991, p. 6). Research conducted on organizational culture in schools (i.e., Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1989; Deal and Peterson, 1990; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1992; 1993; Leithwood and Dart, 1994) offers compelling evidence that strong, collaborative cultures impact on school effectiveness. Rutter et al. (1979), researchers involved with effective schools movement, were some of the first to introduce the notion of culture (of ethos) to schools. They maintain that specific practices contribute to the school’s culture, and that culture, in turn, influences student development. Little’s landmark study (1982) indicates that a shared school culture fosters desired student outcomes. In addition to benefitting students, Little observes that collaborative cultures stimulate professional growth for the teaching staff.

Leithwood, Lawton, and Cousins (1989), in an examination of 20 empirical studies of effective secondary schools and five studies of elementary schools, identify seven categories of factors which influence school effectiveness. Two of the categories are culture and administration. In their study of 58 secondary schools, from six school boards in Ontario, they point to two dominant influences on student dropout rates, goals and school culture. They conclude that culture
has a positive effect on teachers, and teachers impact on program and instruction (1989, p. 106).

Deal and Peterson (1990), in a review of five case studies of principals, conclude that “the culture of an organization can influence its productivity,” (p. 9). Specifically, “effective schools’ researchers report that ethos, teamness and school culture were important factors in achieving high test scores,” (p. 10).

Mortimore’s (1991) research on primary school effectiveness cites climate as a specific factor related to school effectiveness. He contends:

Endeavouring to achieve a consensus on the values shared by the school as a whole needs to be a fundamental aim. Expressing a general attitude that is positive towards learning and positive about young people will be a clear signal of what the school stands for and where its priorities lie. Establishing clear rules and guidelines for pupil behaviour and maintaining high expectations for all pupils are ways in which the goals and values of the institution are translated into daily life. (p. 15)

David Hopkins’s (1991) contribution to school effectiveness is his critique of approaches to school improvement. He identifies the following eight organizational factors as characteristic of effective schools: 1) curriculum-focussed school leadership, 2) supportive climate within the school, 3) emphasis on curriculum and teaching, 4) clear goals and high expectations for students, 5) a system for monitoring performance and achievement, 6) on-going staff development and in-service, 7) parental involvement and support, 8) LEA and external support (pp. 57-58). Hopkins points out the limitations of single innovations and certain projects which have little impact on the school’s culture. Instead, he advocates for a coherent strategy which would enable administration and staff alike to change the culture of their schools in a way which will promote learning for students.

Examining models of instructional effectiveness, Jaap Scheerens (1993) contends that “the problem of school effectiveness can be formulated as a two-stage investigation: stage 1: how to create conditions for effective instruction at classroom level; stage 2: how to unite efforts in all sub-units in order to create an effective school,” (p. 26). Stage one sees organizational conditions
playing a major role, while stage two is a problem of coordination. Scheerens contends that coordination is multi-faceted, of which some are “structural (as in creating a hierarchical system of decision-making) and some [are] procedural (such as direct supervision, carrying out a specific recruitment policy and rational planning) and some [are] cultural (as in a shared educational mission of a school’s staff),” (p. 26). He notes that school climate factors, such as pushing for achievement and holding high expectations of students, “imply that these are beliefs and attitudes shared by a significant majority of the teaching staff,” (p. 27). And, it is these cultural factors which contribute to school effectiveness.

Khattri and Miles (1993), in their study on restructuring, state that “changes in school culture would be part and parcel of changes in ‘structure’,” (p. 22, their emphasis). They see culture “not only as an ‘input’ to the change process, but as a durable outcome of it,” (p. 23, their emphasis). Norms of collegiality, collaboration, and risk taking are recognized as crucial culture elements. In addition, other culture descriptors are identified: “reflectiveness, vulnerability, problem orientation, initiative-taking, experimentation, trust,” (p. 23). They conclude that ‘reculturing’ is a central part of restructuring, or in other words, “the skin that holds it all together,” (p. 23).

Two researchers proposed a model that examined how certain variables thought to represent specific aspects of organizational culture could be summarized and their effects on performance assessed. Heck and Marcoulides’ (1996) model tests some aspects of culture that were seen to make a difference in organizational performance. Specifically, they chose values thought to be important in achieving organizational or school productivity. These included:

... the extent to which innovation or risk-taking is encouraged, whether support and time are provided for developing collaboration among faculty, and whether the school promotes greater (or lesser) teacher participation in decision making. (p. 82)

Their data were collected from 26 secondary schools in Singapore. Results indicate that school
performance can be determined from knowledge of a school’s cultural environment.

Relationships Among Culture, Leadership, and Organizational Learning

Culture and Organizational Learning

This study attempted to apply our current understanding of organizational learning and organizational culture in addressing the following research question: “Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?”

Organizational culture is one of the key factors that impacts on and contributes to sustained, long-term organizational learning. Hedberg (1981, p. 6) maintains that culture affects all of the other factors and conditions which indirectly and directly affect the organization's ability to learn, unlearn, and relearn new practices.

The impact of culture on OL, is only beginning to be understood (see, for example, Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1995). In fact, Leithwood et al. (1993) state that “culture can often be used to predict the actions of organizational members, as well as the nature and amount of organizational learning,” (p. 60). For example, if a teacher works in a school with an isolated culture, he has no one to bounce ideas off, no one with whom he can work, and no one from whom he can learn. In a culture which is collaborative, people support one another; they share ideas and their expertise. By working together, a greater opportunity exists for people to learn from each other and to influence each other’s beliefs. Thus, researchers (i.e., Louis and Miles, 1990; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood and Aitken, 1995; Mitchell, 1995) advocate for collaborative cultures because it is within such cultures that organizational learning will occur.

A prime example of the effect of culture on organizational learning is documented by Cook
and Yanow (in Cohen and Sproull, 1996). They tell the story of three flute making companies which make "the best flutes in the world." Each company developed a unique product with its style and quality remaining unchanged over the years. This had been done in spite of the fact that each flute was made by several flutemakers and many generations of flutemakers have come and gone. Cook and Yanow use this story to illustrate that "knowledge has been learned collectively not individually," (p. 443). They point out that "each flutemaker knows how to perform his or her individual tasks; but the know-how required to make the flute as a whole resides with the organization, not with the individual flutemaker because only the workshop as a whole can make the flute," (p. 443). This example illustrates that OL does not require the organization to change for learning to occur. Instead, new members are "socialized or acculturated into the organization, learning by the organization takes place. The organization learns how to maintain the style and quality of its flutes through the particular skills, character, and quirks of a new individual," (p. 444).

In a second example, Cook and Yanow (1996) explain how the Powell flute making company changed its flute because of the invention of the Cooper scale. To do this, the company did not have to reorganize or restructure; they simply learned how to make a different flute. These researchers contend "much of organizational learning, in our view, is tacit, occasioned through experiences of the artifacts of the organization’s culture that are part of its daily work," (p. 449). From the cultural perspective, Cook and Yanow (1996, p. 452) argue:

(a) that one aspect of the human capacity to act is the ability to act in groups; (b) that a group of people with a history of joint action or practice is meaningfully understood as a culture; (c) that a culture is constituted, at least in part, from the intersubjective meanings that its members express in their common practice through objects, language, and acts; (d) that such meaning-bearing objects, language, and acts are cultural artifacts through which an organization’s collective knowledge or know-how is transmitted, expressed, and put to use; and (e) that organizations are constantly involved in activities of modifying or maintaining those meanings and their embodiments - that is of changing or preserving their cultural identity. Finally, it has been our position that such activities constitute organizational learning.
To date, Leithwood and colleagues have provided the most comprehensive research on this topic in a school setting. After investigating six schools' improvement processes, Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) conclude that "a large proportion of teachers identified strong elements of collaboration within their schools, an important contribution to organizational learning," (p. 69).

Mitchell (1995), in her study of an urban Saskatchewan school, "found that the teachers' collective learning and their collaborative efforts flourished when each individual took responsibility for maintaining psychological safety in group deliberations, for participating in school-wide activities, and for honouring diversity among them," (p. 31). In other words, organizational learning was able to occur because of the safe, collaborative culture that was in place in the school.

The same type of environment was documented in Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach's account of "Sutton District High School" (1993). In this secondary school, the staff shared the same values and beliefs. Collaborative decision-making processes and structures were seen as learning opportunities. The teachers said, "We learn by cooperating," (p. 28). Teachers who collaborate have a stronger sense of confidence because they realize that they can call on others to help them (Little, 1982). The end result is that educators are more willing to trust, share, seek advice, and give and receive help from both inside and outside the school.

According to Kruse and Louis (1994, p. 23), one area for schools to consider when incorporating elements of OL into their strategic planning is a "focus on the creation of organizational memory." They suggest that schools identify "those aspects of their school culture and climate that can enhance their future ability to collectively learn," (p. 23). They note that "school organizations [must] collaboratively address the learning needs of faculty as well as students" so that the schools may move from "isolated, atomistic organizations to responsive, self-appraising and learning environments," (p. 23).
Simon (1996) also recognizes the need for learning organizations to "share a common culture," (p. 178). By this he means that the organization's members share the "knowledge, beliefs, and values that are necessary for implementing the new goals," (p. 180). When new members are indoctrinated, the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 1985) take over so that the new personnel quickly learn the organization's standard operating procedures, "the way things are done around here." Simon suggests that if organizations wish to restructure, they must first learn to reculture. An important aspect of reculturing is trying to get people to move beyond "bounded rationality". Bounded rationality limits "the ability of human beings to adapt optimally, or even satisfactorily, to complex environments," (1996, p. 186). This concept makes people realize their individual limitations and they recognize that many heads are better than one. As a result, people begin to solve their problems together. In other words, people collaborate with one another.

In addition to cultures being collaborative, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1995, p. 44) identify several cultural characteristics found in learning organizations. These characteristics fall nicely into the components of the definition.

**Norms:**
- norms of mutual support,
- informal sharing of ideas and materials,
- support for risk taking,
- encouragement for open discussion of difficulties,
- shared celebration of successes,

**Beliefs:**
- shared belief in the importance of continuous professional growth,
- belief in providing honest, candid feedback to colleagues,
Values:
- respect for colleagues' ideas,

Underlying Assumptions:
- all students valued regardless of their needs, and
- commitment to helping students.

In 1995, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach discovered that neither a leader's vision-building activities, nor the school's mission and vision appeared to stimulate significant OL. Instead, they found other sources of direction, such as “school culture and a coherent set of practices engaged in by leaders which modelled at least the leader's vision of what the school should become,” (pp. 34-35), had a greater effect on OL.

Leadership and Organizational Culture

This study endeavoured to add to our present understanding of leadership practices and organizational culture by answering the research question: “Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture?” Some of the studies which discuss the relationship between these two constructs, and which have added to our knowledge base in this area, are discussed below.

Judith Warren Little (1982) was one of the first to investigate the relationship between principal practice and school culture. In a footnote to her research, she makes the following inference:

By virtue first of office and then of performance, principals are in a unique position to establish and maintain the important norms of collegiality and experimentation, and to promote and foster the critical practices of talk about practice, observation, joint work on materials, and teaching each other about teaching. (p. 338)

Little recognizes that people learn by experience. This is not a new idea. But how does one learn, and under what conditions do people gain confidence and competence? People learn in many
different ways (Gardner, 1993), particularly from one another. Variation in practices may be the result of a change in structure (i.e., joint planning time, peer mentoring), and the principal can put these structures into place. In addition, the principal can empower teachers and involve them in shared decision making practices and goal setting for the school. By providing a vision for the school and modelling expected behaviours and values, the principal is able to set the tone of the school. Further, by providing teachers with personal and professional support, the leader models the importance of caring for one another. All of these activities are dimensions of transformational leadership, and the more a principal embraces these characteristics, the more impact he or she will have on the culture of the school. The following examples provide support for this argument.

In his 1988 case study, Lambert quotes a principal's diary. It read, “the way to school effectiveness, and administrative sanity, is through the building of a healthy school culture,” (p. 55). Lambert maintains that principals build culture through their vision, mission, and communication. In addition, planning, modelling, consensus building, professional development, and leadership development were essential to creating a strong school culture.

Deal and Peterson (1990) describe individual case studies of five principals. Although they admit that each of the cases is unique, they agree that “the critical commonality among our successful principals and headmaster was a clear and focussed sense of mission or values,” (p. 81). The administrators in this study,

... used formal cultural devices - rituals, ceremonies, traditions, and symbols - to help define, reinforce, or simply express the culture he or she was striving to construct. (p. 86)

They created strong cultures through their symbolic actions. These leaders employed modelling, ceremonies, traditions, and stories to nurture the values and traditions that were in keeping with the kind of culture they were attempting to establish. Moreover, Deal and Peterson note that symbolic
leaders were willing to deal with conflict.

Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) investigated the practices of administrators in 12 schools. For three years, these schools had been involved in school improvement initiatives, and they had developed collaborative professional relationships among their staff members. These researchers discovered that six principal practices were essential to school culture: strengthening school culture; using a variety of bureaucratic mechanisms; fostering staff development; engaging in direct and frequent communication regarding norms, beliefs, and values; sharing power and responsibility; and effectively using symbols to express cultural values.

The practices outlined in the above articles were found to have a positive affect on teachers' interactions which, in turn, impacted on the culture of the school. As stated earlier, many of these leadership practices were "transformational" in nature. According to Leithwood and Aitken,

... school leadership must acknowledge the importance of situation and context: It must allow for variation in leadership style and behaviour ... A transformational model of leadership appears to meet these requirements (1995, p. 86).

Sashkin and Egermeier support this argument. They contend that "cultures change as a consequence of the actions of leaders who transform their organizations," (1993, p. 2). Deal and Peterson also agree with these researchers. They state, "We believe the leadership of principals is key to building a strong school culture," (1990, p. 89). Thus, in response to the research question, the literature supports the idea that transformational leadership practices contribute most to organizational culture.

Leadership and Organizational Learning

This study tried to answer the following research question: "Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning?" The number of empirical studies which
specifically link principals to the concept of organizational learning are limited. However, recent studies by Leithwood and colleagues shed light on this area. In 1993, Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach's six school study found:

A significant amount of variation in organizational learning conditions was explained by transformational school leadership. But such leadership had substantially different levels of effects on different areas (e.g., culture, structure) of the organization in which conditions for learning arise (1993, p. 75).

In 1994, Leithwood wrote a paper titled "Leadership for School Restructuring" which reviewed the research he and his colleagues had been engaged in since about 1990. Once again, he made the case for transformational leadership based on two assumptions. One assumption is that "instructional leadership images are no longer adequate." (p. 3). Secondly, he contends that "school restructuring will dominate the change agenda for school leaders for some time to come." (p. 3). He concludes:

Commitment to change serves as the primary motive for school restructuring on the part of teachers and is influenced by leadership practices. Organizational learning, however, is necessary if such motivation is to actually result in the skilful use of those new practices associated with restructuring. (p. 22)

In 1995, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach described the results of their five year longitudinal study of policy implementation in British Columbia. In earlier research, they had discovered that "school leadership has emerged as an important explanation for variation in OL," (p. 4). Thus, their study was designed to explore the "nature, causes and consequences of OL in schools and to discover those leadership practices which contribute to such learning," (p. 4). These researchers note that among school conditions which foster OL, "culture appears to be the dominant influence on collective learning," (p. 24, their italics). They maintain that "school cultures fostered learning when they were collaborative and collegial," (p. 19). In addition, they contend that "principals are significantly influenced by district-level decision making" and that a "surprising amount of influence
[was] exercised by districts on the OL of teachers,” (p. 33). This influence took the form of professional development opportunities.

Although the study posits that a “coherent sense of direction for the school is crucial in fostering OL,” it is unclear as to the source of this direction. The researchers state that leaders often initiate goal-setting strategies which provide a less obvious sense of direction. In addition, the study credits leaders with providing a sense of direction through the school’s culture and “practices engaged in by leaders which modelled at least the leader’s vision of what the school should become,” (p. 35).

These studies provide a starting point for understanding the impact that leadership practices can have on organizational learning. If a principal has a vision of the direction in which the school needs to go, and if that vision is communicated to staff in such a way that they “buy into it” then they will be more likely to participate in learning that will work towards its attainment. An even better situation would be if staff were involved in the school’s goal setting and decision making processes which would decide how to attain those goals. If a principal provides intellectual stimulation and resources, then staff will have the tools they require to take on new learning experiences. And, if the principal provides support for staff, as they are on their journey of learning, then they will be more apt to continue that journey.

**Organizational Learning, Leadership Practices, and Organizational Culture**

Although a plethora of research exists on leadership practices, few empirical studies have been conducted which attempt to understand the relationships among leadership, organizational learning, and culture (ex., Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1995). The above mentioned studies add to the knowledge base on these three concepts;
however, it is obvious that much research still needs to be done in order to understand the relationship among these constructs.

In summary, the literature establishes organizational learning as a fundamental mediator between change initiatives and improved educational practices. The literature also provides an understanding of the conditions which foster organizational learning, organizational culture and leadership practices believed to be the most powerful conditions. The remainder of this paper will discuss how these three concepts played themselves out in three unique school settings.
Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The nature of the research questions suggested a need for thick description of what leaders do to influence a school's culture and how that culture impacts on organizational learning. A mixed methods design was employed in order to respond to the research questions. Data were gathered in several stages. First of all, each principal was interviewed. Secondly, a focus group interview was conducted in each school with members on the School Growth Team (SGT). Thirdly, individual interviews were conducted with three members of the SGT and five staff members not on the team. These individual interviews provided an opportunity to follow up on issues that arose from the focus group interviews. Data were then coded around the three research questions and causal maps were drawn to clarify the relationships among organizational learning, leadership practices, and school culture.

The Context of the Study

This study took place in three schools of a large school board in southern Ontario. Each school, referred to as school 1, 2, and 3, was successfully involved in change initiatives. The principals had each been administering their schools for three or four years, and all schools had a School Growth Team in place.
School Growth Teams were initiated in this particular Board of Education in the late 1980s. The SGT is a group of people usually made up of representatives from administration, the primary, junior, intermediate divisions, support staff, and sometimes student and/or parent representatives. School Growth Teams provide a vehicle for facilitating change in schools inasmuch as their main purpose is to set academic and social goals which tie in with the management plan, which, in turn, is to reflect the objectives of the system plan. In other words, if the school has a particular initiative, it is the responsibility of the SGT to see that the initiative is implemented. This is to be done in conjunction with all staff members. A secondary function of the SGT is to provide a forum for discussing issues that have been brought to the attention of SGT members.

Mixed Methods Design

According to Greene, Caracelli and Graham (1989), mixed method research design serves a number of purposes. It may be used for: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion. In this research, individual interviews with the principals put them at ease, thus securing support for the project. The focus group interviews were employed to examine the School Growth Team’s perspective on change initiatives and the individual and group learning that resulted from those initiatives. The members of the SGT also had the opportunity to talk about the school’s culture and the principal’s leadership practices. Subsequently, individual interviews with three staff members on the SGT, and five staff members not on the SGT, provided an opportunity to follow up on issues that were discussed during the focus group interview. In this case, therefore, the mixed methods design allowed results from the focus group interview to bridge the gap and provide a starting point for the individual interviews.

By using focus group interviews and individual interviews with the principals, SGT
members, and staff not on the SGT, an attempt was made to confirm data from as many different sources as possible. This method, referred to as triangulation, “is the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point,” (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 144). Anderson (1990) notes that “conclusions suggested by different data sources are far stronger than those suggested by one alone,” (p. 163). Data from different sources may be used to corroborate, elaborate, or illuminate the research in question (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). In effect, then, the argument is that the more techniques employed in data collection, the more one may be assured of the validity of the data obtained, assuming they produce the same results. Thus, in order to strengthen this study’s usefulness in other settings, three school sites were examined, focus group interviews were conducted, and individual participants were interviewed.

**Application of Methods**

This study is a comparative case study. Three case studies were developed using focus group interviews and individual interviews, in an attempt to collect and analyse data. This section outlines how these methods were employed.

Questions for the research fell into three categories: culture, leadership, and organizational learning. During the first stage of data collection, individual interviews were conducted with the principals. In stage two, focus group interviews were held with members of the School Growth Team. At the focus group interview, participants were asked questions related to individual and collective learning, as well as questions about leadership practices that affected the school’s culture. Following the focus group interviews, stage three of data collection occurred. Individual interviews were conducted with three members on the SGT, and with five staff members who were not part of the SGT. Participants were asked about the school’s culture in an attempt to discover its content.
and form, and how they perceived it got to be that way. In addition, questions regarding the
cultural conditions that have impacted on their learning were posed. Participants were also asked
about leadership and their perceptions around the principal’s role in fostering the school’s culture.
The intent of these questions was twofold: to gain an understanding of which leadership practices
affect organizational learning, and also which practices foster the development of collaborative
cultures.

Data were coded around the research questions and causal maps were drawn for each school
to illustrate the relationships among school culture, leadership practices, and OL. The maps were
shared with participants and they had the opportunity to discuss the accuracy of the maps.

Sample Selection

Three elementary schools were selected from a large school board in southern Ontario.
Several steps were involved in this process. First, the thesis proposal and an External Research
Application form was submitted to the School Board’s Research Advisory Committee. Permission
to conduct the research was granted on January 30, 1997. Contact was made with each of the
Board’s four area superintendents and they were asked for a list of schools which met the following
criteria: 1) the school had to be “on its way” in implementing new initiatives, 2) a School Growth
Team, which worked with the principal to implement new initiatives, had to have been in place for
a minimum of three years, and 3) the principal must have been in the school for two years, or more.
Of the 93 elementary schools in this system, 19 were identified as meeting the criteria for this
research. The Board’s staff development officers were asked to confirm that the schools did meet
the above criteria. Three schools were randomly selected from the schools which met all the
criteria.
Contact was made with the principals of the three schools and they were asked if their schools would like to be involved in the study. All three schools agreed to participate. Subsequently, a follow-up letter of permission was sent to the principals (see Appendix B). This letter included a description of the project, steps involved in the research, and a guarantee of anonymity for the schools as well as confidentiality for the participants. Principals were given the opportunity to consult with their School Growth Teams to see if they would like to participate in this research. School 2's SGT agreed to support this project. In schools 1 and 3 the decision appeared to be made by the principal.

All teachers were provided with a letter of permission (also included in Appendix B). Once again, this letter outlined the steps involved in the project and guaranteed anonymity for the school and confidentiality for the participants. Further, the letter stated that “participation in this study is totally voluntary, and you will be free to withdraw from participation at any time.” If teachers agreed to be part of the research, they were asked to complete the permission form and return it to the researcher.

Focus Group interviews were arranged at convenient times for each of the schools. Once teachers' permission forms were returned, teachers were contacted and individual interview times were arranged. In some cases, teachers gave up preparation periods or lunch hours in order to participate in the interview. In all three schools, the principals set up an interview schedule. Teachers in schools 2 and 3 were covered internally. A supply teacher was paid for by the researcher so that coverage could be arranged for teachers in school 1.
Data Collection Procedures

Focus Group Interviews

Focus group interviews were conducted with members of the SGTs in each school. A focus group is a “group comprised of individuals with certain characteristics who focus discussions on a given issue or topic,” (Anderson, 1990, p. 241). This particular method of data collection developed as a result of social scientists expressing concern about the interview as a data collection technique. Interviews were thought to be too rigid, dominated by the interviewer, and not able to get at the true feelings of the respondents. Since the 1960s, the focus group interview has been employed by market researchers to find out what consumers think of products. “Scholarly researchers have also discovered the technique and are now using it for data collection on a wide variety of issues and topics,” (1990, p. 241).

The focus group method of data collection “provide[s] a setting in which individuals are comfortable in self-disclosure,” (Anderson, 1990, p. 242). The group synergy may furnish insight into the group’s culture. A focus group “strives to provide in-depth qualitative data which could not be obtained as efficiently any other way,” (Anderson, 1990, p. 241). The “trick”, according to Marshall and Rossman, is to “promote the participants’ self-disclosure through the creation of a permissive environment,” (1995, p. 84).

Krueger (1988) discusses the advantages to focus group interviews:

[Focus group interviews are] ... socially oriented, studying participants in a natural, real-life atmosphere (neither experimental nor the strain and artificiality of a one-on-one interview); the format allows the facilitator the flexibility to explore unanticipated issues as they arise in the discussion; the results have high face validity - because the method is readily understood, the findings appear believable; it is relatively low cost; it provides quick results; and it can increase the sample size of qualitative studies by interviewing more people at one time. (pp. 44-46)

There are disadvantages to this method as well.
The interviewer has less control over a group interview than an individual one, which can result in lost time as dead-end or irrelevant issues are discussed; the data are difficult to analyse, as context is essential to understanding the participants’ comments; the method requires the use of highly trained observer-moderators; the groups can vary a great deal and be hard to assemble; and, finally, there are logistical problems arising from the need to conduct the discussion as conducive to a conversation (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 85).

Considerable care was taken before the focus group interview process to overcome many of these criticisms. Having used the focus group interview before, I was quite comfortable with this method of data collection. In a previous experience, however, recording information was problematic. As a result, the “Focus Group Interview Protocol Outline” (see Appendix C) was developed to facilitate the recording of responses during the discussions. An interview protocol (see Appendix D) was also employed to direct the discussion so that irrelevant issues were avoided. Every attempt was made to establish a relaxed atmosphere for the group. The interview took place at a time when the group felt they would be most relaxed (i.e., the morning of a Professional Activity day, after school), and refreshments were provided for the participants.

**Individual Interviews**

Individual interviews were conducted with each principal and eight staff members, three on the SGT and five not on the SGT. Marshall and Rossman (1995, p. 80) state that "in-depth interviewing is a data collection method relied on quite extensively by qualitative researchers." Interviews provide a useful way of quickly obtaining large amounts of information. According to Patton:

We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe ... We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviours that took place at some previous point in time ... The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective (1980, p. 196).
Merriam (1988) notes that the decision to use the interview method as a mode of data collection ought to be based upon the type of information needed and whether this is the best way to obtain it. The interview may be employed exclusively, or in combination with other data collection techniques, the latter being the case in this research.

Patton (1990, pp. 280-290) outlines three general types of interviews: the informal conversational interview, the general interview guide approach, and the standardized open-ended interview. The standardized open-ended interview affords a degree of uniformity in questioning which is necessary in “a multisite case study or when many participants are interviewed,” (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 80). Since this was the situation in this study, the standardized open-ended interview was employed.

Borg and Gall (1974) point out that interviewing “involves the collection of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals. This direct interaction is the source of both the main advantages and disadvantages of the interview as a research technique,” (p. 211). According to these researchers, the main advantage is adaptability. The interviewer is able to make full use of the respondents’ answers, follow-up on points, and thus obtain more data and greater clarity. Because of the relationship that the interviewer can establish with the interviewee, the subject may reveal more information than under other circumstances (i.e., questionnaire). The result is the interview provides greater depth than other methods of collecting data.

The main disadvantage, according to Borg and Gall is that the “very adaptability gained by the interpersonal situation leads to subjectivity and possible bias,” (p. 213). Bias may be the result of the interviewee’s eagerness to please the interviewer, or sometimes an antagonism arises between the two, or the interviewer may seek out responses that support his or her preconceived notions. Marshall and Rossman (1995) also view personal interaction as a weakness of this method. They
state “cooperation is essential,” (p. 81).

Marshall and Rossman (1995), Anderson (1990), and Burgess (1982) consider the role of the interviewer. They state that a strong rapport must be established. Marshall and Rossman note that, “The interviewers should have superb listening skills and be skilful at personal interaction, question framing, and gently probing for elaboration,” (p. 81). Succinctly put, Anderson suggests:

... the interviewer’s goal is to listen actively and to communicate this attentiveness through a relaxed posture, use of varied eye contact, and verbal responses which indicate to the person that the interviewer is attempting to understand what is being communicated (1990, p. 229).

During the interviews, every attempt was made to put the participants at ease and a comfortable congeniality was maintained. This task was made easier, with some of the participants, because a rapport had previously been established during the focus group interviews. All interviews were conducted at a convenient time for participants and took place in a quiet room away from interruptions. In an attempt to alleviate biases and misinterpretations, interviews were tape recorded, notes were written, and participants were requested to review the transcripts (Anderson, 1990; Burgess, 1982).

Data Collection - Stage One

All data were gathered on-site at each of the three schools. Data collection began with the principals’ interviews. These occurred in March for schools 1 and 2, and in early May for school 3. Each interview lasted approximately one and a half hours. Interviews were tape recorded and the researcher also took notes. An Interview Protocol (see Appendix D) was used to stimulate a discussion on leadership and how it affects the school’s culture. In addition, questions, regarding the individual and collective learning that had occurred since the inception of the SGT’s initiative, were asked. Principals were also consulted about the school’s history and demographics.
Information regarding the principal’s personal experience as an administrator was requested (see Appendix D - Additional Questions for Principal).

Focus Group interviews took place in March in school 2 and in May in schools 1 and 3. Prior to the focus group interview, members of the School Growth Team were invited to join the researcher for refreshments. At that time, teachers were asked to complete the Teacher Profile Form (see Appendix E). The procedure for the Focus Group interview was explained, and participants had the opportunity to ask the researcher questions regarding the study. Every attempt was made to put the teachers at ease and create a warm, friendly environment.

The same Interview Protocol (see Appendix D), as was used for the principals, was employed with the focus groups. Each Focus Group interview lasted approximately an hour and a half. The interview was tape recorded and the researcher recorded the sequence of responses on the Interview Protocol Outline (see Appendix C).

Data Collection - Stage Two

During the months of March, April, May, and June, individual interviews were conducted with three members of the each School’s Growth Team. An additional five teachers who were not on the SGT, were also interviewed. These interviews followed the Interview Protocol (see Appendix D), but they delved more deeply into particular issues that arose from each of the schools’ Focus Group interviews. Teachers who had not been interviewed as part of the SGT were asked to fill in the Teacher Profile Form. Each interview lasted anywhere from 25 minutes to an hour. Interviews were tape recorded and written notes were kept.
Data Analysis

A qualitative analysis of the data was undertaken. In each case, the unit of analysis was the school.

Round One

Focus group interviews, and individual interviews, were transcribed and checked for accuracy by listening to the tapes and making any necessary changes. Transcripts were given to the interviewees so that they could confirm each transcript’s accuracy. Following this, a content analysis was conducted by coding transcripts in relation to the research questions (see Table 3.1).

Transcripts were coded using descriptors for culture, leadership, and organizational learning (see Appendix F). Coding was done by “identifying idea units corresponding to categories,” (Leithwood and Dart, 1994, p. 36). Categories for coding interview data were derived from the literature. In addition, categories were amended and augmented depending on needs which arose from the interview information.

Relevant idea units were bracketed and identified by initials in the margin of the transcript. For example, in school 1, Teacher 2 commented, “My staff is very, very, very, very supportive.” This idea unit was coded “CCNA” which stands for Culture, Content, Norm, Mutual Support Among Colleagues. Teacher 2 also told how a colleague “would provide me with materials that she had produced, or found and put together.” This is an example of “CCNB” (Culture, Content, Norm, Sharing of Ideas and Resources). A complete list of codes may be found in Appendix F.

Once comments had been coded, they were recorded in a computer database according to each of the descriptors. The idea units were totalled for each participant and entered on a master coding sheet. The individual interviews, and the focus group interviews, were treated similarly. A frequency count was calculated for the teachers, the principal, and the focus group.
Table 3.1

How the Interview Questions Correlate to the Research Questions

For Focus Group and Individual Interview Protocol, See Appendix D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTIONS:</th>
<th>INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture?</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Two

The second level of coding used the transcripts from the individual interviews and the focus group interviews. By re-reading the transcripts, linkages were established among the concepts (see Khattri and Miles, 1993, p. 15). These linkages represented the interviewees’ conceptualization of the relationships among organizational learning, leadership practices, and organizational culture. For example, in school 2, when Teacher 10 was asked about any individual, or collective growth that had occurred in the school, she identified “increased understanding in the use of cooperative learning” as an organizational learning outcome for the staff as a whole. She was then asked how the school’s culture affected that learning. She replied:

There are always opportunities to learn from one another. PD is encouraged. If someone on staff thinks a workshop would be good for you, or would like to take it, they will suggest, ‘Why don’t you come with me?’ There is always that peer coaching that is going on.

In this case, the comments, “There are always opportunities to learn from one another. PD is encouraged,” were coded “CCND” (Culture, Content, Norm, Professional Development) and linked to “OUTU” (Organizational Learning Outcome, Group). The statements, “If someone on staff thinks a workshop would be good for you, or would like to take it, they will suggest, ‘Why don’t you come with me?’ There is always that peer coaching that is going on,” were coded “CCNA” (Culture, Content, Norm, Mutual Support Among Colleagues) and linked to “OUTU” (Organizational Learning Outcome, Group). Once linkages had been ascertained, they were recorded in the data base according to their categories (i.e., “Leadership Practices Which Influence Culture”, “Leadership Practices Which Influence Organizational Learning”, “Cultural Conditions Which Influence Organizational Learning”). The linkages were totalled and entered on a master sheet. Frequency counts were calculated and, finally, a causal map was developed for each school.
Weick and Bourgon (1986) suggest that cognitive maps are one method of representing an individual's organizational experience. These researchers encourage the use of maps because they “focus beyond the range of immediate perceptions, they deal with phenomena that cannot be observed but rather must be explored,” (1986, p. 105). They also find maps to be relevant to joint experiences. A composite map is useful in representing “what the group thinks, is likely to perceive, and how it defines itself,” (p. 111). Weick and Bourgon note that several things can be learned from maps: “the degree to which the relationships are structured, the degree to which tacit goals are singular or plural, and what the content of those goals might be,” (p. 123).

Once the maps were drawn, the researcher met with the interviewees, discussed the concepts, and verified the linkages among the concepts. Following this, a descriptive text was written to explain each of the maps (see “Overview of the Pattern of Relationships” section of chapters 4, 5, and 6). Together, the three schools’ maps identified the focus groups’, the teachers’, and the administrators’ views of the relationships among OL, leadership practices, and organizational culture.

Limitations of the Study

The research was limited to three elementary schools and three leaders. Since the sample was small, and individuals are unique, findings cannot be generalized. In addition, since the schools initially selected by the area superintendents all met the project’s criteria, then one might assume that the schools named by the superintendents were indeed “moving” schools (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991, p. 46).

Data collected were to help determine the relationships among organizational learning, leadership practices, and culture in three specific settings. Although culture and leadership may have
a significant impact on organizational learning, other conditions and factors, not included in this study, also needed to be addressed in order to understand fully how an organization learns. As a result, there are three principal limitations to this study:

- a small number of sites were investigated (three),
- school cultures are unique, and
- every principal has his or her own leadership style.

Each of these limitations curtails the generalizability of the project's findings.
Chapter Four

CASE STUDY: SCHOOL 1

Introduction

The case study for school 1 is described in this chapter. The first section provides an overview of the site and interviewees’ profiles. Section two presents a global perspective of the data where the results from level one coding are briefly described. A third section examines the linkages from level two coding which provides an overview of the pattern of relationships among the three constructs of the study. Subsequent sections respond to the research questions as they examine the relationships between culture and organizational learning (OL), leadership and culture, and leadership and organizational learning. The next section investigates the relationships among all three concepts. A summary response to the three research questions completes the chapter.

Site and Participants’ Profiles

School 1 has a population of 550 students. The school is staffed with a principal, a vice principal, 28 teachers, five educational assistants, one and a half secretaries, and three custodians. According to the principal, the school services an interesting community.

It’s a fairly multi-ethnic community. We can go as high as 35 to 40% visible minority kids. It’s a surprising kind of community in that it is set in a traditional middle class kind of suburban neighbourhood. But, that’s not really the kind of kid that comes here. There are kids where that is the norm, but we have a lot of houses that are split up into two and three apartments that are rented by single moms and recently arrived immigrant families who share homes. We have a real cross section of kids and their needs. It looks middle class, and there are certainly strong elements of that. We laugh about our community a little bit. There’s some very wonderful
people in it, but, at the risk of saying this, it kind of has a pick up truck kind of mentality to it ... Snowmobiles are big, pick up trucks, and that kind of stuff. Then, amongst that I have the ethnic families who, in a lot of cases, are struggling to get a toe hold.

The school is a kindergarten to grade eight structure that was built ten years ago. Many of the original teachers are still on staff. The founding leader retired and the present principal arrived at the school three years ago. Principal 1 (the principal presently working in school 1) has been in education for 24 years, four and a half as a vice principal, and eight years as a principal. This school has had three different vice principals in three years, and there was even a time when no vice principal had been assigned to the school.

Participants in the focus group interview were members of the School Growth Team (SGT). In this school, anyone could be a member of the SGT. During the 1996-97 school year the team consisted of seven members: a kindergarten teacher, a primary teacher, an academic resource teacher, a special education teacher, a junior teacher, the vice principal, and the principal. Six members were present at the interview. In consultation with the principal, a meeting time had been arranged for the focus group interview. The principal had told the chairperson of the SGT about the focus group interview, but unfortunately this did not appear to have been communicated to the other team members. Some of them were taken aback by the tape recorder. After the first question had been asked, Teacher 3 (T3) responded immediately, while Teacher 2 (T2) said, “I just froze.” Although every effort was made to put the interviewees at ease, it took this group awhile before they forgot about the tape recorder and began speaking freely. Eventually, they were caught up in what was being said by their colleagues and they began to laugh and joke with one another. A week later, in her individual interview, Teacher 4 commented:

I really did come away from the last get together [the focus group interview] thinking, ‘Boy, are we really this good!’ and that was kind of a nice feeling. It was also nice feeling that people were sitting and listening so nicely ... It was nice to be
listened to and I think it's a really great place to work so I'm happy to be here. I know we have more changes again now, but that's okay.

Three teachers from the SGT, Teachers 2, 3, and 4 agreed to be interviewed individually. In addition, four teachers, Teacher 6, 7, 8, 9, the school's secretary, and the principal volunteered for individual interviews. So the case data consisted of a focus group interview with six people, and individual interviews with nine people. Table 4.1 illustrates the participants' main characteristics.

In Table 4.1, individuals are identified by letters. For example, the letter “P” stands for the principal, “S” indicates the secretary, and the teachers were labeled with numbers (i.e., T1 represents the first teacher interviewed). Participants' gender is recorded in the second column. The third column tells how many years the teachers and principal had taught, and how many years the secretary had been employed in her position. Number of years participants had been at school 1 (five since the school's inception) is indicated in column four. The fifth column states the grade level taught. There was an even representation from the three divisions, as well as a special education teacher, the academic resource teacher, the vice principal (labeled as a teacher), and the secretary. Column six indicates whether or not teachers were on the School Growth Team, and the final column tells how long people had served on the SGT.
Table 4.1

School 1 - Participants' Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th># of Years Taught</th>
<th># of Years at School 1</th>
<th>Division Taught</th>
<th>SGT Member</th>
<th># of Years on SGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interme./ Special Ed</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Primary/ A. R.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Junior/ P. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.  * indicates School Growth Team members who had individual interviews  
** indicates School Growth Team members who were present at the focus group interview
The Data

The first phase of the qualitative analysis was to read the transcripts and code them by “identifying idea units corresponding to categories,” (Leithwood and Dart, 1993, p. 36). The relevant statements were bracketed and identified by initials in the margin of the transcript (see Appendix F for a complete list of codes). Transcript coding yielded a total of 837 idea units, with the teachers’ statements representing 477 of these units. The focus group’s comments totalled 208, and the principal’s remarks constituted 152. For a global perspective of participants’ responses see Table 4.2. In this table, the constructs of the framework (i.e., form and content of culture, leadership, OL processes, structures, outcomes, stimuli, barriers) are listed in the first column. The second column indicates the number of teachers making comments, while the third column illustrates the percentage of participants’ comments about each of the constructs. Percentage of comments made by the focus group and principal are recorded in the fourth and fifth columns. Lastly, the percentage of relevant responses was tabulated and noted in column six. Leadership accounted for 49% of all responses. Statements made regarding the form and content of culture represented 31%, and the remaining 20% of statements were about OL.

Level one coding tried to determine the form and content of the culture, the various leadership practices that were in place, and any OL that occurred in school 1. For a complete picture of the data related to these three constructs, see Appendix G. In brief, however, what was learned from this first level of coding was the following. First, the form of culture was collaborative, professional. Staff had created a “warm, inviting learning environment,” (Secretary) for kids and these teachers had a “very child-focussed,” (Teacher 6) approach to education. Their collaborative culture extended, to a certain extent, to the community. Parents were welcomed in the school and they were considered to be part of the “team,” (School Growth Team).
### Table 4.2

School 1 - Level 1 Coding

Global Perspective of Dimensions of Culture, Leadership, and Organizational Learning

(N = 837)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 477</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 208</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 152</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 837</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Stimuli</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to OL and Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The calculations were derived as follows:

Leadership:  
- Participants' Percentage of Comments - 229/477 = 48%
- Focus Group's Percentage of Comments - 83/208 = 39.9 = 40%
- Principal's Percentage of Comments - 99/152 = 65%
- Percentage of Total Relevant Responses - 411/837 = 49%
Second, the content of school 1's culture explained its form. The two most salient cultural conditions were the belief that students should come first in the staff's deliberations and practices and that there was mutual support among colleagues. Furthermore, sharing ideas and resources, working together, risk taking, respect, collegiality, professional development, and humour were all viewed as cultural conditions which contributed to the school's collaborative culture.

Third, principal 1 embodied all the dimensions of a transformational leader (Leithwood, 1994). His professional and personal support for staff was viewed as his strongest practice. However, the following were also cited as significant transformational leadership practices: employs structures and decision making processes, models expected behaviours, holds high expectations, provides a vision, provides resources, and builds consensus about school goals. Further, his low-key, relaxed manner and good listening skills, as well as certain administrative practices were also considered to be important leadership practices.

Fourth, organizational learning was happening in school 1. Besides providing examples of single-loop learning, teachers offered an excellent example of double-loop learning. Their explanation of how they dealt with inappropriate behaviour on the playground is reported in Appendix G, the section on OL. Organizational learning structures (i.e., use of professional activity days, staff meetings, P.E.P.S. - Planning for Exceptional Pupils) and OL processes (i.e., shared decision making, learning from each other, group goal setting) were also present in this school. Teachers were able to identify stimuli for their growth (i.e., personal preference, change issues, professional development opportunities, collaborative performance appraisal), as well as barriers to OL (i.e., people not being open to change, pressure/stress, time) and barriers to collaboration (i.e., time, isolation).

A second level of coding was employed in an attempt to understand what people were
saying about the three constructs of OL, leadership, and culture. Linkages were established between the constructs and these linkages formed the basis for the causal map (see Figure 4.1) which is explained in the “Overview of the Pattern of Relationships” for school 1.

**Overview of the Pattern of Relationships**

This case study provides an example of a school with a collaborative culture in which collective learning occurred, fostered, in substantial measure, by support from the principal. School 1 had been involved with several initiatives over the last few years. For example, the teachers developed their own standards for writing for each grade level. Junior teachers created a new report card which they re-vamped many times. More recently, their major change initiative had to do with technology, specifically the use of computers and Lego Dacta (a move advanced form of Lego which includes moving parts and engines).

Figure 4.1 is a causal map depicting the variables involved in the development of the school’s new initiatives over the three years the principal was at school 1. Further, Figure 4.1 illustrates the relationships among the three main variables of this research. A number has been placed in brackets beside each word grouping so that the map may be followed more easily.

The principal (1) implemented several organizational learning structures (2) since he had been at the school. For example, “certain parts of staff meetings (3) are devoted to working on things that are directions in our school,” (T2). According to Teacher 3, “Things are discussed by staff within ourselves, first in small groups (4) and then taken to staff meetings.” They used “the PA day (5) to get together as a division (6),” (T4). In addition, the focus group spoke of their “PEPS” (Planning for Exceptional Pupils) where teachers used a preparation period to work with the academic resource teacher to develop appropriate strategies for students with special needs (7).
Figure 4.1: Causal Map for School 1

**Principal (1)**
- provides support collectively (22)
- provides individual support (23)
- provides resources (24)
- structures and decision making (25)
- vision (26)
- intellectual stimulation (27)
- shared goal setting (28)
- builds culture (45)
- leadership traits and capacities (46)
- models expected behaviours (47)

**Transformational Leader**
- OL Structures (2)
  - staff meetings (3)
  - small group discussions (4)
  - P.A. days (5)
  - division meetings (6)
  - P.E.P.s (7)
  - shared prep time (8)
  - single issue meetings (9)

**OL Processes (10)**
- SGT (11)
  - shared decision making (12)
  - goal setting (13)
  - division works together (14)
  - learning from each other (15)
  - workshops (16)
  - brainstorming (17)
  - discussions (18)

**Stimuli (48)**
- personal preference (49)
- change issues (50)
- P.D. opportunities (51)
- performance appraisal (52)

**Barriers (53)**
- not open to change (54)
- pressure/stress (55)
- time (56)
- isolation (57)

**OL Outcomes (19)**
- increased understanding, group and individual (20)
- new skills and practices, group and individual (21)

**Culture (29)**
- collaborative (31)
- professional (32)
- inclusive (33)

**Form (30)**
- mutual support (35)
- risk taking (36)
- sharing ideas and resources (37)
- students first (38)
- planning together (39)
- collegiality (40)
- respect (41)
- professional development (42)
- reflection (43)
- trust (44)

**Legend**
- Indirect or Lesser Effect
- Significant Effect - positive
- Significant Effect - negative
The principal established shared preparation time (8) among grade levels and he worked with anyone on staff who would like to help make decisions on single issues (9).

This principal facilitated organizational learning processes (10). For example, he worked with the School Growth Team (SGT) so that they would present ideas to staff (11). The SGT and the principal then used different methods of shared decision making (12). “We’ve done a gallery walk. We’ve had charts up and gone around and people were signing off to things they think were most important,” (T4). Teacher 7 told how they set goals early in the year and then “we meet again at the end of June to try to streamline it a little bit, let everybody go away for the summer and then come back in September and actually set out the goals (13).” Another learning process was having teachers work and plan together as a division (14). The focus group explained, “We went to the board office and planned out Lions Quest (a social skills program) for the division.” These teachers learned from each other (15), from workshops (16) they presented to brainstorming (17), and discussions (18).

The outcomes (19) which resulted from these organizational learning processes and structures were increased understanding (20), particularly about the planning and use of Lego Dacta, and new skills and practices (21) in the area of technology. Individuals, as well as the staff as a whole, were involved in these new learning opportunities. Their learning, however, could not have taken place without the support of the principal. His support was both collective (22) and individual (23). Teacher 7 said, “As a group ... sometimes we’ve come up with ideas that I think surprised Principal in the way we wanted to set our focus and he just simply says, ‘Well, if that’s the tack that you want to take, then I’ll see what I can do [to facilitate it],’”. On an individual basis, Teacher 6 noted, “He provided feedback and reassurance.” This leader also supplied whatever resources (24) were necessary so that learning could take place. Teacher 8 said that the principal
"provides lots of opportunities for us to become familiar with new policies." These opportunities took the form of time ("We had, on two occasions, some release time that was organized," Teacher 2), "money," (FG), and workshops ("We have had in-service, a whole day," FG.). Further, other dimensions of leadership were attributed to teachers' learning. The focus group talked about structures and decision making processes." (25). "Principal always has meetings, like when we get together for putting in our computer proposals and how we use them [and that affects learning]." Part of the decision making processes involved sharing power. For example, "The vice principal and the principal work together on things," (Focus Group). "He [principal] and SGT work very closely together so it's difficult to tell whose were whose ideas," (T7).

Teacher 8 said that the principal's vision (26) influenced his learning. "He was the one who presented it [the idea of standards] at a staff meeting and indicated that this is what we were going to work on and he wanted this to become a focus for the school simply because we needed a standard," (T8). Teacher 8 contended that the principal provided intellectual stimulation (27). "He is responsible for introducing staff to any new ideas and he provides lots of opportunities for us to become familiar with new policies." Although the principal "sets directions" (FG), a member of the focus group maintained that the goal setting (28) the staff did together influenced their learning. "We decide as a group what areas are important for us now ... In addition to teaching all day ... there is always something else that we're working on improving," (FG). All of the above mentioned dimensions of transformational leadership were cited as contributing to increased understanding and new skills and practices for teachers in school 1.

Besides leadership practices influencing OL, the form and content of the culture (29) also impacted on the staff's learning. The form (30) of school 1's culture was collaborative (31), professional (32), and to a lesser extent, collaborative, inclusive (33). Moreover, cultural
conditions, which formulated the content (34) of the culture, influenced learning. For example, mutual support among colleagues (35) was seen to contribute immensely to people’s growth. A member of the focus group stated, “If you’re supported and accepted, then you can learn.” Risk taking (36) was also viewed as a condition which promoted learning. Teacher 8 noted, “We are all open to new ideas that come along.” Other conditions which provided strength to the idea that culture impacts on OL were: sharing ideas and resources (37), a widely held belief that students should come first (38), planning/working together (39), collegiality (40), respect (41), professional development (42), reflection (43), and trust (44).

When it came to culture building, the data provided evidence that certain transformational leadership practices influenced the culture of school 1. “Leader Provides Support” (22 and 23) was considered to be the most significant dimension. Teacher 4 said the principal influenced the culture because he “supports us - helps us when we ask for help and lets us know what’s going on.” Teacher 9 also felt considerable support from the principal. He explained why.

At the end of the year, he [principal] writes a nice note, a personal note thanking us for our time, which we don’t have to give, thanking us for our commitment to children, and our excellent sportsmanship ... I find that’s more rewarding than receiving anything else because, from another professional, that’s basically what you really strive for is that other people think that you’re doing a half decent job.

“Structures and Decision Making Processes” (25) was another dimension seen as impacting on the culture. “If there’s any changes to be made within the day to day running of the school, it’s taken up at the staff meeting, sometimes it’s put to a vote [and that affects the culture],” (T4). The leader’s attempt to “Build Culture”(45) by promoting shared values was a significant dimension of transformational leadership. “He makes it clear that he values [caring for children],” (T6). Teachers indicated that one of the leader’s traits (46) influenced the culture. The focus group observed, “He’s a very relaxed person ... if you get the impression it can be handled through
calmness, it does affect your staff.” “Leader Models Expected Behaviours” also influenced the culture (47). Teacher 6 explained:

I have always said, ‘How can I as a teacher be sensitive and loving or caring and everything that I need to be for my kids if I’m not being fed in the same way and nurtured in the same way by the person who is my leader?’ I have to be fed or I will be empty myself if I’m not receiving. And Principal does that, very much.

Teacher 3 gave her opinion on why people in school 1 learned. “People learn a lot better when they’re happy and when they’re relaxed and when they feel that they’re accomplishing something and giving something to the school.” In this school, “It’s OK for you to go ahead with any cockamamie ideas you might have [because the support is there],” (T4) and the support comes from the staff, as well as the principal.

The group of professionals in school 1 believed in the importance of learning, and they offered several stimuli (48) for learning. Personal preference (49) contributed immensely to individual and collective learning. According to Teacher 6, “We, as a profession, need to be responsible for our own professional growth ... because it’s going to be a lot more effective if it’s something we choose and if it’s in response to our own self-determined need.” Another stimulus for learning was issues of change (50). Teacher 2 commented that “directives that come from the board” must be addressed and that means learning how to do things differently. Professional development opportunities (51) were a stimulus for some teachers’ growth. For example, Teacher 3 said, “I have taken a Multiple Intelligences workshop,” and the focus group mentioned, “We have done a lot of in-services on cooperative learning.” In addition, these teachers provided workshops for one another. “We have really good people who know a lot about computers, [and they] have given in-services within the school,” (T4). One final stimulus for learning was discussed by the principal and Teacher 6. She explained, “I’ve just been through a self-directed appraisal (52) ... [and] took on planning as an area of growth.”
Barriers (53) to OL and a collaborative culture were mentioned by a few participants. Not being open to change (54), pressure/stress (55), and time (56) were cited as inhibitors of OL. Time (56) and isolation (57) were viewed as obstacles to collaboration.

This school’s causal map sets forth our initial pattern of relationships among school culture, leadership, and organizational learning. All three constructs are well established, and internal coherence appears to be strong in school 1.

Culture and Organizational Learning

Participants in school 1 shared several examples of individual and collective learning. Table 4.3 summarizes comments made about the cultural conditions which influenced organizational learning in this school. Data were provided by a second level of coding whereby linkages were established between statements made that had to do with the concepts of OL and culture. In the first column, the components of culture are listed (i.e., form, content). Column two indicates how many participants responded. The third, fourth, and fifth columns report the percentage of total responses made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal. Lastly, column six illustrates the percentage of total comments made for each condition of culture.

“Risk Taking” and “Mutual Support” both received 24% of all comments made which linked culture and OL. Four participants, the focus group, and the principal discussed “Risk Taking”, while four participants and the focus group elaborated on “Mutual Support”. Teacher 4 commented on risk taking. “Our culture, which is one where you feel comfortable, you can risk take, [and that] promotes learning because you’re not afraid to go out and try things.” A focus group member claimed, “We are given the chance and opportunities to go out and try things in your classroom, to
### Table 4.3

**School 1 - Level 2 Coding**

**Cultural Conditions Which Influence Organizational Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form, Content, Barriers</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 31</td>
<td>N = 9</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>N = 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Profess.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be a risk taker,” and that allowed her the freedom to experiment and learn.” Further, Teacher 9 stated, “The climate is learning conducive ... If I want to learn something, I can learn it here.”

Mutual support was an important cultural condition which fostered OL. For example, Teacher 2 explained that she had learned a tremendous amount from a teaching partner. “My very best experience was partnering with Teacher ... The things that I was weak at, she was strong at, and vice versa.” A focus group member commented, “If you’re supported and accepted, then you can learn.” She felt that she had changed her teaching style over the past few years and exclaimed, “I have grown so much!” She also confided, “I could just about go in and try anything new.” Another focus group member agreed, “I have had major support from this staff,” and she too felt this support had contributed to her learning.

Other conditions which were viewed as influencing OL were: “Sharing of Ideas and Resources” (three teachers, 13%), “Collegiality” (two teachers, 5%), “Working Together” (two teachers, 5%). One participant and the focus group mentioned “Students Should Come First” in teachers’ deliberations and practices. This category received seven percent of all statements. Furthermore, “Collaborative Culture - Professional” (one participant, 2%), “Collaborative Culture - Inclusive” (focus group, 2%), “Professional Development” (one participant, 2%), “Reflection” (one participant, 2%), “Respect” (principal, 2%), and “Trust” (one participant, 2%) received limited support. The “Barrier” category was commented on by two participants representing 10% of all responses. For example, Teacher 3 remarked, “We were going to do a store front unit, but time was a factor.” Further, Teacher 6, who planned with another teacher on a regular basis, stated, “Time constraints interfere with your willingness and desire to do a lot of collaborative planning.”

Teachers in school 1 attributed their learning to two main cultural conditions, “Risk Taking” and “Mutual Support”. A member of the focus group provided evidence for both mutual support
among colleagues and risk taking, as well as leader provides support. She observed,

I have major support from this staff ... We are given the chance and opportunities
to go out and try things in your classroom, to be a risk taker ... We were always told
[by the principal] that we’re doing a terrific job, and that makes you feel ok about
trying something new.

Leadership Practices and School Culture

When analyzing qualitative data, Miles and Huberman (1994), Leithwood and Jantzi (1990),
and Khattri and Miles (1993) established linkages between idea units. An adaptation of their
methods was employed during a second level of coding of this study’s data. Transcripts were re-
read and re-coded establishing linkages between leadership and culture, leadership and
organizational learning, and culture and organizational learning. For example, Teacher 3 observed,
“He thinks about how you’re feeling and will give you time to do whatever you need to do, so if
you feel non-threatened you’re going to take more risks.” In this case, the teacher attributed
people’s ability to take risks, which is a condition of collaborative cultures, to the principal
providing support. In this example, a linkage was made between culture and leadership.

A second level of coding was used to establish linkages between principal practices and
school culture. Table 4.4 summarizes the results. In this table, the dimensions of leadership
employed in the analysis are listed in the first column. The number of participants making comments
is recorded in column two. Columns three, four, and five depict the percentage of comments made
by the participants, the focus group, and the principal. Lastly, column six reports the total
percentage of statements made regarding leadership practices which influenced school 1’s culture.

In this school, only some of the dimensions of transformational leadership appeared to
impact on the school’s culture. “Leader Provides Support” seemed to be most influential. Six
Table 4.4
School 1 - Level 2 Coding

Leadership Practices Which Influence School Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 27</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
participants, the focus group, and the principal made comments on this dimension, representing 38% of all relevant responses. The focus group made statements, such as, “We were always told that we were doing a terrific job and that makes you feel ok about trying something,” (FG). Teacher 3 said that the principal takes your personal situation into consideration and always gives teachers the time they need to do whatever they have to do. She claimed, “If you feel non-threatened, you’re going to take more risks.” Both of these comments illustrate that the leader’s support encouraged risk taking. Further, Teacher 4 commented, “He [principal] supports us - helps us when we ask for help and lets us know what’s going on,” and that affects the culture.

Four participants and the principal discussed “Builds Culture” (13%) as a noteworthy dimension. A sense of shared values is a component of this dimension. Teacher 9 stated that the principal tried to ensure that everyone was on the same wave length when it came to appropriate behaviour at school. He explained, “The premier point that the school tries to get across is fairness and fairness stems from a very clear cut system of what is accepted and what is not accepted in the school and on the grounds.” Principal 1 seemed very aware of the school’s culture and the impact his actions had on it. For example, he said, “As principal of the school, everything you do affects the culture of the school. The way you deal with the day to day kind of things [shows them what you expect].”

Three teachers felt that the principal’s “Traits and Capacities” affected the culture (15% of all remarks). “He’s a very relaxed person ... If you get the impression it can be handled through calmness, it does affect your staff,” (FG).

The “Structures and Decision Making Processes” employed by the leader also impacted on the culture (15%). Two teachers and the principal commented on this dimension. Principal 1 observed, “I think decisions in school are a critical part of the culture ... People doing the work, day
to day in their classrooms are the ones that need input into those decisions.” He explained, “We use structured decision making as part of the staff meeting if it’s a major issue.” Teacher 4 also felt the decision making processes impacted on culture. “If there’s any changes to be made within the day to day running of the school, it’s taken up at the staff meeting.” Having all personnel involved in decision making influenced the way school 1 “did business”.

“Leader Models Expected Behaviours” was talked about by one teacher and the principal (8% total). They maintained that the leader’s modelling affected the culture. For example, Teacher 6 maintained:

I have always said, ‘How can I, as a teacher, be sensitive and loving and caring and everything that I need to be for my kids if I’m not being fed in the same way and nurtured in the same way by the person who is my leader?’ I have to be fed or I will be, I’ll empty myself if I’m not receiving. And, Principal does that, very much.

Other leadership dimensions which teachers felt impacted slightly on the culture were “Vision” (5%), “Administrative Practices” (3%), and “Intellectual Stimulation” (3%).

The data from this case study support the idea that leadership practices impact on school culture. Teacher 2 made a perceptive comment about the relationship between leadership and culture. She claimed that the present principal’s “style of leadership isn’t too different from that of the principal that he followed, and so the climate that was established from the school opening has been carrying on.” The principal admitted, “The gentleman I followed, and myself, aren’t that diverse in terms of our outlook ... so there’s a fair amount of continuity there.” This kind of continuity, in terms of vision and shared values, only helps to strengthen a culture. Thus, when senior administration consider which principals should be appointed to schools in their system, they ought to bear in mind the type of leadership that is in place, as well as the form of culture, so they may conscientiously strive to achieve a suitable match.
Leadership Practices which Influence Organizational Learning

Once again, a second level of coding was employed to establish linkages between leadership practices and organizational learning. In Table 4.5, the first column lists the dimensions of leadership used in the analysis. Column two represents the number of participants who made comments. The third, fourth, and fifth columns indicate responses made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal, while the last column reports the percentage of relevant responses. A total of 50 linkages were discovered. In many cases, linkages to OL involved two or more leadership practices. The following example will illustrate this point:

He [principal] sets directions (vision) and then we decide as a group what areas are important for us now (leader builds consensus about school goals) ... The School Growth Team has set certain goals (leader shares power) and we got more into broad headings and spreading it over two or three years, like the technology plan ... We couldn’t do all of it at once ... It’s not a static school is it? When I think about it, in addition to teaching all day, and teaching our regular program, there is always something else that we’re working on improving (outcome - improved group understanding), (Focus Group).

Of the dimensions linked to OL, 34% of them dealt with “Leader Provides Support”. Five teachers, the focus group, and the principal referred to this dimension. In some cases the principal provided support for the entire staff. This may be seen from the following quote where the focus group explained what impact the leader had on their learning:

We have had in-service, a whole day on Lego Dacta and computers (leader provides resources) ... It is basically the whole structure of the school [that affects learning], the meetings we have (organizational learning structure) ... Yes, Principal always has meetings where we get together for putting in our computer proposals and how we are going to use them (shared decision making). He has been very supportive regarding staff attending workshops (leader provides support). He promotes awareness of different issues at staff meetings (intellectual stimulation) ... Resources play a big role [in our learning], money, materials, outside expertise or inside expertise (leader provides resources).

In addition to providing support for the staff as a whole, principal 1 also provided professional
Table 4.5
School 1 - Level 2 Coding

Leadership Practices Which Influence Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 22</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 13</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 15</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
support for individuals through the collaborative performance appraisal. He explained how this worked:

I do a fair amount of stuff around self-directed appraisals, where people set their own goals and work on their own goals ... For example, one of my teachers was just having, throughout the year, a reflection dialogue which goes back and forth between she and I [sic] about the things she is working on in her classroom, etc. Another one of my staff members, whose project is around assessment, keeps bringing me drafts of the assessment things that she is working with and we talk back and forth. Another staff member, who is working on management, invites me in a fair bit to watch the kinds of approaches that she is putting into practice. So, I think those kinds of things help people's learning.

In addition, he said, “I have also always been a big fan of the notion of a plan for yourself for the year. And, all I do is ask about those plans and try to facilitate them where I can.”

The second dimension which received a significant response from four participants, the focus group, and the principal was “Leader Provides Resources” (30%). In order to get the school’s technology initiative off the ground the principal said, “We have had two years of staff development around computers.” In terms of resources, he provided “full day release time” and “found some extra time to pay off those people who give of their own time to plan [workshops for staff].” This leader recognized his staff’s limitations and found innovative ways to assist them. For example,

This is a demanding school to work in, and a four o’clock start is not a good start time [for workshops or working on initiatives]. My staff is really whipped. That is one of the biggest challenges, I find, is to try and find usable time that people can work with that kind of stuff. This year, fortunately, we have three days in a row [P.D. days]. It’s amazing ... We’ve done a limited amount of stuff with large scale activities covered by myself, the vp, and a couple of us so that staff can have time. We did one thing last year where we brought in every facilitator in the system and sprung every single staff member for a day to work around the planning for our Lions Quest [a social skills program] initiative.

Other leadership practices also impacted on organizational learning, but they received less support. For example, “Structures and Decision Making Processes” was mentioned by two participants, the focus group, and the principal, representing 12% of responses. “Intellectual
Stimulation” received eight percent of all remarks; “Vision” and “Administrative Practices” received six percent; “Builds Consensus Regarding Goals” attained four percent of responses. The data from school 1 advance the notion that leadership practices do contribute to the organizational learning of the staff. Of particular consequence were “Leader Provides Support” and “Leader Provides Resources”.

Organizational Learning, Leadership, and School Culture

This research attempted to discover the relationships among the three variables of organizational learning, leadership, and school culture. Through a second level of coding, linkages were established whereby participants made connections among these concepts. The focus group, and six participants were able to describe twelve examples where these constructs over-lapped. Some of their stories will help illustrate the relationships among these constructs.

Teacher 4 provided an insightful observation. “Our culture, which is one where you feel comfortable, you can risk take, [and that] promotes learning because you’re not afraid to go out and try things,” and the principal gives “his genuine support.” In this case, being part of a collaborative culture and having a supportive principal encouraged risk taking, a cultural condition which “promote[d] learning.” Teacher 4 offered a second example. She told how the principal provided “some time off” so that teachers could plan “a Lego unit.” They then collaborated with their “grade partners” on a “PA day” and met as a division. They did “more planning ... We set up ourselves whenever we can.” Here, the principal provided the resource of time. Having time to work with a colleague, or with a grade partner was an OL process. By working together on a “PA day”, an OL structure, the division was able to produce a Lego unit. Their Lego unit was proof that they were able to incorporate technology in the curriculum. This new skill was an outcome of their
collaboration, which was facilitated, in part, by the time the principal provided for them.

Teacher 2 described how individual learning occurred. She said that she learned a great deal because the staff was extremely supportive and the administration had always “encouraged whatever staff development you want to do.” This teacher, and her teaching partner, felt that a certain OL structure impacted on their learning. “We requested and got preps together for two years” and during this time, they were “learning from each other ... She would provide me with materials that she had produced, or found and put together.” In this situation, the teachers learned because they were supported by a colleague and their administrator. By working collaboratively with another teacher, and sharing ideas and resources, these teachers facilitated their own personal growth. Again, the leader was also able to indirectly foster learning for these two teachers by providing time, through common preparation periods.

Another example of individual learning was supplied by Teacher 6. She claimed that her learning was instigated by the collaborative performance appraisal.

I have just been through a self-directed appraisal ... [and] took on planning as an area of growth ... I talked it [performance appraisal] through with Principal ... I said to Principal, at the beginning, ‘I feel as if I’m opening my most vulnerable area. Is it safe for me to do that?’ and he said, ‘Yes,’ and I knew that it was ... I did it as a team approach with another staff member. It’s been the most gratifying thing I’ve ever experienced professionally ... [I’m] grateful to be working with someone where I felt safe and could open up an area that I felt was an area of weakness ... [I could] sit down and work collaboratively with someone with whom I have great synergy ... We do generate materials so well together; we really complement each other ... As a result of going through this process I feel so much better about my planning and I’ve learned a tremendous amount and we have about fifteen on-going projects that have growth out of this process.

Once again, this teacher received support from the principal and support from a colleague. Because of her relationship with the teacher, she “felt safe” and was able to “open up” an area of weakness and learned to be a better planner.

A focus group member also attributed her learning to “Mutual Support Among Colleagues”
and "Leader Provides Support". She said the principal had been very supportive and promoted workshops. The teacher participated in a Multiple Intelligences workshop and took "it back to [her] classroom and [tried] those things out." She felt the workshop was "all growth" in terms of her knowledge base. However, while at the workshop, she was able "to sit with other people and talk about common problems" and that facilitated even more learning.

The situations described above illustrate the interdependent relationships among OL, leadership, and culture. By having a transformational leader and a collaborative culture, organizational learning occurred. These three variables, working in harmony, seemed to provide the internal coherence necessary to facilitate the change that had occurred in school 1 over the past three years.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the results of interviews with a six member focus group, the principal, seven teachers, and the secretary for school 1. The data are summarized below in response to the three research questions.

Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?

Organizational learning was fostered in this school by the collaborative culture. The content included cultural conditions which encouraged collaboration. "Risk Taking" and "Mutual Support Among Colleagues" were considered fundamental conditions for OL. "Sharing of Ideas and Resources" also received significant support. Other conditions which received support were a sense of collegiality among colleagues, a willingness to work and plan together, and a belief, widely held by staff, that students should come first in all of their deliberations and practices. Finally, receiving limited support were the following conditions: being part of a collaborative - professional and
collaborative - inclusive culture, as well as a belief in up-grading through professional development, taking time with colleagues to reflect on practices, a respect for all people, and trust.

Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? Leadership practices associated with some dimensions of transformational leadership influenced school 1’s culture. “Leader Provides Support” was the most critical leadership practice. Efforts the principal made to “Build Culture” and certain “Leadership Traits and Capacities” (i.e., low key, relaxed) were viewed as impacting on culture. Additional leadership practices which were seen as contributing to this school’s collaborative culture were: “Structures and Decision Making Processes”, “Models Expected Behaviours”, “Provides a Vision”, “Provides Intellectual Stimulation”, and some “Administrative Practices” (i.e., flexible, deals with discipline).

Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? The two dominant leadership practices which influenced organizational learning were providing support and providing resources. Also receiving some support were: structures and decision making processes, intellectual stimulation, vision, administrative practices, and builds consensus regarding goals.

School 1’s principal realized that his staff was “whipped” at the end of the day. Instead of burdening them with non-stop new initiatives, he chose to focus on one or two initiatives and implemented them over two to three years. He provided his teachers with support and resources, such as money and release time, to accomplish their goals and this appeared to foster collaboration and organizational learning. Furthermore, the collaborative culture, which was based on mutual support and an atmosphere that encouraged risk taking, provided a foundation for OL to occur. By having all three variables highly developed, school 1 attained internal coherence which enabled the staff to move forward with their various initiatives.
Chapter Five

CASE STUDY: SCHOOL 2

Introduction

The case study for school 2 is presented in this chapter. An overview of the site and interviewees’ profiles is provided in the first section. The second section provides a global picture of the data. This section includes a brief description of the level one coding, followed by a causal map which illustrates second level coding linkages. These linkages are explained in the section titled, “Overview of the Pattern of Relationships”. Subsequent sections respond to the research questions as they address the relationships between culture and organizational learning (OL), leadership and culture, leadership and organizational learning, as well as the relationships among OL, leadership, and culture. The final section includes a summary of results pertinent to each of the three research questions.

Site and Participants’ Profiles

School 2, located at the north end of a large city, serves a blended urban and rural community with a mixed socio-economic status. The school, built in 1960, has eight classrooms and eleven portables. Since the original building was constructed, a gymnasium has been added and, this year, a new addition will be connected to the main building. The school has an enrolment of approximately 400 students.

The principal has been in education for 34 years, six as a vice principal. She has served as
a principal for three years in school 2. Her career began in a neighbouring board, but after five years she moved to her present board of education.

Participants in the focus group interview were members of the School Growth Team (SGT) which consisted of eight members. Seven were present at the interview. Three teachers from the SGT, Teachers 1 (T1), 6, and 12 agreed to be interviewed individually. In addition, five other staff members, Teachers 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 volunteered for individual interviews. So the case data consist of a focus group interview with seven people and individual interviews with nine people.

The main characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 5.1. For example, the first column refers to participants. The letter “P” stands for principal and all teachers were labelled with numbers (i.e., T1 represents the first teacher that was interviewed). In the second column, participants’ gender is recorded. An attempt was made to have an equal number of both genders participate in the research; however, there were only two men on staff. Number of years teachers had taught is indicated in column three. The teacher with the least experience had been hired in the fall, and the most experienced teacher had been in the profession for 34 years. Column four explains how many years the teachers had been at school 2. Some teachers were relatively new to the school, and had been teaching there for six or seven years, while others had been at the school for 20 or 22 years. The fifth column states at what grade level the participants worked. There was an even representation from the primary, junior, and intermediate levels. The academic resource teacher, librarian, and vice principal were also involved in the research. Column six states whether or not teachers were on the School Growth Team. The principal, and all teachers who were part of the focus group interview were on the SGT. One teacher, T12, who was unable to be part of the focus group interview, agreed to an individual interview. Finally, column seven indicates how long people had been on the SGT. All members had been a part of the SGT for two or three years.
Table 5.1

School 2 - Participants' Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th># of Years Taught</th>
<th># of Years Taught at School 2</th>
<th>Division Taught</th>
<th>SGT Member</th>
<th># of Years on SGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.  * indicates School Growth Team members who had individual interviews
** indicates School Growth Team members who were present at the focus group interview
The Data

School 2's data were treated the same way as the data for schools 1 and 3 (see Chapter 3 for an explanation of the process). Transcript coding yielded a total of 1038 idea units, with the teachers' comments representing 575 of those units. The focus group's statements totalled 300, and the principal's remarks constituted 163 units. For a global picture of participants' responses, see Table 5.2. In this table, the dimensions of the framework (i.e., form and content of culture, leadership, organizational learning processes, structures, outcomes, stimuli, barriers) are listed in the first column. The second column represents the number of teachers making comments, while the percentage of statements made by the teachers, the focus group and the principal are recorded in the third, fourth, and fifth columns. Lastly, column six reports the percentage of total relevant responses made by all participants. Leadership accounted for 48% of all responses. Statements made about the form and content of culture accounted for 30%, and remarks about organizational learning accounted for the remaining 22%.

Level one coding examined the form and content of the culture, the leadership practices which were in place, and OL that occurred in school 2. For a complete picture of the data related to the main constructs, see Appendix H. In brief, however, the following few paragraphs will highlight results from the first level of coding.

First, school 2 had an extremely collaborative culture. Not only was it a collaborative, professional culture, with strong working relationships among staff, but this collaborative culture extended into the community. In fact, when the school was promoting literacy, teachers from other schools in the area, and parents became involved in the project. Cultural conditions which supported this collaborative culture were a belief, widely held by staff, that students should come first in their deliberations and practices, that ideas and resources should be shared, that a caring and
Table 5.2
School 2 - Level 1 Coding

Global Perspective of Dimensions of Culture, Leadership, and Organizational Learning
(N=1038)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 575</th>
<th>Percentage of Total focus Group’s Comments N = 300</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 163</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 1038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Processes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Structures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Stimuli</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to OL and Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The calculations were derived as follows:
Leadership: Participants’ Percentage of Comments - 261/575 = 45%
Focus Group’s Percentage of Comments - 133/300 = 44%
Principal’s Percentage of Comments - 105/163 = 64%
Percentage of Total Relevant Responses - 499/1038 = 48%
comfortable atmosphere be maintained, that colleagues provide each other with mutual support, that people respect one another, that professional development be encouraged among staff, that teachers make time to work and plan together, and that staff feel comfortable risk taking or experimenting. In this school, the most salient belief was stated simply by Teacher 12, “People are united on the important things which is what’s best for kids.”

Second, all the dimensions of a transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1994) were characterized by principal 2. Her personal and professional support for staff was seen to be her strongest practice. However, all of the other dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., models expected behaviour, uses structures and decision making processes, holds high expectations, provides intellectual stimulation, provides a vision, builds consensus regarding school goals, provides resources, builds culture) were discussed by interviewees. Further, two additional categories, not included in Leithwood’s framework, were also viewed as significant practices. These categories were leadership traits and capacities (i.e., good interpersonal skills, enthusiastic and positive attitude, high energy level, good listening skills) and administrative practices (i.e., staffing, communication, board issues, parental issues, gate keeping, discipline, school safety).

Third, individual and collective learning occurred in school 2. Numerous OL processes (i.e., working within divisions, whole group problem solving, working with teaching partners, sharing of expertise) were in place in this school, as were OL structures (i.e., P.D. days, cooperative home base groups at staff meetings, division and grade meetings). Further, the staff provided examples of single and double-loop learning. They felt that increasing their understanding of how to work with students to resolve conflicts and how to incorporate Multiple Intelligences (Gardner’s Theory, 1993) in unit and lesson planning were major outcomes for the group. In addition to outcomes for staff, this school was able to cite outcomes for students and the community. Interviewees identified
stimuli for their learning (i.e., personal preference, change issues, professional development, collaborative performance appraisal, university students) and a few teachers commented that time was a barrier to OL and collaboration.

A second level of analysis attempted to understand what people were saying about the three constructs. Idea units were “linked” to represent the interviewees’ conceptualization of the relationships among organizational culture, leadership, and organizational learning. The linkages then formed the basis for the causal map (see Figure 5.1) which is explained in the “Overview of the Patterns of Relationships”.

**Overview of the Pattern of Relationships**

This case study is a prime example of a school with a highly collaborative culture. In school 2, individual and collective learning occurred under the guidance of a leader who embodied all the dimensions of a transformational leader (Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993). Organizational learning was due, in part, to the collaborative culture. For example, one teacher observed, “Being on this staff, you are motivated. You want to be up to date so you need new teaching methods. You also need these new methods to meet the needs of the students,” (T1).

Figure 5.1 is a causal map depicting the variables involved in the development of new initiatives that took place over the three years the principal was in school 2. Figure 5.1 also illustrates the relationships among the three main variables of this research. Because one of the theme’s of this study was on the development of collaborative cultures, it is worthwhile to note the number of variables that constitute aspects of such a culture. Numbers were placed in brackets beside word groupings (i.e., ‘OL Processes (2)’) to help the reader follow the process depicted in Figure 5.1.
Figure 5.1: Causal Map for School 2

**OL Processes (2)**
- whole staff problem solving (3)
- attend workshops and work with a partner. "Train the Trainer" (4)

**OL Structures (5)**
- P.A. days (6)
- cooperative home base groups (7)
- division meetings (8)
- staff meetings (9)
- grade meetings (10)

**Stimuli (11)**
- change initiatives (12)
- collaborative performance appraisal (13)
- student teachers (14)
- personal preference (15)
- professional development (16)

**OL Outcomes (17)**
- group (18)*
- individual (19)
- new practices (20)
- cooperative learning (21)
- increased understanding (22)
- conflict resolution (23)
- M.I. Theory (24)
- students' understanding (59)
- community understanding (60)

**Culture (40)**
- collaborative (42)
- professional (43)
- inclusive (44)

**Form (41)**
- mutual support (46)
- sharing ideas or expertise (47)
- professional development (48)
- collegiality (49)
- risk taking (50)
- respect (51)
- students come first (52)
- work/plan together (53)
- reflection (54)
- feedback (55)
- trust (56)
- pride in profession (57)
- physical plant (58)

**Legend**
- Indirect or Lesser Effect: 
- Significant Effect - positive (+)
- Significant Effect - negative (-)
According to Teacher 8, the principal (1) influenced the group's capacity to learn by offering them OL processes (2) such as whole staff problem solving (3). She encouraged them to attend professional development sessions with a partner, and then present what they learned to staff. This reflects a "train the trainer" model of staff development (4). OL structures (5) (i.e., P.A. days (6), cooperative home base groups (7), division meetings (8), staff meetings (9), grade meetings (10)) were also established by the principal.

In addition to the principal providing opportunities for growth, staff pointed to other stimuli (11) such as change initiatives (12). For example, Teacher 1 said, "Teaching is the type of profession where there is always change." Another stimulus for learning came from the collaborative performance appraisal (13). Teacher 12 said, "I am up for appraisal this year and I am doing the self-evaluation package" with Multiple Intelligences as her area of growth. The focus group also talked about a group of teachers using the collaborative performance appraisal. "Because it was their evaluation year, a group of three teachers, a primary, kindergarten, and a junior worked on an integrated unit together. Their unit incorporated outcomes, something new for all of them."

In some cases, having a student teacher stimulated learning (14). Teacher 12 noted, "Because of the University students [teacher candidates], I learned more about outcomes." In other cases, personal preference was the stimulus for learning (15). Teacher 1 explained, "I like to learn. It is one of the things I enjoy." Teacher 7 commented, "Learning is an interest. I want to keep up with what's going on." A member of the focus group observed, "I think there is an innate desire to move forward." Teachers also cited professional development opportunities offered by the board as the impetus for their growth (16). Teacher 12 told about the various sessions she had attended, "I went to a half day session on True Colours ... I did a full day workshop on the PA day on
Multiple Intelligences ... I took Lions Quest training during the March Break ... And, I feel my personal growth has hinged on the opportunities presented to me.” Teacher 1 spoke about the help the school had received from the board’s facilitators. “The facilitators that we have had, and the things they have put in place, have really helped us learn about new methods [of teaching].”

In terms of outcomes (17), the group (18) and individuals (19) had learned new teaching practices (20). For example, teachers were trained in cooperative learning (21) and used these structures on a regular basis. The whole staff had increased their understanding (22) in the area of conflict resolution (23), which had been a focus for several years. More recently, the staff received training in Multiple Intelligences (Gardner’s Theory, 1993) and they were now attempting to incorporate this theory into their literacy and technology programs (24).

This staff spoke very highly of their principal and they provided examples of each of the dimensions of transformational leadership (25). For example, Principal 2 had a vision (26) which all teachers stated in one way or the other. “The major vision for the school has to do with children and growing, any kind of growth, meeting the needs of all,” Principal.

This leader had “high expectations (27). Just be the best you can be,” (T6). “She expects you to do your very best for kids,” (T9). The principal was able to build consensus around school goals (28). Teacher 10 said, “We set areas of growth for the following year.” Teacher 12 explained that this was easily achieved, “We brain stormed and the group came to a decision.” Teacher 1 commented, “Goal setting is something that comes naturally and is discussed and just becomes part of the school climate.” Teacher 6 noted, “A school and a program cannot function unless you have goals and outcomes. I think that has been ingrained in us.”

Principal 2 provided her staff with intellectual stimulation (29) on an on-going basis. “When the principal reads something, and it is relevant to my division, or my grade level, she will fill me
in on it,” (T1). “She often hands me articles, Michael Fullan, for instance,” (T6).

This principal modelled expected behaviours for her staff (30). According to Teacher 1, “She is a terrific role model, really, in all aspects.” Teacher 6 remarked, “She models everything. Because of her height, she can be intimidating to a little kindergarten child. But she will crouch right down beside him.” Teacher 7 said, “She models different strategies, like cooperative learning, or Tribes (a cooperative learning theory developed by Jean Gibbs, 1987).” “She’s a very kind person, and she models that kindness and genuine concern for all human beings,” (T9). Teacher 10 noted, “She coaches teams, runs ... is right in there doing the extra curricular things.”

This leader also provided support for her staff (31). For example, “She has a wonderful blend of personal and professional support,” (T9). As Teacher 8 put it, “If you have a problem within the classroom, and you go to her, she is really approachable ... And she will help you out any way that she can ... She always backs you up.” Teacher 9 claimed, “She is very protective and supportive of her staff.”

This leader ensured that teachers had the resources they needed (32). “If you need some equipment, books, or materials, she will go to bat for you,” (T1). If teachers wanted to up-grade themselves, “the school funds technology courses, and I have taken three of them,” (T6). Principal 2 provided “in-service sessions,” (T9), “release time,” (T10), “facilitators from the board,” (T11), “workshops and PD sessions,” (T12), and “new computer software,” (FG).

Principal 2 ensured that structures were in place so that decision making was shared (33). Teacher 9 explained how the principal dealt with the electives issue. It was “done through a series of meetings and discussions with people pleading their cases, voting and getting into groups. I can’t think of anything when she has unilaterally, arbitrarily made a decision that impacts on staff.” A member of the focus group mentioned that “the staff has used a variety of methods of decision
making, such as: committees, stickers on charts, meetings, debates, or just hashing it out.” This leader was also good at sharing power which is a component of “Structures and Decision Making Processes”. “She bounces ideas off of the School Growth Team, or Chair’s Group, and she understands the importance of parental involvement and power in the school,” (T9). Teacher 10 observed, “There is [sic] leadership opportunities for everybody.” The focus group concurred, “There are a lot of rotating leaders on staff.” They also noted that the principal and vice principal worked as a team. “They think it through very carefully to see if there are going to be any glitches.”

When it came to building culture (34), Teacher 6 stated that the principal’s “Christian background comes through, but she does it through the five C’s (courtesy, common sense, conflict resolution, cooperation, and communication).” Teacher 1 explained, “Our five C’s are an on-going thing. It just has become part of the school climate.” The principal used “the five C’s and the Bridge of Conflict (a symbol the Principal used with students in conflict resolution situations) on a regular basis,” (T11). These symbols were an integral part of the culture and students who practised using them were recognized on the morning announcements. Principal 2 constantly reinforced the basic belief that kids came first.

The idea that we are here for the kids is pervasive among the whole staff and the school community. I think that comes from the administration. I mean it is wonderful to think that way and think that you can individually think that way, but to have it continue on year after year, there has to be leadership and growth in that. (Focus Group)

Principal 2 manifested all of the characteristics of a transformational leader. The dimensions which impacted most on OL were: “Leader Provides Resources” (32), “Leader Provides Support” (31), “Leader Models Expected Behaviours” (31), and “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation” (29). In addition, this principal possessed certain “Leadership Traits and Capacities” (35) which made learning together appealing. The staff spoke of her strong interpersonal skills (36), her
extremely high energy level (37), and a positive attitude (38). Teacher 9 commented:

You have got this interesting blend of huge energy, you know zooming down the halls being extremely extroverted and effervescent, coupled with this very subtle way of getting people to do what she thinks they should do.

The focus group pointed out that “her enthusiasm is contagious” and because of that she gets people involved and excited about new initiatives. “She always talks about how great these things are and basically when she tells you about all these things, you want to go out and find out for yourself and do it,” (T8). Further, administrative practices (39) were viewed as important leadership practices.

According to Teacher 6, “Leadership Traits and Capacities” also affected the culture (40) of the school. “She is instrumental. How your administration is, is the key to how the school works and how people work with that.” Furthermore, the focus group felt that the culture had been influenced, to a great extent, by the principal. “I see our school as being a collaborative school. The Principal runs things by us and has several staff members tell her if she is on the right track or not.” The leadership dimension which affected culture the most was “Leader Provides Support” (31). In addition, “Vision” (26), “Models Expected Behaviours” (30), “Structures and Decision Making Processes” (33), “Builds Culture” (i.e., promoting shared values, using symbols and rituals) (34) and certain “Administrative Practices” (i.e., dealing with staffing issues, communicating, gate keeping) (39) influenced this school’s culture.

Besides relying on the principal for growth opportunities, these teachers relied on one another. The form (41) of school 2’s culture was collaborative (42). Staff worked very well together to create a collaborative, professional (43) culture. In addition, the school worked with the community to form a collaborative, inclusive (44) culture. The content (45) of this school’s culture may be described by several cultural conditions. For example, Teacher 6 spoke of mutual
support (46). "I have taken a lot of computer courses so I could help show the teachers and children [how to use them]." There were several examples of sharing ideas or expertise (47). Teacher 8 pointed out, "When people have attended a workshop, they come back and present to staff ... Plus, people who are far more skilled [in sports] just jump right in there [and share their expertise]." Teacher 12 told how "teachers run workshops/seminars for others" in the school. The principal also pointed out that it was "one teacher [who] showed the others how to use outcomes." In addition, teachers cited: professional development (48), collegiality (49), risk taking (50), respect (51), and a belief that students come first (52) as cultural conditions which impacted on OL. Other cultural conditions which were prevalent in school 2, and had a more indirect impact on culture were: work/plan together (53), reflection (54), honest feedback from colleagues (55), trust (56), pride in profession (57), and the physical plant/building (58).

Two additional outcomes occurred at this school, one had to do with students and the other dealt with the community. The focus group shared, "As a group, we have learned how to use the 'Bridge of Conflict'. It has been an on-going process among all of us to learn it." The teachers said that they did this "to help the students" and they had seen a noticeable change in the students' abilities (59) to resolve their own conflicts. Secondly, the principal discussed the video on literacy that staff had produced. Principal 2 claimed that the video had helped parents in the community have a better understanding (60) of how to help their children with literacy skills.

This story sets forth a second pattern of relationships among culture, leadership, and OL. In this case, the significance of the role played by the principal and the staff in developing a collaborative culture was clearly illustrated. This leader and the collaborative culture both contributed to the OL that brought about the change initiatives. By having all three constructs extremely well established, it appeared that school 2 had powerful internal coherence.
Culture and Organizational Learning

Teachers in school 2 shared numerous examples of individual and collective learning. Table 5.3 summarizes cultural conditions which influenced organizational learning. These data were provided by a second level of coding whereby linkages were established between statements made that had to do with the concepts of organizational learning and culture (see Chapter 3 for a complete explanation of this procedure). In the first column, components of culture are listed (i.e., form, content). Column 2 indicates the number of participants making statements. The third, fourth, and fifth columns report the percentage of comments made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal which linked culture to organizational learning. Lastly, column six illustrates the percentage of total comments made for each condition of culture.

Mutual support among teachers, representing 24% of all linkages, was seen to have the largest impact on OL. Six teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on this condition. Teacher 10 claimed that the supportive culture affected learning because if someone on staff thought a workshop would be good for you, or would like to take it, they would suggest, “Why don’t you come with me ... There is always peer coaching going on.” Teacher 6 said that she received support from the EA (educational assistant). “She works with me and helps me a tremendous amount with computers and we often take courses together.” According to a focus group member, “We have all done something incorrectly and fallen on our noses, and we have had someone quickly pick us up.” She claimed this kind of support from colleagues encouraged her to experiment and learn from her mistakes. These examples illustrate a desire for continuous professional growth and they show how support from colleagues facilitate that growth.

A belief in the importance of professional development was cited by four teachers and the
### Table 5.3

**School 2 - Level 2 Coding**

**Cultural Conditions Which Influence Organizational Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form, Content, Barriers</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 29</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 4</td>
<td>N = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Profess.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
focus group as a cultural condition which influenced OL (14%). According to Teacher 1, “Being on this staff, you are motivated, you want to be up-to-date so you need new teaching methods ... so, you have to go and take workshops to stay on top of it, to stay relevant.” Teacher 10 noted, “There are always opportunities to learn from one another. Professional development is encouraged.” This staff’s culture influenced their capacity to learn because “you don’t want to be left out ... If you’re not involved, good Lord, you feel, ‘Oh, geez!’ They drag you along,” (FG).

In addition, willingness to experiment or risk take (10%), collegiality with colleagues (10%), respect for colleagues (10%), sharing of ideas and resources (8%), and the belief that students come first (6%) were identified as cultural conditions which influenced organizational learning. For example, Teacher 10 described an experiment in which a grade six, a grade one, and an intermediate teacher had been involved. They planned and taught an integrated unit on gardening to their multi-aged group. This unit lasted for four weeks and it “was really well received by the students. They loved it.” In addition, the teachers learned how to collaboratively plan an integrated unit and they had to “learn to be flexible.” Teacher 10 noted they also learned about each other’s teaching styles and had gained a “better understanding of human dynamics.”

Teacher 11 explained how his learning had been affected by the culture. He said, “Once you’ve created that sharing mode ... staff will share and there’s [sic] opportunities to piggy back ideas and see what other people have going on around them.” Further, Teacher 7 remarked that the culture had affected her learning because “we are all very supportive of each other ... and aware of each other’s needs ... We are all friendly and willing to help out.”

Of less import, but still relevant, were the following cultural conditions: trust (4%), willingness to work/plan together (4%), collaboration - professional culture (4%), physical plant (2%), celebrate successes (2%), and pride in profession (2%). In school 2, teachers said they grew
because:

... the culture will feed from one culture to another. I am doing this. I am willing to share ... When one or two or three people work together, then we learn from that also ... We have a pride in our profession and in ourselves, and that’s why we don’t want to be left behind (Focus Group).

**Leadership Practices and School Culture**

A second level of coding was employed to establish linkages between leadership practices and culture. For example, a member of the focus group said, “I see our school as being a collaborative school. And, the principal runs things by us and has several staff members tell her if she is on the right track or not.” In this quotation, the focus group attributed collaborative culture to the leader’s shared decision making style. Thus, this quote would have a linkage between culture and leadership practices.

The leadership practices which impacted on school 2’s culture are presented in Table 5.4. In this table, the dimensions of leadership employed in the analysis are listed in the first column. Column two indicates the number of participants making comments. The next three columns depict the percentage of statements made by the teachers, the focus group, and the principal. Finally, column six summarizes the percentage of remarks made regarding leadership practices which influenced school 2’s culture.

Data from this school indicated that “Leader Provides Support” had a major impact on culture. Eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal made statements in this category, constituting 33% of all remarks. The focus group claimed she was “really supportive” when dealing with parents and that influenced the culture.
### Table 5.4

**School 2 - Level 2 Coding**

**Leadership Practices Which Influence School Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants*) Comments N = 47</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 28</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 10</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.  * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
She is not wish-washy. She says how it is. If she means, in the discipline line, that if you throw snowballs, then you are going to get so many detentions for it, then she means that. She follows up, and follows up on those students ... and it is very, very helpful for the teachers to know that you have that kind of support.

Teacher 10 also felt support because the principal was available. “She is here an awful lot. She schedules her meetings so it doesn’t affect her being away from the school as much.”

Five teachers, the focus group, and the principal felt that principal 2’s traits and capacities impacted on the culture (16% of responses). Teacher 10 noted, “The longer that the principal has been here, the more staff that are willing to take the risk and jump in.” According to Teacher 7, “The principal has been the one that, ah, now she doesn’t force or push anything like that, but she makes it pleasant. It is just her general attitude, and she is just such a ball of fire herself that it just gets you going too.” The staff contended that principal 2’s personality was “infectious and that makes you feel good and positive,” (T9) and that also affected the school’s culture.

Principal 2 worked at “Building Culture” by promoting shared values and employing symbols and rituals. Three teachers, the focus group, and the principal discussed this dimension which received nine percent of responses. “Principal, every morning, has a message, and it is coming from her ... a message on how we can make this day better, or a thought for the day on how to get along in life,” (T8). She used the “five C’s as a symbol to represent the vision and use[d] the PA system to communicate the vision to students.” Because the staff held similar values, “we reinforce them [the five C’s which stand for courtesy, common sense, conflict resolution, cooperation, and communication].”

Three teachers and the focus group felt the leader’s vision contributed to the culture (11%). Teacher 10 explained that getting teachers to work together, a condition of collaborative cultures, had been a real focus for principal 2. When Teacher 10 first arrived at the school, teachers worked independently, whereas “they are now planning units together. We did a unit, between divisions ...
that used the cooperative learning model.”

“Leader Models Expected Behaviours” was cited by four teachers and the focus group as impacting on culture for nine percent of relevant responses. When asked how the principal influenced culture, Teacher 11 replied, “She models it. She is out there and she’s active and the kids know she is.” Teacher 7 remarked that “we are all very supportive of each other ... [and] we are all friends and willing to help out.” This supportive culture exists because the principal “is a good model for this behaviour ... she just pitches in and does everything that we do,” (T7).

One teacher and the focus group spoke of the various “Structures and Decision Making Processes” the leader employed which influenced the culture. According to the focus group, “I see our school as being a collaborative school” and principal 2 runs things by several staff members to see if she is on the right track. When administration knew about the new addition, the principal and vice principal “discussed the addition to the school with staff,” and decisions were made which “for the most part, everyone was contented and very happy.” Principal 2 also shared power. “There are a lot of rotating leaders on staff ... When we needed somebody to do literacy, we called on Teacher ... It is not a static leadership; it is somebody who comes forward and then leads, and then somebody else comes forward, and that really makes a good team,” (FG). By sharing decision making and power, principal 2 furthered the school’s collaborative spirit.

Two teachers and the principal spoke of “Administrative Practices” which influenced the culture (7% of responses). Teacher 8 noted that something as simple as “sunshine calls” home to parents impacted on culture. Two teachers felt her high expectations influenced culture (2%) and one teacher and the focus group cited “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation” (2%). Two other dimensions received limited support. “Goal Setting” was discussed by one teacher (1%) and the focus group mentioned “Resources” (1%).
Although all dimensions of transformational leadership were touched on by the teachers, the focus group, and/or the principal, the ones of consequence were: “Leader Provides Support”, “Leadership Traits and Capacities”, “Leader Builds Culture”, “Vision”, “Leader Models Expected Behaviours”, and “Structures and Decision Making Processes”. It appeared, however, that the leader's support was critical. As a focus group member stated, “The support with discipline is so important to the climate.”

Leadership Practices which Influence Organizational Learning

Once again, through a second level of coding, linkages were established between idea units that had to do with leadership and OL (see Table 5.5). A total of 105 linkages were found. Of these, 66% linked OL with four dimensions of transformational leadership. “Leader Provides Resources” received the most overall support (21%), while “Leader Provides Support” (18%), “Leader Models Expected Behaviour” (17%), and “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation” (10%) were viewed as significant practices. Of less import, but still worthy of note, were: “Leadership Traits and Capacities” (11%), “Structures and Decision Making Processes” (7%), “Shared Goal Setting” (6%), “Administrative Practices” (4%), “Leader Holds High Expectations” (3%), “Leader Builds Culture” (2%), and “Vision” (2%). Often linkages to OL involved two or three leadership practices as can be seen from the following example. In this case, the leader modelled and provided individual support.

If I as a teacher were not sure about a particular way of teaching something, Principal would say, ‘Well, I know how to do that and I will come in ... and we will work together,’ . You get that support, not, ‘Well, you just to ahead and do it,’ but ‘I'll be there to support and help you,’ (Focus Group).
Table 5.5

School 2 - Level 2 Coding

Leadership Practices Which Influence Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 48</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 40</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 17</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
The focus group member explained that principal 2 also ensured that they “review it [their work together]” and this process “really, really helps make the teacher understand.” Furthermore, the teacher stated, “You gain the confidence to go on and maybe the next time do it with another person and have the ripple effect.”

A member of the focus group said that the principal provided intellectual stimulation for the staff when she had people come in to do workshops that were “relevant. One day it was fun and intellectually stimulating, that was ‘True Colours’. And another time we had someone else do a workshop on Multiple Intelligences.” The principal “then purchased the very large posters [on Multiple Intelligences]” and one teacher said, “I now try to plan some of my lessons to incorporate a variety of those things.” Another teacher added, “We all have one of those posters and I have mine in my desk blotter so that when I do my planning it is right there in front of me.” This example illustrates two leadership practices at work, intellectual stimulation and leader provides resources.

An example of “Leader Models Expected Behaviours” and “Leader Provides Resources” was presented by the focus group. They explained that principal 2 often modelled cooperative learning activities in their staff meetings. On one occasion, she modelled a Tribes activity (Tribes, developed by J. Gibbs, 1987, is a philosophy of education which incorporates cooperative learning structures). She then provided teachers with a sheet of information on how they could apply the Tribes activity to their curriculum. They noted that she also modelled collaboration with their cooperative home base groups. Teachers “learn that their opinions are important, but when you make decisions with kids they have to have input too.”

“Leadership Traits and Capacities” also played a part in teachers’ learning in school 2. According to one staff member, “She [principal] listens to your ideas ... [She is] really keen and encourages you to try new things and is there to help you implement it, or just bounce ideas off,”
Teacher 8 contended that the principal’s enthusiastic personality really impacted on your learning because “she always talks about how great these things are and basically when she tells you about all these things, you want to go out and do it.”

These data support the notion that transformational leadership impacts on OL. However, they also suggest that the framework is not all inclusive. Leaders spend a large amount of their time dealing with administrative issues. If these mundane, day to day occurrences are not dealt with, the principal will find it difficult, if not impossible, to lead the school. In addition, this principal’s traits and capacities may have impacted on the teachers’ willingness to be lead. These two components of leadership warrant a closer look when investigating culture and organizational learning.

Organizational Learning, Leadership, and School Culture

A systemic approach to change focuses on the relationships among variables and the extent to which they harmonize with one another in support of change initiatives. An attempt was made to establish linkages through a second level of coding whereby participants formed connections among the three concepts, organizational learning, leadership, and school culture. The principal provided four examples where these concepts were inter-twined. The following story will illustrate this point.

Principal 2 was asked if learning occurred in her school, and if it did occur, could she explain how it happened. She replied facetiously, “I dictated that learning should happen (laughter).” The stimulus for learning had been a new Ministry document and principal 2 observed that it was not something you tried to deal with at the end of the day. So, she provided the staff with a bench mark document from her previous school and gave them release time to work through the material. Meanwhile, the principal and vice principal covered teachers’ classes by working with students on
conflict resolution skills using the ‘Bridge of Conflict’. Teachers met as a team; they shared ideas and resources, and developed a check list, which was tied to outcomes, for the report card. Individual and collective learning occurred for teachers in that they understood the new document, which dealt primarily with outcomes. In addition, the check list helped parents understand the new Ministry document. The stimulus for learning came from an outside source, the Ministry. The leader, however, had a vision. She wanted her staff to comprehend and implement the new document. In order to do that, she provided them with the necessary resources, the bench mark document from her previous school, and time. Teachers provided support for each other by working as a team and sharing their ideas and resources. “Working Together” and “Sharing of Ideas and Resources” are two conditions of collaborative cultures. “Vision” and “Leader Provides Resources” are dimensions of transformational leadership. Thus, in this example, collaborative cultural conditions and features of transformational leadership facilitated individual, collective, and community learning.

Teachers 1, 3, 6, 7, and 8 provided examples which illustrated relationships among OL, leadership, and culture. For example, T1 declared, “You get enthusiasm, especially from the principal, and the staff is there to support you so you are willing to try something new. You are willing to learn and to grow and to take risks and try new things.” Here, the teacher attributed learning to a leadership trait (enthusiasm), support from colleagues, and a willingness to risk take. “Mutual Support” and “Risk Take” are cultural conditions which were recognized as impacting on learning, but in conjunction with “Enthusiasm” from the leader, staff were “willing to learn and to grow.”

The focus group provided another three examples of how OL, leadership, and culture interact. In one instance, they talked about how staff engaged in goal setting. They explained a
cooperative learning “snow ball” activity in which they participated last June. The activity was structured by the principal.

We wrote down, on several topics, areas that we felt we would like to do individually, and then we [rolled the paper into a snow ball and] threw them [into the centre of the room. We] took one out and had a chance to read that one [and throw it back into the centre of the room. After that] we were able to think and do some thoughts and then ... that was taken by the office [and compiled]. Our thoughts were put down and viewed, and if there were any changes to be made in September [we made them], before we put this in our final plan that we would be starting in October (Focus Group).

A focus group member insisted that she liked this process and claimed it affected her learning because she could “focus on literacy and computers, and know that I can focus my energy ... [and not be] swayed by every new thing that you hear about.” In this case, principal 2 employed a cooperative learning structure as an organizational learning process so that teachers could come to an acceptance of goals for the school. Individuals were given time to reflect, a condition of collaborative cultures, and this decision making process illustrated the leader’s willingness to share power. The result was a set of goals which staff agreed would serve as their focal points for the following year.

By looking closely at the above examples, a few key points emerge. OL occurred when the following cultural conditions were in place: mutual support among colleagues, sharing of ideas and resources, professional development was valued, and teachers were willing to take risks. Support from the principal, as well as the availability of resources, modelling, certain structures, and decision making processes appeared to contribute to teachers’ learning in school 2. Thus, having a transformational leader and a collaborative culture which fosters OL seems to provide internal coherence in a school. Internal coherence appeared to facilitate the systemic changes which occurred in school 2 over the past three years.
Summary

This chapter presented the results of interviews with a seven member focus group, the principal, and eight teachers from school 2. The data provided by this case inform the three research questions.

Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning? A school with a collaborative culture facilitates OL. In school 2, all participants, the focus group, and the principal claimed that mutual support among colleagues was an important cultural condition. Professional development opportunities received the second largest amount of support from these three groups, while collegiality ranked third. Risk taking was viewed as important by the teachers and the focus group. Respect received limited support from all three groups, while sharing of ideas was seen as important only by the teachers. Finally, these teachers' value system was so embedded that the comment, “We’re here for the kids” was espoused by all during focus group and individual interviews. The belief, widely shared by staff, that students should come first in their practices and deliberations was noteworthy.

Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? The more a leader illustrates the dimensions of a transformational leader, the more influence she has on the school’s culture. Specifically, the dimensions of transformational leadership which appeared to have the most impact were: “Leader Provides Support”, “Leadership Traits and Capacities”, “Leader Builds Culture”, “Vision”, “Models Expected Behaviours”, and “Structures and Decision Making Processes”.

Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? The five main practices which impacted on OL were: “Leader Provides Resources”, “Leader Provides Support”, “Leader Models Expected Behaviour”, “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation”, and
“Leadership Traits”. In addition, the following stimuli seemed to support organizational learning in this school: personal preference, change issues, professional development opportunities, student teachers, and collaborative performance appraisal.

Data from school 2 suggest that leadership practices do impact on culture and organizational learning. The types of practices which promote OL are transformational in nature; however, the leader’s enthusiasm for learning also influenced the teachers in school 2. Principal 2 did not believe in leaping from one new initiative to another, neither did her staff. Instead, each year they would decide together what their major focus would be for the school and they would build on their previous areas of growth. For example, they had been working on literacy for a number of years. Then they added technology to their school plan and looked at how technology could provide a new dimension to literacy skills. This past year, the staff had received training in Multiple Intelligences. So, while still maintaining their focus on literacy, they now saw their goal as improving students’ literacy skills through technology and Multiple Intelligences.

Organizational learning occurred in this school because of the transformational leader and the collaborative culture. These three variables, all extremely well developed, provided internal coherence in school 2. It was this internal coherence which allowed the school to carry on and add more new initiatives to their already over-loaded plate.
Chapter Six

CASE STUDY: SCHOOL 3

Introduction

This chapter describes the case study for school 3. An overview of the site and interviewees' profiles is provided in the first section. This is followed by an explanation of the data, where the results from level one coding are briefly described. Linkages from level two coding are included in a third section and the linkages provide an overview of the pattern of relationships among the main constructs of the study. Subsequent sections examine the relationships between culture and organizational learning, leadership and culture, and leadership and organizational learning. The relationships among all three concepts are then addressed. The final section includes a summary of results relevant to each of the three research questions.

Site and Participants’ Profiles

School 3 has a transient population with 100 to 140 of its 600 students moving in and out of the school each academic year. The school draws from six different areas which include everything from town houses, high rise apartments, and condominiums, to detached, and semi-detached houses. The principal believes that because the catchment area is so large, “you don’t get a really good sense of community because they are all different communities.” He explained that the socio economic status of students is quite varied. Some parents “own their own businesses, [while others] are on welfare, or are single parent families just trying to get by.” He noted that “it
is very multi-cultural which adds a very good rich tone to the school” and this is “very positive.”

The original school was built in 1962. A few years later a general purpose room was added, as well as the home economics and industrial arts rooms. In 1967, a back section comprised of a top and bottom floor was attached; this quadrupled the size of the school. Approximately eight years ago, a gymnasium, washrooms, change rooms, and storage rooms were also connected to the school. The general purpose room then became the library.

The school is a kindergarten to grade eight structure. Officially, it has 32.7 teachers on staff, but with the part time people they actually have 37 teaching staff and five educational assistants, two are part time, and two are half time.

The principal has been in education for 30 years, sixteen as a teacher, five as a vice principal, and nine as a principal. He has spent four years at school 3.

Participants in the focus group interview were members of the School Growth Team (SGT), which they referred to as the Growth Team. Their SGT consists of eight members. Each member represented a group of five to seven people, with the exception of the administrative team which consisted of the principal and vice principal. The primary division had two representatives because of the large number of primary teachers. There was a junior and intermediate representative, a representative from the resource team (which includes the academic resource teachers and teacher librarian), the educational assistants, administration, and the clerical/custodial staff. Although participants had been given plenty of notice for the focus group interview, only three members were able to attend. However, Teachers 7, 9, and 11 offered to participate in the individual interviews. In addition, five teachers not on the SGT (Teachers 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10) volunteered for individual interviews. So the case data consist of a focus group interview with three people and individual interviews with nine people. Participants’ profiles are illustrated in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1
School 3 - Participants' Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th># of Years Taught</th>
<th># of Years Taught at School 3</th>
<th>Division Taught</th>
<th>SGT Member</th>
<th># of Years on SGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Junior/Intermed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary/French</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Intermed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Academic Resource</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Intermed</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates School Growth Team members who had individual interviews
** indicates School Growth Team members who were present at the focus group interview
The first column of Table 6.1 refers to the participants. Teachers were labeled with numbers (i.e., T1, T2, and T3 were the first three teachers interviewed during the focus group interview). The letter “P” stands for the principal. In the second column, participants’ gender was recorded, while the third and fourth columns indicate the number of years taught and the number of years the teachers had been at school 3. Division taught is recorded in the fifth column. The last two columns address Growth Team issues (i.e., whether the participant was a member of the SGT and the number of years they have served on the Team).

The Data

The data gathered for school 3 were handled in the same fashion as that for schools 1 and 2 (see Chapter 3 for an explanation of the process). Transcript coding yielded a total of 1116 idea units, with the teachers’ comments representing 604 of these units. The focus group’s comments totalled 268 and the principal’s remarks amounted to 244 units. An overview of participants’ comments may be found in Table 6.2. In this table, the constructs of the framework (i.e., form and content of culture, leadership, organizational learning processes, structures, outcomes, stimuli, and barriers) are listed in the first column. The second column indicates the number of teachers making comments, while the third column illustrates the percentage of teachers’ comments about each of the constructs. Percentage of comments made by the focus group and principal are recorded in the fourth and fifth columns. Lastly, the percentage of relevant responses was tabulated and noted in column six. Leadership accounted for 50% of all responses. Form and content of culture represented 33% and statements about organizational learning accounted for the remaining 17%.

Level one coding attempted to determine the form and content of school 3’s culture, the leadership practices that were in place, and OL that had occurred. For a complete picture of the
Table 6.2

School 3 - Level 1 Coding

Global Perspective of Dimensions of Culture, Leadership, and Organizational Learning

(N = 1116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 604</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 268</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 244</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 1116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Processes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Structures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning Stimuli</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to OL and Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The calculations were derived as follows:

Form of Culture: Participants’ Percentage of Comments - 40/604 = 6.6 or 7%
Focus Group’s Percentage of Comments - 35/268 = 13%
Principal’s Percentage of Comments - 23/244 = 9%
Percentage of Relevant Responses - 98/1116 = 8.7 or 9%
data related to these three constructs, see Appendix I. However, the next few paragraphs will briefly highlight what was learned from level one coding.

First, the form of school 3’s culture was not uniform. Although the majority of comments described the culture as collaborative, most of the collaboration seemed to occur between teaching partners or within divisions. Therefore, the culture had components of collaboration, but other forms of culture (i.e., isolation, balkanization, and comfort) impinged on the uniformity of this school’s culture.

Second, the content of the culture explained its form. The two most significant descriptors were “Teachers Work/Plan Together” and “Students Come First”. Other categories which were noteworthy were “Mutual Support Among Colleagues” and “Sharing of Ideas and Resources”. Further, categories which were seen as contributing somewhat to school 3’s culture were: professional development, risk taking, collegiality, and pride in profession.

Third, principal 3 demonstrated all of the dimensions of a transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1994). Eighty-nine percent of the comments were of a positive nature; however, eleven percent were negative. For example, “Leader Provides Support” was viewed as the most important dimension, with positive comments representing 24% and negative comments constituting three percent. “Structures and Decision Making Processes” was a dimension which also received positive and negative comments (+18%, -2%). Participants appeared to have mixed feelings about the principal’s practices. Perhaps this is because each staff member experienced principal 3’s leadership style differently.

Fourth, OL was happening in school 3. Increased understanding for the group was identified as a major outcome. Staff learned now to plan, collaboratively, units which included modifications for special needs students and technology. Further, new practices, such as the use of cooperative
learning strategies, was also seen as an important outcome for the group. Several OL processes (i.e., group problem solving, discussing issues, planning together, goal setting, sharing of ideas) and OL structures (i.e., SGT, PA days, common preparation time, Monday meetings) were in place. In addition, teachers identified stimuli for their growth (i.e., professional development, change issues, collaborative performance appraisal, personal preference, university students). Barriers to OL were mentioned (i.e., time), as were barriers to collaboration (i.e., pressure/stress, morale, time, not open to change, isolation).

A second level of coding was employed in an attempt to understand what people were saying about the three constructs of leadership, culture, and organizational learning. Linkages were established between the constructs and these linkages then formed the basis for the causal map (see Figure 6.1) which is explained in the “Overview of the Pattern of Relationships”.

Overview of the Pattern of Relationships

This case study provides an example of a school with a distinctive culture. Although more than 50% of all relevant responses indicated the culture was collaborative, 12% called it isolated, and 22% referred to it as “Other”. In the majority of cases, “Other” meant balkanized. Nevertheless, both individual and collective learning occurred facilitated, to a great extent, by support from the principal.

For the past four years, “we have [had] a consistent theme throughout our school of cooperation and a cooperative environment and collaborative decision making, trying to empower the kids to do the same thing” and that has impacted on learning because “the biggest change that we have done is a shift towards cooperative learning,” (Teacher 4). More recently, a change initiative the entire school took on was a “Teaching/Learning” project titled “How Technology
Impacts on the Environment”. This project was funded, in part, by the board of education.

Figure 6.1 is a causal map depicting the variables involved in the development of the school’s initiatives over the four years principal 3 was at the school. This figure also illustrates the relationships among the three main variables of the research. Numbers have been placed in brackets beside idea units (i.e., ‘whole staff problem solving’ (3)) to help the reader follow the causal map.

The principal (1) implemented many OL processes (2). For example, teachers got together to: solve problems (3), discuss issues (4), plan (5), set goals (6), and share ideas (7). Sometimes teachers worked with a partner (8), with other teachers of the same grade level (9), or with their whole division (10). “There have been a few things over the last few months where the whole school (11) has worked on projects, like the Canada theme, the ethno-cultural quilt, our technology project,” (principal). Principal 3 also utilized the following OL structures (12): School Growth Team (13), PA days (14), common preparation time (15), staff meetings (16), a day for each division for planning (17), and Monday meeting days to share cooperative learning ideas (18).

The outcomes (19) which resulted from these OL processes and structures were three fold. First, increased understanding (20) occurred in the intermediate division as “they [knew] exactly what they [were] doing” when it came to collaboratively planning units which incorporated modifications and technology. Second, a change in practice (21) occurred for most of the staff as they moved from Socratic instruction to cooperative learning. Individual change in practice occurred as some teachers changed their assessment practices (22) as a result of training in the use of portfolios. Third, teachers explained a new skill (23) they had acquired. They had learned how to work together to develop curriculum such as “school wide units, like the Canada and multicultural units” (T4). In addition individuals learned new skills (24); the music teacher’s “focus [was] trying to use that software and hardware to enhance and develop her music program,”(P).
Figure 6.1: Causal Map for School 3
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Mutual Support (41)
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work together (43)
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Learning occurred, to a large extent, because the principal provided both individual and collective support (25). Teacher 7 stated, “He has been very encouraging if we are interested in something.” Principal 3 provided the resources (26) necessary for learning to take place. According to Teacher 8, “He gives us the time, will find supply days, or find time to cover us.” In addition, intellectual stimulation (27) was provided by this principal. “He is the one that brings all these workshops into the school,” Focus Group.

In addition to the intellectual stimulation that the principal provided, teachers claimed there were five stimuli for their learning (28). Opportunities for professional development (29) were cited as having a major impact on their growth. Teacher 4 remarked, “We have had whole staff inservices [on cooperative learning].” Teacher 9 also attributed his personal learning to “taking courses that the board has provided, such as cooperative learning, and the summer courses they have provided.” Another stimulus for growth was issues of change (30). According to Teacher 4, “My teaching has changed a lot and it is partly due to The Common Curriculum and other new initiatives.” Personal preference (31) was a stimulus for some teachers. The principal observed, “Our grade eight teacher was already interested in ethno-cultural enlightenment with students” so that was an area that he personally pursued. The collaborative performance appraisal model (32) was the impetus for three teachers’ learning. Teacher 4 found it “very beneficial” because it reflected what “you felt you needed to work on.” The final stimulus for growth came from the presence of teacher candidates (33) in the school. They provided the teachers with information on outcomes and also shared their personal learning portfolios.

A factor which appears to have impacted on the teachers’ learning in an indirect manner was support from an outside source (34). Here, the board’s staff development officer (35) provided opportunities for the teachers to attend workshops. The staff, in turn, hosted visitors from “all over
the world,” (principal).

In addition to leadership practices impacting on OL, the form and content of the culture also influenced the staff’s learning. The form of culture (36) was inconsistent. Two teachers and one focus group member referred to the culture as isolated (37). Collaboration (38) formed a large part of the culture, but balkanization (39) existed within divisions and even across grade levels. The content (40) of the culture consisted of the following conditions: mutual support among colleagues (41), a belief in putting students first (42), working together (43), and sharing of ideas and resources (44). Other conditions which were viewed to be of lesser, but still relevant, significance were: professional development (45), risk taking (46), collegiality (47), honest feedback (48), and pride in profession (49).

Data provided evidence that certain transformational leadership practices influenced school 3’s culture. The primary practice was “Leader Provides Support” (25). According to Teacher 10, the principal “spends a lot of time in the classrooms ... He’s very supportive of teachers. He backs you up in dealings with parents and in dealings with students. He is continually encouraging us to up-date ourselves.” All of these actions contributed to a collaborative culture. On the other hand, a member of the focus group felt that some teachers had more support than others (50). “I don’t want to be like the kid that says, ‘Mommy likes you better,’ but that is, I guess what I am saying.”

Besides providing support, certain structures and decision making processes (51), as well as having a vision (52), contributed to the culture. According to Teacher 4, “He has put in place all sorts of things from the very beginning. The idea of a school growth plan which has a very definite focus on building a cooperative environment, building a collaborative environment” was principal 3’s vision. Another dimension which was seen to impact on culture was leadership traits and capacities (53). “He is pretty laid back too ... There is not an electrified feeling around here,”
Further, the following dimensions of leadership were seen to have some influence on the culture: provided intellectual stimulation (27), modelled appropriate behaviour (54), involved staff in goal setting (55), built culture (56), provided resources (26), and managed administrative practices (57), in particular, dealt with discipline issues (58), communicated with students, parents, and staff (59), handled parental issues (60), and dispensed with unnecessary tasks for staff which meant “gate keeping” (61).

Two staff members, and the focus group, provided negative examples of collaboration - inclusive (62). “People get frustrated when things don’t go well, when there is not parent support, or when there is negative parent input,” (T4). Moreover, participants mentioned barriers to collaboration (63). Pressures/stress (64), time (65), morale (66), isolation (67), and not open to change (resistors) (68) were all viewed as inhibiting collaboration. One barrier to organizational learning (69) was commented on by Teacher 7. “We just don’t have the time (70) [for intellectual stimulation] because we are overwhelmed with the kids and what is going on in our classrooms.”

This story provides a third pattern of relationships among culture, leadership, and organizational learning. All three constructs were in place. Internal coherence appeared to exist in school 3 and because of this ecology, change initiatives were successful in this school.

**Culture and Organizational Learning**

Several examples of individual and collective learning were cited by participants (see Appendix I, section on OL). Table 6.3 summarizes comments made regarding the cultural conditions which influenced organizational learning in school 3. Data were provided by a second level of coding whereby linkages were established between cultural and organizational learning responses. In the first column, components of culture are listed (i.e., form and content). The
Table 6.3

School 3 - Level 2 Coding

Cultural Conditions Which Influence Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form, Content, Barriers</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 41</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Profess.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
second column indicates the number of participants making comments, and the third, fourth, and fifth columns record the responses made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal which linked culture to OL. Total percentage of relevant responses are recorded in the last column.

Mutual support among teachers was viewed as having the greatest impact on OL. Five of the teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on this condition representing 27% of all comments made. Teacher 4 explained how this condition affected learning.

In a supportive environment, someone who wants to excel, someone who wants to learn [can]. Someone who wants to try new things [can]. [You are] free to do that in a supportive environment. If you are not in a supportive environment, if you are in a stifling environment, or an environment where you feel hen pecked or constantly being watched when you make a mistake, or if you don’t do something according to traditional rules ... then you are not going to want to try; you are not going to want to learn.

One of the members of the focus group counted on her teaching partner for support.

Both of us had deadly groups last year and it was even just a pep talk before we even started the day, which allowed for growth. You know it made us come to school. And we would say, ‘Ok, let’s do this,’. And then we would come in at the end of the day and go ‘Ugh!’, or we would run in and say, ‘All right, don’t do this. Don’t use that structure.’. Between us we created a pretty good lesson, or a really bad lesson got avoided. So for me, if I have someone else on the same wave length then we do things together and we can sort of plan together and sort of bounce ideas off each other. Then that makes you grow more.

Teacher 10 contended that the culture encouraged teachers to learn and “teachers go out of their way to be better teachers because there’s always that support there.”

Other conditions which were seen as influencing OL were: a belief widely held by staff that students should come first in their deliberations and practices (five teachers commented on this, 11%), professional development (four teachers, the focus group, and the principal referred to it, 13%), and working together (four teachers and the principal made reference to it, 15%). Teacher 6 explained how she and her teaching partner “asked for and got the same prep time, at least one prep time per cycle” and that really facilitated their planning together. She remarked, “That worked
very well because we planned together. We do our units together ... and we make time, at lunch time and after school [to plan together].” Teacher 6 felt she had learned a great deal because she had a teaching partner with whom she could work.

Principal 3, a true supporter of professional development, thought the culture influenced people’s capacity to learn because “there were an awful lot of people who were interested in their development. That has spread so that there are other people [interested now].” In this culture, teachers felt a need to “learn even more to make sure I’m keeping up with everything that’s happening around here,” Teacher 8.

Furthermore, collaborative culture (three teachers and the principal, 8%), sharing of ideas (two teachers, the focus group, and the principal, 10%), risk taking (one teacher, the focus group, and the principal, 11%), collegiality (one teacher, 1%), and feedback (focus group, 1%) received limited support. The barrier category obtained 3% of the comments made, but it will be dealt with in a subsequent section.

**Leadership Practices and School Culture**

A second level of coding was applied to the data to establish linkages between leadership practices and culture (see Chapter 3 for a further explanation of this process). For example, Teacher 10 observed, “He’s very supportive of teachers. He backs the teachers up in dealings with parents and in dealings with students.” This, plus the fact that “he spends a lot of time in the classrooms” was viewed by Teacher 10 as contributing to the school’s culture.

Table 6.4 summarizes the leadership practices which impacted on school 3’s culture. The dimensions of leadership used in the analysis are recorded in column one. Number of participants
Table 6.4

School 3 - Level 2 Coding

Leadership Practices Which Influence School Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 41</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 13</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 4</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
making comments is recorded in the second column, and the rest of the columns depict the percentage of comments made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal, as well as the total percentage of relevant responses.

Data from this school indicate that “Leader Provides Support” had a significant impact on the culture. Four teachers and the focus group made comments in this category representing 39% of all comments, 32% of the comments were positive and seven percent were negative. On the positive side, teachers felt that the principal always supported them in professional development.

According to Teacher 11:

He encourages people to get out. I mean he sees professional development and workshops and in-services as a chance to get out of the classroom for a breath of fresh air which is important a lot of times. He sees it [PD] as an opportunity for you to grow and change as a teacher, and if you generally believe you want to do that, then he is going to do whatever he can to support you in that venture.

Teacher 7 also felt that the principal went beyond the call of duty by supporting not only staff and students, but parents as well. “He does a lot of mediation and helps the transition for people who are new in the community, or new in the country, and new in the school. He helps them to deal with us, and helps us to deal with them.” On the negative side, a member of the focus group had several concerns regarding lack of leader support.

You need to feel that you are being supported and that it is ok to let somebody vent, but if they [parents] are venting and they are telling lies about you as well, that’s not just letting them vent. That’s making your name tarnished ... Since I brought up the subject of the cliques before, I believe that he has influenced the cliques. I think whatever administration does has a big impact on the teachers, or whatever the teachers perceive the administrator does has a big impact on the school’s culture. So obviously if there are cliques I think it has got to be influenced by what administration does ... I don’t want to be the kid that says, ‘Mommy likes you better,’ but that sort of is, I guess, I am saying that. There are groups of people that get certain privileges. We think [they do]; it appears that way.

Some of the other dimensions of transformational leadership were cited as influencing school culture. “Structures and Decision Making Processes” was a dimension that two teachers and the
focus group mentioned, representing ten percent of all comments. For example, when it came to
decision making, Teacher 8 remarked, “I think this opening up and letting everyone feel that they
[sic] can contribute, or have a say [has influenced the culture].”

Two teachers, the focus group, and the principal made statements about “Builds Culture”.
Seven percent of the remarks were positive and two percent were negative. Teacher 6 provided an
eexample of a negative comment. “They [administrators] don’t understand ... the need that we have. WE don’t think it’s being addressed and we are losing the cohesiveness.”

Two teachers spoke of the principal’s vision (3%). Teacher 4 stated that the principal’s vision had a marked affect on culture. “He has put in place all sorts of things from the very beginning. The idea of a school growth plan which has a very definite focus on building a cooperative environment [was the principal’s idea].” Other categories which received limited support were: “Intellectual Stimulation” (2%), “Leader Provides Resources” (3%), and “Administrative Practices” (3% positive, 7% negative), and “Builds Consensus Regarding Goals” (negative 2%).

Table 6.4 suggests, however, that “Leadership Traits and Capacities” influenced the culture (17% of all relevant responses). Three teachers, the focus group, and the principal all remarked that this dimension impacted on the school’s culture. Teacher 5, for example, observed, “He is pretty laid back too. It is just kind of a ... there is not like an electrified feeling around here [and that affects the culture].” The principal admitted that, “I try to keep calm and not over react” and he hopes in so doing “the teachers know that that’s the way I am going to deal with them [students] and I see them dealing with them [kids] the same way.” He hopes by modelling a calm demeanor teachers will emulate his style and thus impact on the school’s culture.
Leadership Practices which Influence Organizational Learning

Once again, a second level of coding was employed to establish linkages between leadership practices and organizational learning (OL). Table 6.5 summarizes the results. Dimensions of leadership are listed in the first column. The number of participants making comments are in the second column and percentage of comments made are recorded in subsequent columns. A total of 76 linkages were discovered. Ninety-five percent of the linkages were positive and five percent were negative. In some cases, linkages to OL implicated more than one leadership practice. The following example demonstrates this point:

He has brought in speakers. He has organized workshops. He’s made financial contributions through PA days and supply teachers to go to conferences. He has been very supportive, basically whatever you want to do, if the opportunity is there, he will let you take it. It is just a whole atmosphere of encouragement and support. [There are] so many opportunities. There is time given. It is just so encouraging. It is an encouraging atmosphere. I never feel like I am going to be rejected when I ask him to do something (Teacher 4).

Here, the teacher attributed her learning to “Intellectual Stimulation”, “Leader Provides Resources”, and “Leader Provides Support”.

Of the dimensions linked to OL, the three strongest were “Leader Provides Support”, “Leader Provides Resources”, and “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation”. Seven teachers, the focus group and the principal pointed to “Leader Provides Support” as having the most influence on OL with 36% of all relevant responses in this category, as well as three percent negative. Teacher 5 explained that the principal’s support of professional development had a tremendous impact on teachers’ learning. “He doesn’t shove anything down anyone’s throat. He certainly makes everybody aware of what is out there and if you would like to go, it is not a problem. It is never, ‘No, it’s not possible.’ Things are presented and you are more than encouraged to go to it.” Building on this idea, Teacher 6 asserted that the present principal enhanced the whole staff’s
Table 6.5

School 3 - Level 2 Coding

Leadership Practices Which Influence Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 49</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 21</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
growth in cooperative learning by "encouraging further workshops or whatever was available. For the staff who want to pursue this ... the opportunity has been presented ... Everyone has got to go to at least two courses on cooperative learning." From a personal standpoint, Teacher 6 claimed, "He [principal] is excellent at promoting workshops. I think that is one of his fortes. I personally have felt that I have grown in that I have felt very satisfied in accomplishing that [cooperative learning] in my class and have used that considerably."

"Leader Provides Resources" was another dimension which was viewed to impact on OL. Five teachers, the focus group, and the principal all commented on this dimension. For example, teachers in the focus group said that the principal provided them with "lots of resources. When he found some books, like when he went to GLACIE [Great Lakes Association for Cooperation in Education Conference], he brought some back. He gave us some really good science books that he found and said, 'Have a look at these.' He is really good at making sure that everyone sees them too." Teacher 11 told how the principal served as a resource for him. Principal 3 supported Teacher 11's project by acting "as a network for me to get out to see other people and to connect me to other people, to set up things like budgeting and whatever." This project was part of the teacher's collaborative performance appraisal and his end product was a three day workshop that he planned and presented.

The third dimension, which was seen to impact on OL, was "Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation". The focus group commented that "he arranges to have people come in and that influences and affects it [their learning] in a positive way." Teacher 10 felt that the principal had influenced their learning because:

He brings people into the school to talk to us and to do workshops on a variety of different things over the years. He brought people in to do the Rainbows training ... and we've had cooperative learning and we've had people come to do the outcomes workshops. So there's always something going on.
These data support the idea that three dimensions of transformational leadership impact on OL. Although other dimensions were mentioned by one or two teachers, or the focus group, it seemed clear that by providing support, resources, and intellectual stimulation this leader was able to promote individual and group learning among his staff members.

Organizational Learning, Leadership, and School Culture

This research examined the relationships among the three variables of organizational learning, leadership, and school culture in an attempt to understand the extent to which these variables “cohere” with one another in support of change initiatives. Through a second level of coding, linkages were established whereby participants made explicit connections among these concepts. The principal provided three examples where these concepts were inter-connected. The following quote will illustrate this point:

Our grade eight teacher was interested in ethno-cultural enlightenment with his students. [So he] worked with another teacher from another school ... [and] we [staff] were able to support him. I was able to support him by making connections with other people, getting the money that he needed from different sources, bringing in people to see him, to see them as they worked, and that included our director of education ... [The result was] he set up the program for our mini conference [on ethno-culturalism] and two groups of students from two different schools [attended the conference] ... [The conference] made them feel good and it showed [students] how important it was.

In this example, the stimulus for learning came from the teacher. “He was interested in ethno-cultural enlightenment for his students.” An organizational learning process occurred when he “worked with another teacher from another school.” The principal said, “We [staff] were able to support him.” This mutual support from his colleagues was a cultural condition which helped the teacher achieve his goal. Furthermore, the principal provided individual support. He made “connections with other people” and brought “in people to see him ... and that included the director
of education.” This principal also provided resources. He secured “the money that [the teacher] needed.” The outcome was the teacher learned how to set up a mini conference for students on ethno-culturalism. A second outcome ensued for students. They felt good about the conference and they learned the importance of ethno-culturalism.

Teachers 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 told stories which showed how OL, leadership, and culture inter-relate. Teacher 4 explained how the intermediate division learned how to work together to create integrated units.

Principal has always made it really easy for us to collaborate. He gives us a lot of time on PA days. We take the opportunity during lunch hours and after school [to plan together]. It doesn’t have to be a long drawn out process ... [I work] with my grade seven teacher partner, we just know we are partners, and we work together. Principal gives us a lot of opportunities to work together and have time together by giving us professional freedom to take that time that’s there. We will sit together and sometimes it is only half an hour and we’ll say, ‘OK, we’re doing a health and fitness unit. All right, I am going to do this section on hygiene and you are going to do that section on nutrition. OK and what activities do you want to do? And it is really quick ... and then we each go off and do our own thing and bring it back and we show it to either our grade teaching partner or the whole division. And then we put it all together. And now that we have been together doing this sort of thing for four years, we are pretty good at it, so it doesn’t take long. There is usually six of us working together on something like that ... [They produce] at least three integrated units per year with the grade sevens and eights. The kids all enjoy the fact that they are all doing the same sort of work.

In this case, the principal’s support, both in terms of encouraging collaboration and providing staff with the “professional freedom” to use their time to work together, facilitated learning. He also provided them with the resource of time “on PA days” so they could work together. Teacher 4 was fortunate to have a teaching partner, but they did not work in isolation. They worked as a team with six intermediate teachers to prepare integrated units, a skill which they did not possess four years ago. Their OL outcomes were that they produced “at least three integrated units per year” and students benefitted because they were “all doing the same sort of work.” In that way, students were all exposed to the same curriculum. By having a supportive principal who provided resources,
and a culture where mutual support and sharing of ideas and resources existed, these teachers learned how to function as a team as they accomplished writing integrated units for their students.

Teacher 4 also observed, if you are not in a supportive environment, “you are not going to want to put forth the effort ... But, I think the environment of the school [if supportive] and the administration [if supportive] are extremely important for individual learning.”

Teacher 6 provided a personal example of how culture and leadership impacted on her learning.

I have grown in that [cooperative learning], and I have felt very satisfied in accomplishing that this year in my class and have used that considerably. Principal has very strong ideas about PD and he has encouraged, I know personally myself, along with my colleague who teaches at the same grade. And we went to workshops together. He continued and encouraged us and, of course, there is always a price because we end up having visitors at our school because of this.

In this situation, the teacher had grown in her ability to employ cooperative learning strategies. This change in practice, which is an OL outcome, was the result of the principal’s encouragement and support in the area of professional development, as well as the support she received from her colleague who attended workshops with her. The “price” she had to pay, “having visitors at our school” was a source of pride for Teacher 6 and, in fact, for teachers throughout the school.

Teacher 7 told how teachers learned how to create units that incorporated outcomes, a new skill for them. “Sometimes we have time to work together, on PA days, basically as divisions or as grade levels. He [principal] will give us time, a couple of hours here and there to get together to work on something. We were just doing a, creating a unit ... dealing with outcomes.” The leader provided the resource of time and the staff worked together, a collaborative cultural condition, to achieve a new skill, using outcomes in the development of their units.

An example of group learning was furnished by Teacher 10 as she talked about the staff’s growth in cooperative learning. The teachers in school 3 “have done a lot of work on cooperative
learning. We’ve been allowed to go out to the workshops” and it was encouraged by the principal. “We’re encouraged amongst ourselves to work as groups within our divisions” and “even in terms of the teacher appraisals, we’re doing the collaborative appraisals. We sit down and we chat together.” They talked “about things that we could be working on and ways to improve.” In this example, the teacher mentioned “Reflection”, another condition which fostered collaboration. Here, the teachers talked about things and tried to find ways to improve what they were doing. This teacher identified “Leader Provides Support” as essential to learning. She also recognized “Mutual Support Among Colleagues” as a cultural condition which helped facilitate learning. Teacher 10 specified two stimuli for learning, professional development opportunities (“we have been allowed to go out to the workshops”) and collaborative performance appraisals which encourage teachers to talk and work together.

By carefully examining the above instances a pattern emerged. Teachers were able to learn, individually and collectively, when they had support from their colleagues and support from their principal. “Mutual Support Among Colleagues” was a cultural condition critical to collaboration. Furthermore, “Leader Provides Support” and “Leader Provides Resources” had a profound effect on teachers’ learning in school 3. By having a transformational leader and a collaborative culture, OL occurred. These three variables, working together, seemed to provide the internal coherence that was required for the change initiatives to be successful in school 3.

Summary

The results of interviews with a three member focus group, the principal, and eight teachers were presented in this chapter. The data are summarized below in reply to the three research questions.
Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning? Organizational learning was fostered in this school because it had a collaborative culture. The content of the culture included conditions which facilitated collaboration. "Mutual Support" among colleagues was considered a crucial condition for OL. A belief widely held by staff that "Students Should Come First" in their deliberations and practices was also viewed as a significant condition. OL occurred in this school because "Professional Development" was valued and supported by staff and administration alike. Teachers "Worked Together" on a regular basis. Educators contended that being part of a "Collaborative Professional Culture" impacted on their learning. When people around you respect learning, then individuals are motivated to keep up with their colleagues. Although OL was fostered in collaborative cultures, it also appeared within balkanized groups (i.e., the intermediate division), across similar grade levels, and with teaching partners. Other conditions which were less influential were sharing of ideas and risk taking.

Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? Several of the leadership practices attributed to transformational leadership influenced the culture in school 3. "Leader Provides Support" was a crucial leadership practice. "Structures and Decision Making Processes", which includes shared decision making and shared power, was a powerful leadership practice. Additional leadership practices which were seen as significantly contributing to collaborative cultures were: "Leader Holds High Expectations", "Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation", "Leader Models Expected Behaviour", "Leader Provides a Vision", and "Leader Provides Resources". To a lesser extent, the following dimensions of leadership were mentioned: "Leader Builds Consensus Regarding Goals" and "Leader Builds Culture". In addition, certain administrative practices were cited as having an impact on culture. Specifically, participants commented on "Dealing with Discipline", "Communicating with Staff, Students, and Community",
“Dealing with Parental Issues”, and “Gate Keeping”. Further, leadership traits were recognized as significant by participants in school 3. Being a good listener, and having a low key, relaxed demeanor were viewed as having a positive influence on the culture.

Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? The three dominant leadership practices which influenced OL were: “Leader Provides Support”, “Leader Provides Resources”, and “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation”.

Principal 3 believed in professional development. His “symbiotic relationship” with the staff development officer helped him provide resources necessary for this staff to take advantage of PD opportunities. He brought in specialists who introduced the staff to new ideas. This principal listened to his staff, and then provided them with whatever support they needed to carry through with their ideas. And, according to Teacher 4, “All that support makes this a very positive environment for learning.” Furthermore, the collaborative culture, which was based on mutual support, facilitated learning among the staff. School 3 had attained internal coherence by having all three variables well developed; it was this internal coherence which allowed the staff to succeed with their new initiatives.
Chapter Seven

COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to depict the meaning of "internal coherence" in relation to three important organizational change variables by investigating the patterns of relationships among organizational learning, leadership, and school cultures. This chapter inquires about similarities and differences in such patterns of relationships across the three schools which provided evidence for the study. To do this, the chapter revisits responses from the schools to the three research questions guiding the study:

1) Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?
2) Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture?
3) Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning?

Summary of School Sites and Participants' Profiles

The three school sites involved in this study serviced contrasting communities. School 1's community, for example, was characterized by the principal as having a "pick up truck kind of mentality." The area appeared to be a "traditional middle class kind of suburban neighbourhood." Although there were "certainly strong elements of that," the principal pointed out that a number of houses were "split up into two and three apartments that [were] rented by single moms and recently arrived immigrant families who share[d] homes." School 2 served a relatively stable urban and
rural community with a mixed socio-economic status. On the other hand, school 3's transient population drew from six different areas which represented various socio-economic backgrounds.

While each school was reputed to be exceptionally successful with its change initiatives, each had its own idiosyncracies (see Table 7.1 for a summary of school sites and participants' profiles). School 1 was ten years old and housed 550 students. A new addition was being connected to school 2's thirty-eight year old building to accommodate its 400 children. School 3 was also an older structure. Built in 1962, several renovations had been made to house its 600 students. The schools were kindergarten to grade eight structures and they all had several portables.

The principals had distinct administrative experiences. Principal 1 had been in education for 24 years, four and a half years as a vice principal, and eight as a principal. This was his third year at school 1. School 2 had a relatively new administrator. She had taught for 25 years, been a vice principal for six years, and this was her third year in a principalship. The third principal had 30 years experience, sixteen as a teacher, five as a vice principal, and nine as a principal. He had spent four years at school 3.

Each school had a School Growth Team (SGT). However, the make-up of each team was quite different. In school 1, anyone could be on the SGT. The team consisted of seven members: a kindergarten teacher, a primary teacher, an academic resource teacher, a special education teacher, a junior teacher, the vice principal, and the principal. Six members of the SGT participated in the focus group interview. Membership in school 2's SGT was voluntary. The team was comprised of eight people: the principal, the vice principal, two primary teachers, two junior teachers, an academic resource teacher, and the teacher librarian. Seven were present at the interview. The composition of school 3's Growth Team was more specific. Each member of the eight person Growth Team represented a group of five to seven people, with the exception of the administrative
Table 7.1

Composite Table - Summary of Sites and Participants' Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of School Building</strong></td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>38 years</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Attending the School</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades Taught at the School</strong></td>
<td>K - Grade 8</td>
<td>K - Grade 8</td>
<td>K - Grade 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time Principal had been in Education</strong></td>
<td>24 years</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time Leader had Served as a Principal</strong></td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time as Principal at this School</strong></td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Members on School Growth Team</strong></td>
<td>7 members</td>
<td>8 members</td>
<td>8 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of SGT Members at Focus Group Interview</strong></td>
<td>6 members</td>
<td>7 members</td>
<td>3 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Individual Interviews Conducted</strong></td>
<td>8 staff (3 on SGT) 1 principal</td>
<td>8 staff (3 on SGT) 1 principal</td>
<td>8 staff (3 on SGT) 1 principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
team which consisted of the principal and vice principal. There were representatives from: the primary division (two people because of the large number of primary teachers), the junior division, the intermediate division, the resource team, the educational assistants, administration, and the clerical/custodial staff. Three members attended the focus group interview.

Individual interviews were conducted with three members from each of the School’s Growth Teams and with five other staff members not on the team. In school 1, the secretary, five female and two male teachers were interviewed individually. One male and seven female teachers were interviewed in school 2. Individual interviews were conducted with two male and six female teachers in school 3.

The Data

Data were treated in a similar fashion for all three schools. Level one transcript coding yielded a total of 2991 idea units. School 1's codes accounted for 837 units; school 2's represented 1038; and school 3's constituted 1116 units. Level one coding looked at the form and content of culture, leadership practices, and organizational learning that occurred in the schools. For a complete picture of the data, see Appendix J.

A second level of coding attempted to understand what people were saying about the three constructs of culture, leadership, and OL. Linkages were established between constructs and these linkages then formed the basis for each school's causal map. The next section, "Overview of the Pattern of Relationships" explains why school 2 is an exemplary case of a school with internal coherence that is successfully engaged in change initiatives. School 2's pattern of relationships will be summarized and, in so doing, it will become apparent, both from a qualitative and quantitative perspective, that this school had the highest level of coherence. The patterns in schools 1 and 3 will
then be examined to discover where similarities and differences occurred. Yin (1984) suggests that this replication strategy is useful in multiple case studies. He states that once one case study has been investigated in depth, then successive cases may be analyzed to ascertain whether patterns match those of the initial case.

**Overview of the Pattern of Relationships**

Each school's story was unique, yet their tales paralleled one another. All of the schools had been involved in change initiatives over the past three or four years. The impetus for change had come from a need to keep up with technology or a need to incorporate new instructional strategies in their teaching repertoires. All three principals had implemented OL structures (i.e., P.A. days, lunch bag meetings, P.E.P.S., common preparation periods) and OL processes (i.e., working with grade partners, or divisions). Individual and collective learning occurred in the schools. In school 1, an outcome of OL was increased understanding, particularly in the use of Lego Dacta. In addition, teachers gained new skills and practices in the area of technology. Increased understanding occurred for both staff and students in school 2. Teachers' cooperative learning skills improved and "the staff's whole awareness of Multiple Intelligences" had been heightened (T12). An outcome for students was that they learned how to use the 'Bridge of Conflict' in order to resolve their problems. In school 3, the intermediate division became adept at writing integrated units which incorporated technology and modifications for special needs children. A change in practice transpired for most of the teachers as they moved from Socratic instruction to cooperative learning.

Collaborative cultures were associated with organizational learning in all schools. However, in school 3 the culture appeared to be balkanized in that teachers worked closely together, but
mainly within their own divisions or grade levels. Cultural conditions which facilitated learning varied from school to school, nevertheless “Mutual Support” was viewed as vital by all schools.

In each of the schools, teachers recognized that certain leadership practices impacted on the school’s culture. Specifically, all schools stated that support from the principal was fundamental to the development of collaborative cultures. Leadership traits, especially that of being a good listener, as well as leader builds culture, models expected behaviour, and provides a vision were also mentioned in all schools.

Further, the teachers maintained that the principal’s support was central to their learning. Supplementary to support was the provision of resources by principal-leaders. Leaders provided significant amounts of intellectual stimulation in all schools, as well.

The tales told by participants in these three schools illustrate the salience of the principal’s role in developing collaborative cultures and inspiring organizational learning. Although the principal’s role is a piece of the puzzle, so too are the cultural conditions which foster collaborative cultures and the OL processes and structures which support OL. While all three schools have been successfully involved in school improvement initiatives, some justification exists for thinking school 2 was more advanced in terms of internal coherence. This point can be made from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective.

From a quantitative perspective, an attempt was made to estimate the internal coherence of each school by tallying the total number of comments made by participants, principal, and focus group with regards to leadership and culture, leadership and organizational learning, culture and OL. Table 7.2 summarizes this data. The first column lists the various combinations of linkages between variables and the participants who made comments on the variables. Columns two and three indicate the number of positive and negative responses made by participants in school 1. Columns
### Table 7.2

**Composite Table - Level 2 Coding**

**Estimating a Schools Internal Coherence: Total Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Comments</strong></td>
<td>N = 135</td>
<td>N = 242</td>
<td>N = 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture &amp; OL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>31 (23%)</td>
<td>29 (12%)</td>
<td>41 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (31%)</td>
<td>51 (21%)</td>
<td>72 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>27 (20%)</td>
<td>47 (20%)</td>
<td>41 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>6 (4.5%)</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6 (4.5%)</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39 (29%)</td>
<td>85 (36%)</td>
<td>58 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership &amp; OL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>48 (20%)</td>
<td>49 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
<td>40 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 (37%)</td>
<td>105 (43%)</td>
<td>76 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Comments</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table provides a detailed breakdown of the total comments across different categories for each school, showing both the raw numbers and the percentage of total participants.
four and five report the number of comments made by participants in school 2 and school 3's results are recorded in the last two columns. The results from Table 7.2 indicate that school 2's internal coherence was extremely well developed. Twenty-one percent of the positive comments made were in the "Culture and Organizational Learning" category. School 1 had 31% of its comments in this category, while school 3 had 32% of its positive comments in this category. In the category "Leadership Practices Which Influence School Culture", 36% of school 2's comments fell in this category compared to 29% of the comments for school 1 and 26% of the positive, as well as five percent of the negative responses for school 3. "Leadership Practices Which Influence OL" received 43% of the comments in school 2. School 1 had 37% of its positive comments in this category and school 3 had 34% positive and two percent negative responses. School 2's negative comments were negligible (0.4%), compared to school 1 with three percent negative comments and school 3 with eight percent negative responses. These data indicate that although schools 1 and 3 had internal coherence, school 2's internal coherence was more pronounced. Many more positive linkages were made by all participants interviewed in school 2, with the exception of the category "Culture Which Influenced Organizational Learning".

The number of respondents were the same in each school. Overall, school 2's linkages outnumbered schools 1 and 3. However, limitations to these results are two-fold. First of all, participants in schools 2 and 3 were more chatty than those in school 1. For example, in the first level of coding, the total number of comments made by participants in school 2 were 1038 compared to 1116 in school 3 and 837 in school 1. Although school 3 had more comments in level one coding, the number of positive level 2 comments were higher for school 2.

School 2 also appeared to have more internal coherence from a qualitative perspective. For example, in the area of culture, school 2 had a collaborative, professional and inclusive culture
compared to school 1 which demonstrated some components of inclusion, and school 3 which did not have any characteristics of inclusion. In fact, school 3 appeared to be at odds with its community. Lack of trust between the school and community was apparent, as can be seen from the following quote:

You aren’t going to get support from the parents [regarding kids swearing or misbehaving] ... Because of the difficulty with some of the parents in the area there’s sometimes back stabbing involved, or not back stabbing, a full blown lie has gone home ... and teacher bashing. And, a little network of phone calls or parents that meet out in the school yard, dropping off their children and then they are into the office quick as anything to run you into the ground (Focus Group).

In contrast, in school 1, Teacher 1 remarked, there is “a community feeling here. Parents are very involved. We’ve always had parent volunteers, and they’re quite visible, so it’s a sense of community.” Several other staff members made similar comments. For example, Teacher 6 said, “I think it is wonderful that we have more and more parents on board.” Noting that everybody pitches in and helps, Teacher 7 observed, “Parents are good to get things done.” Teacher 9 told how, for grade eight graduation, “parents come in and completely transform the gym.” Teacher 10 also stated, “We have great kids, and the community feels welcome. [There are] lots of volunteers and a lot of support from the community.” One member of the focus group asserted,

Community keeps coming back in my mind [to describe the culture]. Community is something that is not just a buzz word. We don’t even use the word community, but, to me, it describes the way the school operates.

Supporting this viewpoint, principal 2 stated that the community and school were like one “huge family.”

In the area of leadership, all three principals demonstrated characteristics of a transformational leader. However, principal 2 embodied all of the dimensions of this type of leadership. Furthermore, teachers at school 2 thought the world of their principal. For example, Teacher 9 commented, “She cares about all people, and she certainly cares about her staff.”
Teacher 12 maintained, "She does what's best for the school and the kids. That's paramount."

According to the focus group, "The principal is visible to everyone ... and she is willing to fight for our school too." Teacher 6 observed,

She is number one. She is instrumental. How your administration is, is the key to how the school works and how people work with that ... from her personality, her work ethic, her everything, her whole focus on life is infectious.

When it came to organizational learning, school 2 did not focus on one initiative at a time; they built on previous initiatives. They were not willing to let go of an area of growth and jump on a new band wagon. Instead, they incorporated new areas of interest into their school plan. Principal 2 explained:

We were trying to keep our school plan to three or four things [initiatives], and we stuck with six because they [the staff] wouldn't let anything go. And I thought that was exciting. They didn't want to let go of things that were well in place. So we just choose to continue, but we didn't want to let literacy go, we wanted to integrate multiple intelligences into literacy. We didn't want to let go of the technology because it was a continuance of the integration. We didn't want to let go of the environmental issues because they were important to people. So we just kept going with all of the things, and it really hasn't been a burden, so because our continuations have just allowed us to get better.

The pattern of relationships which exists in school 2 provides an excellent example of internal coherence. This is as close as it gets to being an ideal school in the real world. Although schools 1 and 3 also demonstrated internal coherence, their patterns were slightly different from school 2's in particular ways. Their differences will be identified in subsequent sections.

**Culture and Organizational Learning**

In this study, participants in all three schools identified cultural conditions which they felt influenced their learning. Data were gathered through a second level of coding whereby links were established between statements made regarding concepts of culture and organizational learning (see
### Table 7.3

**Composite Table - Level 2 Coding**

**Cultural Conditions Which Influence Organizational Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form, Content, Barriers</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Profess.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collabor. Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3 for a further explanation of this process. Table 7.3 summarizes the results. The first column lists the cultural conditions, as well as barriers. Number of teachers who made comments were recorded in columns two, three, and four. Columns five, six, and seven indicate the percentage of statements made by participants and the next three columns tabulate the percentage of remarks made by focus groups. In columns eleven, twelve, and thirteen, the percentage of responses made by the principals is recorded and, finally, the last three columns summarize the overall percentage of relevant remarks made for each condition of culture. It is interesting to note that school 2 identified fourteen different cultural conditions compared to school 1, which identified thirteen, and school 3 which identified ten.

Responses regarding the cultural conditions which influenced organizational learning were divergent. In some cases, such as school 3, teachers would view a condition (i.e., students first) as fundamental to their learning, yet the focus group and principal did not comment on this condition. On the other hand, there appeared to be more cohesion in school 2. For example, in the area of mutual support, 24% of comments made by participants identified this condition. Focus group members’ responses for mutual support were 22% and 25% of the principal’s statements were about this condition. Nevertheless, “Mutual Support Among Colleagues” was viewed as a primary condition for organizational learning by participants in all schools. Four teachers in school 1, six in school 2, and five in school 3 identified this condition as contributing to their learning, as did all three focus groups, and the principals in schools 2 and 3. For example, a focus group member in school 1 asserted, “If you’re supported and accepted, then you can learn.” Another participant in the focus group added, “I have had major support from this staff.” In school 2, Teacher 7 said that the school’s culture had affected her learning because “we are all very supportive of each other ... and aware of each other’s needs.” Teacher 4 (school 3) explained how mutual support affected
learning. “In a supportive environment someone who wants to excel, someone who wants to learn [can].” Another comment which reiterated the profound impact of mutual support was made by Teacher 10. He felt that the school’s culture encouraged teachers to learn inasmuch as “teachers go out of their way to be better teachers because there’s always that support there.”

“Professional Development” was a condition which acquired substantial support from schools 2 and 3 and lesser support from school 1. Four teachers in both schools, their focus groups, and the principal in school 3 commented on this condition, representing 14% and 13% of relevant responses. School 1 had only one teacher remark on this condition. According to Teacher 1, “Being on this staff [school 2], you are motivated. You want to be up-to-date so you need new teaching methods.” One of the focus group members also felt that the culture influenced the staff’s capacity to learn. “You don’t want to be left out ... If you are not involved [in learning], good Lord, you feel, ‘Oh, geez!’ They drag you along.” Another focus group participant added, “That’s right, and because it [learning] is such an on-going process, you could get left in the dust really quickly,” but they do not let that happen in this school. The same holds true for school 3. Teacher 8 claimed, “As an individual I found with the change from a high school to the elementary in learning, I’m now trying to learn even more to make sure I’m keeping up with everything that’s happening around me.” Teacher 9 made a similar comment. “I think you feel as though you should be getting out and finding out about these things ... I have felt since I have been here that I needed to find out about things [even though] it was later in my career.”

“Risk Taking” was a cultural condition commented on by four participants in school 1, three in school 2, and one in school 3. All focus groups remarked on this condition, as did principals 1 and 3 depicting 24%, 10%, and 11% of all relevant responses in schools 1, 2, and 3 respectively. In school 1, teachers maintained, “We are given the chance and opportunities to go out and try new
things in your classroom, to be a risk taker ... [As a result] I could just about go in and try anything new,” (FG). According to Teacher 8, “We are all open to new ideas.” Teacher 4 observed, “Our culture, which is one where you feel comfortable, you can risk take, [and that] promotes learning because you’re not afraid to go out and try things.” Teachers in school 2 made comments about this condition. “We are all willing to risk take,” (FG). Or, as Teacher 1 offered, in their school, “You’re willing to grow, learn, and take risks.” In school 3, the principal observed, “More and more people are ready to learn new things and see new things.” Teacher 4 claimed that her school had a “supportive environment” which allowed people to “make a mistake.” She felt that if the school’s culture did not encourage risk taking, “then you are not going to want to try. You are not going to want to learn.”

Sharing of ideas and resources was identified by all schools as a condition for learning. This condition received different amounts of support from the various participants. However, overall, it represented 13% of all comments in school 1, 8% in school 2, and 10% in school 3.

Another condition which was seen as important was “Students First”. Five teachers in school 3 commented on this condition representing 11% of all responses. In schools 1 and 2 this condition received 7% and 6% of all statements. According to Teacher 4, in school 3, the teachers had to switch “from full rotary eight periods a day” to having their classes “for at least fifty percent of the day.” They had to gain a better understanding of “more home room style teaching” because they needed to have “consistency within the classroom.” They felt that spending more time with their students would provide stability for the students and improve discipline, as well as academic results. Thus, because their culture condoned doing what was best for students, the teachers were willing to move from being subject specialists to home room teachers.

All three schools shared similar viewpoints on cultural conditions which fostered OL. In
particular, they identified: collaborative cultures, mutual support, professional development, risk taking, kids come first, and sharing of ideas and resources. Although school 3 reported more linkages in this area, the teachers, focus group, and principal did not necessarily view each condition with the same import. In school 2, however, there were more similarities in responses from the various participating groups suggesting more internal coherence existed in this school.

**Leadership Practices and School Culture**

In an attempt to establish linkages between leadership practices and culture, a second level of coding was employed (see Chapter 3 for a further explanation of this process). Leadership practices which were viewed to impact on the schools’ cultures are summarized in Table 7.4. The dimensions of leadership used in the analysis are recorded in the first column. The second, third, and fourth columns indicate the number of teachers making comments about each dimension. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh column, the percentage of participants’ comments are recorded. Columns eight, nine, and ten illustrate the percentage of statements made by focus group participants and columns eleven, twelve, and thirteen show the percentage of responses made by the principals. Finally, the last three columns record the overall percentage of relevant responses.

The data presented in Table 7.4 indicate that “Leader Provides Support” had the most impact on all three schools’ cultures. In school 1, six teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on this dimension representing 38% of all relevant responses. For example, Teacher 4 remarked that Principal 3 influenced the school’s culture because “he supports us - helps us when we ask for help and lets us know what’s going on.” Thirty-three percent of all comments made by participants in school 2 had to do with this dimension. All eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal connected leader provides support to culture. Teacher 11 explained:
She models it [the culture]. She is out there and she’s active and the kids know she is. She provides support by showing up on weekends for tournaments. She has one-on-one chats with you or with small groups and listens and is fair and gives feedback when it is needed. She pulls us along when we need it ... a little kick start here and there.

Four teachers in school 3, and the focus group, made positive comments about the principal’s impact on culture. These responses accounted for 32% of all statements made. However, one teacher and a focus group member made comments of a negative nature representing 7% of relevant responses. On the positive side, Teacher 10 contended that the principal influenced the culture by spending “a lot of time in the classrooms. He’s very supportive of teachers. He backs the teachers up in dealings with parents and in dealings with students. He is continually encouraging us to update ourselves and to go to workshops.” The opposite perspective was shared by a member of the focus group, “I guess we need to see that [support] more often ... You need to feel that you are being supported.” These diametrically opposed viewpoints occurred in other dimensions as well (i.e., administrative practices), thus taking away from school 3’s internal coherence.

A close examination of Table 7.4 offered justification for adding “Leadership Traits and Capacities” to the framework. Three teachers in schools 1 and 3 and five teachers in school 2, as well as their focus groups, and principals in school 2 and 3 contended that leadership traits affected school culture. In school 2, for example, when asked what the principal did to influence culture, Teacher 6 answered, “The whole climate has changed,” because of her. This change in culture was attributed to her traits (“Now she doesn’t force or push, or anything like that, but she makes it pleasant. It’s just her general attitude. And she is just such a ball of fire herself that it just gets you going too,” T7) and her good listening skills (“She listens to your ideas,” T10).

One final pattern which emerged from this data was that participants in school 2 linked more leadership practices with culture than did participants in the other two schools. Looking vertically
Table 7.4
Composite Table - Level 2 Coding
Leadership Practices Which Influence School Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers a Vision*</td>
<td>1 3 2</td>
<td>4 10 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5 11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1 -1</td>
<td>2 -2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 -2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14 15</td>
<td>17 25 8 9 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>6 8 4</td>
<td>41 38 35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18 31</td>
<td>17 50 38 33 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2 1 2</td>
<td>14 2 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>4 3 1</td>
<td>14 6 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>17 25 13 9 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>3 5 3</td>
<td>15 21 12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10 31</td>
<td>10 25 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices*</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
<td>4 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 6 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
at column fifteen, it appears that participants commented on all of the eleven dimensions listed in the framework. Participants in school 1 remarked on eight of these dimensions (see column fourteen) and teachers in school 3 commented on ten of them (three of the responses indicated negative and positive comments while one response was negative only, see column sixteen). The inference from this data would be that principal 2 embodied more of the dimensions of a transformational leader and, therefore, contributed more to developing a collaborative culture in her school. Having a transformational leader and a collaborative culture both added to the internal coherence in school 2.

**Leadership Practices which Influence Organizational Learning**

Once again, a second level of coding was employed to establish linkages between leadership practices and organizational learning. Table 7.5 summarizes the results. The first column lists the dimensions of leadership used in the analysis. Columns two, three, and four record the number of participants making comments and columns five, six, and seven indicate the percentage of participants’ comments. In columns eight, nine, and ten, the percentage of statements made by the focus groups are recorded and columns eleven, twelve, and thirteen depict the percentage of principals’ responses. The last three columns represent the percentage of all relevant remarks.

Of the leadership dimensions associated with organizational learning, the most powerful were “Leader Provides Support”, “Leader Provides Resources”, and “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation”. In schools 1 and 2, five teachers commented on “Leader Provides Support”, as did seven teachers from school 3, the focus groups, and the principals. The total percentage of relevant responses from the schools were 34%, 18%, and 36% respectively. School 3 had three percent negative comments in this category.
Teacher 3, in school 1, contended, “Any program that I wanted to go to, I came and asked him [principal]. He’s been really amazing that way. He doesn’t come at you personally. He sort of opens it up and lets you know about it and then supports you if you want to go, which is great.” Principal 1 maintained, “I have always been a big fan of the notion of a plan for yourself for the year.” Therefore, he sponsored any teachers who wished to attend any staff development opportunities. A similar situation occurred in school 2. At the beginning of each year, the principal asked “what areas of professional growth ... we plan to pursue for the year, and she follows up on that.” (T8 - S2). According to Teacher 9, “She’s very open to staff members who have goals ... she will let you run with it.” Principal 3 appeared to operate in an analogous manner. Teacher 5 reported that the principal was always asking if teachers wanted to attend workshops. “He doesn’t shove anything down anyone’s throat. He certainly makes everybody aware of what is out there and if you would like to go, it is not a problem ... things are presented and you are more than encouraged to go to it.” By having teachers set goals for themselves and by encouraging people to attend professional development sessions, these three leaders fostered learning in their schools.

Providing resources was another dimension of leadership which was seen as impacting on learning. Five teachers in schools 2 and 3, four teachers in school 1, the focus groups, and the principals considered this dimension significant in relationship to OL. This dimension represented 30% of all responses in school 1, 21% in school 2, and 25% positive and 3% negative in school 3. In school 1, for example, the principal confessed, “I fund anything that people want to go to ... The vice principal and I cover [classes] so staff can have time ... I find some extra time to pay off those people who give of their own time to plan workshops for staff ... I bring people in ... [We brought] in every facilitator in the system and sprung every staff member for a day.”

Principal 2 explained how she got teachers moving with technology. She provided them
### Table 7.5

**Composite Table - Level 2 Coding**

**Leadership Practices Which Influence Organizational Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>1   1  2</td>
<td>5  2  4</td>
<td>15  3</td>
<td>6  2  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>2   1  4</td>
<td>4  2</td>
<td>6  3  1</td>
<td>4  6  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>1   2  1</td>
<td>5  6  2</td>
<td>8  8</td>
<td>4  6  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>1   4  4</td>
<td>9  13  20</td>
<td>8  5  24</td>
<td>7  12  8</td>
<td>8  10  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>7   2  17</td>
<td>17  4</td>
<td>20  12</td>
<td>12  17  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>5   5  7</td>
<td>50  10</td>
<td>38  15  20</td>
<td>27  35  50</td>
<td>34  18  36 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>4   5  5</td>
<td>17  19</td>
<td>20  30  29</td>
<td>46  24  33</td>
<td>30  21  25 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>2   1  14</td>
<td>14  4</td>
<td>16  13  4</td>
<td>12  7  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>1   1  2</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>8  6</td>
<td>4  2  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>7   21</td>
<td>5  4</td>
<td>17  11</td>
<td>3  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>1   2  8</td>
<td>8  5</td>
<td>13  6</td>
<td>6  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
with “prep time, brought in the computer facilitator, and set up a schedule where they [teachers] met with the facilitator for one quarter of the day on two occasions.” She felt that the stimulus for learning was there because people were excited about the changes that had occurred before and now they wanted to keep up with the technology and Multiple Intelligences end of it. The result was they “did it”; they integrated literacy, technology, and Multiple Intelligences into their new project.

In school 3, the principal provided resources so that staff could take advantage of numerous professional development opportunities. On an individual basis, he told how the music teacher “hadn’t touched anything or gone near a computer before.” So he provided her with the resources to learn how to use technology in her program.

Now we have a computer in her room and we have got a new Yamaha keyboard that has the Midi format to it and we got the Q-Base program for her so that’s attached. Her focus is trying to use that software and hardware to enhance and develop her music program. So she is doing that.

All three principals also provided their teachers with intellectual stimulation. For example, principal 1 observed, “You have to be the initiator. It depends on what happens when you throw stuff out.” Teacher 7 would agree. “He just simply poses a question and allows everybody to react because he knows them [staff] well. However, when it’s something he feels people are not reacting to, and they should, Principal starts by initiating things.” Teacher 8 declared that “the principal is responsible for introducing staff to any new ideas and he provides lots of opportunities for us to become familiar with new policies.” Teacher 3 also felt that “he has brought a lot of ideas in and sort of lets us take off with them at our own pace.”

Principal 2 provided intellectual stimulation for her staff in numerous ways. According to Teacher 7, “She brings in speakers.” Teacher 6 revealed, “She often hands me articles, Michael [Fullan] for instance.” Principal 2 ensures that the school has professional journals (i.e., “Canadian Educator”) and she will summarize articles for the staff. This principal also admitted that she used
staff development officers and trainers to bring new ideas to staff.

Teachers in school 3 commented on the number of ways that their principal stimulated them intellectually. “He has brought in speakers ... He has organized workshops,” (T4). Teacher 8 remarked that the principal provided them with intellectual stimulation by making “sure we get out to the workshops and get involved in the in-services at the board.” Teacher 9 also pointed out, “We have a lot of contact with outside specialists ... there is a lot of contact between the administration and people of that nature who have helped the teacher in the classroom.”

A final dimension that was cited as impacting on learning was noted only by school 2. “Leadership Traits” was discussed by seven teachers, the focus group, and the principal representing 11% of all responses for this school. Teacher 10 said that the following aspects of the leader’s personality influenced her learning: “She listens to your ideas. She is really keen and encourages you to try new things and is there to help you implement it or just to bounce ideas off. She is always learning with us as we go.” Teacher 9 asserted that it was her “dynamism” that fostered learning. “She has a way with people, it’s non-threatening ... Principal has a very subtle way of invoking change.” When asked what role the principal had played in Teacher 7's learning, she stated by “making me aware of what is available and just her general up and going attitude.” According to Teacher 6 her “whole focus on life is infectious.” Teacher 1 explained how the principal had impacted on her learning:

Principal is in my age group. So when I see Principal doing all of the stuff that she does, I mean there is no such thing as, ‘Oh, I have passed that. I can't do this.’ She just simply won't accept that, you know (laughter). I mean, age just doesn’t simply come into play at all. You can't say, ‘I have done this; I have been there.’ You just keep going. It is new. It is exciting. She makes it exciting. She really does. I mean, teaching.

Table 7.5 illustrated a pattern similar to that which was found in Table 7.4. In examining Table 7.5 vertically (see column fifteen), participants in school 2 commented on all of the
dimensions listed in the framework. Participants in school 1 remarked on eight of the dimensions (see column fourteen), while members of school 3 mentioned ten dimensions (see column sixteen). Further, it appears that the more a leader embodies the characteristics of a transformational leader, the more impact on organizational learning. Having a transformational leader and OL happening both contribute to the internal coherence of school 2.

**Organizational Learning, Leadership, and School Culture**

A second level of coding provided insight into the linkages which were established among organizational learning, leadership, and culture. In school 1, the focus group and six participants were able to describe twelve examples where these constructs occurred. Having the three variables working in harmony provided a very good level of internal coherence which facilitated the change initiatives that had taken place over the past three years.

In school 2, the principal provided four examples where organizational learning, leadership, and culture inter-twined. Teachers 1, 3, 6, 7, and 8 also provided six examples of connections among these variables. Further, the focus group identified another three examples of how these constructs interacted for a total of thirteen examples. Again, having a transformational leader and a collaborative, professional and inclusive culture fostered organizational learning which, in turn, provided an excellent example of internal coherence. This internal coherence was necessary for school 2 to build, year after year, on their past initiatives.

School 3 was also able to describe situations where organizational learning, leadership, and culture interacted. Teachers 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 provided six examples and the principal described three more. The focus group did not provide any examples of the relationship among the constructs. Nevertheless, this school had a good level of internal coherence which helped
successfully implement school 3's change initiatives.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a cross case analysis of three schools and their second level of coding. Data are summarized below in response to the research questions.

Which conditions associated with culture contribute most to organizational learning? Participants from all three schools maintained that a collaborative culture contributed to their learning. Further, participants stated that certain cultural conditions fostered their collaborative cultures. Specifically, they all agreed on the following conditions: mutual support, risk taking, sharing of ideas and resources, students should come first in deliberations and practices, and professional development.

Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? The data suggested that the more a leader demonstrated transformational leadership practices, the more influence there was upon the school’s culture. Participants in all three schools acknowledged four transformational leadership practices: leader provides support, leader provides a vision, leader builds culture, and leader models expected behaviours. Further, a dimension, which was not part of Leithwood’s (1994) transformational framework, was also identified by participants in all schools. They observed that certain traits and capacities impacted on their schools’ cultures. In particular, they observed that the leaders’ listening skills were of import.

Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? Although participants mentioned most of the dimensions of transformational leadership, three practices dominated in this area. Leader provides support, resources, and intellectual stimulation were cited as having a major impact on teachers’ learning.
Although all three schools demonstrated internal coherence, school 2's internal coherence appeared superior from a qualitative and quantitative perspective. Furthermore, data indicate that neither organizational learning, leadership, nor culture is key to organizational change. Rather, by approaching change in a systemic fashion, where internal coherence prevailed, these three schools were able to successfully implement new initiatives.
Chapter Eight

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Summary

As we approach the 21st century, change may well be our only constant force. Earlier efforts to respond productively to the need for change appear to have conceived of the process too narrowly. For example, culture, leadership, and organizational learning (OL) have all been promoted independently as the "keys" to change. More promising, however, are recent efforts to view planned change processes more systemically (i.e., Hutchins, 1991; Sashkin and Egermeier, 1993; Elmore, 1993b; Fuhrman, 1993). Rather than searching for a "key", single, lever for change, systemic approaches focus on the relationships among multiple variables and the extent to which these variables productively "cohere" with one another in support of change initiatives.

As one approach to inquiring further about the meaning of systemic change, this study examined the relationships among three variables often cited as critical to successful change - leadership, culture, and organizational learning. A comparative case study was conducted with three elementary schools in a large, southern Ontario school board. Data collection techniques for each school included a focus group interview with members of the School Growth Team (SGT), as well as individual interviews with the principal and eight staff members (three were on the SGT and five were not). Transcripts were subjected to two levels of coding (see Chapter 3, Methodology) and data provided responses to the three research questions posed in the study.

Which conditions associated with school culture contribute most to organizational learning?
Collaborative school cultures contributed to participants’ learning in all three schools. Elements of such cultures which were identified as contributing to organizational learning were: mutual support among colleagues, risk taking, sharing of ideas and resources, the belief that students should come first in the teachers’ deliberations and practices, and professional development.

Which leadership practices influence the nature of school culture? The more a leader demonstrated transformational leadership practices, the more influence that person had on the school’s culture. Specific leadership practices which were mentioned by participants in all three schools were: providing support, building a shared vision, building a collaborative culture, and modelling expected behaviours. An additional dimension, not part of the original transformational leadership framework (Leithwood, 1994) used for this study, was described by participants. They noted that certain leadership traits and capacities impacted on the schools’ cultures, particularly the principals’ good listening skills.

Which types of leadership practices contribute most to organizational learning? Participants in all three schools cited providing support, resources, and intellectual stimulation as having a major impact on teachers’ learning.

Data indicated that neither culture, leadership, nor organizational learning, in isolation, was responsible for moving the schools forward in their change initiatives. Instead, schools were successfully achieving their goals because they experienced a relatively high degree of internal coherence among the three variables. This meant that each school was characterized by substantial organizational learning, transformational leadership practices, and relatively collaborative cultures. Of course, the three schools did differ in the degree to which each of the elements was evident.
Relationships Between Results And Previous Research Findings

Isolated and collaborative are two basic forms of school cultures discussed in the literature (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991). According to Rudduck (1991, p. 31), “Education is among the last vocations where it is still legitimate to work by yourself in a space that is secure against invaders.” Being in a state of professional isolation provides teachers with “a certain degree of protection to exercise their discretionary judgement in the interests of the children they know best. But it also cuts teachers off from clear and meaningful feedback about the worth and effectiveness of what they do,” (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991, p. 38). Collaborative cultures, however, “create and sustain more satisfying and productive work environments ... Teachers develop the collective confidence to respond to change critically, selecting and adapting those elements that will aid improvement in their own work context, and rejecting those that will not,” (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991, p. 49).

Findings from this study confirm what Fullan and Hargreaves suggest regarding teachers gaining “the collective confidence to respond to change critically.” Teachers in all three schools were fortunate enough to be part of a collaborative culture where they relied on one another for mutual support and for ideas and resources. Because they felt comfortable working in their collaborative environments, they were willing to take risks. Further, they promoted professional development amongst themselves and were willing to share their new-found expertise with one another. These results coincide with the work of Little (1982) and Rosenholtz (1989) who observed that in effective schools, collaboration is tied to norms and opportunities for continuous improvement and life-long learning.

Findings from my study are also in keeping with those of Nias, Southwood, and Yeomans (1989). These authors provide an insightful account of what collaborative schools look like in practice. As with my study, Nias and her team discovered that mutual support, helping one another,
trust, and openness provided the basis for staff relationships. Teachers involved in my study valued individuals and the groups to which they belonged. Their collaborative cultures had a purpose which was developed and shared by the staff. These cultures also respected the personal lives of their members; concessions were made for personal circumstances. Mitchell (1995) reported similar findings in her examination of teachers’ learning processes to improve instructional practices. She “found that the teachers’ collective learning and their collaborative efforts flourished when each individual took responsibility for maintaining psychological safety in group deliberations, for participating in school-wide activities, and for honouring the diversity among them,” (p. 31).

This study draws attention to a prevailing belief that was unquestioned by participants in all three schools. “Kids come first,” was a phrase that was reiterated by individuals, administrators, and focus group participants. Putting students first in their deliberations and practices appeared to be a customary component of each of the school’s cultures. According to Hopkins (1991), having administrators and staff work together to change a school’s culture can promote learning for students. Scheerens (1993) supports Hopkins’ position in that he states that striving for academic achievement and having high expectations for students are cultural factors which contribute to school effectiveness. Although my study did not measure student achievement, participants in all three schools seemed to have high academic expectations for their students and they ensured that students’ interests were a priority in their thoughts and actions.

On a similar note, Heck and Marcoulides (1996) maintain that some aspects of culture make a difference in organizational performance. They specifically identify risk taking, support and time for collaboration among staff, and teacher participation in decision making (p. 82). The schools in my study were known, by their superintendents and staff development officers, to be high performing schools which were actively involved in change initiatives. Risk taking and collaboration
among staff were conditions that participants in all three schools identified as impacting on culture. Teachers also talked about their involvement in decision making, and they viewed this as a leadership practice which had a positive influence on culture.

While collaborative cultures have been viewed in a positive light, Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) warn against three distinct forms of collaboration: balkanization, comfortable collaboration, and contrived collegiality (p. 52). They claim that balkanized cultures are frequently found within subject specific departments at the secondary level and within divisions at the elementary level. Although collaboration occurs within these departments or divisions, little, if any, collaboration occurs across such cultures. In this study, teachers in schools 1, 2, and 3 worked collaboratively within their divisions and with grade partners. While this might seem to indicate balkanized cultures, or comfortable collaboration, this did not appear to be the case in schools 1 and 2. Teachers often prepared long range plans or curriculum units with their grade partners, and they also worked outside their respective divisions with colleagues to achieve their schools' goals. Thus, making judgements about the extent of collaboration is difficult because people were involved at a variety of different levels of collaboration.

The findings from this study which relate to culture and change are partially in line with the work of Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993). In their study on restructuring, they viewed culture as central to the process. They discovered that certain conditions were crucial to collaborative cultures. In particular, they cited norms of collegiality, risk taking, reflectiveness, vulnerability, problem orientation, initiative taking, experimentation, and trust. My study found that all of these norms, with the exception of vulnerability, fostered collaboration. However, although culture is an important component of the change process, it does not act alone. In keeping with the findings of others, this study suggests that the development of collaborative school cultures
depends, to a great extent, on the actions of the principal (Fullan, 1991; Nias et al., 1989; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990).

For years, public schools have been able to close their doors to the outside world and carry on with the business of teaching and learning in their insular territory. In Kanter’s words “leaders of the past often erected walls. Now they must destroy these walls and replace them with bridges,” (1996, p. 91). The process of bridge building requires people to work together and to support one another as they discover more effective and efficient ways of doing business. Leadership based on the ability to empower others is often referred to as transformational (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1990). According to Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1994):

We consider the central purpose of transformational leadership to be the enhancement of individual and collective problem-solving capacities of organizational members; such capacities are exercised in the identification of goals to be achieved and practices to be used in their achievement. (p. 8)

Prior evidence has suggested that the principal can influence the school’s culture (Schein, 1985; Deal and Peterson, 1990), as well as the organization’s ability to learn (Senge, 1990a; Watkins and Marsick, 1993; Hallinger and Heck, 1996). Support for these claims has been based on a transformational model of leadership developed in school contexts by Leithwood (1994). In my study, results from the first round of coding indicated that the principals in all three schools engaged in many practices associated with transformational leadership. First, they had developed a shared vision in conjunction with their teachers. According to Deal and Peterson (1990), principals can create strong cultures through symbolic actions and by having a clear and focused sense of mission or values (p. 81). Second, these principals provided staff with intellectual stimulation, as well as personal and professional support. Third, the principals worked with their staffs toward the acceptance of group goals. In addition, they modelled expected behaviours, held high expectations, and built culture. Moreover, all three leaders worked with their teachers to solve
problems and to try to improve the way they were “doing business”.

The second round of coding identified transformational leadership practices which impacted on culture. Specifically, the following practices were identified: providing support, having a shared vision, building culture, and modelling expected behaviours. These results are in keeping with Little’s (1982) evidence. She found that it is the principal who establishes a standard of collegiality, where experimentation, joint work, and teaching each other about teaching is the norm (p. 338). The principals involved in my study worked on developing a sense of collegiality among staff. For example, they modelled new instructional strategies and encouraged teachers to work together on school-wide projects. They also had teachers share their expertise with one another when they returned from their various workshops. Often these sharing sessions took the form of a mini workshop at division or staff meetings. This “train the trainer” model of staff development encouraged openness, a willingness to share ideas and resources, and created an atmosphere that was conducive to risk taking.

Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) also provided evidence that leadership practices impact on school culture. They observed the following six principal practices: strengthening school culture, using bureaucratic mechanisms, fostering staff development, communicating norms, beliefs, and values, sharing power and responsibility, and using symbols to express cultural values. My data corroborate the notions that principals can strengthen school cultures as well as communicate norms, beliefs, and values. The principals in the three schools in this study used bureaucratic mechanisms (i.e., common preparation time) to foster collaboration and these administrators also promoted staff development. In addition, principals in schools 1, 2, and 3 shared power with their School Growth Teams, their vice principals, and other individuals (i.e., the academic resource teachers) or groups of individuals (i.e., chair people). Moreover, a leadership practice which came
to the fore in my data was in the area of “leader provides support”. Data from all three schools advanced the view that the principal’s support is a crucial leadership practice which has a major impact on the school’s culture.

The second round of coding also identified leadership practices which influenced organizational learning. Again, providing support, both personal and professional, was viewed as a dominant principal practice which impacted on organizational learning. Providing resources and intellectual stimulation were also cited as consequential leadership practices. These findings are in line with those of Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) who discovered that transformational leadership explained variations in OL conditions (p. 75). Another salient observation was made by these researchers in 1995. After completing a five year longitudinal study of policy implementation in British Columbia, they found that “principals are significantly influenced by district-level decision making” and that a “surprising amount of influence [was] exercised by districts on the organizational learning of teachers,” (p. 33). This influence often took the form of professional development opportunities. Schools in my study belonged to a board of education which had been involved, for some time, in a system-wide initiative to implement cooperative learning. A great deal of professional development had been made available to administrators and teachers on this initiative. Teachers in all three schools felt that individually, and as a staff, they had gained an understanding of this instructional strategy. According to the principal, school 3 had a “symbiotic” relationship with the staff development officer and this school was known for its major advancements in cooperative learning. My study, therefore, substantiates Leithwood et al.’s position that districts can influence the OL of their teachers through staff development.

Two new ideas, around the concept of leadership, emerged from my study. First, basic transformational leadership can be exercised through diverse “styles” of leadership. Secondly,
teachers' attributions of transformational leadership are formed not only on overt leadership practices but also on perceived traits and capacities. The principals in this study had very different styles of leadership. For example, principal 1 worked collaboratively with the SGT and staff by having "single issue meetings" where everyone could have input on the topics under discussion. He was described as having a consultative style of leadership. Principal 2 and her vice principal worked as an administrative team in conjunction with the SGT. Teachers referred to her leadership style as democratic. In school 3, the principal was viewed as collaborative, but almost to a fault. Staff said that he entrusted decision making to the SGT and committees. Thus, his leadership style featured delegating responsibility. These three leaders were collaborative, yet their individual styles appeared to be quite different. Findings from my study are in keeping with Corcoran and Wilson's (1989) research where they found that principals of effective secondary schools had various styles of leadership.

What is most striking about this collection of schools is the diversity of leadership styles. No one leadership style appears to be dominant. What seems to matter most is the fit between the style of the principal and the various subcultures in the school community. In some cases, there are dynamic powerful principals who seem to be everywhere and orchestrating everything ... In other cases, the principals are collegial and low-key relying on persuasion, delegation, and their ability to select and develop strong faculty members. (pp. 80-81)

What is interesting to note, however, is that in spite of the fact that the three principals employed different leadership styles, they all demonstrated practices that were characteristic of transformational leaders.

A second notion about leadership emerged from this study that went beyond previous knowledge about transformational school leadership. The importance of the leader's traits and capacities was illuminated. The trait approach, which dominated the study of leadership until the 1950s (Stogdill, 1948) concluded that this approach by itself yielded negligible and confusing
results. Immegart's review in 1988, however, acknowledged the influence of both traits and situations. More recently, Fullan (with Stiegelbauer, 1991) stated,

The elaboration of the importance and the complementarity of leadership and management functions helps us interpret the most recent findings that principals with very different personalities can be equally effective. (pp. 158-159)

Similar results were provided by Smith and Andrews' (1989) study of seven effective principals. They found that some of the leaders were strong, aggressive, fearless, while others were quiet, nurturing, and supportive. All of their leaders paid attention to four task areas: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, visible presence. Nevertheless, they did it in different ways depending on their personality and the situation.

Each of the principals in my study had different "styles" of leadership and they also possessed unique combinations of traits. Principal 1, for example, was very calm, low key, and relaxed. Teachers said that "if you get the impression it can be handled through calmness, it does affect your staff." In fact, they felt principal 1's relaxed manner impacted on the school's culture. Principal 3 was also characterized as quiet, laid back, but a little on the stubborn side, "like a bull dog." Teachers in his school felt that his "laid back manner" affected their school's culture. Participants in school 2 depicted their principal as effervescent, flamboyant; she exuded energy and was extremely extroverted. They observed, "How your administration is, is the key to how the school works and how people work with that." A member of the focus group commented, "I see our school as being a collaborative school," and this teacher felt that it was the principal's demeanor which encouraged collaboration among staff. Teachers in school 2 maintained that their principal's "enthusiasm is contagious" and, as a result, people got involved and excited about new initiatives. In fact, they attributed much of their learning to her enthusiasm for learning. Teacher 8, for example commented, "She always talks about how great these things are and basically when she
tells you about all these things, you want to go out and find out for yourself and do it.”

Of all the traits and capacities that were discussed by participants, the ability to listen carefully to people was a capacity common to all three leaders. Teachers cited this capacity as one which influenced their cultures and their ability to learn. For example, principal 1 listened to his staff and realized that they were “whipped” at the end of the day. So, instead of loading them down with several new initiatives, he had them focus on one or two initiatives over two or three years. As a result, they had the time, and energy, to implement initiatives that were important to the whole school. In school 2, teachers stated, “She [principal] listens to your ideas ... [She is] really keen and encourages you to try new things and is there to help you implement it, or just bounce ideas off.” Thus, besides exemplifying the dimensions of a transformational leader, these principals possessed the invaluable capacity of listening to people, and this capacity appeared to have an affect on their schools’ cultures and their organizational learning capacities.

This research draws attention to the importance of organizational learning in a school setting, yet limited inquiry has been conducted on this topic. One study, completed by Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993), investigated the impact of organizational learning on a school involved in restructuring. These researchers claimed that OL was key to the school’s success. Louis (1994) undertook an examination of two schools engaged in organizational learning. Her study contended that OL had implications for practice and restructuring. Findings from my study support these researchers’ views as OL was found to impact on school restructuring. However, OL alone did not facilitate change. Both transformational leadership practices and the schools’ collaborative cultures influenced the learning that occurred in all three schools.

Another study on organizational learning was conducted by Mitchell (1995). Teachers’ learning processes were examined in an attempt to improve their pedagogical practices. She viewed
OL as a conscious, reflective approach to practice. My study also identified a change in teaching practices, for individuals and the group, as an outcome of OL. Teachers in all three schools reported an increased understanding in the use of cooperative learning strategies. Some teachers claimed that as their skill level increased in this particular instructional strategy, their mode of instruction changed. That is, they moved from a totally Socratic form of teaching to incorporating cooperative learning structures into their daily lessons. Thus, this research supports Mitchell's claim that OL may influence teachers' practices.

In 1995, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach reported the following outcomes of OL: new practices, understanding, commitment, and skills. My study was in keeping with these researchers' results in that all of the schools identified three of the afore mentioned outcomes. Commitment was not discussed. It is interesting to note that the outcomes that were identified by Leithwood et al. were considered to be outcomes for teachers. In addition to identifying outcomes for teachers, school 2, which had the most internal coherence, cited increased understanding for students and increased understanding for the community as outcomes of the learning that had occurred in their school. Specifically, students learned how to resolve their disputes using the "Bridge of Conflict" and parents gained a better understanding of how to improve their children's literacy skills. School 2 was also the school whose culture extended into the community which compels one to notice the correlation between inclusive collaborative cultures and organizational learning outcomes.

In this study's investigation of organizational learning, processes, organizational structures, stimuli for learning, and barriers to learning were identified. Processes which were viewed to impact on OL were: whole staff problem solving, attending workshops with a partner, working/planning with a partner or with a division, a "Train the Trainer" model of staff development, as well as using staff meetings, small group discussions, professional development days, division meetings, and
shared preparation time for learning opportunities. Structures which were seen as influencing OL were: School Growth Team, professional activity days, common preparation time, division meetings, staff meetings, and regularly scheduled staff development time. Teachers identified five stimuli for learning. These included: issues of change, personal preference, the presence of teacher candidates in their rooms, the collaborative performance model of appraisal, and professional development.

Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) state that “culture can often be used to predict the actions of organizational members, as well as the nature and amount of organizational learning,” (p. 60). Nevertheless, they claim that three features of school cultures challenge the possibilities for OL. First is a norm of equality, autonomy, and isolation (Fieman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Teachers used to working in isolation may find it difficult to collaborate with other colleagues. Second, a “practicality ethic” may exist in many schools. According to Leithwood et al., “This is a strongly held value for consideration of ‘how to’ questions at the expense of either tolerance or energy for ‘what’ or ‘why’ questions,” (1993, p. 61). Teachers are busy people who may not have the time, nor the inclination, to deal with questions surrounding school restructuring. As a result, individuals and the organization are often limited to single-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978). The final cultural concern has to do with the tradition of oral, non-written communication. By not recording their practices, teachers erode their opportunities to reflect and learn from each other. Journals and video recordings of teaching practices provide an organizational memory of what the school is doing.

Some of the challenges identified by Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1993) were found to be barriers to OL in this study. For example, in school 1, a teacher talked about being isolated and not having anyone with whom she could plan. Although many teachers, in all of the
schools, said they “found” or “would make” time to collaborate, some cited time as a barrier to collaboration and to OL. A few teachers in schools 1 and 2 talked about being stressed with family commitments and the pressures of the job. They claimed that stress and pressure were inhibitors to OL. For the most part, teachers were not involved in recording their practices. An exception, however, was a teacher in school 1 who had an on-going journal exchange with the principal which was part of her collaborative performance appraisal. On the other hand, the learning that occurred in the three schools was not limited to single-loop learning. Examples of both double and single-loop learning were evident in each of the schools as they attempted to find more efficient ways of achieving their goals.

Findings from this study confirm that leadership, which is transformational, and cultures, which are collaborative in form, impact on organizational learning. While the results of the study make new contributions regarding culture and leadership, much of what I learned about OL is similar to what we know from previous research. For example, a stimulus is required to spark OL. Factors shaping organizational learning conditions (i.e., a district’s vision) may have an indirect affect on OL, while conditions which directly affect organizational learning are the vision, structure, culture, strategy, and policies/resources. Outcomes of OL include increased understandings, increased skills, increased commitment, and new practices for both the individual and the organization.

This research adds to the body of knowledge that presently exists on OL by disputing the notion that just one variable can be considered a “key” to change. Instead, my data support those advocating a systemic approach to change. As Land and Jarman (1992, p. 104) state:

Everything and everybody is connected. Everything affects everything else. No matter how different, no matter how far away, we are all part of an interconnected whole ... the fact is that no real division can be found between ourselves, other people, and the world around us - unless we create it in our minds (their emphasis).
Hutchins contends that a system's perspective helps to explain organizational change. He states:

Whether we consider a particular change at the upper system level to be the result of evolution 'adaptation' or the result of design depends on what we believe about the scope of the awareness of the subsystems. If we think that some of the subsystems have global awareness, and can represent and anticipate the consequences of possible changes, then we may view an organizational change as a result of design. If we believe that the subsystems do not form and manipulate representations of system operation, then we must view change as evolutionary (1991, p. 38).

Sizer (1991), in referring to changes that were made in the Coalition of Essential Schools, states:

In a school, everything important touches everything else of importance. Change one consequential aspect of that school and all others will be affected ... We are stuck with a school reform game in which any change affects all, where everyone must change if anything is to change. (p. 32)

Results from my data indicate that organizational learning is unlikely to happen in the absence of a collaborative organizational culture, and a leader who supports teachers and provides them with resources and intellectual stimulation. Coherence, or synergy, among culture, leadership, and OL in the three schools seemed to account for their progress in implementing change.

**Implications for Theory and Research**

Results of my study suggest at least four sets of directions for future research and theory. These directions are in the areas of: organizational culture, leadership practices, organizational learning, and systemic approaches to change. First, understanding organizational culture is a tricky business. Nevertheless, progress has been made in this area by some researchers (i.e., Little, 1982; Smircich, 1983; Schein, 1985; Patterson, Purkey, and Parker, 1986; Nias et al., 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989; Deal and Peterson, 1990; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1993). The findings in my study are in line with these researchers' work; however, two components of organizational culture require further investigation. First, does size of school impact
on the degree of collaboration that occurs in schools? Nias found that collaborative cultures existed in the five primary schools that she investigated. Each of the schools had up to 12 teachers working in them. Similarly, in my research, school 2 appeared to have the most collaborative culture and it was the smallest school in the study. School 3, the largest school, had 53% of all responses describing the culture as collaborative and 22% depicting it as other (i.e., balkanized).

Another implication for research on organizational culture has to do with the various levels of collaboration. Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) have warned us about two forms of collaborative cultures, balkanized and comfortable. Yet, should these two types of collaboration be viewed from a negative perspective? Teachers need to begin somewhere in their move from working in isolated egg crate classrooms (Lortie, 1975) to planning collaboratively with others. Perhaps educators should begin this process by working cooperatively with a grade partner, or with other colleagues in their division. Then, once their interpersonal and collaborative skills have reached a level where they feel at ease working with larger numbers of people, then they may move to a higher level of collaboration. If this is the case, perhaps these two forms of collaboration are not as fearsome as we have been led to believe. Thus, an exploration of how teachers learn to collaborate would shed light on this aspect of organizational culture.

A second area which requires further investigation is that of leadership practices. In addition to the dimensions of transformational leadership identified by Leithwood (1994), it appeared that leaders’ traits and capacities and administrative practices (i.e., discipline, budget, communicating with parents) were two additional dimensions which would be useful foci for subsequent research. Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1994) suggest that it would be “worthwhile to investigate also the role that personality characteristics in general (for both men and women) play in socialization,” (p. 165).
Third, organizational learning may be a mediator in the change process, but few empirical studies exist which link OL to school change. The application of OL concepts ought to be extended in subsequent studies of schools as organizations. For example, research has not focussed specifically on stimuli for learning. Participants in my research cited: personal preference, issues of change, opportunities for professional development, university teacher candidates, and a collaborative performance appraisal as stimuli for learning. However, if the latter three stimuli lead to individual or collective learning, then these areas require further investigation.

Fourth, the notion that either culture, or leadership, or organizational learning may be the “key” to organizational change has been challenged by this study. Instead, a systemic approach to change where coherence exists among these variables seems a better explanation for the progress being made in three schools. We cannot be sure that the concept of system is limited to these variables, so future research should investigate other variables, as well as combinations of additional variables, in order to determine what a coherent approach to educational change means.

**Implications for Practice**

By carefully analyzing what three successful schools did to implement change, the following recommendations are made for schools actively involved in change initiatives. First, leaders should try to foster collaborative cultures. They may do this through several of the dimensions attributed to transformational leadership. By employing structures and decision making processes (i.e., single issue meetings), the principal can draw upon the expertise of members of a School Growth Team, or a similar structure (i.e., chair people, department heads, task forces) to assist with decision making and the implementation of initiatives. Common preparation periods and regularly scheduled professional development times are two structures that principals may put in place to foster
collaboration among teachers. The leader may also build a strong, collaborative culture by ensuring that cultural conditions conducive to collaboration are encouraged. These conditions include: mutual support among colleagues, sharing of ideas and resources, risk taking, working/planning together, professional development, and putting students first. Further, leaders need to develop a shared vision, or work with one that is already in place. Modelling what is valued in the school is another way that administrators get the message across to students, staff, and the community about what is important in the school. By supporting teachers, both personally and professionally, the principal can set a tone for mutual support among colleagues. Furthermore, listening carefully to staff enables the principal to know what kind of support is needed to accomplish individual and school goals.

Second, leaders of today and tomorrow must move beyond managerial and instructional leadership to become transformational leaders. Granted, principals must deal with the day-to-day administrative tasks. But, the more a principal embodies the characteristics of a transformational leader, the more impact he or she may have on culture and organizational learning. Thus, leaders ought to be trained in this form of leadership. In addition, leaders need to remind themselves of the importance of listening carefully to people.

Third, if organizational learning is to transpire in a school, certain conditions must be in place. For example, administrators and teachers need a shared vision. The school’s culture must be collaborative and include the above mentioned conditions. Strategies which emphasize innovation and an entrepreneurial spirit are essential, as are decentralized structures (i.e., school growth teams, committees). The leader has to endorse learning by providing staff with support, intellectual stimulation, and resources (i.e., money, time, professional development opportunities). Organizational learning may be stimulated by change initiatives, professional development
opportunities, collaborative performance appraisals, and teacher candidates. Thus, all of these stimuli ought to be available to teachers. Barriers which prevent collaboration and OL should be eliminated. In my research, teachers identified isolation as a barrier to collaboration, so administrators must try to ensure that teachers have a teaching partner or partners with whom they can plan. Further, teachers mentioned pressure and stress as barriers to organizational learning. Principals need to be aware of the pressures facing teachers and try not to add to their tension. This may be done through creative scheduling where teachers would be provided with time to work with colleagues. Administrators can also relieve stress by acting as a gatekeeper and by ensuring that staff do not take on too many new initiatives which could add to their stress level.

Fourth, in order for organizational learning to occur, teachers need to be motivated. Results from my study illustrate the importance of professional development as a stimulus for learning. Yet, we are in an era of cut-backs. The Ministry of Education and boards of education must realize the importance of staff development. It is essential that professional development opportunities be made available to teachers and administrators alike. In addition, funding is required so that educators can take advantage of growth opportunities.

Fifth, participants cited their board’s collaborative performance appraisal as a stimulus for learning. The process, in brief, requires teachers, at the beginning of a school year, to set goals for growth. Teachers then work with a cohort group, and an administrator, to further their understanding in a particular area (i.e., classroom management, incorporating technology in their curriculum, portfolio assessment). This is done through an action plan which is carried out over the year. At the end of the year, the teacher writes an account of what she has accomplished and explains what she has learned. The administrator also writes a description of the specific learning outcomes that the teacher has achieved. Although participants in all three schools commented on
this form of appraisal, only some of the schools in their board employ this form of evaluation. Therefore, if this type of performance appraisal can stimulate individual and collective learning (through the cohort group), then perhaps its use ought to be adopted by more schools within the board, and, in fact, by other boards of education.

Sixth, teacher candidates were also cited as a stimulus for learning. By having experienced teachers share their expertise with teacher candidates, and by having teacher candidates share their new ideas from the faculties of education, learning occurred for both educators. A recommendation, therefore, would be to provide all teachers, from time to time, with the opportunity to have a teacher candidate.

Seventh, educators are constantly having to respond to change initiatives. Yet, what training, or support, have they received to help them cope with the myriad of change forces which face them year after year? Administrators, and teachers, need to understand such concepts as organizational learning, transformational leadership, and collaborative culture so that these in-school variables may work to their school’s advantage.

Building effective schools is an evolutionary process. Relying on one component of the organization to facilitate change is unreasonable. Trying to achieve internal coherence by having salient components working in unison appears to be a more realistic approach to organizational change. This is the challenge for educators of today and tomorrow.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Alternative Forms of Organizational Learning

Huber’s (1991) first form of organizational learning is congenital. Congenital learning is “a combination of knowledge inherited at its [organization’s] conception and the additional knowledge acquired prior to its birth,” (p. 128). This type of learning is applicable to new organizations. The founder will have a major influence on the organization (Schein, 1985) as he or she calls on vicarious learning, grafting, or searching in order to learn for the new organization. Knowledge about the organization’s initial environment and the founder’s intentions must be made known to new members. What the organization comprehends at its inception will impact on “what it searches for, what it experiences, and how it interprets what it encounters,” (Huber, 1996, p. 128).

Congenital and experiential learning (explained in Chapter Two) are processes where the experience leading to learning was first hand. The following two processes explain how organizations acquire knowledge through second-hand experiences. Vicarious learning occurs when organizations try to learn about other organizations’ strategies and practices. Eells and Nehemiks (1984) contend that borrowing ideas from other organizations is one form of organizational learning; however, Mahajan, Sharma, and Bettis (1988) suggest that imitation or mimicry may be a limited form of organizational learning. Some researchers (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1987) support the “Institutional Theory” which maintains that organizations imitate each other because it downplays sanctions from different stakeholders. Other researchers employ the term “Corporate Intelligence” which is “the idea of searching for information about what corporate competitors are doing and how they do it (Fuld, 1988; Gilad & Gilad, 1988; Porter, 1980; Sammon, Kurland, & Spitalnic, 1984),” (Huber, 1996, p. 135). Huber explains that information about one’s competitors
may be easily obtained through “consultants, professional meetings, trade shows, publications, vendors and suppliers and, in less competitive environments, networks of professionals,” (p. 135).

Grafting is another way that organizations obtain information from second-hand experiences. In this case, organizations “increase their store of knowledge by acquiring and grafting on new members who possess knowledge not previously available within the organization,” (Huber, 1996, p. 136). Simon discusses this type of learning. He states:

All learning takes place inside the individual human heads; organizations learn in two ways: (a) by the learning of its members, or (b) by ingesting new members who have knowledge the organization didn’t previously have (1996, p. 176).

Although there are more than two ways that organizations learn, Huber expects that “as the rate at which organizations must assimilate new knowledge continues to increase (Drucker, 1988; Huber, 1984), grafting will become a more frequently used approach for organizations to acquire quickly knowledge that is new to them,” (p. 136).

The final of the five knowledge acquisition processes is learning by searching or noticing. According to Huber (1996), information acquired through search may occur in any of the following three forms: scanning, focussed search, and performance monitoring. “Scanning refers to the relatively wide-ranging sensing of the organization’s external environment,” (p. 137). Scanning in an organization may view a department as the unit of analysis (referred to as “macro” scanning), or the individual could be the unit of analysis (“micro” scanning). There is an assumption that “scanning contributes to performance,” (p. 137). Watkins and Marsick (1993) contend:

Organizational learning is enhanced by individual learning, but it goes way beyond that to systems in place for scanning the environment and using information to make better decisions, regardless of its source. What is learned impacts on the organization as a whole. (p. 156)

Huber clarifies what is meant by focussed search. He says it “occurs when organizational members or units actively search in a narrow segment of the organizations’s internal or external
environment, often in response to actual or suspected problems or opportunities,” (1996, p. 137).

A focussed search is usually conducted only if the organization has received loud signals from multiple sources that there is a need for the search. According to the literature, searches are initiated “when (1) a problem is recognized and (2) some heuristic assessment of the costs, benefits, and probabilities involved suggests that a search-justifying threshold value has been reached or exceeded,” (pp. 138-139).

Finally, Huber explains that the most extensive form of organizational search is performance monitoring. “Performance monitoring is used to mean both focussed and wide-ranging sensing of the organization’s effectiveness in fulfilling its own pre-established goals or the requirements of stake-holders,” (p. 137). With the accountability movement that education is presently facing, performance monitoring will become pervasive in our schools.

Dimensions of Leadership

Leithwood and Duke (in press) discuss six different models or dimensions of leadership. The first approach is instructional leadership which “typically focuses on the behaviours of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students,” (p. 5). Since few researchers have explicitly described instructional leadership (Foster, 1989), it is hard to say if those writing about it mean the same thing. For example, Geltner and Shelton (1991) employ the term “strategic instructional leadership”; Stalhammar (1994) uses the term “pedagogical leadership”; Kleine-Kracht (1993) comments on “direct” and “indirect” instructional leadership. Others, such as Duke (1987), Smith and Andrews (1989), and Hallinger and associates (1985; 1990) describe the instructional leadership approach along multiple dimensions. They include a number of specific leadership practices as well as their effect on outcomes. Hallinger and colleagues (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985;
Hallinger & McCary, 1990) have a model which comprises three categories of leadership practice: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program; and promoting school culture. Leithwood and Duke (in press) view this conception of instructional leadership as “the most fully tested of these models” and they note that “considerable empirical evidence has accumulated in support of the contribution these leadership practices and functions make to student achievement and other types of outcomes (see Sheppard, 1996, for a review of this evidence),” (p. 5).

The second approach to leadership is transformational. Leithwood and Duke (in press) include in this category articles about charismatic, visionary, cultural, and empowering concepts of leadership. The main focus of this category is “the commitment and capacities of organizational members,” (p. 7). Bennis and Nanus (1985, p. 217), define transformational leadership as:

.... collective, there is a symbolic relationship between leaders and followers and what makes it collective is the subtle interplay between the followers’ needs and wants and the leader’s capacity to understand ... these collective aspirations.

Transformational leadership was initially mentioned in Downton’s (1973) sociological treatise, Rebel Leadership, and then again in Burn’s seminal piece. Burns (1978) suggests that transformational leaders identify potential motives in followers, attempt to satisfy their higher needs, and involve the follower in decision making. The result is a mutually positive relationship that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. Kowalski and Oates (1993) support Burns’ notion that transformational leadership represents a complementary experience for both leader and followers.

In 1985, Bass presented the first formal theory of transformational leadership. Bass, Avolio and associates (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1989, 1994; Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb, 1987) went on to refine the model. Their model suggests that leaders behave in certain ways to achieve exceptional results by utilizing one or more of the “Four I’s”: idealized influence,
Leithwood (1994) views transformational leadership in a different light. He provides evidence to suggest that schools are unique organizations, and therefore, “the base of leadership in schools may not be transactional leadership but individual consideration,” (p. 20). Individual consideration on its own will not produce a great deal of change. But with “trust, loyalty and sense of affiliation produced by these softer (Regan, 1990), more considerative [sic] (Blase, 1989) aspects of leadership,” (p. 20), transformational initiatives may be extremely successful.

Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) identify the dimensions of transformational leadership as: identifying and articulating a vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, providing an appropriate model, and having high performance expectations (p. 318). Hipp and Bredeson (1995), in examining the relationship between leadership behaviours and teacher efficacy, condense the factors to five. Gronn (1996) notes the relationship between transformational and charismatic leadership, and at the same time mentions that some conceptions of transformational leadership omit the notion of charisma. Leithwood (1994) went on to develop a superordinate classification of the above mentioned dimensions of transformational leadership. The six original components have been subsumed into four leadership dimensions: purposes, people, structures, and culture (p. 14). He explains:

"Within each of these dimensions, a number of dimensions earlier treated in an independent fashion have been subsumed. So, for example, the dimension purposes encompasses: developing a widely shared vision for the school; building consensus about school goals and priorities; and holding high performance expectations. (pp. 14-15)

The dimension of people includes providing individualized support, intellectual stimulation, and modelling. Structure is a new dimension that "has not been used as an independent dimension of
transformational leadership by us or others in the past, and encompasses issues around decision making,” (p. 15). The final dimension, *culture*, is “adopted from our own previous revisions to conventional transformational leadership theory (Leithwood, 1993) and extends some of the practices found in our earlier work associated with this dimension,” (p. 15).

Moral leadership is the third category of leadership and it includes normative, political/democratic, and symbolic concepts of leadership. According to Duke, the 1990s have seen the normative dimension of leadership as one of the fastest growing areas of leadership study (1996). Authors, such as Bates (1993), Evers and Lakomski (1991), Greenfield (1991), and Hodgkinson (1991) contend that values play an important role in administration. Thus, the central focus of moral leadership is on “the values and ethics of the leader,” (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 11).

Several different perspectives to moral leadership exist. Duignan and MacPherson (1993), for example, assert that “educative leadership” should be about what is right and wrong (p. 10). Greenfield (1995) identifies five “role demands” or “situational imperatives” for leadership. These include: moral, instructional, political, managerial, and social/interpersonal. Arguing that cultural leadership involves defining, strengthening, and articulating values, Reitzug and Reeves (1992) provide a caveat that culture should not be used by leaders to their own advantage. Lees contends that leaders have a moral duty, in a democratic society, to “promote democracy, empowerment, and social justice,” (1995, p. 225). Hodgkinson (1991), in an attempt to understand how leaders make decisions in value conflict situations, employs an “analytic model of the value concept.” The model includes three sets of values. The “Subrational” is based on preference, feelings, emotions. The “Rational” set has leaders making decisions based on consensus of stakeholders, or on the consequences of the decisions being made. No specific set of values exists for the “Transrational”
category. Instead, Hodgkinson views such values as being grounded in the metaphysical; they are principles which "take the form of ethical codes, injunctions or commandments ... their common feature is that they are unverifiable by the techniques of science and cannot be justified by merely logical argument," (p. 99).

Evers and Lakomski (1991) claim that "the basic normative framework for educational administrators is provided by the general requirement that decision and action should be, in the long term, educative; that growth of knowledge be promoted," (p. 186). Thus, they support leadership which encourages organizational learning.

Another perspective on leaders' values has a political slant. Besides sets of values, "this aspect of moral leadership focuses on the nature of the relationships among those within the organization, and the distribution of power between stakeholders both inside and outside the organization," (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 13). This position assumes that organizations have specific power relationships, modes of communication, and policies and procedures which help achieve the organization's goals. The informal organization, on the other hand, may have a "more authentic explanation for organizational activity," (p. 13).

The "symbolic", "democratic", or "political" forms of leadership could be located in either the moral or participative categories of leadership because the main argument for participation is rationalized by democratic theory. Slater (1994), for example, contends that democracies value freedom and often they oppose authority figures. In some situations, when decisions are made, the "majority rules" and the majority opinion, in very large groups, "tends to be the lowest common denominator," (p. 98). This opinion needs to be corrected by the leader whose job is to "help restore meaning and common purpose to daily life," (p. 99). Yet the principal walks a fine line as he or she administers the school in a manner which will encourage public participation, but not upset
democratic principles.

Participative leadership is the fourth type of leadership. This form was adopted from Yukl’s (1994) description which includes notions of “group”, “shared”, and “teacher” leadership. This type of leadership “stresses the decision-making processes of the group,” (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 14). One perspective on this view of leadership contends that participation enhances organizational effectiveness. Hayes’ (1995), for example, discusses the leader’s success in implementing a government-driven change agenda. This was achieved by creating mutually advantageous relationships among stakeholders. Other researchers, Johnston and Pickersgill (1992) and Vandenberghe (1992), maintain that shared or team leadership is the best way to meet the demands of change that are placed on today’s principals. Adopting a similar viewpoint, Hallinger (1992) and Murphy and Hallinger (1992) contend that leaders will have to engage in more participatory forms of leadership where they consult with teachers and parents in decision making.

The second perspective on participative leadership emerges from the idea of site-based management (SBM). Murphy and Beck (1995) identify three forms of SBM: administrative controlled SBM, professional controlled SBM, and community controlled SBM. Administrative controlled SBM gives principals more authority over budget, personnel, and curriculum. The hope is that by providing leaders with such authority, they will make good use of resources, provide better service for students, and be more accountable to the board office. Teacher controlled SBM contends that teachers have relevant knowledge that should be put to good use when making decisions regarding budget, curriculum and, sometimes, personnel. The thought is that if teachers are involved in decision making, then they will be more likely to implement the decisions that have been made and this will lead to greater efficiency, effectiveness, and better outcomes (Clune & White, 1988; David, 1989; Mojkowski & Fleming, 1988). Community controlled SBM assumes
that the school's curriculum ought to reflect the values of the parents and local community (Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992). If curriculum, budget, and personnel decisions are made by the community, the feeling is that school staff will be more responsive to the community's decisions.

Managerial leadership is the fifth form of leadership identified by Leithwood and Duke (in press). Incorporated in this concept are "organizational" and "transactional" leadership. The main focus of managerial leadership is "on functions, tasks or behaviours and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated," (in press, p. 17). This type of leadership assumes, for the most part, that members in the organization behave in a rational manner.

Many of the recent articles on managerial leadership suggest that it be replaced by, or enhanced by other forms of leadership in order to deal with the change agenda that faces leaders today (e.g., Cusack, 1993; Hallinger, 1992). Other articles debate the difference between leadership and management (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Yet other articles treat leadership and management as two separate, competing concepts (e.g., Achilles, 1992; Atkinson & Wilmore, 1993; Bolman & Deal, 1992; 1994; Reilly, 1993; Whitaker et al., 1991). On the other hand, Leithwood (1994) and Reitzug and Reeves (1992) view leadership and management as complimentary concepts. Their stance is supported by those who maintain that principals often influence others simply by dealing with ordinary, day-to-day situations (e.g., Kmetz & Willower, 1982; Harvey, 1986; Davies, 1987).

According to Rossmiller (1992), management, when referred to as a form of leadership, refers to two main functions. First, the leader buffers the school's technical core (curriculum and instruction) from distractions and interruptions. Second, the principal is responsible for smoothing "input or output transitions [e.g., organizing support groups for students experiencing stress]," (p. 143). Myers and Murphy (1995) identify six "organizational control" mechanisms: supervision,
input controls (i.e., teacher transfers), behaviour controls (i.e., job descriptions), output controls (student testing), selection/socialization, and environmental controls (community responsiveness). Duke and Leithwood (1994), in reviewing five different approaches to leadership, identify ten sets of managerial tasks. They identify: providing adequate financial and material resources, distributing financial and material resources so they are most useful, anticipating predictable problems and developing effective and efficient means for responding to them, managing the school facility, managing the student body, maintaining effective communication patterns with staff, students, community members and district office staff, accommodating policies and initiatives undertaken by district office in ways that assist with school improvement goals, buffering staff so as to reduce disruptions to the instruction program, mediating conflict and differences in expectations, attending to the political demands of school functioning. Although these tasks need to be attended to, Deal and Peterson (1994) recommend that leaders go beyond the traditional meaning of management and adopt a “bifocal” perspective while completing their tasks.

The final category is contingent leadership. Subsumed in this category are: “styles”, “problem solving”, “reflective”, and “craft” concepts of leadership. This type of leadership focusses on “how leaders respond to the unique organizational circumstances of problems which they face as a consequence, for example, of the nature and preferences of co-workers, conditions of work, and tasks to be undertaken,” (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 20). This approach to leadership assumes that a leader will be successful if he or she recognizes that different contexts exist and each context may require a distinct response. Both “styles” and “problem solving” orientations to contingent leadership share this assumption. However, they are dissimilar in other ways. For example, leadership styles research tries to determine specific patterns of leadership practice. Early work in this area, conducted by Blake and Mouton (1964) and Hersey and Blanchard (1988), led
to the use of Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire. Other researchers have identified the following distinct dimensions of leadership style: "task vs. relationships (Heller, Clay & Perkins, 1993); managerial vs. visionary (Lesourd, Tracz & Grady, 1992); initiating structure vs. consideration; autocratic vs. facilitative (Cheng, 1991; Fenech, 1994; Hoy & Brown, 1988; Johnston, 1986; Uwazurike, 1991); male vs. female (Coleman, 1966)," (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 21).

The problem solving orientation to leadership consists of two types, one which stresses principals' internal processes (without modelling these processes) and one which employs cognitive science models of such processes. The first orientation, supported by Sergiovanni (1989), Battersby (1987), and Clark (1988), uses Schön's (1983) notion of reflective practice to examine whether principals employ scientific theory in their decision making. Bredeson (1988) supports the idea of administrators using metaphors to encourage problem solving, while Willower (1994) advocates Dewey’s (1933) method of inquiry as a model to develop administrators’ reflective practices. Leithwood and Hallinger (1993) and Leithwood (1995) champion the cognitive perspective on leadership and explain what that entails. Allison and Allison (1993) examine the difference between beginning and experienced principals as they compare their knowledge structures. Allison (1996) also investigates cognitive processes connected with problem interpretation and how that can be applied to administrators’ thinking processes. Leithwood, Steinbach, and Raun (1993) explain superintendents’ problem solving processes “within a framework which attends to those cognitive processes entailed in problem interpretation, goal setting, anticipating constraints, the use of personal values and principles (see also Moorhead & Nediger, 1991), solution processes, and mood or affect,” (Leithwood and Duke, in press, p. 22). Building on this framework, Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) provide extensive research results on the nature of expert principals' problem
solving processes and their impact on administrative practice.

Alternative Perspectives on Organizational Culture

The influence of anthropology on organizational culture.

One school of thought in anthropology considers a group, or society, as a whole (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952; Malinowski, 1948). People holding this point of view investigate beliefs, practices, and other cultural components to see how the group's social structure functions. Benedict (1934) and Mead (1962) examined groups, or societies as a whole, but they tended to describe society as a big, complex personality. This position implied that culture "selects" a set of behavioural patterns for the group's members to follow. Contemporary work which portrayed culture as patterns of assumptions within an organization (Dyer, 1982) followed this anthropological stance.

A second school of thought may be seen in the work of Geertz (1973). His approach has been referred to as "semitic" for he tries to discover the "native's point of view" by focussing on language and symbols. Geertz notes that:

... the whole point of a semiotic approach to culture is to aid us in gaining access to the conceptual world in which our subjects live so that we can, in some extended sense of the term, converse with them (1973, p. 24).

This may be accomplished if one immerses himself in the symbols the people use to bring meaning to their world. Van Maanen (1977), Morgan (1986), and Smircich (1983) were all affected by the semiotic approach.

Goodenough (1971) developed an approach to culture that has been labelled "ethnoscience", "componential analysis", or "cognitive anthropology". Although the goal was similar to what Geertz was trying to achieve, the methodology differed. Culture, for ethnoscientists, is a system of rules for understanding, believing, and acting that must be in place so that people will behave in
a way that is acceptable to the rest of the members of that culture. In order to describe the culture, then, one must discover and write out the rules that govern the members of the culture.

For anthropologists, culture includes: the language, rituals, and social structures of people, and these components take years and years to develop. The dimensions of culture are seen by anthropologists as solutions to a group’s survival or to their social life. On the other hand, students of organizational culture view culture as a tool that can be manipulated by leaders to shape the behaviour of the organization’s members.

The influence of sociology on organizational culture.

Durkheim’s (1893) work had a tremendous affect on the study of organizational culture. He suggested that simple, symbolic representations of social reality are basic to a group’s life, and symbolic structures may be understood by studying the myths and rituals of the people. He also made the distinction between the explicit and implicit features of social life. This fascination with the subjective and objective components of organizational life has been a major theme in the sociology of organizations, and it has also become a salient feature of organizational culture.

In 1938, Chester Barnard wrote *The Functions of the Executive*. He noted the ambiguity of organizational life and suggested that the executive ought to be responsible for bringing order and meaning to corporate life.

In 1947, Simon initiated the discussion of rational versus nonrational organizations. He contended that behaviour, that may appear to go against organizational goals, is actually quite rational. He stated that people have limited information-processing abilities. Their short term memory allows them to process five to seven bits of information at one time. Because each person’s processing powers are restricted, individuals often lack an understanding of the bigger
picture. He suggested that "two or more heads are better than one" in order to overcome "bounded rationality", the expression he coined to express "the ability of human beings to adapt optimally, or even satisfactorily, to complex environments," (1996, p. 186).

During the 1950s and 1960s, organizational sociologists investigated how informal relationships and beliefs affected the bureaucratic system that dictated organizational life. Their disposition had been influenced by Weber (1947) who trusted the rationality of organizations:

> Experience tends universally to show that the purely bureaucratic type of administration is, from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of exercising authority over human beings. It is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability ... The choice is only between bureaucracy and dilettantism in the field of administration. (p. 223)

Although much of the research done during these years was quantitative in nature, qualitative social scientists were still on the scene. The ethnographic method of research was also developed at this time. It began by examining the sociology of occupations (see, for example, the work of Becker & Caper, 1956; Roy, 1960).

In 1972, Cohen, March, and Olsen stated that the idea of bounded rationality was unable to capture the unstable rational properties of school systems. They described these systems as "organized anarchies". Since the paradigm of formal organizational structure was no longer able to explain organizations such as schools, hospitals, and modern Japanese corporations, a new paradigm was required. Imershein and Liebert (1977) recommended that the notion of a scientific paradigm be applied to the organization instead of to the profession as the unit of study. This formulated the idea of an organizational paradigm. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) solidified this idea by describing how the processes found in occupational socialization could also work in organizations. Pfeffer (1981) expanded on the notion of an organizational paradigm and included
the idea of studying management as symbolic action.

The influence of social psychology on organizational culture.

The field of social psychology has influenced organizational culture by noting the nonrational features of individual behaviour. Social psychologists also studied organizational climate (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964). Some scholars of culture, however, do not consider studies of climate relevant to studies of culture, even though several of the underlying themes may be similar.
APPENDIX B
Introductory Letter to Principals with Consent Form

January 1997

Dear Principal:
I have been granted permission by The Board of Education's Research Department to conduct a research project on organizational learning. I am interested in doing research in your school, provided the school meets the following criteria:

i. The school must be "on its way" in implementing a new initiative (i.e., a new instructional strategy).
ii. The school must have a School Growth Team in place that has worked with the principal in helping staff implement a new initiative.
iii. The School Growth Team must have been in place for a minimum of three years.
iv. The principal must have been in the school for at least three years.

Steps involved in the research include a “Focus Group” interview with all of the members of the School Growth Team. I would meet with them for a joint interview that would last approximately an hour and a half. I would then need to interview three members of the School Growth Team, five staff members not on the School Growth Team, and you, the principal. Individual interviews would last 40 - 60 minutes.

All data gathered during this research will be treated confidentially. The identity of the school, and the identity of participants will be kept anonymous. Once the project is completed, all interviewees will receive a summary of the report.

Participation in this project is voluntary and you, and the staff, will be free to withdraw from the study at any time. However, I would like you to consider this opportunity and discuss it with your staff at your earliest convenience.

If you would like to participate in the study, please sign below, and return this form to me by February 7, 1997.

Sincerely yours,

Bonnie Larson-Knight

Yes, the teachers on the School Growth Team, the rest of the staff, and I would be willing to participate in your research project. ______________________________________________________________________(Principal’s Signature)

A new initiative that we are working on is: ____________________________________________

Please return to Bonnie Larson-Knight at Dr. Roberta Bondar P.S. by February 7, 1997.
Introductory Letter to Staff with Consent Form

February 1997

Dear Staff Member:
I have permission from The Board of Education’s Research Department, and your principal, to conduct a research project on organizational learning in your school. I will require assistance from all of the members on the School Growth Team, and from five other staff members.

All members of the School Growth Team will be asked to meet with me for a large group interview called a “Focus Group” interview. This interview will take approximately an hour and a half. On a second occasion, I would like to individually interview three members from the School Growth Team, and five other staff members. I will also be interviewing your principal. Individual interviews will last approximately 40 minutes.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary, and you will be free to withdraw from participation at any time. All data will be treated confidentially. The identity of participants, and the school, will be kept anonymous.

Your principal is supporting this project, and has said that anyone who wishes to participate should feel free to do so.

If you would like to participate in this study, please sign below, and return the form to me at Dr. Roberta Bondar P.S. by February 28.

Sincerely yours,

Bonnie Larson-Knight

Yes, I would be willing to participate in the research project.

Name: ________________________________________________________________

School: ________________________________________________________________

____ I am a member of the School Growth Team and would be willing to participate in a “Focus Group” interview only.

____ I am a member of the School Growth Team and would be willing to participate in the “Focus Group” interview and an individual interview.

____ I am not on the School Growth Team, but would be willing to participate in an individual interview.

Please return to Bonnie Larson-Knight at Dr. Roberta Bondar P.S. by February 28, 1997.
Focus Group Interview Protocol Outline

QUESTION #____:

1

........................................................................................................................................

2

........................................................................................................................................

3

........................................................................................................................................

4

........................................................................................................................................

5

........................................................................................................................................

6

........................................................................................................................................

7

........................................................................................................................................

8

........................................................................................................................................

Additional Comments:
Interview Protocol - for Individuals and Focus Groups

It has been said that the only constant in education today is change. In Ontario we certainly have had our fair share of new initiatives. What I am interested in talking to you about is how your school has initiated changes over the past few years and what accounts for those changes. Therefore, I am interested in what your School Growth Team has done to initiate new changes in your school.

1. Can you tell me about any individual or collective learning that has taken place over the last few years in your school?

2. Who has been responsible for stimulating the professional learning in your school?
   a) Has s/he brought in workshops on certain topics?
   b) Who has provided you with in-service opportunities?

3. Is there anything you think the principal does to facilitate learning among you?
   a) Is there anyone else who has taken a leadership role and facilitated learning?

4. Are there opportunities for you to collaborate with colleagues in your school?
   a) What are the formal and informal contexts in which you and your peers learn together?

5. I would like to know a little bit about the culture of your school. By this I mean the extent to which people have a common view of the school, the way things are done, the way things work. Can you describe the kind of culture that is in place in your school?
   a) Would you describe it as isolated or collaborative? Why?

6. Tell me about the important beliefs people share about how you do things around here.

7. How do you think the culture of your school influences the capacity/opportunity of staff members to learn?

8. What does your principal do that influences school culture?

9. To what extent do staff participate in decision making in this school?
   a) What kinds of issues are dealt with collectively by the staff?
   b) Which issues do not involve staff?
   c) What are the forums for staff participation in decision making? How do they work?
10. Does your school ever engage in goal setting?
   a) How is it done?
   b) What is the impetus for it?
   c) What does your principal do to initiate goal setting?
   d) Once goals are set, how do they influence what your school does?

11. Is there an overall vision for your school? Can you describe it?
   a) Is the vision understood and/or shared by most of the staff?
   b) What is the role played by the principal in developing or communicating the vision?

12. What expectations does your principal have of you?

13. What kinds of behaviours are modelled by your principal? What is important to him/her?

14. Does your principal provide support for you individual, or as a group?
   a) What kind of support?

15. Do you feel that you are provided with intellectual stimulation in this school?
   a) What kind of stimulation?
   b) Who provides it?

NB. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the culture, leadership or learning that goes on in your school?

Additional Questions for the Principals

1. Would you please acquaint me with your school (i.e., how old is it, grades in the school, student population, size of staff, student make-up, SES).

2. How long have you been the principal at this school? How long have you been an administrator?

3. Do you have a vision for the school? If so, how do you articulate the vision to staff/students/community?

4. It has been said that the culture of a school is shaped by the personality and belief system of the leader. How would you describe the culture of the school? What beliefs and values are important to you?
Teacher Profile Form

Please fill in the following information before we begin the interview.

Teacher’s Name: ________________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Number (to be filled in by the researcher): _________________________________

Teacher’s Gender: ______________________________________________________________

Number of Years Teacher has Taught: _____________________________________________

Number of Years Teacher has Taught at this School: ________________________________

Teacher’s Teaching Responsibility: _______________________________________________

Are you a member of the School Growth Team? ____________________________________

If you are a member of the SGT, how many years have you served on it? ______________

When would be a convenient time for your individual interview? Please indicate morning, before school, noon hour, after school (until what time), and preparation times you would be willing to give up for this interview. Please state the day of the cycle, or week, and time of preparation period.

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to be part of this research project. Your support is greatly appreciated!

Bonnie Larson-Knight
Codes Employed for Individual Interviews and Focus Group Interviews

Organizational Learning
OLP Learning Processes - group
OLPI Learning Processes - individual
OLS Learning Structures - group
OLSI Learning Structures - individual

Organizational Learning Outcomes
OUTU Increased Understanding - group (embedded practices)
OUTUI Increased Understanding - individual (increased capacity)
OUTUC Increased Understanding - community
OUTUS Increased Understanding - students
OUTS Increased Skill - group (embedded practices)
OUTSI Increased Skill - individual (increased capacity)
OUTP New Practices - group (systems thinking)
OUTPI New Practices - individual (reflection)

Stimuli which Impact on Organizational Learning
SCC Change Issues (i.e., new curriculum, school need)
SPA Issues Related to Evaluation, Collaborative Performance Appraisals
SPD Professional Development Opportunities
SPP Personal Preference
SU Student Teachers

Barriers to Organizational Learning
BT Time, Energy
BNO Staff Not Open to Change
BPS Pressures, Stress
BI Isolation - teachers wanting to do their own learning
BM Morale

Culture - Form
CFI Form of culture - individualistic, isolated
CFC Form of culture - collaborative (professional - school staff)
CCC Form of culture - collaborative (inclusive - extending to the community)
CFO Form of culture - other (balkanized, contrived collegiality, comfortable)
Culture - Content

CCP Physical plant, location of classrooms
CCNA Mutual support among teachers, mentoring, peer coaching, caring
CCNB Sharing of ideas, resources, expertise
CCNC Collegiality with colleagues, sociable with each other
CCND Importance of professional development or professional growth
CCNE Willingness to experiment, risk take
CCNF Honest feedback to colleagues
CCNG Colleagues make or find time to work/plan together
CCNH Humour, laughing, joking together
CCNJ Importance of reflection
CCNK Celebrate each other's successes
CCVP Pride in profession
CCVR Respect for colleagues and/or students
CCVT Trust one another
CCA All students are valued, commitment to helping students, students come first
CCVO Other

Leadership - Purpose

LV Leader provides a vision/mission, communicates the vision to others
LE Leader holds high expectations
LG Leader builds consensus about school goals (shared planning process)

Leadership - People

LI Leader provides intellectual stimulation
LM Leader models expected behaviours
LIS Leader provides emotional and professional support, caring for staff, praise

Leadership - Structure

LR Leader provides resources
LDS Leader provides structures for sharing power and decision making processes

Leadership - Culture

LC Leader builds culture through:
Promoting shared values and/or beliefs
Leader uses symbols
Leader uses rituals
Leader reads the culture
Leadership - Administrative Practices

LAP-1 Hiring staff, staffing issues, meeting with teachers regarding their goals
LAP-2 Communication with staff and/or the community
LAP-3 Leader deals with discipline issues
LAP-4 Leader deals with issues of school safety
LAP-5 Leader deals with school board and/or superintendent issues
LAP-6 Leader deals with parental issues
LAP-7 Leader “gate keeps”
LAP-8 Leader deals with administrative issues, office problems

Leadership - Traits and Capacities

LPT Leadership traits - positive attitude, enthusiastic, high energy level, low key, relaxed, good sense of humour, flexible, trustworthy, modest
LPC Leadership capacities - very organized, good listener, strong interpersonal skills
APPENDIX G
School 1 - Data from Level 1 Coding

Form of Culture

Isolated and collaborative cultures are the two main forms of school culture that have been identified by Fullan and Hargreaves (1991). Isolated cultures encompass those where staff work independently, while collaborative cultures find teachers working together to find better ways of doing business. Collaborative cultures may occur within the framework of the school, or they may be more far reaching, extending into the school’s community.

Table 1 summarizes participants’ statements regarding the form of school 1’s culture. The first column lists the various forms of culture: isolated, collaborative - professional, collaborative - inclusive, and other. Column two records how many participants made comments. Percentage of total statements made by participants, focus group members, and the principal are recorded in columns three, four, and five. Finally, column six represents the total percentage of all relevant remarks. Five percent of comments were in the isolated category, while 77% of the comments referred to the culture as collaborative, and 18% were in the “Other” category.

Teacher 9 made a comment which was indicative of an isolated culture, “Being a physical education teacher, I think at times, I feel disjointed.” He observed that specialist teachers sometimes get removed “from the actual complexities of overall teaching.” Yet he pointed out that his situation had changed this year because he had been assigned physical education for part of the day and a grade six home room class for the rest of the day.

In the “Culture Form - Other” statements were made which might lead one to think that the culture was balkanized. For example, Teacher 3 talked about “working together in the intermediate wing.” Teacher 8 also pointed out that they seemed to work “within divisions, say primary, junior, intermediate.” The principal also noted that “learning has varied from division to division,” but he
Table 1

School 1 - Level 1 Coding

Organizational Culture - Form of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Isolated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative: Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative: Inclusive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did not feel that the staff was segregated because of the division framework. Instead, he suggested reasons for the school’s collaborative culture:

The divisions are separate in so far as they are labelled separately [i.e., primary, junior, intermediate]. They do have their own separate meetings ... but we have a fair number of people who cross divisions to teach. So, I don’t see their thinking as different. [They hold the same] beliefs about what’s in kids’ best interests.

Seven of the eight participants, the focus group, and the principal described the culture as collaborative - professional, representing 62% of all statements made on the form of culture. For example, Teacher 2 said, “It’s an informal atmosphere. There’s a lot of collaboration that goes on.” The principal also referred to the culture as informal. He contended, “It is a very informal, extremely collaborative culture, a very caring kind of place.” Teacher 6 noted that it’s a “very child-focused school ... [We have] created a community where kids feel loved and safe, and yet, I also believe that people have very high standards academically and the programs that are presented here are pretty high, pretty solid programs.” A teacher, during the focus group interview, commented, “It’s a really strong team. They all work together really well.” The secretary also spoke of the culture. “It’s a warm and inviting learning environment and it’s not just in my mind. I hear it all the time. There isn’t anyone here who doesn’t go the extra mile to make the right things happen for kids.”

In school 1, the collaborative culture appeared to spread into the community. This seemed to suggest two different forms of collaboration. In this research, these forms of collaboration are referred to as collaborative - professional, which includes school personnel, and collaborative - inclusive, which extends into the community. Fifteen percent of comments made fit into the latter category. For example, a focus group member said, “It’s important that we invite parents in, as volunteers and feel comfortable in supporting community days.” T6 maintained, “Parents are welcome. They are valued and they are part of the team.” The principal also pointed out that “we
had parents involved in the team [SGT]."

If the two forms of collaboration, professional and inclusive, are examined concurrently the total number of comments regarding the content of the school’s culture is 77%. The data suggests that the form of school 1’s culture is collaborative.

**Content of Culture**

The content of a school’s culture refers to the norms, values, beliefs, and underlying assumptions which are considered important by individual members and shared by these members. The form of a professional culture is the nature of the relationship among those inside and outside of the organization which emerges from, and is built upon, the shared norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions. This research did not attempt to distinguish which comments were norms and which were values, beliefs, or assumptions. Instead, the following descriptors were employed to interpret the content of the school’s culture: mutual support among teachers, sharing of ideas and resources, collegiality, importance of professional growth/development, willingness to experiment or risk take, teachers provide each other with honest feedback, colleagues make time to work/plan together, sense of humour, educators reflect on their teaching, staff celebrate their successes, pride in profession, respect for colleagues and students, trust, and commitment to the idea that students should come first in teachers’ deliberations and practices. In this case, content explains form.

Table 2 outlines all comments made about the content of school 1’s culture. The first column lists the descriptors which were employed in the analysis. In the second column, number of participants who made comments are indicated. Columns three, four, and five report the percentage of comments made by participants, focus group members, and the principal. Finally, column six records the total percentage of responses in each category.
### Table 2

**School 1 - Level 1 Coding**

**Organizational Culture - Content of Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms, Values, Beliefs, Assumptions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 121</td>
<td>N = 70</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride - Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cultural condition which appeared most salient was “Students Come First”. The belief widely held by staff that students should come first in their deliberations and practices was commented on by all eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal representing a total of 16% of all responses. The secretary’s words illustrate this point:

We’re all here for the kids and probably wouldn’t be in the business if that wasn’t our driving force ... I believe it’s true of everyone here. Whatever works for kids is what’s best. You have to do that to make things work for kids. That’s what you do.

In the same vein, Teacher 8 said, “What we are doing is what’s best for the child.” Teacher 9 maintained, “This staff is committed to working on children liking themselves.” The focus group also spoke of self-esteem:

First we were focussing on self-esteem and confidence ... for the children, to make kids successful ... We believe that children are really important and certainly deserve equal opportunities ... One of the things that moves us to working on discipline is that we want to create an environment that is enabling for kids, safe.

The principal, in his individual interview stated, “[We do] what’s good for kids... [It] drives the work that people do here, almost exclusively.” He also added, “There is a common sense of purpose about what’s good for kids and it extends through the teaching staff, the custodial staff, and through the secretarial staff. Everybody knows what it is they are here for.”

“Sharing of Ideas and Resources” received support from the focus group, the principal, and seven of the eight teachers (a total of 12%). Teacher 2 explained, “We’re not possessive about things ... that means sharing materials and sharing expertise, and sharing experiences. It is a great place to be!” A tremendous amount of this sharing was done at division meetings. Teacher 7 said, “We do share a lot of ideas there [at the primary division meeting] so we have a set monthly division meeting.” These teachers also shared their expertise. According to Teacher 4, “We have really good people who know a lot about computers ... [and they] have given in-services within the school.” During the focus group interview a teacher told how she had taken a workshop on
Multiple Intelligences and then “came back and talked about it to the teachers.” The principal also spoke about a workshop that “was lead by a staff member who shared his expertise with the others.”

“Working Together” was discussed by seven participants and the focus group representing a total of eight percent of all remarks. When it came to planning together, Teacher 2 claimed, “We did our long range planning together.” She also stated, “I know a pair of teachers that, each week, they work together.” Teacher 4 told how, “we sat down with our division and decided how to tackle that and set up a plan.” A focus group member explained, “People get with their grade partner and just work together.” Another focus group participant observed that the intermediate teachers “plan units in history and geography together.” Even the secretary mentioned “there’s a lot more planning at grade levels, working together [than there used to be].”

Participants’ comments (19%), and those made by the focus group (27%), and principal (5%), indicated that “Mutual Support” was an important condition for a collaborative culture (total of 20% of relevant remarks). For example, Teacher 3 commented, “We have a detention room now. We all sort of pulled together on that.” Teacher 4 said in this staff “you can talk to people if you have a problem.” An example of how the staff provided support for one another was also offered by the secretary. “New teachers are buddied. We do the same thing with supply teachers.” A focus group member stated, “People pitch in and help whenever it’s needed.” Although the comments made by the principal only represented five percent of his statements on cultural content, he pointed out that “if there is something happening in someone’s life, they rally really quickly.”

The principal’s comments showed support for “Risk Taking” (26%), as did the focus group (13%), and five teachers (9%), representing a total of 12% of all remarks. For example, Teacher 3 commented, “It’s an atmosphere that invites risk taking.” A focus group member said, “You can risk take ... The staff makes so many decisions because the atmosphere, or culture, is one of risk
taking.” The principal also declared, “There’s an understanding that you are welcome to try, whatever.”

Five participants, the focus group, and the principal discussed “Respect” as a condition of collaborative cultures. Teacher 7 observed, “There is a lot of respect ... when you walk around you can see everyone does their own job. They may not do it the way you might, but the job is done and it’s done well.” Teacher 3 remarked, “There’s a lot of people on this staff with a lot of gifts and a lot of talent.” According to Teacher 9, “I am allowed to show my personality, state my opinion, and know I’m respected as a person here.” Further, Teacher 2 contended, “He [principal] really respects the opinion that I bring to meetings,” and “I respect him [for the way he handled a situation].”

“Collegiality” was referred to by four teachers, the focus group, and the principal, constituting seven percent of relevant remarks. Teacher 4 observed, “It’s a nice feeling when you come into the school because you no sooner walk in and say ‘Good morning’ to people and people start to joke around.” She also commented, “I really like the people that I have gotten to know better and can go out to lunch socially ... I enjoy work and the people here.” Focus group members also commented on the social aspect of the staff. “You are invited out to lunch, made to feel part of the staff.” When they have a party, “everyone is invited.” They even had “a hugs and kisses [Hersey] day ... It was a real party.”

Another category which received limited support from all groups (teachers - 7%, focus group - 3%, and principal - 4%) was sense of humour, constituting 5% of all remarks. For example, in the focus group interview one teacher said, “One thing that you hear a lot of with this staff is laughter.” Another teacher added, “We don’t take ourselves too seriously.” The principal commented, “The staff who work here have fun ... There’s a lot of silliness that goes on here in the
office.” Teacher 7 mentioned that the principal “allows us, in staff meetings, to sit with whomever we want ... but just so there is laughter, you sit with people who you know are fun to be with.” Teacher 4 noted that “we have lots of joking around... [and the principal] tries to be in the staff room and just interact with staff and laugh and joke with us.”

Some of the other categories, such as “Professional Development”, received limited support. Thirteen percent of comments made by the principal, three percent of teachers’ statements, and one percent of the focus group’s remarks were on professional development, which resulted in four percent of relevant responses. “Reflection” was mentioned by all groups with the principal’s comments attracting only four percent of his remarks, three percent of the focus group’s statements, and two percent of the teachers’ comments for a total of three percent overall. “Feedback” was commented on by the principal and the focus group for a total of one percent of responses. “Trust” was referred to only by the focus group (3% of all comments) and “Pride in the Profession” was discussed by the teachers (1% of all responses).

Overall, the data obtained from this research provide evidence that certain conditions contributed to the collaborative culture in school 1. School 1’s culture was dominated by the above mentioned descriptors. However, descriptors which were most noteworthy were: students come first, sharing of ideas and resources, working together, mutual support, and risk taking. Respect, collegiality, professional development, and sense of humour also received limited support. Because of the percentage of overall relevant responses, the two descriptors which appeared to be the most salient were “Mutual Support” (20%) and “Students Come First” (16%). As a focus group member stated, “If you are supported and accepted, then you can learn.” The reason they are learning is to “meet the needs of the individuals ... because that’s what we do here,” (T2).
Leadership

Leithwood’s dimensions of transformational leadership provided the foundation for this research. However, during the analysis, two additional dimensions emerged, “Administrative Practices” and “Leadership Traits and Capacities”. In Table 3, the first column lists the dimensions employed in the analysis. Number of participants making comments is indicated in column two. The third, fourth, and fifth columns report the percentage of responses made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal concerning the dimensions. Lastly, column six reports the percentage of relevant responses in each dimension.

Of the dimensions employed in the analysis, “Leader Provides Support” received, by far, the largest overall response with 25% of the total responses. All of the participants, the focus group, and the principal spoke of the leader’s support. In some cases, teachers referred to his professional support. For example, one of the teachers in the focus group commented, “If I have a problem with a student, I’m supported in that way.” Teacher 4 said, “He’s been really supportive for me ... I had a minor crisis with a parent ... from the moment he heard what was going on, I no longer talked to the parent. He just took over.” Teachers offered examples of support that the principal provided in the area of staff development. “When you want to do something, Principal will make it happen ... say I need release time or I need funds, or I need a committee formed, or I need [his] authority, whatever,” (T 2). Teacher 9 voiced his appreciation of the principal’s support, “He’s really good in the after school sports. He supports all the teams. He goes to a lot of the games.”

In addition to professional support, Principal 1 provided personal support. A focus group member noted, “If you’re not feeling well ... you can feel comfortable enough to come and say it.” Another focus group member said, “You’re supported from the family perspective.” In fact, according to Teacher 7, principal 1 is approachable on any topic. “I don’t think there is any staff
Table 3

School 1 - Level 1 Coding

Dimensions of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
here ... who doesn’t feel that they can go into Principal with a problem and say, ‘I have this sort of problem’ albeit whether it’s social, or academic, or personal.” (T7).

The dimension with the second highest response was “Structures and Decision Making Processes”. All participants, the focus group, and the principal commented on this category, constituting 16% of relevant remarks. According to Teacher 4, “We participate a lot in decision making ... If there’s any changes to be made within the day to day running of the school, it’s taken up at the staff meeting. Sometimes, it’s put to a vote.” Teacher 9 commented, “The staff has to be the focal point of decision making ... Administration here will set up a committee, and then say, ‘Do you want to belong to it?’ and, if you do, then you come at this time and you tell us what you think.” The principal also spoke about this process. He called it single issue meetings, and these meetings were held on “an as need basis.”

I also use a structure [single issue meeting] whereby if we can’t make a decision on an item, we will set aside a separate time. It’s Tuesday lunch. Anybody who comes will be part of that decision ... And if there are only four people there, then four people make the decision. But the understanding is that everybody buys into the decision.

One of the teachers in the focus group commented on these sessions, “With all of our meetings, everybody is welcome, and the more the merrier. You must grab your lunch and everybody just goes over to the table and jumps right in, and that is very welcoming.”

Another dimension which received a significant response was “Leader Models Expected Behaviour” with a total of 11%. Once again, all participants provided examples of this dimension. Teacher 2, for example, said, “He models patience and discipline in dealing with children and dealing with parents.” Teacher 4 noted, “He’s very professional, therefore, he sets a really good example.” According to Teacher 8, the principal models “cooperative learning” structures during staff meetings. Focus group members spoke of his “relaxed fashion ... [He’s] very calm, when there
is conflict or a difficult situation.” The secretary felt that he modelled a positive attitude and fairness. “He’s a very positive person and he likes all of his staff to be that way ... He’s very fair in his treatment of kids - fair with handling anything,” (S).

“Leader Holds High Expectations” received nine percent of all comments made about leadership with eight participants, the focus group, and the principal referring to this dimension. When teachers were asked what expectations the principal had of them, they responded in various ways. “I think of everyone he expects us to do our very best,” (T2). “You keep open communication with parents,” (T3). Teacher 4 said, “He expects us to be professional.” Teacher 7 commented, “He expects us to promote the love of learning.” He also expects teachers to “be humane in dealing with children, dealing with parents,” (T8), “to be positive,” (FG), “to be team players,” (FG), “to use common sense,” (T8), and “to not be afraid to state what it is you want and what you expect of the students,” (FG). Principal 1 does not feel that he needs to state his expectations for his staff. “You need to treat people as professionals, so I don’t lay out a whole list of thou shalt and shalt nots,” (P).

Eight participants, the focus group, and the principal commented on the “Leader’s Vision” (5% of all responses). Principal 1 stated, “The vision was here before I got here ... all I have done is fine tune it a little. The vision is to focus on what we feel would be right for kids.” A focus group member contended, “Our vision involves what makes sense for kids.” The teachers made similar observations. For example, Teacher 9 said, “The child is the key. The child is the focal point.” Teacher 4 also claimed, “Our vision, that’s maybe very general, is to develop the kids as well as we can to give them a chance to show off their best stuff.”

“Leader Provides Resources” also received a fair amount of support. Seven participants, the focus group, and the principal discussed this dimension, constituting 8% of all responses.
According to the teachers, principal 1 provided them with whatever resources they required. They had: “opportunities for PD,” (T2), “time set up for meetings has been made available,” (T3), “resource personnel,” (T7), “time [for planning],” (T3, 4, 6, 7, S, FG), and “money,” (FG). The focus group expanded on this dimension. “Resources play a big role, that includes money, materials, outside expertise or inside expertise ... We’ve spent $2000 on primary resource materials ... We have had in-service for a whole day on Lego Dacta ... [and] the Lego reps in.” The principal also noted that he used to just fund professional development opportunities that tied in with the school plan, but now “we just fund anything that people want to go to” because he believes strongly in teachers having opportunities for learning and growth.

A dimension which was added to Leithwood’s (1994) original framework was “Leadership Traits and Capacities”. Since the research was attempting to determine which leadership practices influenced culture and organizational learning, the interview questions were very open-ended. Many statements were made, in the three case studies, which did not fit the framework. In school 1, for example, six participants, the focus group, and the principal spoke of leadership traits and capacities, such as “low key, relaxed” or “good listener”. These comments represented four percent of all remarks on leadership. Thus, a new dimension was added to the framework.

In school 1, seven traits or capacities were identified. They are listed in column one of Table 4. The second column indicates the number of participants making statements. Columns three, four, and five report the percentage of total comments made by participants, the focus group members, and the principal. Finally, column six displays the total percentage of relevant remarks. The following outline illustrates comments made about principal 1’s traits (numbers 1 - 6) and capacities (number 7):
### Table 4
**School 1 - Level 1 Coding**

**Leadership Traits and Capacities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Traits and Capacities</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 9</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 5</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 2</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice, Kind, Friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude, Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Key, Relaxed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, Sincere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interpersonal Skills*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listener*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N.B.** * Indicates capacities, the other traits are characteristics.
1) Nice, Kind, Friendly Person
   “Everyone responds to the fact that he is just a truly nice, kind man,” (S).

2) Low Key, Relaxed
   “He’s very low key,” (T7, T6).

3) Sense of Humour
   “There is a sense of humour ... so we can get through anything,” (FG).

4) Flexible
   “He’s very flexible. He offers you alternatives plus the consequences of your decisions,” (T9).

5) Trustworthy, Sincere
   “He’s very trustworthy,” (T4).

6) Modest
   “Principal is being very modest,” (FG).

7) Good Listener
   “He’s a good listener,” (T3, T7).

The capacity which received the most support was good listener with two teachers and the principal commenting on it, representing 24% of all relevant responses. According to principal 1, “Listening is critical ... [You must] listen to your staff.” Teacher 3 contended, “He’s a good listener.” Teacher 7 said, “He listens.” Another trait which was discussed by three participants was “Nice, Kind, Friendly Person” (19% of all statements). The secretary claimed, “Everyone responds to the fact that he is just a truly nice, kind man.” Two participants and the focus group, constituting 19% of comments, felt he was “very low key,” (T7). A focus group member observed, “[He’s a] very relaxed person ... if you get the impression that it can be handled through calmness, it does affect your staff.” One teacher and a focus group member stated, “he’s very trustworthy,” (T4). This category received 13% of all remarks. Finally, “Sense of Humour” (6%) and “Very Flexible” (6%) received limited support.

“Builds Consensus Regarding Goals” was addressed by seven participants, the focus group,
and the principal (3% of all comments). Teacher 8 remarked, "[Goals] that's a staff decision. We may pick one or two things a year and that will be our focus for the year. That's decisions [made] by staff." According to Teacher 3, goal setting is "done collaboratively ... It's done in small groups and brought to staff meetings." A focus group member contended, "We decide as a group what areas are important for us now." The principal felt his role was as follows: "I structure the activity around setting priorities of goals [so they decide what they are]." The focus group explained that "we got more into a broad heading and spreading it over two or three years, like the technology plan ... we couldn't do all of it at once."

Another dimension which was added to the framework was "Administrative Practices". Comments about the day-to-day issues that the principal dealt with fell into eight categories. Table 5 summarizes the data. The first column lists the administrative practices. Column two records the number of participants making comments on these categories, while the remaining columns report the percentage of comments made by the various participants. Examples of statements classified as referring to administrative practices are as follows:

1) Staffing Issues - hiring, transferring
   "He deals with organizational issues, staffing issues," (FG).

2) Communication - with students, parents, and staff
   "He likes a lot of open dialogue ... lots of communication and he's really good at communicating with the community," (S).

3) Discipline Issues - suspensions
   "If you send somebody down who has a disciplinary problem, you know it is going to be dealt with," (T3).

4) Board/Superintendent Issues
   "He brings us the initiatives [from the board] that he needs to bring," (T2).

5) Parental Issues
   "If you have got trouble with parents, he will try to intervene," (S).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
<td>N = 3</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/SO Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Gate Keeping
"Principal makes sure that things are in manageable chunks ... [He] tries to be somewhat protective of staff because it is very go-getting," (FG).

7) Other - ordering materials, fund raising, time table
“He spends time preparing for staff meetings,” (T4).

Of the responses listed in Table 5, the “Other” category was discussed by four participants, the focus group, and the principal receiving 21% of all remarks. Three participants and the principal mentioned “Discipline Issues” (21%) and “Communication” (19%). Other practices which were commented on included: “Parental Issues” (14%), “Gate Keeping” (11%), “Staffing Issues” (7%), and “Board Issues” (7%).

In this school, 411 comments were made regarding leadership. Participants’ comments totalled 229; the focus group made 83 remarks, and 99 statements were made by the principal. All remarks were positive, indicating that the members of this school shared a similar, positive perspective of the principal’s leadership.

Organizational Learning

Organizational learning, which is the process of a group of people trying to improve their actions through knowledge and understanding, was happening in school 1. In fact, Teacher 7 provided an example of double-loop learning. Apparently, the school was having a problem with the intermediate students’ behaviour on the playground. Their system of sending students to the office, giving behaviour slips to home room teachers, or providing positive reinforcement for good behaviour was not working. At a staff meeting, the topic was broached. Teachers discussed their options and decided to try a detention room.

It was established. Moan, groan, whine, complain. That all went on. We tried it. Then we came back, revisited the issue ... [We] let it run for a couple of weeks,
came back and revisited it again, and the evolution of what happened took place over about a three week period. Everyone came with ideas, suggestions that would make it work better and now it’s working smoothly (Teacher 7).

This situation illustrates how the staff had to “resolve incompatible organizational norms by setting new priorities” and restructure “the norms themselves together with associated strategies and assumptions” (Argyris and Schönb, 1978, p. 24) in order to solve their problem. This kind of learning is referred to as double-loop learning because it requires the organization to question basic assumptions about the way they do business.

The results of comments made about organizational learning processes, structures, and outcomes may be found in Table 6. Table 6a illustrates that the largest percent of comments made had to do with organizational learning structures (51%). Five of the participants, the focus group, and the principal provided examples of structures which facilitated their learning. For example, Teacher 2 said, “We requested and got preps together for two years.” She explained how that time was used by her and her teaching partner to plan and work collaboratively. Teacher 3 told of a time when the principal arranged for the whole staff to go to the board office for a day and “we planned as a division.” Teacher 6 said that “every Wednesday evening, we [she and her teaching partner] work at school or home, have dinner and work until 9:00 or 10:00.” Another example was given by Teacher 7, “We meet as a primary division [on a monthly basis]” and a great deal of sharing of resources and planning takes place at those meetings. Other divisions met on a regular basis too. The focus group noted that “shared planning time is just the way things work a lot of the time around here. People get together with their grade partner, you know, somewhere and just work together.” They also explained the use of “P.E.P.S.” (Planning for Exceptional Pupils) where “everyone gets one of their assigned release periods to meet with their assigned AR and they talk kids, and programming strategies which they need.” According to Teacher 4, “He [principal] might
### Table 6
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**Organizational Learning**

Table 6a - Organizational Learning Processes and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 32</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 15</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 14</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b - Organizational Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’s Comments N = 24</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 13</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 10</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-Group*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Individual*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Community*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Students*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Individual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * Under is the abbreviation for Understanding
use the staff meeting [as a learning place]" or "if people are interested in a topic, they can join the committee that's going to be organized for that something new." Principal 1 admitted, "I provide the structure for them to focus the dialogue ...[and] I will also take part in meetings and provide direction or input and outside knowledge for them," but he lets the staff work through their problems and come up with their own solutions.

Table 6a also shows that 44% of comments made had to do with the group’s organizational learning processes, while only five percent had to do with individual learning processes. Five teachers, the focus group, and the principal supplied examples of OL processes. Teacher 4 told of a process that was used to help boost staff morale. "The School Growth Team presented it [the idea] to staff and staff agreed on it just with a general vote in the big staff meeting and we made our lists and the staff just carried through with it." The idea was for everyone to be a member of the social committee and divide the school year into two month terms where a team of teachers would take responsibility for doing special things to bolster morale, such as special luncheons, "Hugs and Kisses Day" (with Hersey chocolate kisses), treats in teachers' mailboxes, and after school gatherings.

Other learning processes that the teachers discussed were: "we collaborate with our grade partners," (T4), "learning from each other," (T2), getting together to "hash over something like discipline issues," (T6), "we’ve done it [worked through our problems] in a small group. We’ve done it by grade. We’ve done it cross grade, or by stations," (T7), and "we set time aside on PA days," (T8). The focus group mentioned that "we work with our division", or "we brainstorm; it’s really important to bounce ideas off each other." The principal felt that a great deal of their learning "came through an outgrowth of discussion - there was a lot of talking." He also explained how they got teachers involved with the Lego aspect of their technology initiative. They took "a bunch of
fortyish teachers and let them loose, and let them play with Lego for a day. [It was] a whole lot of fun for starters, but that has had a real infectious sort of influence throughout the junior division.”

Table 6b illustrates the percentage of comments made regarding outcomes. All of the participants (with the exception of the secretary), the focus group, and the principal were able to provide examples of organizational learning outcomes. Increased understanding for the group received the greatest support (40%). Teacher 3 explained how the intermediate division decided that they were going to try to do an integrated unit together. “We would set time to meet. Every person took a different role [for the unit plan] and when we got together it was excellent.” They have now used this process several times to plan different units and, as a group, have an understanding of how to create integrated units.

Another outcome that received significant support was new practices for the group (28%). The focus group provided an example. Teachers were dissatisfied with the board’s report cards and they did not want to wait for the provincial report card. So, the junior division decided to develop their own. They took on this task because the principal said, “If any of the divisions want to create your own report card, fine.” The juniors went ahead and did it. They said, “We were able to take a risk” and that was ok, because “we decided we’d like to do this.”

Table 6b indicates that there had been some individual growth in the area of individual understanding (14%). Teacher 6 explained her personal situation.

I have just been through a self-directed appraisal and I took on planning as an area of growth. I talked it through with Principal ... And, I did it as a team approach with another staff member. It’s been the most gratifying thing I’ve ever experienced professionally. I’m grateful to be working with someone where I felt safe and could open up an area that I felt was an area of weakness. I could sit down and work collaboratively with someone with whom I have great synergy. We do generate material so well together; we really complement each other and, I have learned a tremendous amount [about planning].

She also provided an example of how she had grown personally in the area of technology.
We all are looking at our own level of expertise [with technology] and I guess respond to our own feelings of inadequacy. Personally, I decided that I wanted to be able to do my report cards on computer. I also decided I wanted to become more knowledgeable about programs that are available for my age range and needs of students so that's something I'm trying to deal with and I have become knowledgeable enough that I now do my report cards on computer and I generate all of my own communication with parents on my computer at home. And I don't even type, but it's effective.

This was quite an amazing example of personal growth, but her story became even more intriguing when I discovered that Teacher 6 had taught kindergarten for 26 years. Two years ago she changed grades, and that change resulted in further personal growth.

When I went to grade one, two years ago, I really needed a mentor, and Teacher was available to be a mentor for me at that point, and it was wonderful to be sharing material and expertise. There's always someone on this staff who is really willing to share and be supportive when someone has the need.

Teacher 6 then began working with another teacher as part of her growth for her performance appraisal. After they had worked together “for about ten weeks” they decided to “do it on an ongoing basis because we have all of these things that we generated that we want to do.”

Another outcome which attracted support from four participants, the focus group, and the principal was a change in practice for the group. This category received 28% of relevant responses. Teacher 6 explained that a change in practice had occurred when a new Ministry document had been introduced to them. “We do our planning now, and collectively we include outcomes.”

Although individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning, organizational learning is dependent on individual learning. In school 1, both types of learning occurred. For school 1, an essential component of organizational learning appeared to be the collaborative concern of individual members who were constantly striving to improve the way their school was operating.
Organizational Learning Stimuli

All of the participants in school 1 cited examples of stimuli for learning. Table 7 illustrates the categories that were identified by the teachers in this school (i.e., change issues, performance appraisal, professional development, personal preference). Personal preference received 34% of the total responses (five participants, focus group, and principal referred to this stimulus). For example, “I take all of these courses [computer courses, Part 1, 2, 3] because I do find them intellectually stimulating,” (T4). A member of the focus group confessed, “I love taking courses.”

Issues of change were identified by four participants and the focus group which constituted 34% of all comments. Teachers made statements such as: “It’s our responsibility to learn about any new Ministry initiatives,” (T6). Teacher 9 provided an example of how changing teaching assignments acted as a stimulus for his personal growth.

I had been an AR [academic resource teacher] for nine years as well as teaching just math and P.Ed. at a senior school ... I had to bring myself to being able to deal personally with children from K up to grade six. I had to change the way I handled discipline, especially when you had to teach one in the morning, kindergarten, and one in the afternoon, grade eight. So, that was a challenge and certainly a learning experience.

Professional development was viewed as a significant stimulus for learning (24%) with four participants and the focus group commenting on this category. Teacher 3 noted, “The Multiple Intelligences workshop was fabulous, so that was growth too.” Teachers 6, 8, the secretary, and the focus group remarked on the number of professional development activities the board offered and how many of the courses had been attended by their staff. In particular, sessions on cooperative learning, Multiple Intelligences, and Lions Quest were mentioned.

The stimulus which received the least amount of support was performance appraisal with only eight percent of the responses, and these were made by Teacher 6 and the principal. Teacher
Table 7
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Organizational Learning Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Issues</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 24</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>N = 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Preference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 said, “We were doing our most recent planning project because both of us were being appraised and evaluated.” The principal remarked, “I do a fair amount of stuff around self-directed appraisal - people set their own goals and work on their own goals.” Citing “Performance Appraisal” as a stimulus for learning was rather unusual. Nevertheless, if the teacher and the principal viewed the self-directed appraisal as one that stimulated learning, then perhaps this model of evaluation requires further investigation.

### Barriers

Comments which were viewed as barriers to collaboration and organizational learning represented only 1% of all statements (see Chapter 4, Table 4.2). Table 8 illustrates the barriers to OL (Table 8a) and barriers to a collaborative culture (Table 8b). The first column lists barriers which were identified in the literature (i.e., time, not open to change, pressure/stress, isolation, morale). Column two indicates the number of participants making comments, while the remaining columns report the percentage of comments made by the various participants. Barriers were mentioned by three teachers for a total of nine comments. They cited time (25%), not open to change (25%), and pressure/stress (50%) as barriers to OL.

Three teachers remarked that time was a barrier to collaboration (80%). For example, “We were going to do a store front unit, but time was a factor,” (T3). Although Teacher 6 planned with another teacher on a regular basis, she stated, “Time constraints interfere with your willingness and desire to do a lot of collaborative planning.” Teacher 7 spoke about the technology initiative and how the primary teachers wanted to get their students more involved with Lego Dacta. Even though they were really excited about the initiative, she confessed, “We haven’t had time to meet together and plan, so that hasn’t happened yet.”
Table 8
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Barriers to Organizational Learning and to Organizational Culture

Table 8a - Barriers to Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 4</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8b - Barriers to a Collaborative Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 5</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although these three teachers' comments represented only 1% of the comments made, and their major concern appeared to be time, it begs the question, "What can be done to alleviate time as a barrier to collaboration and organizational learning?". In these days of cutbacks, time is a scarce commodity. Leaders will have to become innovative in providing time for their teachers to work and learn together.
APPENDIX H
School 2 - Data from Level 1 Coding

Form of Culture

Table 1a summarizes participants' comments concerning the form of school 2's culture. The first column lists the various forms of culture: isolated, collaborative - professional, collaborative - inclusive, and other. Column 2 indicates the number of participants making comments. Percentage of total comments made by participants, the focus group, and the principal are recorded in columns three, four, and five. In column six, the total percentage of relevant responses is reported. Two percent of comments fell into the isolated category, while 88% of the statements referred to the culture as collaborative, and ten percent were in the "Other" category.

All eight teachers, as well as focus group participants, and the principal described their school's culture as collaborative. For example, Teacher 1 said, "[It] isn't autocratic at all ... it's a democratic process. We all have input. You aren't afraid to voice your opinions and you are listened to." Other people in the focus group said that they "consider [their] school a democracy." Teacher 6 also used the word democracy in her individual interview.

Focus group participants and individuals (T1, T9) used the word "family" to describe the culture. "We work like a great, big family," (FG). T9 said, "We are like a family when it comes to children. It doesn't matter if one of my students is in trouble or hurt, somebody will look out for that child as if she were his or her own." Principal 2 stated, "We really continue to think of one another as team members." The Focus Group observed, "We haven't isolated ourselves ... There is not this separation of divisions." In fact, they declared, "We were collaborative before it became a buzz word."
Table 1
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Organizational Culture - Form of Culture and Teachers’ Perceptions of Physical Plant

Table 1a - Form of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative: Professional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative: Inclusive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b - Teachers’ Perceptions of Physical Plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Plant</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This collaborative culture appeared to extend into the community. Five teachers, the focus group, and the principal, talked about community involvement in the school. Teacher 7, for example, mentioned that in the past school 2 “was just part of this little community,” and she thought it still was. When T1 first arrived at the school, “[There was] a community feeling here. Parents were very involved. We always had parent volunteers, and they were quite visible. So it was that sense of community,” (and T1 believed that continued to be in place). T6 noted, “I think it is wonderful that we have more and more parents on board.” In fact, for the grade eight graduation, “the parents come in and completely transform the gym,” (T9). One of the focus group participants commented, “Community keeps coming back in my mind [to describe the culture]. Community is something that is not just a buzz word. We don’t even use the word community, but to me it describes the way the school operates.” The principal agreed. She said that the community and school were like one “huge family.”

The extension of this school’s collaborative culture into the community seems to suggest that there may be two forms of collaboration. For the purpose of this research, these forms of collaboration are referred to as collaboration - professional, which would encompass school personnel, and collaboration - inclusive, which spreads out into the community.

The principal provided an example of how their collaborative culture carried over into the community. She explained that when they were making a literacy video, they used all kinds of experts (i.e., another principal’s reading recovery teachers, teachers outside of the school, parents, and facilitators). She pointed out that the video was not made at the school; it was taped in community members’ homes.

Another example of this inclusive culture came to light during the focus group interview. One of the teacher’s husbands dropped into the library during the interview. All of the School
Growth Team (SGT) members waved and said, "Hi," to him. Apparently, he had helped staff put the school's report cards on computer. This example suggests that the sharing of expertise from various sources is an additional feature of an inclusive culture.

Table 1b illustrates the number of statements made about the building or physical layout of the school. A total of 16 comments were made by teachers’ and the principal on how they perceived the building’s layout impacted on the school’s culture. For example, as a member of the focus group noted, “The physical plant has forced a certain amount of cooperation because of the sheer need.” Another teacher commented, “The physical plant has an impact because we have a grade 7/8 here, and then [next door] we have Teacher with her grade one class.” Teacher 6 explained that the library was used by everyone as a meeting place because there was no other room large enough to accommodate group meetings.

Looking across the data, it appeared that school 2 had an extremely collaborative culture. Only 2% of comments made regarding culture were indicative of an isolated culture. On the other hand, when responses were combined to include collaborative cultures which were professional and inclusive, this resulted in 88% of all statements made regarding the form of this school’s culture.

**Content of Culture**

The content of an organization’s culture refers to the norms, beliefs, values, and underlying assumptions which are shared by the members of a community and which provide the basis for common understandings. This research did not distinguish between norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions. Instead, descriptors (i.e., mutual support among teachers, sharing of ideas and resources, collegiality, importance of professional growth, willingness to experiment or risk take, teachers provide each other with feedback, colleagues make time to work/plan together, sense of
humour, educators reflect on their teaching, staff celebrate their successes, pride in profession, respect for colleagues and students, trust, and a belief that students come first in all deliberations and practices) were employed to analyze the content of culture. The content of the culture explains the culture's form. The form is the result of the descriptors that people employ to describe their cultures. Collaborative cultures are characterized by a prevalence of the above mentioned conditions.

Table 2 summarizes all comments made regarding the content of school 2's culture. The first column lists the descriptors that were used in the analysis. Column two illustrates the number of people making comments. Percentage of statements made by teachers, the focus group, and the principal are reported in columns three, four, and five. Lastly, column 6 represents the percentage of relevant responses.

An interesting finding was that all participants made comments that had to do with their commitment to students. The belief, widely held by staff, that students should come first in their deliberations and practices received 15% of all comments made regarding content of culture. Invariably, people said the same thing, "Kids/Students come first!" (T7, T8, T10, T11). The principal pointed out, "If there isn't something in it for the kids, then we shouldn't be doing it."

The descriptor with the second highest response was sharing of ideas and resources. Eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal made reference to this category constituting 14% of all comments made. Teacher 8, for example, said that in grade meetings and primary division meetings, "we are always talking and sharing." A focus group member commented, "I think everyone on staff, if they have something to offer, they do. They are right there ready to help out."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms, Values, Beliefs, Assumptions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride - Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collegiality or comfort among staff members had eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal comment on this descriptor, representing 13% of responses. Teacher 1 said, "You feel comfortable walking into all kinds of different divisions and getting involved with everybody ... We will cover in any division. [Teachers] feel comfortable enough to deal with all of them [children]," (T1). In addition, "some of us have become really close friends ... and [we] laugh together too, and tease each other," (T1). Teacher 7 noted, "We are all friends and willing to help out." The focus group added, "There is really established a feeling of comradery among the staff. We like to do things together ... [and], as you feel comfortable, then you will progress, I think, if you have a pleasant, positive atmosphere and attitude."

In addition to collegiality rating high, mutual support among teachers received 12% of all comments made on this topic. Seven of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal all commented on this descriptor. Teacher 1, for example, explained, "If someone on staff has difficulties, we just kind of surround them with support." Teacher 7 said, "We help. Everybody pitches in when needed ... We are all very supportive of each other." Teacher 10 pointed out, "There is always peer coaching going on."

Seven teachers, the focus group, and the principal made comments which had to do with respect, representing seven percent of comments made. For example, Teacher 1 said, "[There is such] tremendous respect for each other." Teacher 9 pointed out that in addition to respecting their colleagues, the "principal is highly thought of and respected ... there is a sense of loyalty to her."

Six of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal spoke about the importance of continuous professional growth (8% of all responses). Teacher 9 contended that, "Staff members do a lot of their own learning in different ways. I know a lot take computer courses ... and quite a number attend workshops from this school. So people are definitely recognizing the need to grow
professionally and they are not resisting to grow professionally.” Teacher 12 would agree with this statement. She noted, “Most of the staff is interested in learning themselves ... [they] don’t want to stagnate.” Further, the focus group said, “We intend to get better. I think collectively as a staff that growth, learning, and [more] growth is going to continue to take place.”

Seven percent of comments dealt with making time to work or plan together. Statements were made by six teachers and the focus group (7% of all remarks). Teacher 10 said, “I have seen now whole divisions plan together.” Teacher 11 commented that getting planning time together “can increase what you can do.” When asked when they found time to plan together, the focus group said, “We make opportunities.”

Eleven percent of the comments were about willingness to experiment or risk take. Five teachers, during their individual interviews, the focus group, and the principal said they were willing to experiment (T1, T8, T9, T10, 11). For example, Teacher 1 commented, “I am willing to take risks and try something new.” Teacher 9 admitted, “I will give anything a try.” According to Teacher 10, when a new idea was presented to staff, someone would say, “I haven’t done that before. Let’s try it!” And they did.

Other descriptors received limited support. For example, two participants and the focus group referred to the importance of reflection (3% of all responses). Providing honest feedback to colleagues was mentioned by two people, the focus group, and the principal (2% of all statements). One teacher and the focus group spoke of trust (total of 3%) and pride in their profession (2%). A wonderful sense of humour was noted throughout the focus group interview as there was much laughter and joking with one another. The principal, in her individual interview, commented on the importance of humour, as did T1 in her interview (1% of responses). Teacher 1 stated that one of their beliefs or values was “the sense of humour we all have.” One teacher’s comments and the
focus group’s remarks fell into the “Other” category (1% of comments). Finally, celebrate with colleagues was mentioned only by a focus group member (0.4% of responses).

The data gleaned from this research seems to indicate that certain conditions contributed to the collaborative culture in school 2. These conditions included: a belief that students come first, a sharing of ideas and resources, a caring and comfortable atmosphere, mutual support for colleagues, respect for people, professional development, taking or making time to work and plan together, a willingness to risk take or experiment. In addition, educators must take time to reflect on the teaching and learning process. They also need to provide each other with feedback, trust their colleagues, and have pride in their profession. The most salient of these conditions appeared to be the belief that all students are special and their welfare must come first. If educators believe that their raison d’etre is “for the kids” then teachers appear to be willing to work collaboratively. As Teacher 12 stated, “People are united on the important things which is what’s best for kids.”

**Leadership**

Leithwood’s (1994) dimensions of transformational leadership provided the basis for this research. Two other dimensions, administrators’ practices and leadership traits and capacities, emerged during the analysis and were added to the framework. Column one in Table 3 lists the dimensions employed in the analysis. The second column indicates the number of participants making comments, while columns three, four, and five report the percentage of responses made by the teachers, the focus group, and the principal concerning the dimensions. Column six reports the total percentage of responses in each dimension.
### Table 3

**School 2 - Level 1 Coding**

**Dimensions of Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Vision*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding High Expectations*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Expected Behaviors*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Support*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Culture*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
Of the dimensions employed in the analysis, leader provides support received the largest overall response with 21% of relevant responses. All teachers, the focus group, and the principal referred to this dimension as essential to creating an environment conducive to learning. Teacher 9 observed, “She has a wonderful blend of personal and professional support.” Focus group members commented, “Principal will support you in the classroom and help you try a new strategy” and she “is supportive when dealing with parents.” For example, she will set up meetings where, ...

you can come in and sit down as a group and it’s not just you and the parent. You sit, as a group of three, or four, if the child is there, and really deal with the problem in a group rather than feeling you are isolated with this issue.

This principal also provides personal support. Teacher 7 commented, “Individually, I have never felt that I had a problem that I couldn’t take to her. She is very open with people, and I would have no hesitation to go to her with anything.” Teacher 12 explained that the principal is very good at personally encouraging people. In fact, the principal encouraged Teacher 12 to take on the responsibility of adjunct professor for the university student teachers’ program.

The dimension with the second highest response was leader models expected behaviour (17%). Focus group members and all teachers spoke of the principal’s modelling. Teacher 1 remarked, “She is a terrific role model, really, in all aspects.” According to Teacher 7, “She modelled different strategies (i.e., cooperative learning, Tribes).” Teacher 6 claimed, “She models everything” and staff listed the following characteristics: “honesty,” (T7), “fairness,” (T7), “fun loving,” (T7), “active, healthy, life style,” (T7), “cooperative learning,” (T8), “positive attitude,” (T8), “positive outlook,” (T9), “sense of humour,” (T9), “excellent with people,” (T9), and “learning with us as we go,” (T10). Teacher 10 noted that she “coaches teams, runs ... is right in there doing extra curricular things,” (T10). She “interacts among staff,” (T11). She is “positive. It’s number one. She can exude that,” (T11). Teacher 12 said she modelled “instructional
strategies ... unbridled energy ... and a definite love and concern for children and people in general.”

The focus group also provided examples of her modelling. They observed that she “models involvement in education outside the school through committee work.” In addition, they said she modelled “caring and respect ... enthusiasm ... seeing positive elements in every person and every situation.”

Structures and decision making processes were discussed by all participants constituting 11% of all responses. This category included opportunities for shared decision making. Teacher 7 explained that the whole staff decided on activities that involved students and “what we want to do as a staff.” According to Teacher 9, the principal was “very collaborative in her decision making,” and “decisions aren’t necessarily laid in cement. They can be revisited. I think we are a big part of it,” (T10). Focus group members commented, “Some of the deeper decisions do require input and those are things that we (SGT) try to bring to the staff.” They talked about the “electives” issue and how staff had to decide whether or not the school would run electives during that school year. One member described the situation:

Everybody is involved, or they have to be committed to the task. They have to go through the process. It is like, you have got to go through those rapids, buddy. We are going through these rapids, and once we have decided, then everybody has to get their paddles out and go in the same direction ... And we need everybody.

Principal 2 also described her decision making styles.

I have three decision making styles. One, when I make the decision. I know I need to make it. I need to make it quickly. I use my expertise, my judgment ... The second one is when I gather data and then, with a small group of people, make a decision. And the third one is when we ... try to reach consensus, and I figure if we get to 80%, that’s good consensus. That’s my time taker. I do that one when major issues, like ‘Are we going to reinstate some sort of skiing electives? Where do we go with this?’ and then I set that up so that the process can take place.

She also spoke about power. “I make sure I never use positional power, unless it’s absolutely, absolutely desperate. I use my personal power. And, positional power, I have got it, why would
I use it? That’s how I view it.” This personal power was obviously quite compelling. T9 observed, “She is infectious and she makes you feel good and positive ... she also has this very subtle way of invoking change,” (T9).

Throughout the interviews teachers spoke of the principal and vice principal, and what they did as an administrative team. The principal explained their relationship, “VP and I have a signal now. The round circle means circular file, and we don’t have to talk about it. If I think it is circular file, and he agrees, then we pitch it because it means we are getting into overload.” In addition, Principal 2 is good at delegating. For example, she asked “the secretary to take charge of announcements.” (P). She also worked with Teacher 6 to put forth a proposal to the board for funding. The money was used to promote technology and literacy, a school-based project.

All participants spoke about the leader’s high expectations (7% of all remarks). According to Teacher 1, “She is not willing to take second best ... as a professional you do your very best and you better be the very best for the kids’ sake.” Several other teachers had the same sentiment, “She expects you to do your very best for kids,” (T9). Or, as Teacher 8 contended, “She expects you to be the best person you can be ... and she expects you to treat the kids fairly.” Focus group members said her expectations were “HIGH” and that she expected you “to be the best you can be.”

“Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation” was a dimension which also received seven percent of responses. Teacher 8 contended, “She makes you aware of everything that is out there and promotes it.” Focus group members remarked that she provided intellectual stimulation through “workshops and speeches ... having people come in ... [and providing] new professional resources, professional readings ... [and getting staff involved in] Trivia Nights.” Principal 2 conscientiously provided stimulating opportunities for her staff. For example, she “summarized articles for them.” She brought in staff development experts who introduced the teachers to new
instructional strategies (i.e., cooperative learning) and philosophies (i.e., Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences, 1993). Principal 2 organized a “best practices” session among staff on a PA day and she “encouraged subscriptions to OPHEA and Canadian Educator.”

A new dimension which was added to the framework, “Leadership Traits and Capacities”, was talked about by all teachers, the focus group, and the principal representing seven percent of statements. Column one of Table 4 lists the traits and capacities. The second column indicates how many people made comments, and the remaining columns display the percentage of responses in each of the areas. The following outline illustrates comments that were made about each of principal 2's traits (numbers 1 to 3) and capacities (numbers 4 and 5):

1) Enthusiastic, Positive Attitude
   “From her personality, her work ethic, her everything, her whole focus on life is infectious,” (FG).

2) High Energy Level
   “She is extremely dynamic and full of energy,” (T9).

3) Sense of Humour
   “You have to know when to laugh and put everything in perspective,” (P).

4) Strong Interpersonal Skills
   “She has a really marvelous way with people where she can get them excited about things in a very non-threatening way,” (T9).

5) Good Listener
   “She listens to your ideas,” (T10).

The trait that received the most support was good interpersonal skills (32%). Enthusiastic, positive attitude (29%), high energy level (21%), and good listening skills (15%) also received some support, while sense of humour received a limited response (3%).
### Table 4

**School 2 - Level 1 Coding**

**Leadership Traits and Capacities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Traits and Capacities</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 24</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 2</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice, Kind, Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude, Enthusiastic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Key, Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interpersonal Skills*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listener*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N.B.** * Indicates capacities, the other traits are characteristics*
"Vision" was discussed by all eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal, representing six percent of the comments. Principal 2 stated, "My overall vision is that I see productive, busy, happy kids learning in a variety of ways. My big vision is that kids are moving forward and are becoming responsible for their learning." Staff understood this vision because when asked what their leader's vision was, they replied, "The main vision for the school has to do with children, growth, any kind of growth, meeting the needs of all," (T1). Teacher 6 answered that the vision was "to treat every child as if they were the most important item, to get the family and community on board, to teach that child to be the best, most active learner that she or he can be." Or, simply stated by Teacher 7, the vision was "for each child to develop to his fullest."

All teachers, the focus group, and the principal addressed goal setting (4% of responses). Teacher 6 said, "Last June, Principal needed help with her management plans and those goals [set by staff] became an important part of her plans." According to Teacher 8, they usually do their goal setting "at the beginning of the year when we are looking at what we are going to do this year." The focus group felt that by establishing goals together, "goal setting actually helps us focus our energy."

Three other dimensions of leadership received support; however, not all participants provided examples of these dimensions. "Leader Provides Resources" was talked about by seven teachers, the focus group, and the principal (8% of responses). Principal 2 supplied teachers with "binders of materials," (T8), "in-service sessions," (T9), "release time," (T10), "facilitators from the board," (T11), "workshops and PD sessions," (T12), "coverage," (FG), "new computer software," (FG), and "materials and budget," (FG).

This principal worked on "Building Culture" (seven participants, the focus group and principal mentioned this category representing 6% of remarks). Staff in school 2 shared the same
values. “Our five C’s, it’s just an on-going thing. It just becomes part of the school climate,” (T1) and these values were reiterated each day on the PA system. Principal 2 used a symbol, ‘The Bridge of Conflict’ to help students work through their problems. She also employed rituals. “We have gone into the cooperative groups and worked there with our groups and we begin each [staff] meeting like that,” (T8). Teacher 10 explained another ritual, “Every other Friday is treat day where the vice principal and principal do yard duty and staff have a chance to meet informally and discuss things.” According to Teacher 12, the principal took time to read the culture when she first arrived at school 2. “When Principal came on to our staff, well, the first year you are on staff you have to sit back a little bit, check out the lay of the land, get in there, but without down grading anybody previously or anything like that.” The first year she wanted to see how everything was working,” (T6).

Another dimension which was added to the framework, “Administrator Practices”, was mentioned by five participants, the focus group, and the principal constituting six percent of responses. Table 5 summarizes the eight categories in this dimension. Examples of statements classified as referring to administrative practices are as follows:

1) Staffing Issues - hiring, transferring
   “If a teacher is not up to snuff, she makes it known, in a professional, nice way,” (T6).

2) Communication - with students, parents, and staff
   “She makes sunshine calls home too,” (T8).

3) Discipline Issues - suspensions
   “If she says you do this and you are going to get suspended, then she follows through,” (T6).

4) School Safety
   “She deals with problems on the bus,” (FG).

5) Board/Superintendent Issues
   “She deals with board members and the superintendent,” (T10).
### Table 5

**School 2 - Level 1 Coding**

**Leadership - Administrative Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/SO Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Parental Issues
   "She has a really open door policy with parents," (T8).

7) Gate Keeping
   "She is a gate keeper and decides whether to take on new projects or not," (FG).

8) Other (i.e., ordering materials, fund raising, time table)
   "I tell people to order materials ... I deal with fund raising ... change the timetable," (P).

By examining participants' statements, categories received the following overall responses: staffing issues (18%), other (18%), communication (14%), board/superintendent issues (14%), parental issues (11%), gate keeping (11%), discipline (7%), and school safety (7%).

Organizational Learning

According to Watkins and Marsick (1993), "Learning results in changed organizational capacity for doing something new, and it is embedded and shared through systems," (p. 147). The results of comments made regarding organizational learning processes, structures, and outcomes may be found in Table 6. Table 6a shows the largest number of comments had to do with organizational learning processes (52%). All eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal referred to processes such as working with people in their divisions, solving problems with the whole staff, and working together with a teaching partner or partners. This sharing of expertise with other staff members was prevalent in school 2. For example, T10 noted, that one of the teachers was an excellent coach and he did a workshop on coaching. She also noted, "The teacher librarian always does mini updates on new computer programs."

Organizational learning structures were commented on by seven of the eight people, as well as the focus group, and the principal, representing 43% of the comments. Participants made reference to the use of professional activity days, the cooperative home base groups that were used
Table 6
School 2 - Level 1 Coding
Organizational Learning

Table 6a - Organizational Learning Processes and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 44</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 28</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 11</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Indiv.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b - Organizational Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 39</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 27</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 12</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-Group*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Individual*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Community*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Students*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * Under is the abbreviation for Understanding
in staff meetings, division and grade meetings. Very few comments were made regarding individual learning processes or individual learning structures. However, many teachers cited stimuli for individual learning (see section on Stimuli). The area of outcomes that received the most support was increased understanding for the group (35%) with six of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal providing comments (see Table 6b). An example of this outcome was provided by a focus group member who stated, “As a group we have learned to use ‘The Bridge of Conflict’ when working with the children.”

Five of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal made reference to increased understanding for individuals (13%). Teacher 11 explained how she had worked on “an integrated, outcomes based unit, with all of those [outcomes, Multiple Intelligences] mixed right through ... I am working on [it] for me.” Other areas that received a fair amount of support were individual change of practice (15%) and collective change of practice (9%). Teacher 8 explained that her practices had changed because “I really [try] to plan towards The Common Curriculum and get my goals from that.” Only two teachers and the focus group referred to an increase in skills, and that had to do with using “new [cooperative learning] techniques,” (T1).

An outcome, which was not included in the framework, but which was added, had to do with benefits for students. This outcome earned 18% of responses, the second highest rating overall. Teacher 8 noted, “It is important to keep in mind that this is for the kids and we are here, working as a unit, and they are going to benefit in the end.” Or, when the principal and staff got out and walked or ran with the students, “it had a positive affect on the children,” (FG).

Another interesting outcome mentioned by the focus group was the impact their literacy program had on the community. Parents learned how they could work with their children to improve the children’s literacy skills. This outcome was labeled as increased understanding for the
community and it received 6% of responses.

Teachers in school 2 were involved in individual and collective learning. Their leader’s support, her provision of resources and intellectual stimulation, as well as modelling of expected behaviours appeared to influence the staff’s learning. Nonetheless, staff pointed to her enthusiasm as an impetus for learning. According to Teacher 10, “She listens to your ideas. She is really keen and encourages you to try new things and is there to help or just to bounce ideas off. She is always learning with us as we go.”

Organizational Learning Stimuli

Participants cited five stimuli for learning (see Table 7). The first column lists the stimuli: change issues, performance appraisal, professional development, personal preference, and university students (teacher candidates). Column two indicates the number of people making statements. In columns three, four, and five percentage of responses for the teachers, the focus group, and the principal are recorded. Finally, column six summarizes the percent of all comments made regarding stimuli. Thirty-seven percent of responses attributed growth to personal preference, “an interest. I want to keep up with what’s going on,” (T7). As Teacher 1 noted, “I like to learn. It is one of the things that I enjoy.”

Issues of change (i.e., new curriculum documents from the Ministry) were commented on by 27% of participants. A focus group member explained that change had impacted on her learning.

The times are a changing. I think maybe a few years ago we could have a five year plan, but I don’t think we can anymore, not with the changes going on in the Ministry, and policies coming right from the top, and even with our own Board, the constant changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 37</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Preference</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A third reason for growth was associated with opportunities for professional development (18%). Teacher 12 said her personal growth “hinged on the [workshop] opportunities presented.”

A fourth stimulus that promoted organizational learning was having student teachers in their classrooms. Teachers noted that “it is very much a growing experience for everybody. And, I think the host teachers would say that it was a lot of work, but they learned a great deal out of it because they were exposed to outcome based planning,” (T12).

The teachers in school 2 were a very motivated group of learners, some more so than others. Teacher 12, for example, gave several examples of new learning experiences. She spoke of taking a workshop on Multiple Intelligences and then going out and purchasing a book on the topic so she could increase her knowledge in this area. She was the adjunct professor for the university students. She took Tribes training (a cooperative learning philosophy developed by J. Gibbs, 1987) and incorporated this philosophy into her class. She also took a workshop on True Colours (which matches colours and personalities). This teacher was a self-starter; she believed in her own personal, professional growth.

Although some teachers are self-motivated learners, others are not. However, it appears that being on this staff, and having a principal who promoted professional development, provided resources, as well as support and intellectual stimulation, certainly contributed to teachers’ growth.

**Barriers**

Comments which were indicative of barriers to collaboration and organizational learning represented only 1% of all statements made (see Chapter 5, Table 5.2). Column one of Table 8a lists the barriers identified in the literature (i.e., time, not open to change, pressure/stress, isolation, morale). Column two indicates the number of teachers making comments, while the remaining
columns report the percentage of comments made by the various participants. Interesting to note is that statements regarding: not open to change, pressure/stress, and isolation were made by three teachers. Eight of the eleven statements were made by Teacher 9. This is a teacher who had been hired to a new school, left the new school four years ago to come to “this kind of environment ... Here, you have teachers who have been on staff many, many years, and ... generally speaking, the staff is not open to new things. They need a longer time to really think about things and digest things.” Teacher 9 came to school 2 with “another staff member whom I worked with really well [in her previous school]. We were very compatible at the other school ... but she has gotten pregnant twice since she has been at this school, so you know she has been off a lot.”

Teacher 9 found it challenging to break into the culture of school 2. She said, “I found it very difficult to be accepted.” According to her, “there hadn’t been a new teacher at the school in the 17 years before I came.” Teacher 9 told how there had been a new person join the staff this year and “just, out of curiosity [I have] been watching because she is the first new one since I have been here.” The “new” teacher had been teaching for “many, many years and she has been around and she really seemed to fit in very easily and I don’t recognize any of the difficulties that I experienced when I first came.”

Teacher 9 did “some collaboration” but found “one of the draw backs with collaboration was just the time restriction.” She also felt that her change in grade level forced her to learn the new curriculum before she could collaborate with others. Nevertheless, she said, “I personally do like to collaborate. I find that two heads are better than one and ... other people’s ideas ignite ideas of your own ... but there isn’t anybody at the school, at this moment that I collaborate with on a regular basis.” Teacher 9 also mentioned “pressures and stresses”, which teachers were faced with, as detriments to collaboration.
Table 8
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Barriers to Organizational Learning and to Organizational Culture

Table 8a - Barriers to Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 5</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8b - Barriers to a Collaborative Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher 10, a relatively new teacher to the school (six years), expressed a concern about the staff’s openness to change. “There are a few staff ... that are more hesitant, just in that they have had certain teaching styles for a long time and it’s hard to break those patterns.” She suggested that this represented about 25% of the people on staff. She noted that “the longer the principal has been here, the more staff that are just willing to take the risk and just jump in.” Teacher 10 also found the staff eager to support her initiatives. “I am pretty much game for anything that comes up, so I tend to drag everybody else along with me. They [the experienced staff] know more of the realities of implementing things, whereas I get excited about it ... so it is good in that way that they have the practical, ‘Well, how are you going to move 80 bodies through these stations?’.”

T10 had been involved with several different teachers and planned multi-aged grouping units with them. This teacher, apparently, had no trouble fitting in with staff. She contended that they “were really very, very open.”

It didn’t take too long to realize that you could take the risks or that you could go to that person in the portable next to you and ask, ‘Now how is this done?’ or ‘What’s this all about?’ ... When you first arrive, you think, ‘Well, I can’t just go and ask them, you know. I can’t mooch all of their ideas,’. But it became very evident that they were willing to help out. A lot of senior people on staff became mentors and looked after me and made sure that I wasn’t spending 24 hours a day here trying to plan. If they had something in their filing cabinet that was similar to what I was doing, that would always be offered as a guide (T10).

The only other person who made comments, that were considered to be barriers, was another new teacher. He observed,

Whenever you try to produce change, there is always going to be some kids, or some people, lagging behind or dragging on it. I think we are all going in the right direction, and I think it will happen. It is starting to happen, and I think we are starting to see the effects of what Principal wants. And, you can see it starting to come around, and I think it just takes time (T11).

Teacher 11, a grade six teacher, had only been on staff since October. This teacher seemed to have fit into the staff quite well. He told of a fairy tales unit that he was working on with a grade one,
two, and kindergarten class. In spite of this, Teacher 11 felt isolated. He said that there is not “a real academic mentor for me yet ... [no one at] the same grade level, kind of helping me through the academic part.”

Although these three teachers’ comments only represented 1% of all comments made, it was concerning that they were all relatively new to the school. This begs the question, “What can be done to ease a newcomer into the culture of the school?” Perhaps principals, and staffs, need to be aware of this situation and make an extra special effort to acculturate newcomers. Furthermore, wherever possible, teachers should have another teacher to work with who is dealing with students at the same grade level. As T12 pointed out, “It would have been easier [to collaborate] if there had been another straight grade four.”
APPENDIX I
School 3 - Data from Level 1 Coding

Form of Culture

Table 1 summarizes participants’ responses regarding the form of school 3’s culture. The first column lists the various forms of culture: isolated, collaborative - professional, collaborative - inclusive, and other. Column two indicates the number of participants making comments of a positive or negative nature. Percentage of total comments made by the participants, the focus group, and the principal are recorded in columns three, four, and five. In column six, the total percentage of relevant responses is indicated. Fifty-three percent of all comments referred to the culture as collaborative - professional and an additional three percent viewed the culture as collaborative - inclusive. Twelve percent of the comments were in the isolated category, while 22% fell into the “Other” form of culture.

Six teachers spoke of the culture being collaborative. Teacher 11 said that they “have a very collaborative culture.” Teacher 8 explained, “I think that the idea’s not to feel like we’re all separate people and that inside somewhere you’re part of a team dealing with something within the school.” According to Teacher 9, “the collaborative approach is very evident in a lot of the things that we do here.” One of the reasons why “we decided that we would all work, even the fours, fives, and sixes together, that way we would make sure we were all on the same track,” (T5).

The focus group provided several examples of times when the whole school worked together on projects. Earth Week was one of those projects. “We were given a theme and the librarian [came] up with things, and we collaborate[d] that way.” They noted, “We collaborated more when we had to do that group unit” or “we collaborate when something big happens” such as the school wide project on Canada or their technology project.
### Table 1

**School 3 - Level 1 Coding**

**Organizational Culture - Form of Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 40</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Isolated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17% 5%</td>
<td>3% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two teachers, the focus group, and the principal made negative comments about the form of the culture being collaborative - inclusive. These were all remarks which had to do with the lack of support from the community. Teacher 6 noted that although “we want to involve the community more and we need students to realize that we are an entity of the community. We are not solely a school, but we have to involve neighbours. We have to be good neighbours.” But, she does not feel this is happening. According to teacher 4, “People get frustrated when things don’t go well, when there is not parent support, or when there is negative parent input.” The focus group commented that when it comes to kids swearing or misbehaving “you aren’t going to get support from the parents.” They explained what they were up against:

Because of the difficulty with some of the parents in the area, there’s sometimes back stabbing involved, or not back stabbing, a full blown lie has gone home, and teacher bashing. And a little network of phone calls or parents meet out in the school yard, dropping off their children and then they are into the office quick as anything to run you into the ground.

These types of statements accounted for the negative responses in the collaborative - inclusive category.

Three teachers and the focus group labelled the culture as isolated, representing 12% of all comments made. For example, Teacher 6 observed, “We are all individuals. We run our ship the way we think it should be run.” Teacher 7 noted, “I don’t think we [staff] agree on a lot of things,” and as an example she mentioned “the way things should be done in the school, the way children should be treated, the level of teacher involvement in the situations.” One focus group member also remarked, “I don’t find us as one big happy family. I think there’s cliques.”

The idea of cliques came up again in the category culture, form - other. In this category four teachers and the focus group spoke of a balkanized culture. Teacher 5 noted, “Certainly there is divisions between divisions. I mean you have got your primaries who run a different ship than the
juniors, and the intermediates are different again.” The focus group also viewed the staff as being divided according to their divisions. For example, “You are sort of disjointed, especially with the intermediates. They get a morning recess, but you don’t see them in the afternoon.” Nevertheless, teacher 9, a member of the intermediate division, felt the intermediates worked well together as a team. He pointed out, “I think specifically in the intermediate division we have had a very collaborative approach.”

Balkanization in this school was not merely contained to divisions. There appeared to be a lack of unity within the primary division. “I would say as a grade we have our goals, but I know the grade one’s did it [goal setting] as well, so that is the one’s and two’s out of the primaries. I don’t know about the three’s,” (FG). Perhaps balkanization occurred within grade levels because the size of the primary division was so large.

In the “Other” category of Table 1, the focus group and three teachers referred to the culture as comfortable. “Here it is pretty laid back. I never feel pressured with things at this school,” (T5). Or, as Teacher 4 expressed it, “I think there are a lot of people who are comfortable not changing and would rather keep on doing things the way they are doing them.”

Although the majority of comments (53%) would suggest that the culture of this school was collaborative, it did not appear to be a uniform culture. Fifty-five percent of the teachers’ comments fell into the collaborative category; seventy-eight percent of the principal’s remarks were in this category too, but only 30% of the focus group’s statements were indicative of a collaborative culture. There seemed to be collaboration, but this collaboration occurred in large part within divisions. For example, Teacher 11 commented, “I know in the intermediate division we do a lot of integrated units, units as a division.” The teachers also seemed to work together when they had a major school wide project because, as Teacher 5 pointed out, “You know you get farther ahead
when it is a group thing versus individual and we are encouraged to work together.” Therefore, school 3’s culture had components of collaboration, but other forms of culture, such as isolation, balkanization, and comfort impinged on the uniformity of this organization’s culture.

Content of Culture

The norms, values, beliefs, and underlying assumptions which are shared by the organization’s members constitute the content of a school’s culture. An attempt was not made to distinguish which comments were norms and which were values, beliefs, or assumptions. Instead, descriptors (i.e., mutual support, sharing of ideas, collegiality, professional development, risk taking, feedback, working together, humour, reflection, celebration, pride in profession, respect, trust, and students first) were employed to interpret the content of the culture.

Table 2 provides an overview of comments made about the content of school 3’s culture. In the first column, the descriptors employed in the analysis are listed. The second column indicates the number of participants who made comments on content, while the third column illustrates the percentage of comments made by the participants. Columns four and five record the total percentage of comments made by the focus group and the principal, and the last column is the percentage of total relevant responses.

“Work Together” and a belief that “Students Come First” were the two descriptors which received the most support. All eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on the former descriptor. The principal, for example, commented:
### Table 2
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**Organizational Culture - Content of Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms, Values, Beliefs, Assumptions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 119</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 62</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 71</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 252</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Together</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have different people working together ... the grade sevens and eights all work together ... The two grade five teachers do a super job working together ... All the grade ones got together and they worked on a project ... Two grade two teachers got together and they worked on a project ... All of the junior division got together and decided to work cooperatively on a project.

Teacher 4 told how there are "usually six of us working together on something like that [integrated units]." This teacher noted, "We have the opportunity during lunch hours and after school [to plan together]. It doesn't have to be a long drawn out process." According to Teacher 10, "We have had instances where everybody, the divisions will get together. They will plan things that they have to do together to meet the goals." When they became involved in a technology project, Teacher 11 reported, "We got together with our divisions and decided where we wanted to go with that."

The category "Students Come First" also received a great deal of support from the teachers, the principal, and the focus group. Seven teachers commented on this category. For example, Teacher 4 stated:

This is a challenging school. It is large. It has got a transient population. It has got a wide variety of cultures and socio-economic groups. It has got a large number of bussed kids. It is a big, challenging school to teach in. I think that we all want to do the best that we can in terms of preparing the students to learn and to help them be good citizens.

The principal agreed. "I think by and large they want to do a good job for the kids." He said:

When you go into the staff room, if you ever hear a teacher venting because they have had a lousy day with a particular student, within seconds, you will have the same teacher trying to figure out how to help the student. You don't have a staff room where it is a place where you bitch and complain.

Teacher 9 remarked, "With all teachers there is a belief in the fact that children can be educated and they can be changed, [even if] it is social, and there is a strong social component that is necessary in this type of school." Teacher 10 also noted:

I think for the most part the students come first. All the teachers are really willing to go out of their way and put extra effort into what goes on for the students. As a resource teacher, I deal with several different teachers and I am amazed at what
some of these teachers will put into doing what’s best for kids. I mean they really teach with their hearts and their souls.

Another category which received support from seven teachers, the principal and the focus group was “Mutual Support”. In this school, the principal said that the teachers “are really very supportive.” Teacher 4 also contended, “The culture and atmosphere of the school is supportive.” “There is a strong bond between the teachers here,” (T9). Teacher 10 said they “help each other out.” The kids in this school are very difficult and, according to the focus group, this can be “very discouraging. That is why as a staff if you can just let vent, you know, because there is usually someone on the staff that you can go and let them know what kind of a day you’ve had.” In fact, a member of the focus group stated, “I feel like I can go to pretty well anyone here and ask for help.”

The “Sharing of Ideas and Resources” category was commented on by five teachers, as well as the focus group, and the principal. Teacher 6 explained that “at a junior meeting we would share with others what we learned at a specific workshop.” Teacher 9 commented that “there seems to be more sharing” in this school than in her previous school. The principal provided opportunities for sharing. Teacher 10 explained that once a month they had meetings “where the teachers go out together and brought in their cooperative learning ideas so we’re encouraged to share with each other.” Principal 3 remarked that this staff “are not people who hoard ideas. They are people who actually share.”

Other categories which received some support were: professional development (7%), risk taking (7%), collegiality (4%), and pride in profession (3%). Professional development was relevant in that six of the teachers, the focus group, and the principal all made reference to this descriptor. The principal noted, “I think because there were an awful lot of people who were interested in their development, that it has spread so that there are other people interested now.” Teacher 8, for
example, said, “As an individual I found with the change from a high school to the elementary panel, I’m now trying to learn even more to make sure I’m keeping up with everything that’s happening around me.” Teacher 9 shared the same sentiment. “I have felt since I have been here that I needed to get out and find out about these things [new teaching strategies].” He updated himself in spite of the fact that “it was later in my career.”

In this school, the four conditions of culture which received the most support were: working together, students come first, mutual support among colleagues, and sharing of ideas and materials. These characteristics were all indicative of a collaborative culture. Although teachers worked together within their division, or with teachers at the same grade level, the fact is they got “together quite a bit for curriculum development and teaching techniques” (T9). As a focus group member stated, collaboration happens “if you have someone to work with.”

The school’s present culture is quite a contrast from what it was several years ago. A focus group member elaborated:

When I came here my first year [17 years ago], there used to be a group of men in the corner, and when you walked in as a female ... I mean there were six brand new teachers and I went in [to the staff room], but there were four or three [female teachers] who wouldn’t even go in the room because they knew they were going to be rated on a scale of one to ten ... It was horrible!

Another member added that the present culture was “much better than it was then!”

Leadership

Leithwood’s dimensions of transformational leadership formed the basis for this study. Two other dimensions, administrators’ practices and leadership traits and capacities, emerged during the analysis and were added to the framework. Table 3 displays the frequency of mention for each of the dimensions of leadership which are listed in the first column. The second column indicates the
number of participants making comments, while columns three, four, and five report the percentage of responses made by the participants, focus group, and the principal concerning the dimensions. The last column reports the percentage of total relevant responses in each dimension.

Eighty-nine percent of the codes were positive and eleven percent were negative. Teachers’ negative comments totalled eight percent, while the focus group’s negative comments numbered 22%. The most positive influence was “Leader Provides Support” with 24% of all relevant responses. All eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on this dimension. For example, Teacher 11 observed, “Whatever he can do to help out, he is supportive in so many ways. That, in my mind, is one of his strongest points. He makes you believe that he is fully supporting you, and he is.” This principal was particularly supportive in the area of staff development. Teacher 11 noted, “He is very into professional development and he is a big supporter of PD ... People aren’t forced to go, but they are encouraged.” This stance was reiterated by the focus group. “He lets you know, first of all about what is available [in terms of PD opportunities], and asks would you like to go and he finds a way of allowing you to go, by covering your class, whatever.” Teacher 5 commented, “He has often asked us, ‘You know, I am going to this one [workshop], would you like to come?’ or, ‘This is available on such and such a date. I am going to send a couple of people. Would you like to go?’,” (T5). Further, Teacher 6 noted, “He is very, very willing to support us in terms of initiating or setting up something that will enhance you personally or the school.” At the same time, she said, “He lets you know you are doing a good job.”

Several teachers commented on the support they received because of the principal’s presence in the building. Teacher 4, for example, said:
Table 3
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Dimensions of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 337</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 130</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 106</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 573</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4% 1%</td>
<td>2% 3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7% 1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25% 2%</td>
<td>20% 6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4% 1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18% 1%</td>
<td>17% 5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3% 1%</td>
<td>2% 2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3% 1%</td>
<td>5% 6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5% 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformational Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
He is supportive in terms of, he is around. He will just come up for a visit. You know, he is there. You know you can pop downstairs and see him in his office, if he is in his office, but he is usually out just visiting lots of different classrooms and different areas of the school and different people in the school.

Teacher 8 maintained, “I think his roaming the school and talking to everybody [is supportive].” She added, “Just the fact that he’s here and involved [is supportive].” Teacher 9 agreed. “He is good at getting around the school and talking to people.” Teacher 10 observed, “He spends a lot of time in the classrooms.” This teacher also mentioned that the principal “backs the teachers up in dealings with parents and in dealings with students.”

On the other hand, negative frequency counts were recorded because two teachers felt they did not have the principal’s full support. According to Teacher 7, the principal was often not in the school. “If he is in the school, when we have a problem [he will deal with it]. But, he has to be here first.” Yet this same teacher commented, “I think he has been very encouraging if we are interested in something [i.e., attending workshops].” On a personal note, she told what she did when she had a problem, “Generally, I come down and just talk to him about it. He gives me his advice and tells me what he thinks I should do.” She also added, “He does a lot of mediation and helps the transition for people who are new in the community or new in the country and new in the school and he helps them to deal with us ... [and] he helps us to deal with them.”

The dimension with the second highest response was “Structures and Decision Making Processes”. Eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on this dimension representing 18% of all responses. The principal explained his decision making process:

I don’t try to make arbitrary decisions. And I think at first it drove some of them crazy because they wanted a decision right away ... A lot of times there is that opportunity, and I will want to confer and see all sides. Of course, some of them only want you to see their side, so it drives them a little nuts, and they will tell me that too.

Some members in the focus group interview did find this decision making style frustrating. One
member commented, “Staff does all the decision making ... Everything is delegated in committee, or the Growth Team does it, right? Isn’t that what the Growth committee is for, to make all of the decisions?” Another teacher stated, “As a whole, I don’t think we make a lot of decisions.” Yet, other teachers, during their individual interviews, felt the staff had “a lot to say in what was happening,” (T8). According to Teacher 9, “There is a lot more input here than I have ever seen before.” An insightful comment was made by Teacher 4:

I think they [staff] participate a lot [in decision making], but again, it is a personal choice. There are a lot of opportunities to be on the things like the SGT, the house league group, the graduation groups, student council, resource teams. There are a lot of opportunities, but you have to take those opportunities and teachers, you know, teaching is one part of your life, and I think teachers fluctuate in how much time they have.

This teacher was very astute in recognizing that teachers, at various points in their career paths, may be more or less involved in school life (Huberman, 1990). Perhaps this is why some of the teachers found it frustrating when the principal did not make a decision for them. On the other hand, Teacher 11 contended, “The principal tries to get everybody involved in decision making and give everybody an opportunity to have a say, and that is what the collaborative process is all about.”

All of the other dimensions of transformational leadership were referred to by the teachers, focus group, and the principal. “Leader Holds High Expectations” was commented on by eight of the teachers (a total of 7% of responses). For example, Teacher 5 said that the principal expects “that we do the best we can, that we take the kids’ interests to heart.” Teacher 6 noted, “I think he expects me to incorporate as much of the cooperative learning that we have gone to for the simple reason that we have been to several workshops.” Several teachers also mentioned the importance of professionalism. “[He expects] that you deal with the kids in a professional manner, that you deal with a situation in a professional manner,” (T9).

All eight teachers, and the focus group, spoke about the “Leader’s Vision” (7% of all
responses).

I think the vision for our school is to make it a cooperative environment where the students and teachers and every other staff member treats each other with respect. It is a big focus. It is almost more a social focus than an academic focus because academics will come later, but the social focus, especially in this school is essential. It is a very high needs area and through the use of different cooperative things and collaborative techniques that we are doing, that’s how we are trying to achieve it. It is difficult because the population of the school keeps changing (Teacher 4).

Each of the teachers made similar comments, and when the principal had been asked what his vision was, he said, “building a collaborative and cooperative environment.”

Seven of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal commented on “Leader Provides Intellectual Stimulation” (6% of all responses) and “Leader Models Expected Behaviours” (6% of all responses). The staff credited the principal with their intellectual stimulation. For example, they appreciated the “speakers he has brought in” (T4), “the workshops and in-services at the Board” (T8), “the contact with outside specialists” (T9), “the people he has brought in for training” (T10), and “visiting other teachers’ classrooms” (T11). These educators also valued their principal’s expertise in cooperative learning. “When we have staff meetings, he models cooperative techniques, Kagan structures, which is something of course he believes in.” According to Teacher 9, he modelled cooperative learning “through his style of management.” This teacher felt that the principal modelled “how to deal with kids. I think everybody knows that he will work with the kids, counsel the kids, and that he expects the teachers to do that before we get to the formal type of detentions, suspensions, that kind of thing.” Teacher 11 observed that the principal modelled “conflict resolution ... He believes in working toward a solution and he is not going to jump to a knee jerk reaction ... He will do that [mediate] with the students here. He likes to model conflict resolution skills.” The focus group added that he modelled “seeing the best in everyone ... He is a very, very positive person.”
One behaviour that Teacher 6 would like to see modelled more often was staff meetings. She expressed her concern:

If the chairperson does not call a meeting, then we don’t get a meeting. So I think what should be done should be a required meeting, say every Tuesday, of all the divisions, if not a staff meeting, then at least have a meeting of all the divisions at least once a month, or twice a month. It should be a specific time so that we will know, and we can make plans, and we can feed our discussions during that time.

This comment, however, represented one percent of all comments made by teachers.

The other dimensions of transformational leadership were commented on by several of the teachers, but overall received a low percentage of total responses. For example, seven of the eight teachers spoke of “Builds Consensus Regarding Goals” (3% positive, 1% negative). Six of the eight teachers discussed “Builds Culture” (4% positive, 1% negative). Furthermore, five teachers talked about the “Resources” that the leader made available to them (5% positive, 1% negative).

“Leadership Traits and Capacities” was a dimension that was added to the framework. Although the trait approach (Stogdill, 1948; Immegart, 1988), when employed in isolation, may yield confusing results, here it is acknowledged because four percent of all comments regarding leadership fit this category. Table 4 illustrates how the traits and capacities were sub-divided into nine areas: friendly person, enthusiastic, low key, fair, stubborn, generous, collaborative, good listener, well organized. The first six categories are traits and the last three are skills or capacities. In Table 4, the first column lists the traits and capacities that emerged from the data. Column two indicates the number of participants making comments, while the remaining columns report the percentage of comments made by the various participants.
### Table 4
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**Leadership Traits and Capacities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Traits and Capacities</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 12</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 7</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 5</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice, Kind, Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude, Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Key, Relaxed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interpersonal Skills*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listener*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. *Indicates capacities. the other traits are characteristics
The following outline illustrates comments made regarding the principal’s traits and capacities:

1) Friendly Person
   “I think he is a friendly guy, all in all,” (FG).

2) Enthusiastic
   “Oh, he is the keenest [when it comes to stimulating professional learning in the school],” (FG).

3) Low Key, Relaxed
   “[He is] pretty relaxed, easy going. He is just laid back,” (T5).

4) Fair
   “[My belief] is to be fair,” (principal).

5) Stubborn
   “He can be, I think, very stubborn in terms of if he thinks that something will work. He expects that that’s what will happen,” (T6).

6) Generous
   “He is very generous ... He always has a big party at the beginning of the year too, like he welcomes the staff to his home. Or he will bring a big cheese tray in, or something,” (FG).

7) Collaborative
   “He is a collaborative person ... He is also a cooperative person,” (T11).

8) Good Listener
   “He is a good listener. If you come to him, as a person, whether a staff member or a student, he will listen to what you have to say and weigh it and then decide what is the best action.” (T11).

9) Well Organized
   “He is an organized person,” (T8).

The capacity which received the most support was “Good Listener” with three teachers, the focus group, and the principal commenting on it, representing 38% of all relevant responses. This skill was viewed by the principal as being essential to his role. “I have really been an active listener so that you pick up on what they [staff] want to do ... You just have to wait for the right time sometimes where somebody will be talking away with you and you just say, ‘Hey, I have got
something for you'.” Principal 3 would also agree with the teacher’s remark that he could be stubborn. In fact, he characterized his leadership style this way, “I’m not a bull dozer; I am a bull dog. I latch on to something and just keep moving it along.”

“Administrative Practices”, which was another dimension added to the framework, received both positive (5%) and negative (3%) comments. Table 5 summarizes the eight categories of this dimension. Examples of statements classified as referring to administrative practices are as follows:

1) **Staffing Issues - hiring, transferring**
   “If he hears a rumour, or if he hears that there has been a bad feeling between divisions or between people ... then he does try to go to either the division chair or someone and [mediate it],” (FG).

2) **Communication - with students, parents, and staff**
   “Parents feel quite free to contact this office. It is encouraged in the newsletter too,” (FG - positive comment).
   “Sometimes those lines of communication break down and I think it is important to get the staff together as a whole to disseminate information a little more clearly,” (T11 - negative comment).

3) **Discipline Issues - suspensions**
   “He mediates a lot with the students and teachers,” (T7 - positive comment).
   “I think if we felt comfortable, or felt that if we left it to the office to follow through and we felt comfortable that this would be taken care of, in the manner that would be acceptable to, not to us, but to the student, then we would be more comfortable in having them [discipline issues] addressed there [in the office],” (T6 - negative comment).

4) **School Safety**
   “For the safety and security of students, I didn’t want to have parents here at lunch time or at recess. They shouldn’t be on school property because we don’t know who the parents are and who aren’t. We know most of them. Some of them we don’t. Some of them have got writs against them from the courts,” (principal).

5) **Board/Supervisory Officer Issues**
   “The past SO, a very analytical person, he sat down with me one day and over the course of an hour analyzed my leadership style ... We were talking and he really gave me a lot of insight into it, that I get things done and nobody realizes that it is being done,” (principal).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Number of Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 14</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>N = 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/SO Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Parental Issues
   "He is very good with the parent committee, very generous that way, of giving of his time,"
   (FG - positive comment).
   "He alternates. Don't say that! He alternates with the vp to go to the Community Council.
   He doesn't go to all of them. So I don't know about the giving of his time," (FG - negative comment).

7) Gate Keeping
   "We try to find connections so that you are not loading something else on to them,"
   (principal - positive comment).
   "There are just too many outside influences that I think could be taken care of so it doesn't
   infringe on what we are trying to accomplish," (T6 - negative comment).

8) Other
   "Budgeting is one area that does not involve staff very much, although we went from one
   school budget in which you put in what you wanted and you got the money for it, to now
   we each have our own classroom budget which is, of course, a lot more equitable," (T4 -
   positive comment).
   "People are actually asking for staff meetings because it has almost branched off too far into
   fragments," (FG - negative comment).

Four teachers, the focus group, and the principal discussed “Other” administrative practices
(i.e., his involvement with the fund raising committee, budget, physical running of the school,
organizing the new School Community Council, fun fair). A total of 16% of positive comments
made were in this category, whereas 11% of the comments were negative. A similar situation arose
with the categories of discipline (16% positive, 5% negative), communication (11% positive, 13%
negative), parental issues (11% positive, 2% negative), and gate keeping (2% positive and 2%
negative). The categories of board issues (5%), staffing issues (5%), and school safety (2%)
received only positive comments.

Organizational Learning

Table 6 summarizes the results of comments made regarding organizational learning
processes, structures, and outcomes for school 3. Table 6a illustrates that the largest number of
responses had to do with OL processes with seven of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal commenting on them representing 67% of all comments. Participants talked about getting together as a group to solve problems (“We talked it over,” T5.), discuss issues (“We had some lunch bag meetings about outcomes,” FG.), plan together (“All of the divisions got together and they planned a unit,” T10.), set goals (“I guess it’s [goal setting] a lot of talk again. We talk between the Growth Team, the division teams, the office talking to us; we even talk to the students and it’s a lot of open ended thinking with a closure to it finally,” T8.), and share ideas (Teachers shared their cooperative learning ideas at meetings that were held “once a month, the first Monday of every month,” T10).

Sometimes teachers’ learning processes involved working with a teaching partner, with the same grade level teachers, or with their division. Teacher 4 told how the intermediate division had made tremendous gains in understanding how to plan integrated units that incorporated outcomes.

We will sit together and sometimes it is only half an hour and we’ll say, ‘Ok. We’re doing a health and fitness unit. Alright, I am going to do this section on hygiene and you are going to do that section on nutrition. Ok, and what activities do you want to do?’ And it is really quick .. and then we each go off and do our own thing and bring it back and we show it to either our grade teaching partner or the whole division. And then we put it all together.

She stated one of the benefits of working together was “it divides your work in one quarter because there are four of us, but there is also the music teacher and she contributes, and we also have really good AR support [AR stands for Academic Resource teacher. This person works with all teachers in the school to program for special needs students]. So there is [sic] usually six of us working together on something like that.” Another benefit was for the students. “I think the kids enjoy the integrated units.”
Table 6
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Organizational Learning

Table 6a - Organizational Learning Processes and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 29</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 7</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 16</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Process/Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Structure/Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b - Organizational Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants’ Comments N = 39</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group’s Comments N = 10</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal’s Comments N = 14</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-Group*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Individual*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Community*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Students*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.  * Under is the abbreviation for Understanding
Other learning processes involved the whole staff. For example, Teacher 11 explained, “We set the goal as a staff to get involved in technology and in implementing technology and how it impacts on the environment. That was a goal that we set after collaborating.” He stated, “It wasn’t something that was set, or given to us by administration ... It was something that was arrived at as a staff and we sort of highlighted that as an area that we wanted to move toward as a staff.” He described the process they used to try to access funds from the board for a “Teaching/Learning” project.

We sort of brainstormed things that we could do as a school, possibilities to get that funding. And I think some areas were highlighted as areas that would be more suited to this kind of funding outlay to the school. And once we saw that was the case, then we sort of focussed on technology and we had a lot of input into it.

Once they received funding for the project “then we got together with our divisions and decided where we wanted to go with that. That whole process involved setting goals and objectives that we wanted to reach as a division and [and how we could] implement that into the classroom.” This example illustrates how the staff took it upon themselves to obtain funding which would help them with the implementation of new technology. They worked in teams, either by grade groupings or by division, to determine what expectations were appropriate for their students. Then, collaboratively, they wrote units which incorporated these new technology skills. The kind of learning that resulted from this project was what Argyris and Schön referred to as double-loop learning because it was a more complicated kind of learning that required the staff to set “new priorities” and question their long held assumptions (1992, p. 24).

A simpler type of learning was described by Teacher 4. She recognized that the staff was extremely dissatisfied with their yard duty schedule. After some thought, she approached a colleague and asked her whether she would be interested in developing a new duty schedule. The colleague said she would be willing to work with Teacher 4 on this undertaking. They then
contacted the principal.

The two of us said, myself and another fairly new teacher, ‘Oh, we’ll make up the duty schedule for next year.’ And, the principal said, ‘Great, go ahead.’ So we got input from every teacher and we fulfilled every single request and we had the best duty schedule that we had ever had.

This example is one of single-loop learning. Here the teachers worked together to solve a routine, day-to-day problem. According to Argyris (1992):

Whenever an error is detected and corrected without questions or altering the underlying values of the system (be it individual, group, intergroup, organizational or interorganizational), the learning is single-loop. (p. 8)

Noteworthy, however, is the point the teachers made of getting input from the other teachers. These two new teachers were also risk takers and they appealed to their principal who gave them his full support.

Organizational learning structures were mentioned by all eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal representing 33% of the comments. Structures included such things as “the SGT” (principal), PA days (T5), “the same prep time [as their teaching partner] at least one prep time per cycle” (T6), “staff meetings” (T9), “a day provided, actually I think it was three days over the school year for the different divisions [to meet and work together]” (T10), and “Mondays” (FG) when the staff had meetings to learn about new Ministry curriculum or share cooperative learning structures with one another.

In the area of outcomes, increased understanding for the group (35%) received the most support with six of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal providing comments (see Table 6b). The principal provided an example of this outcome. He explained how he had shared a “unit planning form that I had made up and it was made up of four sheets, including modifications for special programming. They had to sit in their groups and go though it.” The principal’s vision was for “everybody to make up their sheets [complete the unit using his format].” He felt that “they
have gone that far now so they know exactly what they are doing” and they were able to plan units collaboratively using a set unit format and they included modifications and technology.

Another outcome that received support was new practices for the group (21%). Six of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal all talked about their growth in the use of cooperative learning structures. For example, Teacher 8 explained that the principal had a vision.

He’s really brought it [cooperative learning] on board when he came to us four years ago. He made sure everybody got involved somewhere with workshops and [he used] hands on and working with other members in our team to be able to get there. We’ve used our PD days for that ... and [he’s provided] more free time for us so that we can sit down and actually put units together, talk.

The result was “cooperative learning became a big part of the school programming, especially for me, because I came from a high school background into the elementary panel so I had to start basically from step one and grow into the process too.” Teacher 8 also confessed, “Most of us are willing to give up our lunch hours and a lot of time after school to get it [cooperative learning] going.”

Table 6b also indicates that individual growth had occurred. Four teachers, the focus group, and the principal made reference to growth in individual understanding (16%). Further, five teachers, the focus group, and the principal referred to individual growth in practices (10%). Again, many of the participants cited growth in cooperative learning practices. “I personally have felt that I have grown in that I have felt very satisfied in accomplishing that [cooperative learning] in my class and have used that considerably,” T6. Some teachers learned how to develop integrated units. For example, “I have developed at least six [integrated units] with help from other teachers,” T4.

The educators in school 3 experienced both individual and collective learning. The motivation behind their learning stemmed from the principal’s vision of “building a collaborative and cooperative environment” and from the staff’s desire for perpetual learning.
We are always learning because there is always something new coming at us, and new children with new sets of problems. There are new learning problems being diagnosed all the time and the approaches to things [are new]. We are always learning as you go and you are always modifying curriculum to suit your class any way, so you are constantly changing (Teacher 7).

Organizational Learning Stimuli

Table 7 illustrates the five stimuli for learning that were cited by the teachers, the focus group, and the principal. In total, 57 comments were made. Fifty-two percent of all relevant responses were in the professional development category. These comments were made by five of the eight teachers, the focus group, and the principal. Professional development seems to be taken for granted in this school. For example, Teacher 4 stated, “I started in this board, so I started with workshops in cooperative learning.” She added that all of the teachers on staff have had in-service training on cooperative learning and “the biggest change that we have done is a shift towards cooperative learning.” Principal 3 noted, “Our board has provided those opportunities [PD], and I would like to continue taking them.” He also ensured that his staff received all kinds of professional development. They said they had attended the following sessions: “the First Steps reading programs” (T7), “cooperative learning training with Core French” (T7), “Kagan structures” (T9), “portfolios” (T9), “workshops on cooperative learning” (T10), “Multiple Intelligences workshops” (T11), “Creative Controversy with Laurie Stevahn” (FG), “inclusive schools workshops” (FG), and “self-evaluation session with teachers from another school” (FG). All of these opportunities helped the teachers grow and learn. Teacher 9 attributed “most of my growth and learning [to] taking courses that the board has provided such as cooperative learning, Kagan
### Table 7
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**Organizational Learning Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
<td>N = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Preference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structures, and workshops on portfolios.” In the words of one focus group member:

I really appreciate the workshops because I feel especially that the one just two weeks ago, it was just sort of a chance to get re-stimulated, especially I find that you really get bogged down, and not to discredit the school, but I get it [my stimulation] from outside the school.

Issues of change (i.e., new curriculum, change in teaching assignment) were commented on by four teachers, the focus group, and the principal representing 18% of all responses. Teacher 4 remarked, “My teaching has changed a lot and it is partly due to The Common Curriculum initiatives.” Another teacher noted, “My teaching practices have changed because I’m doing a different job now. Before I was teaching grade four, and now I’m doing AR [Academic Resource teacher],” (T10).

Personal preference was a stimulus for learning that was mentioned by three teachers, the focus group, and the principal (14%). Principal 3 noted that two of his teachers “were really interested in attending Carol Rolheiser’s workshop [on portfolios]” so he made sure they were able to attend it. He also told how “our grade eight teacher was already interested in ethno-cultural enlightenment with his students” and the teacher pursued this as an area of growth. According to Teacher 11, “The way the system is set up here is that we are given a lot of those opportunities [for P.D.], and we can take them if we want. And if you don’t want, then that’s your choice.” Further, Teacher 6 pointed out, “There are some teachers who have pursued it [cooperative learning] more than others” adding to the idea that personal preference may impact on learning.

Another category, performance appraisal, also received support (14%). Teacher 4 explained:

Pretty much every teacher has had one of those personal appraisals. And that is really, to me very beneficial because it is not just someone coming and saying, ‘Ok, well, you know, you need to do your report cards a little more neatly, or get your register in on time,’. It is what do you feel you need to work on ... I did my whole focus, my whole goal was on parent communication and it really helped and it carried over the last three years.
Principal 3 stated, "One of the latest, and most influential parts of it [management plan] is with the collaborative and cooperative appraisal ... [learning is facilitated] through the collaborative appraisal." Teacher 11 maintained, "The collaborative appraisal feeds into the collaborative environment. If we were, in this particular case, if I was being evaluated traditionally ... it wouldn't really fit into that goal or that system."

One final category which was mentioned only by the focus group was university students (2%). One member stated, "We had student teachers come in. They did a little store front kind of thing and we learned from them, definitely." Another member agreed, "We did learn from them. They had done a lot of work on that [The Common Curriculum] in Teachers' College." In addition, they also learned "not only about portfolios for the students, but they [student teachers] also showed us their learning portfolios that they did through Teachers' College."

The stimuli of university students, collaborative performance appraisal, personal preference, and change issues all were viewed as stimulating growth. However, the dominant stimulus was unequivocally professional development. The fact that the principal had a special relationship with the staff development department was advantageous to this school. Principal 3 revealed:

We [staff development officer and principal] would have a symbiotic relationship almost. He would want to show case a school with some teachers that were doing a really good job at cooperative learning, and he knew that we had some good people over here because I had talked to him about it ... He [staff development officer] would say we have some people coming in from Vermont, or we have some people coming in from Montreal, or from Argentina or Pakistan and he knew that we would host them. And they would go in and talk to the people and see the things that were going on. They would work with the kids ... And, in turn, whenever I wanted to send anybody to anything then he would always make sure that he would accommodate me so that I could send people to, most of it was cooperative learning activities, so I have sent people to everything from Tribes to Level 1, 2, and 3 [cooperative learning institutes], Multiple Intelligences, everything.
Barriers

Barriers to organizational learning and to a collaborative culture constituted two percent of all comments made (see Chapter 6, Table 6.2). When these statements were further sub-divided, only two of the twenty-one responses were viewed as barriers to OL (see Table 8a). Teachers 5 and 6 both identified “Time” as a barrier to learning.

We did not get our time as we had hoped to get together ... We do need time to get units planned, to get structures that we take from the cooperative learning workshops, to get those in the unit and see how we could apply them. And we haven’t had that this year. That is most disappointing (T6).

Comments which were seen as barriers to a collaborative culture fell into five categories (see Table 8b). Three teachers and the focus group spoke of pressure or stress as being a barrier to collaboration, representing 48% of the statements made. As the teachers’ comments below indicate, School 3 is a tough school and dealing with the day-to-day pressures appeared to be a major impediment to collaboration. For example, Teacher 6 stated, “With the students [being transient], the demand is so great on us accommodating and trying to implement a program ... the students are here maybe six months and sometimes they are off again and you lose what you are trying to build.” Teacher 10 also felt pressured.

I have been at this school for a long, long time so I don’t know what it’s like in other schools, but I think because of the student population we have, there’s an awful lot of stress in the teachers. We just seem to have such a high proportion of high needs students. I think after a while, that, well, it causes extra stress, and unnecessary stress.

Teacher 5 said that because people were so busy they did not have time to get together with colleagues.

Everybody is going, going, going, and even though you work with someone all day long, some days I don’t see the other grade six teacher, like for four days, and she is only two doors down. Because I am involved with things at lunch, and you know, everybody has just got their own things.
Table 8
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Barriers to Organizational Learning and to Organizational Culture

Table 8a - Barriers to Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 2</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 0</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8b - Barriers to a Collaborative Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Group's Comments N = 10</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principal's Comments N = 1</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses N = 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another barrier was mentioned by two teachers and the focus group. They felt that “Time” inhibited collaboration (21%). “You just can’t free up the day and say, ‘Here, go off and plan something.’ So now it is more or less our own time,” (T5).

Teacher 7 and the focus group spoke of morale as a barrier to collaboration (21%). “I think with any school, right now, morale is low,” (T7). According to one of the members of the focus group, “It is sort of cyclical because the social committee has been trying to build up the morale, but at the same time, if you set up something ... people weren’t signing up.” Another focus group member added, “Yet it is so important to get out and socialize. Even that pot luck at lunch or whatever, that is sometimes, the one final thing you can’t do, or handle.”

One teacher felt that the cooperative environment the school was trying to achieve remained isolated within the school’s context. The barrier of “Isolation” represented 5% of relevant responses. Teacher 5 confessed, “The difficult part was getting it [the cooperative environment] out into the community because of this disjointed community factor.”

The final barrier to collaboration was labelled “Not Open”, meaning not open to change. Only Teacher 11 spoke of this, but he labelled the people who were not open to change “resistors”.

I would say there are maybe five or six people, or four or five people [who are resistors]. Anytime you implement change, you have got people that are really hungry for change and will accept it and will run with it. Then you have the people who are unsure, or cautious or anxious about it, but who eventually catch on to the enthusiasm of the people who are really into it and they run with it. And then, no matter what you are introducing, you always have resistors and no matter what it is you are doing, those people who are resistors, or who are seen as resistors have grown as well. But they are still there, and they will find something to resist no matter what. And I think that is sort of a personality thing. But even those people, over time, will grow. Maybe they will grow in little small steps, but I think they will grow as well.

With 89% positive and 11% negative codes, it appeared that some participants had mixed feelings about the principal’s practices. Perhaps the negative comments surfaced because the
interview took place in June when the teachers were tired. Another possibility, for the negative comments could be because the principal and vice principal were not present at the focus group interview. Maybe, as one person in the focus group admitted, “I must be in a bad mood today,” or, conceivably, there is another reason for these results.

People experience leadership differently. For example, Teacher 7 made negative comments about the principal not being in the school. Contradicting this view were Teachers 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11. In the same vein, some of the teachers were very pleased with their means of communication through the Growth Team. Others felt that the staff needed to get together on a more regular basis. The focus group, for example, noted that “there aren’t very many staff meetings ... sometimes people get the wrong information when you are passing it on [from the chairs’ meeting].” They felt that they needed to “ask a question [at a staff meeting] and everybody can hear the same answer.” Therefore, results from this data support the idea that leadership may not be a school-wide phenomena. Instead, people’s perceptions of the principal, and his role, are unique, and therefore, each staff member experienced his leadership style differently.
Comparative Case Study - Level 1 Coding

Form of Culture

Table 1 represents a composite of participants' comments from the three schools concerning the form of their schools' cultures. The first column lists the various forms of culture: isolated, collaborative-professional, collaborative-inclusive, and other. The number of participants making comments in each of the schools is recorded in columns two, three, and four. Columns five, six, and seven indicate the percentage of comments made by participants in schools 1, 2, and 3. In the eighth, ninth, and tenth columns, the percentage of comments made by the focus groups is recorded. The next three columns illustrate the percentage of comments made by the principals, and the last three columns indicate the total percentage of relevant responses.

Few participants described their school's culture as isolated. In school 3, three teachers and a member of the focus group made comments which fit this category for a total of 12%.

In all three schools, the majority of teachers (seven in school 1, eight in school 2, and six in school 3), the focus groups, and the principals all characterized their cultures as collaborative, professional. This represented 62% of relevant responses in schools 1 and 2, and 53% of positive comments made in school 3. For example, in school 1, the secretary remarked, "It's a warm and inviting learning environment ... You've got teachers who truly do work as a team ... They all work very collaboratively." According to the focus group in school 2, "We work like a great, big family ... We were collaborative before it became a buzz word ... We haven't isolated ourselves so there is not this separation of divisions." In school 3, Teacher 9 observed, "I think that the collaborative approach is very evident in a lot of the things we do here." Principal 3 professed, "Everything in the school focusses in on developing the cooperative environment ... If there is anything that impacts on your division or beyond the whole school, then they work in teams."
### Table 1

**Composite Table - Level 1 Coding**

**Organizational Culture - Form of Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8 S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Isolated</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>5 3 15</td>
<td>6 0 17</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>5 2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative: Professional</td>
<td>7 8 6</td>
<td>59 54 55</td>
<td>67 82 30</td>
<td>75 67 78</td>
<td>62 62 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Collaborative: Inclusive</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>11 30</td>
<td>27 18</td>
<td>0 22 17</td>
<td>15 26 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Form - Other</td>
<td>4 3 4</td>
<td>25 13</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>25 11 0</td>
<td>18 10 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. S1, S2, and S3 represent Schools 1, 2, and 3 respectively.
Positive comments are made in the top half of diagonal boxes. Negative comments are indicated in the bottom half of the diagonal boxes.
School 2 had five teachers, the focus group, and the principal portray the school's culture as collaborative, inclusive representing 26% of all comments. A collaborative, inclusive culture was interpreted as extending into the community. Participants spoke of the community involvement in the school, as well as the school reaching out to the community to include them in the taping of their literacy video. This type of collaborative, inclusive culture was encountered, to a lesser extent, in school 1. Here, three people and the focus group talked about community involvement in the school representing 15% of their responses. These participants told how parents were connected to the school through their participation in the School Growth Team. According to the focus group, parents "are valued and they are part of the team." School 3 felt differently toward their community. Although the principal felt that the School Community Council (SCC) was financially supportive, teachers and the focus group felt a lack of affiliation with the community (-9%). Teacher 4 remarked, "People get frustrated when things don't go well, when there is not parent support, or when there is negative parent input." A focus group member observed, "I wouldn't say we are an area that has a lot of support from parents all the time, so that's very difficult."

Other forms of culture were discussed by four teachers in schools 1 and 3, three teachers in school 2, the focus group in school 3, and the principals in schools 1 and 2. These responses represented 18% of remarks made in school 1, 10% of comments in school 2, and 22% of responses in school 3. In school 1, one teacher observed, "I feel very comfortable coming to school," indicating a "comfortable" culture. The rest of the comments made were indicative of a balkanized culture. For example, Teacher 3 noted, "We work together in the intermediate wing. [Planning occurs] within the division." Teacher 2 commented, "I have seen some changes too, there are some camps at the present time ... A year ago we lost a great number [of staff] and that has just changed the balance of personalities so ... there are a couple sets of cliques."
Three teachers in school 2 considered the culture comfortable. Teacher 10 said, “It is such a comfortable environment.” This same teacher was the only one who characterized the culture as balkanized. She said that they worked with colleagues “in our own division,” yet she also gave examples of multi-aged grouping units (i.e., one on gardening and the French “Carnaval”).

In school 3, two teachers spoke of a comfortable culture. For example, Teacher 4 noted, “There are a lot of people who are comfortable not changing and would rather keep on doing things the way they are doing them.” One teacher, and a member of the focus group, depicted the culture as collegial. Teacher 7 confessed, “I enjoy coming to work here ... it is a nice school to come to.”

Four teachers and the focus group portrayed the culture as balkanized. For example, “It is hard for me to comment on the primary and junior division because I don’t really have any contact with them at all,” (T4). As Teacher 7 pointed out, “We do a lot of it [decision making] by division. The primary division will meet and make decisions and the juniors and the intermediates.”

Content of Culture

Table 2 summarizes responses made regarding the content of the three schools’ cultures. The first column lists the descriptors that were employed in the analysis. Columns two, three, and four indicate the number of participants who made comments. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh column the percentage of participants’ comments are recorded. The next six columns list the percentage of comments made by the focus groups and principals respectively. Percentage of relevant responses are indicated in the last three columns.

Certain cultural conditions appear to be more salient than others. “Students First” was addressed by all eight teachers in schools 1 and 2 and by seven teachers in school 3. Focus group members and principals also saw this as a powerful condition. This category represented 16%,
15%, and 21% of all comments made. In these schools, "People are united on the important things which is what’s best for kids," Teacher 12, School 2 (T12 - S2).

"Mutual Support" was deemed noteworthy by six teachers in school 1 and seven teachers in schools 2 and 3. Once again, the focus groups and principals viewed this condition as consequential. Relevant responses totalled 20% in school 1, 12% in school 2, 17% positive and .4% negative in school 3. According to Teacher 4 (S3), "There is a feeling of mutual caring about each other and what you are doing together." This support may take the form of "three or four of us taking courses together at the same time," (FG-S1) to "sitting with people and talking about common problems," (FG-S1) to having senior staff "mentor and look after me," (T10-S2). Support is essential because "we have to look after ourselves, and each other, in order to survive," (T4-S1).

Another condition which received substantial support from all participants was "Sharing of Ideas and Resources". This category obtained 12%, 14%, and 13% of all relevant responses from schools 1, 2, and 3 respectively. According to the secretary in school 1, "They share resources, share ideas, plan all of the units together." When Teacher 10 first arrived in school 2 she "didn’t think [she] could mooch all their ideas, but it became very evident that they were willing to help out ... If they had something in their filing cabinet they would always offer it." The focus group commented, "People work together to share resources or ideas," (S3). Teachers in these schools also shared their expertise. In school 2, Teacher 7 explained the "computer site manager helps [with new programs]." "The sports experts show others how to coach," (T8). "The teacher librarian does mini updates on resources," (T10) and she "will help with computers if you don’t know what to do," (FG). Sharing of expertise also occurred in school 1. "We have really good people who know a lot about computers, that have given in-services within the school," (T4). The same kind of sharing was noted in school 3.
Table 2

Composite Table - Level 1 Coding

Organizational Culture - Content of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.B.</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride-Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S1, S2, and S3 represent Schools 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Positive comments are made in the top half of diagonal boxes. Negative comments are in the bottom half.
Quite often the people that are here are excellent resources for that [learning new things]. We have really good, competent people. We have people here who have done presentations, workshops, with our board and with other boards. And because of that people will go to them, and they are not afraid to do that (Principal 3).

Risk taking received varying amounts of support from participants (five teachers in schools 1 and 2, and one teacher in school 3). Overall, however, this condition obtained 12%, 11%, and 7% of all comments made. In schools 1 and 2 teachers felt comfortable experimenting. Teacher 8 observed, “We’re all open to new ideas that come along,” (S1). “You bite off all kinds of things and say, ‘Yeah, I will try this’,” and they do because “this is a risk taking environment,” (FG-S1). Similar comments were made by teachers in school 2. “We are all willing to risk take,” (FG). Teacher 10 noted, “The longer that Principal has been here, the more staff that are willing to take the risk and jump in.”

“Teachers Work Together” was discussed by seven teachers in school 1, six teachers in school 2, and eight teachers in school 3. One person made a negative comment in school 3. All focus groups referred to this category, as did principal 3. This condition represented only 8% of comments made in school 1 and 7% of responses in school 2. However, 21% of statements made in school 3 were in this category. Participants in this school spoke a great deal about people working together. For example, “The grade sevens and eights all work together ... The two grade five teachers do a super job working together,” and “the grade twos and some of the grade threes worked together,” (P).

Collegiality was talked about by eight teachers in school 2, as compared to only four teachers in school 1 and 3. This condition represented 13% of all responses in school 2. Respect was another category which received more support in school 2 and school 1 representing 7% of all comments while school 3 only received 1.6% in this category. Six teachers, the focus groups, and principals in school 2 and 3 commented on “Professional Development” accounting for 8% and 7%
respectively of all statements. In school 1, four teachers commented on this condition (4% of all comments). Both schools 2 and 3 counted on professional development from outside and inside the school whereas in school 1 teachers appeared to rely, to a great extent, on each other’s expertise for growth.

Some other categories received limited support. For example, comments on “Feedback” represented one or two percent of all responses. “Humour” was viewed as more important in school 1 than in the other two schools. “Reflection” and “Trust” received about the same amount of backing from schools 1 and 2 (3% of all responses). “Pride in Profession” and “Celebrate” also acquired limited support.

Leadership

Leithwood’s dimensions of transformational leadership provided a foundation for this research. During the analysis, however, two additional dimensions emerged, administrators’ practices and leadership traits and capacities. In Table 3, the first column lists the dimensions employed in the analysis. The second, third, and fourth columns report the number of participants making comments in each of the three schools. Columns five, six, and seven indicate the percentage of responses made by the participants. In columns eight, nine, and ten, the percentage of statements made by focus group members is listed. The following three columns represent the percentage of remarks made by the principals and the last three columns report the total percentage of relevant responses in each dimension.

Eighty-nine percent of all relevant responses were positive and eleven percent were negative. All negative responses came from teachers or the focus group in school 3. As indicated in chapter six, negative comments were made primarily by two people, one in the focus group and one who
had an individual interview. Principal “Provides Support” was the dimension which received the most support from all participants representing approximately one quarter of all responses in the three schools. When participants discussed the kind of support the leader provided, they inevitably mentioned both personal and professional support. For example, “Teachers who have had some personal crisis, he’s been more than supportive,” (T7 - S1). In school 2, Teacher 1 observed, “Any problems that you might have with a parent [principal] is very supportive.” Principal 3 was extremely supportive when it came to professional development opportunities. Teacher 11 noted, “He encourages people to take risks and to take chances and try to improve their level of teaching, their level of professional development.”

“Vision” and “Expectations” were discussed by all eight teachers in the three schools, the focus groups, and principals, but “Vision” acquired about five percent of all remarks while “Expectations” attained nine percent in school 1 and seven percent in schools 2 and 3. “Leadership Traits” were mentioned by seven teachers in school 1, eight teachers in school 2, and six teachers in school 3, as well as the focus groups, and the principals. “Intellectual Stimulation” was referred to by four teachers in school 1, eight in school 2, and seven in school 3. “Models Appropriate Behaviour” had comments made by eight teachers in schools 1 and 2. In school 3, seven teachers made positive remarks about the leader’s modelling, and one teacher made a negative statement. This dimension accounted for 11%, 17%, and 6% of comments made by participants in schools 1, 2, and 3. “Structures and Decision Making” obtained 16%, 11%, and 18% (and 2% negative) of all responses. Eight teachers in schools 1 and 2 made positive remarks, and three teachers and the focus group made comments of a negative nature. “Administrative Practices” had negative statements made by two teachers and the focus group in school 3, representing three percent of all comments. Six teachers in school 1 and five teachers in schools 2 and 3 made positive comments
Table 3

Composite Table - Level 1 Coding

Dimensions of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a Vision*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds High Expectations*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Consensus Re: Goals*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Intellectual Stimulation*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Expected Behaviours*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Resources*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures and Decision Making*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Culture*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits and Capacities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * indicates Dimensions of Transformation Leadership according to Leithwood (1994)
on “Administrative Practices” representing 8%, 6%, and 5% of all responses. “Leader Provides Resources” obtained similar results (8%, 8%, +5%, -1%) with seven teachers in schools 1 and 2, and five teachers in school 3, referring to this category. “Builds Consensus Regarding Goals” had seven teachers in schools 1 and 3, and eight teachers in school 2, make comments on this dimension along with three teachers in school 3 who made negative comments. The relevant responses totalled 3% for school 1, 4% for school 2, and 3% (and -1%) for school 3.

Another dimension of transformational leadership which received some support was “Builds Culture”. Six teachers in schools 1 and 3, and seven teachers in school 2 referred to this dimension. Percentage of relevant responses by the respective schools was 7%, 6%, and 4% (plus -1%).

Although “Administrative Practices” and “Leadership Traits and Capacities” were not part of Leithwood’s original framework, these two dimensions require closer investigation. “Leadership Traits and Capacities” was further subdivided into traits, which is a quality that expresses the character or nature of a person, and capacities, the ability to learn to do something. Although traits varied from principal to principal, some correlation existed. Table 4 lists the various traits in the first column. Columns two, three, and four record the number of participants who referred to the traits while the next three columns illustrate the percentage of comments made by the participants. The percentage of comments made by the focus groups is indicated in columns eight, nine, and ten and the following three columns report the percentage of comments made by the principals. The final three columns record the total percentage of relevant responses.

Two of the principals were described as having a “Positive Attitude, Enthusiastic”. This trait received 29% of all comments in school 2 and 4% in school 3. In schools 1 and 3, the principals were portrayed as “Low Key, Relaxed” representing 19% and 17% respectively. “Sense of Humour” was a characteristic of principal 1 (6%) and 2 (3%). The other traits were specific to
each of the leaders, with the exception of “Good Listener”.

Two teachers in school 1, four teachers in school 2, and three teachers in school 3, as well as focus groups 2 and 3, and principals 1 and 3 commented on listening skills. For example, principal 1 declared, “Listening is critical ... Listen to your staff.” Principal 2 made the same comment, “You have to listen to staff.” In school 2, Teacher 11 observed, “He is a good listener. If you come to him as a person, whether a staff member of a student, he will listen to what you have to say and weigh it and then decide what is the best action.” Focus group 2 noted that the principal also “listens to parents.” This particular capacity may indirectly affect organizational learning. For example, principal 2 contended, “I try to take everything in ... That goes back to active listening. You have to wait for the right times sometimes where somebody will be talking away with you and you just say, ‘Hey, I have got something’.” He then would inform the teacher of a staff development opportunity or a resource that he had to share and that would help the individual move forward in his or her learning.

A second dimension, “Administrative Practices”, was added to the framework because participants identified several normal, everyday activities (i.e., organizing staff meetings, disciplining students) which did not fit the transformational leadership model. A summary of these practices may be found in the first column of Table 5. Columns two, three, and four list the number of participants making comments about these activities. In columns five, six, and seven the percentage of participants’ comments is recorded. Focus groups’ comments are tabulated and reported in columns eight, nine, and ten and the principals’ comments are indicated in the next three columns. The final three columns document the percentage of relevant responses for all schools.

Teachers, one focus group, and two principals recognized “Discipline” as an administrative practice. For example, Teacher 4 (S1) remarked, “He spends his time solving problems that come
Table 4
Composite Table - Level 1 Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Traits and Capacities</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice, Kind, Friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude, Enthusiastic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Energy Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Key, Relaxed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, Sincere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Interpersonal Skills *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listener *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * Indicates capacities, the other traits are characteristics
up with different students.” The majority of comments were positive, however, one teacher described times when she felt administration was not adequately dealing with student behaviour. Total percentage of relevant responses for schools 1, 2, and 3 were 21%, 7%, 16% (of which 5% were negative).

“Communication” was another category which was discussed by the teachers, two focus groups, and two principals. Their comments represented 19%, 14%, and 11% (and 13% negative) of the relevant responses. According to the secretary in school 1, communication is a time consuming job, but a crucial one. “He likes lots of open dialogue ... lots of communication and he’s really good at communicating with the community.” In school 2, Teacher 6 commented on the fact that the “principal communicates through the newsletter for staff.” Teacher 8 also admired the time she took to “make ‘sunshine calls’ home” to the students’ parents. Principal 3 explained communication in his school:

There’s various ways in which to communicate and one of them is the SGT. One of them is the chair people; the other one is through the announcements. The other one is through the staff meeting. Another one is through the white, or black board in the staff room. They [staff] know that automatically. If they want to know what is going on, anything, they go to the black board and just look it up. There are messages all over the place on it. And, of course, like most schools, we put down all of our announcements in the book so therefore, like our two EA’s, they come in part way through the morning, so when they do come in, or when teachers come and they have been away for a day, they know that they can just go to the book and look through it.

One of the focus group members said that principal 3 communicates with parents through a newsletter that goes home on a regular basis. Yet, two teachers and focus group participants made negative comments regarding communication. Their major concern was the lack of staff meetings. Although the principal felt that numerous avenues for communication were available, particularly through the Growth Team, as Teacher 11 observed, “Sometimes those lines of communication break down and I think it is important to get the staff together as a whole to disseminate information
Another category which acquired substantial support was "Other". This category referred to those mundane activities which must be done in order to keep the school up and running. For example, in school 1, Teacher 4 observed that the principal had to "spend time preparing for staff meetings" and "he seem[ed] to be solving problems all the time." In school 2, the principal mentioned she had to "tell people to order materials," be involved with "the fund raising marathon," and "change the timetable." Principal 3 also commented on his participation in the fund raising committee. Teacher 4 felt that "budgeting is a big one that does not involve staff very much." In addition, the focus group explained that "if you [parents] want your child’s placement for next year, please let the office know" since this was another area for which the principal was responsible. Comments made in this category represented 21%, 18%, and 27% (16% positive and 11% negative) of all comments on administrative practices.

Two other administrative practices received limited support. Responses regarding staffing issues accounted for 18% of school 2’s comments, while this category received 7% of the responses in school 1 and 5% in school 3. School safety represented 7% of school 2’s comments and 2% for school 3. Although gate keeping was only discussed by one teacher and two focus groups, all of the principals felt this was an important part of their jobs. According to Principal 1, "Buffering staff from what is out there that they really don’t need to put up with" is essential. "Anything that doesn’t fit the plan, we don’t do." He also admitted, "I have gotten very selective over the years about what I’m going to do and not do. There is just so much out there coming at you all the time."

The data from these schools indicated that the three principals involved in this study did, in fact, possess characteristics associated with transformational leaders. "Leader Provides Support" was the most salient dimension. Nevertheless, "Administrative Practices" and "Leadership Traits",
## Table 5

**Composite Table - Level 1 Coding**

**Leadership - Administrative Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/SO Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Keeping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which were not part of the original framework, deserve future consideration when examining dimensions of leadership.

Organizational Learning

In the three schools in this study, individual and collective learning occurred. Each of the schools developed a capacity for learning something new. For example, school 1 discovered a new way to handle discipline. School 2 grasped how to incorporate technology and Multiple Intelligences in their curriculum. In school 3, teachers changed their style of instruction. In addition to their school-wide focal points, learning happened for groups of teachers. For example, the junior educators in school 1 became proficient in the use of Lego Dacta in the curriculum. Primary teachers in school 2 became experts in literacy. The intermediate division in school 3 worked collaboratively to produce integrated units which incorporated technology and modifications for special needs students. Although teachers worked with a grade partner, or a division, they also worked together on school-wide projects, such as the ones mentioned above, which caused them to move outside of their usual working relationships. According to Watkins and Marsick, “When people cross boundaries outside of their teams, organizational learning can take place,” (1993, p. 102).

The results of comments made regarding organizational learning processes, structures, and outcomes are summarized in Table 6. In the first column of the table at the top of the page, Table 6a, OL processes and structures are listed. The next three columns indicate the number of teachers who made statements in these categories, followed by the percentage of comments made by these participants. Percentage of comments made by the focus groups appear in the next three columns and then the percentage of remarks made by the principals. The last three columns report the
percentage of relevant responses by all participants in the three schools.

Table 6a illustrates that the largest number of responses made by participants had to do with OL processes and structures. In school 1, 44% of comments were on OL processes/group; 52% were in this category for school 2, and 67% of school 3's responses were related to OL processes. Processes that were cited in school 1 were: "learning from each other," (T2), "collaborating with our grade partners," (T4), "getting together and to hash over something like discipline issues," (T6), "working together in a small group; we've done it by grade, we've done it cross grade ... by stations," (T7), planning together "on PA days," (T8), "working with our division," (FG), "brainstorming ... bounce ideas off one another," (FG), "discussing - there was a lot of talk," (FG), "we talk back and forth ... we discuss things as a group," (P). School 2 had many of the above mentioned processes in place, however, learning from each other was referred to by many participants. For example, "We have computer experts in the school who help others," (T8). Focus group members noted, "Teachers share their expertise with other staff members ... I have learned from everybody here." Participants mentioned many of the same processes in school 3. Working together, talking things through were meaningful processes. In this school, "We talk between the Growth Team, the division teams, the office talking to us. We even talk to the students and it's a lot of open-ended thinking with a closure to it finally," (T8). A unique procedure was explained by Teacher 10. "Once a month, the first Monday of every month [we had] a meeting where teachers shared their cooperative learning ideas."

In the structure category, the three schools reported 51%, 43%, and 33% of all relevant responses. Few comments were made regarding individual learning processes (5% in school 1 and 4% in school 2) or individual structures (1% in school 2). Organizational learning structures included: "preps together," (T2-S1), "staff meetings," (T3-S1), "PA days," (T4-S1), "committees,"
Table 6b: Organizational Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Group*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Individual*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Community*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Students*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-Individual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. * Under - is the abbreviation for Understanding
(T4-S1), "PEPS," (FG-S1), "working as a pair [team teaching partnership]," (T8-S2), "using a PA day in June to set areas of growth for the following year," (T10-S2), "the School Growth Team is used as a structure to identify areas that need attention," (T12-S2), "providing a quarter of a day on two occasions for the teacher to work with a facilitator on technology," (P-S2), "the Growth Committee," (T9-S3), "three days over the school year for the different divisions to meet together, plan, and discuss issues," (T10-S3), and "Common Curriculum Mondays," (FG-3).

Feedback about OL outcomes is reported in Table 6b. The majority of participants (five teachers in school 1, six in schools 2 and 3), the focus groups, and the principals provided examples of increased understanding for the group. The findings represented 40% of all comments for school 1 and 35% for schools 2 and 3. This is not an unusual discovery since people spoke openly about their growth, as a group, in comprehending a new idea. For example, in school 1, the focus group explained their concerns regarding discipline.

We want to create an environment that is enabling for kids, safe. We sent home surveys to the parents, for parental feedback of what they feel about our school. We are trying to produce all-round citizens. We met together as a discipline group and talked about pro-active discipline. We brainstormed. It’s really important to bounce ideas off each other. We ended up with a better focus on what we’re doing regarding discipline.

These teachers tried a detention room. Once the room was established, people complained about it, but then they came back and revisited the issue. They let the detention room run for a couple of weeks and came back and revisited it again. “Everyone came with ideas, suggestions that would make it work better and now it’s working smoothly," (T7). The result of their work was an increased capacity for understanding how to deal with discipline in their school.

In school 2, the focus group provided an example of increased understanding. They stated, “As a group we have learned how to use the ‘Bridge of Conflict’ (a symbol the principal uses with students in conflict resolution situations). It has been an on-going process among all of us to learn
how to use it.” Thus, their understanding increased in terms of how to help students resolve conflict. The focus group in school 3 also gave an example of increased understanding. They told how the staff met for “lunch bag meetings about outcomes.” Outcomes had been a new term for teachers. However, once they had facilitators from the board do presentations, and they had their lunch time meetings to discuss them, “we started thinking outcomes.” Not only did they think about them, they also included them in their unit planning. Again, by implementing the use of outcomes in their planning, teachers illustrated an understanding of a new concept.

Furthermore, participants in each of the schools were able to provide examples of increased understanding for individuals. In school 1, Teacher 2 claimed, “My very best experience was partnering with Teacher ... the things that I was weak at she was strong at, and vice versa.” This teacher told how she and her partner met every Wednesday night to do their planning together and how this helped her organizational skills and she gained a better understanding of how to plan for a new grade level. Teacher 11, in school 2, explained how teachers from kindergarten, grades one, two, and six worked collaboratively on a multi-aged unit on fairy tales. They met with each other and with a facilitator to plan it and, in the end, they created an integrated, outcomes based unit, which is “something I am working on for me.” This teacher felt he had gained an understanding of how to incorporate outcomes in his planning. Principal 3 spoke of his personal learning. He felt that by taking advantage of professional development opportunities, by “just sitting around talking, I found out an awful lot, and working with them [people in staff development] ... has really been really good and that has helped me.”

Another outcome that was discussed by four teachers in school 1, one teacher in school 2, and six teachers in school 3 was a change in practice for the group. Teacher 6, in school 1, asserted that a major change in practice had occurred for them. “As we do our planning now, collectively
we include outcomes.” In school 2, the principal explained that teachers changed their format for reporting to parents. Instead of writing long anecdotal comments, they had a “conference report in the fall and then an official report card ... [During the conference report they were able] to spend quality time with the parent and the report, whether it be an official portfolio, or a gathered file of materials, with or without the student.” The result in that change of practice was they were able to “break down the barriers that continue[d] to exist between home and school, especially on the reporting issues, be able to explain those things and spend less time at a computer writing meaningless words.” A change in practice which happened in school 3 was the move to incorporating cooperative learning strategies in teachers’ instructional repertoires. Teacher 10 stated, “We have done a lot of work on cooperative learning.” Teacher 4 concurred. “The biggest change that we have done is a shift towards cooperative learning.” Another change of practice that was mentioned by the focus group had to do with the “new computerized report cards. We have moved on that as a whole group.”

In school 2, the focus group and the principal talked about increased understanding for the community (6% of all comments). A team made up of people from six schools in the same socio-economic status worked together on a project. They created a video which taught parents how to help their kids learn to read. This video counselled parents on early literacy skills. Further, in this school, participants and the focus group discussed learning outcomes for students. For example, a focus group member told about an integrated unit that intermediate teachers had planned together. It was a Canadian west unit that involved math and computers. The principal thought it was such an exciting unit that she invited the superintendent to see it. When he visited, he noted that the “kids were under control, working extremely well, totally motivated.” Schools 1 and 3 also made remarks concerning outcomes for students. For example, in school 1, Teacher 9 explained how they
changed their house league system. The result was that “we felt it brought more spirit to the school and allowed for identifying with the classes ... The sports that we did were all sports that allowed the child to do their personal best.” In school 3, the principal told how the grade eight teacher worked with a teacher from another school to design a mini conference on multi-culturalism. “Two groups of students from two different schools [worked together] ... It [the conference] made them feel good and it showed how important it [multi-culturalism] was.” This kind of increased understanding for students accounted for 14%, 13%, and 16% of all relevant responses in schools 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

Although individual learning does not guarantee organizational learning, organizational learning is contingent upon individual learning. Within each of the schools in this study, individual, team, and collective learning occurred.

Organizational Learning Stimuli

Table 7 illustrates the stimuli for learning that were cited by the participants, the focus groups, and the principals. The first column lists the following stimuli: change issues, performance appraisal, professional development, personal preference, university students. Number of participants making comments is recorded in columns two, three, and four and the percentage of these comments is depicted in the next three columns. Columns eight, nine, and ten illustrate the percentage of focus groups’ comments, followed in the subsequent three columns by the percentage of principals’ remarks. The final three columns report the total percentage of relevant responses.

“Personal Preference” was the main stimulus for learning. This motivator was cited by five teachers in school 1, six teachers in school 2, and three teachers in school 3, as well as the focus groups and the principals representing 34%, 37%, and 14% of the total responses in schools 1, 2,
### Table 7

**Composite Table - Level 1 Coding**

**Organizational Learning Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments N = 8</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Preference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and 3 respectively. A focus group member in school 1 confessed, “I love taking courses; I am that type of person.” In school 2, Teacher 1 admitted, “I like to learn. It is one of the things that I enjoy.” Teacher 11 explained his interpretation of the situation in school 3. “The way the system is set up here is that we are given a lot of those opportunities [for PD] and we can take them if we want, and if you don’t want, then that’s your choice.”

A second stimulus for learning was “Change Issues”. Four teachers in schools 1 and 3, five teachers in school 2, all focus groups, and principals 2 and 3 remarked on it. The catalyst for change varied. For example, Teacher 2 mentioned “directives from the board,” (school 1). A focus group member in school 2 claimed, “The times are a changing. I think maybe a few years ago we could have a five year plan, but I don’t think we can anymore. The changes going on in the Ministry, and policies coming right from the top, and even with our own Board, the constant changes” and, therefore, people must learn to keep up with the changes. In school 3, Teacher 4 observed, “My teaching has changed a lot and it is partly due to The Common Curriculum.” The responses made in this category represented 34%, 27% and 18% of all comments made regarding stimuli.

“Professional Development” was discussed by four teachers in school 1, three teachers in school 2, five teachers in school 3, focus groups 1 and 3, and principal 3. These responses represented 24%, 18%, and 53% of all remarks on stimuli. In school 1, a focus group member contended, “The Multiple Intelligences workshop was fabulous, so that was growth too.” Teacher 12 claimed that personal growth has “hinged on the opportunities presented to me,” (school 2). Teacher 9, in school 3, made a similar statement. “My personal learning has been through taking courses they [staff development] have provided, such as cooperative learning, such as the summer courses they have provided.”
Another stimulus which received support from some of the teachers (1 in school 1, 2 in school 2, and 3 in school 3), focus group 2, and principals 1 and 3 was “Performance Appraisal”. Although these remarks only represented 8%, 6%, and 14% of all responses, this category is still noteworthy. For example, Teacher 6, in school 1, claimed that she “took on planning as an area of growth” because she had “just been through a self-directed appraisal.” In school 2, a focus group member explained, “Because it was their evaluation year, a group of three teachers, primary, kindergarten, and a junior worked on an integrated unit together. This unit incorporated outcomes, something new for all of them.” Principal 3 believed that learning was facilitated “through the collaborative appraisal; it is probably one of the best ones.” Teacher 4 would agree, “I have been involved in one and pretty much every teacher has had one of those personal evaluations, I mean, personal appraisals. And that is really to me beneficial because it is not someone coming and saying, ‘Ok, well, you know, you need to do your report cards a little more neatly, or get your register in on time.’ It is, ‘What do you feel you need to work on?’.”

A final stimulus for learning was cited by two teachers in school 2, school 3’s focus group and principal 2. This stimulus was labelled “University Students” and it received 12% of all responses in school 2 and 2% in school 3. In school 2, Teacher 12 claimed that personal learning “started out for me by agreeing to be the Adjunct Professor for the University students.” She went on to say that “because of the University students, [staff] learned more about outcomes.” Teacher 8 would agree. She noted that having a “student teacher [was] a lot of work” but she admitted that she learned from the teacher candidate.

Personal preference may, or may not be, a stimulus for certain individuals. Change is constant and for some people the various issues of change are enough to stimulate their learning. By providing professional development opportunities, however, people may be enticed to learn
about new and exciting teaching strategies, or different philosophies. Every teacher requires an evaluation. If the evaluation could take the form of a self-directed, performance appraisal where the teacher could choose the area of growth, then this type of evaluation warrants further investigation. Finally, if having student teachers in schools motivates experienced teachers to look at new ideas, then perhaps more schools should get involved in teacher education programs. Nevertheless, in some situations, no matter how ideal the conditions for learning, people will find, or put up, roadblocks.

**Barriers**

Just as collaborative cultures are thought to facilitate organizational learning, cultures which are not collaborative may inhibit learning. In this study, participants identified barriers to OL and barriers to collaboration. In schools 1 and 2, remarks which were considered to be barriers amounted to 1% of all comments made, while barriers totalled 2% of all statements in school 3. The results are summarized in Table 8. The first column lists the barriers and the second, third, and fourth columns indicate the number of teachers making comments. Columns five, six, and seven report the percentage of participants' comments, while the next three columns report the percentage of comments made by focus groups. Percentage of principals' comments is depicted in columns eleven, twelve, and thirteen. The last three columns present the total percentage of relevant responses.

In Table 8a, only teachers spoke about barriers to organizational learning. One teacher in school 1 and two teachers in school 3 commented on “Time” as an inhibitor to learning. For example, “We just don't have time [for intellectual stimulation and learning] because we are overwhelmed with the kids and what is going on in our classrooms,” (T7, S3).
### Table 8

**Composite Table - Level 1 Coding**

**Barriers to Organizational Learning and to Organizational Culture**

#### Table 8a - Barriers to Organizational Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to OL</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 8b - Barriers to a Collaborative Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Making Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participants' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Focus Groups' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Principals' Comments</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Relevant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open - Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure/Stress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 20 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table details the barriers to organizational learning and collaborative culture, including the number of participants making comments and the percentage of total relevant responses.
Three teachers in school 2 and one teacher in school 1 indicated that people who were “Not Open” to change were individuals who would not be open to learning. Teacher 9, in school 2, observed, “The staff is not open to new things.” Teacher 11 contended, “Whenever you try to produce change there is always going to be some people lagging behind or dragging on it. I think we are all going in the right directions, and I think it will happen,” (school 2). Change takes time.

“Pressure or Stress” was viewed as a barrier to OL by one teacher in both schools 1 and 2. Teacher 9, for example, said, “It is so hard to learn ... [there is so much] pressure and stress,” (school 2). In school 1, Teacher 3 wished she could just “give up a year” and take “courses and things like that because that kind of stuff really interests me ... [but] it’s having the energy to do it. I mean, being honest, at my age, with a family, it’s hard to have the energy.”

In school 2, Teacher 11 argued, “If you don’t have a grade partner, it is hard to learn.” He felt isolated; he needed someone to help him with his learning. “There is not a real academic mentor for me here yet ... [no one at] the same grade level, kind of helping me through the academic part.”

Barriers to collaboration are illustrated in Table 8b. The format is exactly the same as described above for Table 8a. Three teachers in school 1, one teacher in school 2, and two teachers in school 3 cited “Time” as a barrier to collaboration. This appears to be the most salient barrier in that 80%, 50%, and 21% of all relevant responses fell into this category. Teacher 6 explained that she and her teaching partner had not received the time they needed to collaborate.

We did not get our time as we had hoped to get together ... We do need time to get units planned, to get structures that we take from the cooperative learning workshops, to get those in the unit and see how we could apply them. And, we haven’t had that time this year. That is most disappointing.

Three teachers in school 3, and focus group 3, commented on “Pressure or Stress” as an obstacle to collaboration. Focus group participants felt they were stressed out because “it is a constant battle [with the kids].” Teacher 6 commented, “The fact that there has been such a
demand on staff” and she attributed that to “the transient [nature of the] students.” Teacher 10 made a similar comment, “Because of the student population we have, there’s an awful lot of stress on the teachers.” According to the focus group, “It seems too the more we are dealing with outside, you know not just teaching, but if you could just teach it would be a great job, but there are a lot of other things that everyone seems to be breaking down, overshadowed by these things that weigh on the stress.” Because of this stress, the teachers said it is hard to “accommodate [the students] and implement a program,” (T6). “Everybody is going, going, going, and even though you work with someone all day long, some days I don’t see the other grade six teacher [with whom she plans], like for four days, and she is only two doors down because I am involved with things at lunch and, you know, everybody has just got their own things,” (T5).

One teacher in school 1 and a teacher in school 2 identified “Isolation” as a barrier to collaboration. Teacher 9, for example, felt she could not collaborate because she had changed grades and “I need to get much more familiar with the curriculum ... and just really, personally educated myself;” (S2).

In school 3, one teacher indicated that “Not Open” to change interfered with collaboration. Teacher 11 observed that whenever you try to bring people together to implement change “there are [those] that will find something to resist no matter what.” In this school, one teacher and the focus group referred to “Morale” as a barrier to collaboration. A focus group member declared, “I would really like to look forward to coming to school every day, and enjoy it while I am here” but she is not able to do this because morale is low. In fact, Teacher 7 observed, “I think with any school, right now, morale is low.” As a result, “it is sort of cyclical because the social committee has been trying [to get people together], or we were trying to build up the morale, but at the same time ... [another focus group member completed the sentence] people weren’t signing up [for social
events] because they were just ... [another member finished her thought] tired.”

The number of barriers to OL and collaboration were limited, yet this begs the question, “What can be done to eliminate these obstacles from schools so that people will be captivated by collaboration and fascinated by the idea of acquiring knowledge together?” Leaders of the future will need to address these issues.