ISSN No.
0146-9283

Spring
1993

educational considerations

published at kansas state university college of education

educational considerations

Vol. XX, Number 2, Spring 1993

Table of Contents—Spring 1993

PUBLICATION INFORMATION

Educational Considerations is published at the College of Education, Kansas State University. **Educational Considerations** are Kansas State University do not accept responsibility for the views expressed in articles, reviews, and other contributions appearing in this publication. In keeping with the professional educational concept that responsible free expression can promote learning and encourage awareness of truth, contributors are invited to submit conclusions and opinions concerned with varying points of view in and about education.

Educational Considerations is published two times yearly. Editorial offices are located at the College of Education, Bluemont Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506–5301. Correspondence regarding manuscripts must be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope. No remuneration is offered for accepted articles or other materials submitted.

Material submitted to **Educational Considerations** may vary in length from a paragraph to 4,000 words. All material, including quoted information and footnotes, is to be typed double-spaced. Footnotes should be listed at the end of the manuscripts. Headings should not be underlined. **ONCE AN ARTICLE IS ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION, THE AUTHOR WILL BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THE FINAL VERSION ON DISK.** Disk requirements are Macintosh 3.5" drive in Word 5.0 or higher format. The author's complete name, address and telephone number should be typed on a separate sheet and attached to the original copy of the manuscript. Three copies of each manuscript are to be submitted. Photographs, drawings, cartoons, and other illustrations are welcome. Authors should be prepared to provide copies of permission to quote copyrighted materials. Queries concerning proposed articles or reviews are welcome. The editors reserve the right to make grammatical corrections and minor changes in article texts to improve clarity. Address questions regarding specific styles to the Editor.

Subscription to **Educational Considerations** is $6.00 per year, with single copies $2.00 each. Correspondence about subscriptions should be addressed to the Business Manager, c/o The Editor, **Educational Considerations**, College of Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506–5301. Checks for subscriptions should be made out to **Educational Considerations.**

Printed in the United States of America.

At one extreme are those who contend that the successful completion of a teacher preparation program is an indicator of quality. At the other are those who assert that teacher preparation is a meaningless hurdle, unduly restricting the flow of "high quality" human resources to the teaching labor market

Lateral Entry To Teacher Education: Impact on Labor Quantity, Quality and Student Equity

by Bettye MacPhail–Wilcox and Lynn K. Bradshaw

Alternative routes to teacher certification have become popular again. By 1990, all but one state, Arkansas, had or was considering an alternative certification program (Feistritzer, 1990). One of the most popular alternative certification strategies is the lateral entry program, and early versions of it have been described elsewhere (MacPhail–Wilcox and King, 1988).

Alternative certification programs are labor "sufficiency policies", intended to address teacher shortages which have occurred periodically throughout the history of public education (Sedlak, 1989). Earlier policies established policies which provided for provisional endorsement, approved out-of-field assignments, and emergency licensure programs as means for increasing the employable labor pool.

Concern about teacher quality escalates often following the adoption of alternative certification programs, thus making "quality" a persistent issue in the history of education (Lortie, 1986). For example, "provisional certification" policies and out-of-field assignment practices of the 1970s became targets of criticism when the extent of the practice was made public. Accreditation standards were tightened and legislative mandates were introduced to reduce the proportionate time a teacher might be assigned out-of-field without jeopardizing accreditation status. In other words, labor "quality policies" were adopted to guard against the anticipated erosion of classroom productivity resulting from the earlier adoption of a "sufficiency policy".

Bettye MacPhail–Wilcox, Professor, North Carolina State University

Lynn K. Bradshaw, Nash County School District

The perennial and proximal nature of these events reveals the constant tension between efforts to balance the demand for enough teachers to "have school" with assurance that students will receive "quality" instruction when they are in school. They also illustrate the differential value placed on teacher preparation programs, and how those values are shifted and compromised by changing demographic, economic, labor market, and political circumstances.

At one extreme are those who contend that the successful completion of a teacher preparation program is an indicator of quality (Feiman–Nemser, 1990; Everston, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985), a promise of savvy skill in the classroom that will translate into better student outcomes. At the other are those who assert that teacher preparation is a meaningless hurdle, unduly restricting the flow of "high quality" human resources to the teaching labor market (Johnson, 1989). The tension between these positions, coupled with a changing context, results in policies which oscillate between the competing concern about labor sufficiency and quality. With some periodicity, new versions of old policies intended to widen or narrow the gate to teaching positions are established, and so it is with present day lateral entry policies.

This time, sustained teacher shortages (Weaver, 1979; Haggstrom, Darling–Hammond & Grissmer,1988) and widely notorious reports that the "best and brightest" teachers were not entering or remaining in the classroom (Weaver, 1981; Schlechty & Vance, 1981, 1982) sparked efforts to increase the size of the teaching labor pool. New "alternative routes" to teaching, made possible by the lateral entry policies of the late 1980s and 1990s (MacPhail–Wilcox & King, 1988; AACTE, 1990; Feistritzer, 1990), spread quickly. But, this time the sufficiency policy had a new twist.

Proponents contended that in addition to improving the supply of teachers, lateral entry policies also would improve the "quality" of the teaching labor pool (Smith, Nystrand, Ruch, Gideonse, & Carlson, 1985). They urged that with short, intense training, the more highly qualified persons prepared for other labor markets could enter the teaching ranks and improve school performance. Proponents clearly assumed that teacher education is not a value-added enterprise, and that persons who enter teacher education and stay in the classroom really do represent human capital resources of lower quality than is characteristic of persons in other labor pools.

To examine the validity of these assumptions an exploratory comparative analysis of traditionally and alternatively certified first-year teachers was conducted. The conceptual framework guiding the investigation was derived from human capital theory. It is a study for which data were difficult to obtain, and it represents important knowledge to the field, particularly with respect to resource equity for students. For these reasons, the study seems to warrant both rapid replication in other states and expansion to include additional "teacher quality" variables. The information generated will be useful in the formulation of future teacher certification policies and the improvement of teacher preparation programs.

Human Capital Theory: Conceptual Underpinnings

Schultz (1971) defined human capital as the skills and knowledge acquired as a result of deliberate investments in education. He asserted that the value of one's capital varies with the way it is used, its age, and the effects of depreciation, obsolescence, and supply and demand. Hence human capital theory suggests that labor pools can be increased by expanding the type of educational investments which enable persons to enter a specific labor market. This is consistent with the intent of lateral entry policies to increase the size of the teaching labor pool.

However, human capital theory also warns that increasing the size of the labor pool without rational restrictions may affect the value of one's capital in that labor market. To the degree that one's investment in education does not match the demands of the specific labor market, the quality of one's contribution will be affected negatively. The value of that contribution is productivity, a measure which is fraught with difficulty in education (MacPhail–Wilcox and King, 1988).

Research in education, like research in other human service professions, cannot attest unequivocally to the productivity of differentially prepared teacher educators. In the absence of such knowledge, and without adequate measures of productivity, status variables such as grade point averages, SAT, GRE and mandatory state test scores, classroom performance ratings, teacher attitudes,and other indirect measures, such as employability in other labor markets, are used to assess the quality of human capital in education markets. These measurement inadequacies make it imperative to be diligent and vigilant about the use and interpretation of such measures. They have the capacity to suggest validity where none exists.

The study reported here suffers from these same measurement limitations. It is unique, however, in its use of multiple proxy measures for quality, and it is the first study in this state to employ a field-based measure of teacher quality. It is unique also in that it examines quantity, quality, and equity effects of an alternative certification policy.

Methodology

North Carolina embraced lateral entry programs as an alternative to traditional certification in 1985 and expanded it in 1990. These changes provided the opportunity to conceptualize and conduct this pre-experimental static-group study. The purposes of the investigation were to compare the proportionate numbers of differentially prepared teachers in both groups and in selected classes of school districts and to assess the "quantity and quality of human capital" embodied in traditionally and alternatively certified first-year teachers.

There were two classes of lateral entry teachers. One entered teaching through the state's Modified Certification Program, which enabled local school districts to provide training and recommend certification for non-teacher education graduates. The other entered teaching as members of the Teach for America national program in which they were selected and attended a summer institute to prepare them to teach.

Descriptive statistics were used to assess general differences between the traditional and alternatively certified teachers. School districts were classified four ways in order to examine the distribution of alternatively certified teachers. First, they were classified according to the district's socio-economic advantagement, then district accreditation status, ability to recruit new teachers, and finally according to district size. National Teacher Examination Core Battery and area examination scores along with teacher performance appraisal ratings derived from a mandatory eight-function state-wide evaluation system were the designated measures of "quality". Status variables were collected from the archival files of the State Education Agency and job performance data were requested from local school districts. To address the twin issues of sufficiency and quality of the labor pool, the data were sorted into two groups. These two groups of teachers then were described and differences between them were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Findings of the Study

Of the 2,191 first-time certified teachers in North Carolina between May 1, 1990 and April 30, 1991, 81.6 percent were graduates of approved teacher education programs and 18.4 percent entered teaching through an alternative certification route. Among the alternatively certified group (N=403) were those who were provisionally certified through a state sanctioned modified certification program operated by local units (N=374) and members of the North Carolina Teach for America Group (N=29).

The sample (N=2,191) used in this study is smaller than the actual pool of persons holding initial teaching certificates during the time of this study (N=2,332). This is due to several factors. Some teachers were not employed in North Carolina by May 1, 1991 (N=466), and counselors, social workers and school psychologists were excluded deliberately from the sample. Similarly, the full contingent of lateral entry teachers (N=403) could not be used for each statistical evaluation because a criterion measure was not available for some of them. For example, only 154 of the lateral entry teachers had taken the NTE. The other 249 were not required to complete this examination until after the period during which this study was conducted.

The Impact of Lateral Entry On Labor Sufficiency

Lateral entry teachers for whom data were available (N=346) were more likely to be male, non-white and older than their traditionally certified counterparts for whom data were obtainable (N=1736). African–American females constituted 8.9 and 14.5 percent of the traditional and alternatively certified groups, respectively. For African–American males the percentages were 1.4 and 9.8, respectively. In all age categories up to 65, except for less than 25 years, the proportion of alternatively certified teachers was greater than that for traditionally certified teachers.

Lateral entry teachers were hired in all subject areas with higher proportions than would be expected by chance in foreign language, dance, and vocational education teaching positions. The largest percentages of alternatively certified teachers were hired to teach Science (10.2%), Foreign Language (28.5%), Art (8.4%), and Exceptional Children (10.4%). By comparison, the largest percentages of traditionally certified teachers were employed to teach elementary classes (32.2%), English/Language Arts (11.7%), Social Studies (10.6%), and Exceptional Children (11%).

First-year, traditionally certified teachers were proportionately more likely to be employed in districts reporting average to least difficulty in recruitment, that were meeting accreditation standards, and were classified as having average or above average levels of socio-economic advantagement. They were concentrated in districts reporting between 2,500 and 25,000 students.

Lateral entry teachers were significantly overrepresented in smaller districts reporting most difficulty in recruiting adequate numbers of teachers. They were concentrated in districts ranging from 2,500 to 9,999 in enrollment, the smaller school units. A greater proportion of lateral entry teachers than would have been expected by chance were hired in school districts which were below average in socio-economic advantagement and that failed to meet state accreditation standards.

In summary, the labor sufficiency policy had differential impacts based on race, gender, and age of members of the teaching pool. Lateral entry teachers were more likely to be employed by small school districts finding it difficult to recruit personnel and in districts with higher levels of socio-economic disadvantagement, districts with significantly greater student needs. Lateral entry teachers were significantly more likely to be employed in school districts which were performing below standard with respect to accreditation status. Because lateral entry teachers are more concentrated in districts with high need populations that are already not performing well, questions of quality become more critical in an absolute sense and with respect to equity.

The Impact of Lateral Entry on Labor Quality

Differences between mean NTE Professional Knowledge scores for alternatively and traditionally certified teachers were not significantly different. However, there was a tendency for lateral entry teachers to have lower mean scores on subject area exams in elementary education, biology, general science, and math. They demonstrated higher mean scores than traditionally certified teachers in English, Art, French, and Spanish.

Mean scores on the NTE Communication Skill and General Knowledge for lateral entry teachers were significantly higher than those for traditionally certified teachers. There were significant interaction effects with gender and ethnicity. Scores were highest for lateral entry males, and they were lower for African–Americans. However, lateral entry African–Americans scored higher than did traditionally certified African–Americans. These findings are consistent with those reported in other studies of alternatively teachers (Cornett, 1984; Cooper–Shoup, 1988; Peck, 1988; Schechter, 1987; Hutton, 1987).

The variance within groups on these scores was patterned. In all cases, the variance was wider for the lateral entry teachers. The greatest variance was in General Knowledge, followed closely by Communication Skill, and then Professional Knowledge. For Specialty Area Scores, traditionally certified teachers outperformed lateral entry teachers in Elementary Education, Science, Math, and Physical Education. Lateral entry teachers performed better in English, Social Studies, Art, and Foreign Languages. Variance was greater among the lateral entry teachers in all areas except English, Social Studies, and Physical Education.

Mean scores for all eight functions on the N.C. TPAI were well above the "at standard" (3.0) rating for both groups, and they were not significantly different. However, scores for alternatively certified teachers were slightly lower on six of the eight functions on the TPAI (Student Behavior, Instructional Presentation, Instructional Feedback, Facilitating Instruction, Communicating in the Educational Environment, and Performance of Non-Instructional Duties.). In two of the functions, "management of instructional time" and "instructional monitoring" there were no differences between the groups.

When the performance scores were disaggregated to distinguish between Modified Certification Plan (MCP) and Teach For America (TFA) groups, differences were sharper. TFA scores were much lower than those for MCP and traditionally certified teachers on Student Behavior and Facilitating Instruction and slightly lower on Instructional Feedback and Non-Instructional duties. However, the TFA group scored higher than MCP and traditionally certified teachers on Instructional Presentation.

The Impact of Lateral Entry on Student Equity

Student equity refers to fairness in the quantity and quality of services received by school children. Vertical equity standards make clear that services afforded children should be in accordance with their educational needs. The underlying assumption is that students vary in their need for educational resources if they are to attain similarly with regard to school goals.

To explore the impact of lateral entry policies on student equity, analysis of variance was used to assess the distribution of "quality" embodied in the human capital of lateral entry teachers. NTE scores and performance appraisal ratings for lateral entry teachers in different types of school districts were compared. It was assumed that a state computed measure of school district socio-economic advantagement, failure to meet accreditation standards, size, and difficulty in recruiting teachers were valid indices of differential educational needs among students in those districts.

A higher proportion of lateral entry teachers than would have been expected by chance were hired in school districts which were below average in socio-economic advantagement, failed to meet accreditation standards, experienced difficulty in attracting new teachers, and were relatively small (2,500 to 9,999 students).

Main effects for school district socio-economic advantagement, ability to recruit new teachers, and size were significant for Communication and General Knowledge scores. These scores tended to be higher for lateral entry teachers when compared to traditionally certified teachers, except in small districts where they were lower.

The interaction effect of school district size and certification type was significant for the Professional Knowledge test, as were the main effects of socio-economic advantagement and the ability to recruit new teachers. In large (25,000+ students) and small districts (<2,500 students) the professional knowledge score was lower for lateral entry teachers than it was for traditionally certified teachers. In the medium size districts (2,500 to 24,999 students) the mean professional knowledge scores were higher for lateral entry teachers.

In districts below average in socio-economic advantagement, lateral entry teachers scored higher than traditionally certified teachers on the professional knowledge test. They scored lower in districts of average or higher socio-economic advantagement.

Lateral entry teachers outscored traditionally certified teachers on professional knowledge in districts reporting average and most difficulty in recruiting new teachers. They scored lower in districts reporting little difficulty in recruiting new teachers.

Performance appraisal ratings (TPAI scores) also were used to compare "quality" variation between lateral entry and traditionally certified teachers. TPAI scales encompass use of instructional time, management of student behavior, quality of instructional presentation, quality of instructional monitoring, quality of instructional feedback, skill in facilitating instruction, communication skills, and non-instructional duties.

An analysis of TPAI ratings showed significant main effects for school district socio-economic disadvantagement, ability to recruit teachers, and school district size. Scores were generally lower on all TPAI functions in all types of school districts for lateral entry teachers, but especially so in districts with high or low advantagement and greatest or least difficulty in recruiting teachers. Contrarily, lateral entry teachers employed by districts with average socio-economic advantagement and average levels of difficulty recruiting new teachers were rated higher on all of the eight TPAI functions.

More specifically, there were significant interaction effects with district disadvantagement, for management of instructional time and providing instructional feedback. Significant main effects were observed for management of student behavior, instructional presentation, instructional monitoring, facilitating instruction, communicating in an educational environment, and attending to non-instructional duties, with traditionally certified teachers outperforming their lateral entry colleagues.

The same pattern of performance held in the analysis based on district difficulty in recruiting new personnel. Only in districts experiencing average levels of difficulty did lateral teacher performance ever surpass that of traditionally certified teachers.

The main effect of school district size was significant for communicating in an educational environment and attending to non-instructional duties. Here, both scores were higher for traditionally certified teachers in large school districts.

Conclusions and Implications

Despite measurement and design limitations, this is an important study of labor sufficiency and quality among traditional and lateral entry teachers. It expands the heretofore limited operational definitions of teacher labor quality by including a field-based performance measure, and it employs multiple

measures of "quality". Both tactics represent important steps toward improving the validity of generalizations about the quality of the teaching labor pool. It is important also in its attempt to assess the differential impact that one state policy can have on school districts in the same state.

This study has demonstrated that within one southern state, lateral entry policies do affect the quantity of the teaching labor pool, results which are consistent with other research (Feistritzer, 1990; MacPhail–Wilcox and King, 1988; Schechter, 1987). For example, this study revealed that proportionately more lateral entry teachers are hired by low socio-economic, small districts who frequently fail to meet accreditation standards and experience more difficulty in recruiting teachers. Furthermore these increases were most pronounced for previously under-represented groups (African–Americans and males) and for older members of the general labor pool. The findings corroborate and extend earlier reports that alternative routes to teaching attract more minority candidates than traditional programs (Barnes, Salmon & Wale, 1986; Hutton, 1987; Schechter, 1987; and Wale & Irons, 1990). Further, lateral entry teachers hired by these districts tended to have lower NTE test scores and teaching performance ratings than did those hired in more advantaged and higher performing districts.

It is difficult to partial out the degree to which these employment patterns reflect differences in demand for alternatively certified teachers or differences in teacher preferences for districts in which to work. It is also impossible to state unequivocally that the quality of lateral entry and traditionally certified teachers is different in instructionally valid ways. The validity of using standardized test scores for this purpose is a continuing problem, and it is well known that teacher performance appraisal instruments and processes have shown little capacity for capturing fine discriminations in performance (Millman, 1981).

Nonetheless, this lateral entry policy does increase the teaching labor pool in districts often characterized as unattractive or difficult work environments. Thus, it does seem to enhance the sufficiency of teaching labor, especially for selected classes of people. It is possible, then, to conclude that lateral entry programs do enable society "to have school". But, is sufficiency of the teaching labor pool without concern for the quality of that labor sensible? We think not.

This study does not offer a clear answer to the question of what impact lateral entry policies have on the quality of instruction students receive. However, it does suggest that lateral entry teachers and traditionally certified teachers do display differential levels of "quality". Lateral entry teachers do score higher on some portions of national standardized tests not designed or known to be a measure of teaching quality. Contrarily, their overall performance in the "field" was not as positive as the performance of their traditionally certified counterparts when the criterion measure is derived from a state mandated appraisal instrument. To the degree that the field measurement should have more validity than the test scores as job relevant criteria, the interpretation of findings slightly favors traditionally certified teachers. In other words, the analysis does demonstrate that on some measures of quality, lateral entry and traditionally certified teachers do exhibit "value-added" differences, even though many are not significant. These differences are to a limited degree validated by the observed qualitative differences among two classes of lateral entry teachers and the pattern of performance variation within groups. This provides some confirmation of the human capital theory proposition that the value of one's training is linked to the particular labor market in which one will deploy that capital. Whether or not these differences are critically important turns on the matter of job validity. Less equivocal answers will require the replication of this study using much finer grained measures of labor "quality", perhaps including student outcomes.

This study confirms the danger of relying upon standardized test scores like those produced by the NTE and GRE as salient and valid indicators of teacher quality. It does so by demonstrating the interpretive differences to the question of quality that result from using different standardized test scales and when using data drawn from classroom observation scales.

Despite the fact that lateral entry teachers scored significantly higher on some dimensions of these standardized tests than did traditionally certified teachers, overall differences in classroom performance in six of eight teaching functions favored traditionally certified teachers. These findings confirm Ayers' (1989) assertion that standardized test scores tend to be unrelated to classroom performance, and they confirm other studies which reported less pedagogical proficiency among lateral entry teachers in the classroom (Clarridge, 1990; Soares, 1989).

Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, by combining these assessments of the quantity and quality of alternatively certified teachers with multiple classifications of school districts, distributional inequities in the "quality" of teaching labor were identified. The most "needy" districts (those with higher levels of disadvantagement, smaller size, failed efforts to meet state accreditation requirements, and persistent difficulty in recruiting adequate numbers of teachers) employed proportionately more of the pool of lateral entry teachers. In other words, they drew persons with substantially higher Communication and General Knowledge NTE scores, who performed somewhat less well in the classroom than did other districts.

The implications of this study for policy makers are multiple. Among the most important are the need to carefully consider the effects of sufficiency policies on instructional quality and the distribution of equitable educational opportunities. The study confirms the need for multiple and more valid measures of teacher quality that link more directly to student, class, and school productivity, particularly the inclusion of a wide range of student outcome measures. It directs policy makers to insure that teacher labor "sufficiency" policies contain "quality" safeguards that will minimize the possibility of distributional inequities among teaching resources to students. Thus, it directs policy makers to anticipate policy consequences and follow-through the policy making process with analyses of intended and unintended consequences of policy.

For teacher educators, this study reveals the importance of insuring that preparation programs do increase the novice teacher's capacity to function productively in the classroom. In order to optimize teaching capital, the knowledge and skill embedded in preparatory programs must be tightly linked to the specific demands of the teaching labor market. The fact that traditional teachers outperformed lateral entry teachers in Professional Knowledge by such a slim margin is cause for reexamining what is tested and what pedagogical value is added by traditional preparation programs. The fact that standardized test scores and classroom ratings for traditional and lateral entry teachers yielded nearly opposite conclusions regarding the distribution of teacher "quality" should increase the momentum to clarify school goals and to define the resources necessary to attain them for different kinds of students.

Researchers can benefit both policy makers and teacher educators by identifying the teaching functions which are most effective for different classes of students who seek to obtain the same learning objectives. They can contribute by developing more valid means of assessing and comparing teacher quality, perhaps through the use of more finely discriminating performance appraisal strategies that yield ratings which are unambiguously linked to student learning gains. From this information, they should be able to discern the stocks and flows of resources needed for each class of students to obtain these school goals.

The tension between teacher certification policies which address sufficiency and quality is not likely to diminish. However, continuous assessment of the consequences of such policies, especially distributional equity, and subsequent policy adjustments are essential if all children are to have access to an equivalent high quality of education. Lateral entry policies, while increasing labor quantity in difficult-to-staff schools, may compromise student equity via quality. This study has demonstrated the need to carefully anticipate and monitor the consequences of a labor "sufficiency" policies in teacher education.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1990). Teacher Education Policy in the State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

Ayers, J.B. (1989). The NTE, PSST, and classroom performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, St. Louis, MO. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 373.

Barnes S., Salmon, J. & Wale, W. (1989). Alternative teacher certification in Texas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 316).

Clarridge, P.B. (1990). Multiple perspectives on the classroom performance of certified and uncertified teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education* 41(4), 15–25.

Everston, C.M. , Hawley, W.D., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 36(3), 2–12.

Feiman–Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: structural and conceptual alternatives. In W.R. Houston (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. N.Y.: Macmillan.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1990). *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis, 1990*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information.

Hutton, J.B. (1987). Alternative teacher certification: Its policy implications for classroom and personnel practice. Commerce, TX: East Texas State University Center for Policy Studies and Research in Elementary and Secondary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 264).

Johnson, E.R. (1989). Teachers and teacher training in the twentieth century. In D. Warren (Ed.). *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work*. N.Y.: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Lortie, Dan. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67, 568–575.

MacPhail–Wilcox, B. and King, R. (1988). Personnel reforms in education: Intents, consequences, and fiscal implications. *Journal of Education Finance*, 14, 100–134.

Millman, J. (Ed.). (1981). *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Schechter, E. (1987). The New Jersey provisional teacher program. A third year report. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 859).

Schlechty, P.C. & Vance, R.S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63, 106–112.

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V. (1982). Institutional responses to the quality/quantity issue in teacher training. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 94–101.

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83, 469–487.

Schultz, T.W. (1971). *Investment in Human Capital: The Role of Education and Research*. N.Y. The Free Press.

Sedlak, M.W. (1989). Let us go and buy a school master. In D. Warren (Ed.). *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work*. N.Y. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Smith, D.C., Nystrand, R., & Carlson, K. (1985). Alternative certification: A position statement of AACTE. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 24.

Soares, L.M. (1990). Challenging the typicality of candidates for the teaching profession. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Tyack, D. and Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America 1820–1980*. N.Y. Basic Books.

Wale, W.M. & Irons, E.J. (1990). An evaluative study of Texas alternative certification programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 617).

Weaver, W.T. (1978). Educators in supply and demand: Effects on quality. *School Review*, 86, 552–593.

Weaver, W.T. (1981). The tragedy of the commons: The effects of supply and demand on the educational talent pool. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit, MI (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 261).

Although attention has been focused on the projected teacher shortage caused by the lack of bright young people entering the teaching profession, little has been written about those people who leave positions in other professions to pursue teaching as a second career.

SECOND CAREER TEACHERS: Work Motivations

by Nancy H. Ellis

The teaching profession is rapidly approaching a crisis of numbers. Nearly 200,000 vacancies are anticipated to occur during the next few years, and, while there is an increase in the number of college students interested in becoming teachers, the number falls far short of projected need (Darling-Hammond, 1988, p. 7). The reasons for this projected shortfall are twofold. First, the profession continues to fail to attract a sufficient number of talented young people to its ranks. Added to this is the problem of attrition as many capable, experienced teachers find other doors opening to them and leave to pursue other careers (Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1984).

Although much attention has been focused on the projected teacher shortage caused by the lack of bright young people entering the teaching profession, little has been written about those people who, in their 30's and 40's, leave successful, and often very lucrative positions in other professions to pursue teaching as a second career. If indeed there is a wide spread shortage of qualified, dedicated teachers, perhaps we need to look beyond the recent college graduates to a new, largely untapped yet very talented market—the second career professional. Once considered a rarity in schools of education, second career teachers are becoming an increasingly common sight due to disenchantment with their first careers and a desire to make a contribution to society (Viadero, 1990).

The growing number of students who have chosen to become second career teachers by attending a traditional graduate level teacher certification program at the university provided an opportunity to explore their backgrounds, earlier career choices and motivation for choosing teaching as a second career.

Conceptual Framework

Levinson et al. (1978) point out that society assumes, often erroneously, that a person should have made a firm career choice by the early 20's. Berman and Munson (cited in Okun, 1984, p. 247) agree, adding that "millions of Americans have been inculcated with traditional career wisdom that says an individual needs to identify a career goal during adolescence or early adulthood and develop a long-range plan to achieve it." However, theorists have now come to realize that career choice is a continuous process. It is now becoming recognized that people do change careers in mid-life (Okun, 1984).

"Why a second career?" asks Sheehy (1976):

> The simple fact that people are living longer in better physical condition than ever before makes commitment to a single forty year career almost predestinate stagnation . . . It will be progress when we come to think of serial careers, not as signifying failure, but as a realistic way to prolong vitality. (p. 332)

Mid-life career changes are becoming viewed as a natural phenomenon. Can the teaching profession benefit? A look at the literature on adult development shows why a recruitment effort aimed at attracting to teaching second career people in their 30's and 40's may prove successful.

Gould theorizes that by their late 20's, people begin to realize that although their stated goals may have been attained, hidden goals may remain unfulfilled. Sheehy (1976) concurs. In turning 30, she explains, people begin to feel the constraints of choices made in their 20's. Frequently, people begin to want something more, something that touches some of the vital aspects of their inner beings that have been left out of their earlier choices.

Gould (1978) sees the 30's as the decade of a "new kind of opening up" that offers information on potential new directions and goals (p. 165). To Gould, the 30's are the "natural time for career commitments to deepen; either we extend ourselves anew in the career we've chosen or we enthusiastically move into a new one" (p. 205).

Levinson et al. (1978) see the transition into the 30's as a time to reaffirm initial choices or make new ones. The age 30 transition provides the "opportunity to work on the flaws in the life structure formed in the previous period, and to create the basis for a more satisfying structure that will be built in the following period" (p. 84). The age 30 transition gives people "a second chance to create a more satisfactory life structure" (p. 85). Gould (1978) finds the 30's a period for returning to school to enhance one's present career, to begin a new career, or, for women who have been at home raising families, to begin a career for the first time.

To Okun (1984), the mid-thirties represent a time for consolidation when priorities are revised and new goals are developed as one approaches mid-life. Sheehy (1976) calls the time between 35 and 45 the "deadline decade" (p. 286). People in this stage, she explains, sometimes face an authenticity crisis in which they re-examine their lives and re-evaluate their goals and values. And Krupp (1987) describes the late 30's and early 40's as the time in which "the extrinsic value of work gives way to its intrinsic worth," the time when people "seek self-fulfillment more often than compliments from others" (p. 25).

Jung (cited in Okun, 1984) theorized that the mid-life transition that occurs at about age 40 often calls for a "reorganization of one's dominant pattern of self-identity" as " . . . one turns inward and examines the meaning of life" (p. 179). Gould (1978) concurs. During the mid-life decade of 35–45, he explains, people begin to feel the pressure of time. Often this precipitates changes in their visions of themselves and subsequently in their careers.

To Levinson et al. (1978), the primary task of the mid-life transition is to modify one's life structures to allow a new structure to emerge. They see the mid-life transition as a time for people to reassess their life structures, their decisions and their values. It is "no longer crucial to climb another rung on the ladder . . . " (p. 214), but rather, it becomes a time to search for meaning in life, to make some contribution to the world.

Nancy Ellis, Assistant Professor of Education and Director of the Foundations, Curriculum and Teaching Program at Fairfield University, Fairfield, Connecticut.

Gould (1978) too sees mid-life as the time for reproportioning basic work motivations, the time when doing work that expresses one's inner self becomes more important than wealth or society's view of success. Gould sees this switch of priorities in motivation as a frequent cause of mid-life transitions and career changes.

Sheehy (1976) discusses the phenomenon of mid-life career changes. She finds that "secondary interests that have been trapped earlier in life can in middle and old age blossom into a serious lifework . . . " (p. 404)

Can the teaching profession capitalize on the aging population demographics by tapping into the motivational change that occurs in mid-life? Levinson et al. (1978) would lead us to believe that it can. In mid-life, they explain, a desire emerges "to leave a trace, however small, on the course of humankind" (p. 217). One way to accomplish this, the authors contend, is by becoming a mentor to young adults, i. e., a teacher.

Discussion

These theoretical concepts and propositions were investigated among a group of second career teachers using questionnaires completed by eight adults who received their teacher certification. The eight respondents ranged in age from 31 to 48. Six were female and two were male. Seven were married, one for the second time, and one was divorced. All were in the top 20% of their high school graduating classes and scored well over 1000 in their Scholastic Aptitude Tests. Two had composite scores between 1000 and 1100; one scored between 1100 and 1200; four scored between 1200 and 1300; and one scored above 1300. Their names have been changed to protect their rights to privacy.

Of the eight subjects, only one had not established a firm career path before selecting teaching as a career. Among the others was a physician, two nurses, a stock broker, a homemaker, a management consultant and an environmental analyst. All decided to enter teaching within the last five years.

Why they chose to leave their first careers and enter the teaching profession at this point in their lives was the fundamental question underlying this research.

In a study by Joseph and Green (1986), 234 education majors at Northeastern Illinois University were asked their reasons for entering teaching. More than 90% of the respondents indicated a desire to work with people or the need to be of service (p. 29). The eight second career teachers with whom I worked went beyond these reasons and echoed more closely the reasons for career changes described in the literature on adult development.

"Elizabeth", a 36 year old environmental analyst, and the divorced mother of two young children, attended an Ivy League college majoring in geography. "Elizabeth" credits her role as a parent for awakening in her the desire to teach. She explains:

> I have found personal involvement in the growth and development of my children to be the most satisfying thing I have ever done. The joy of being part of the learning process is immeasurable. Becoming a teacher may be the way to combine my 'two loves'—the earth and its environment and helping children to learn and grow.

"Debbie", a 34 year old emergency room physician, was expecting her first child at the time these data were being gathered. As a physician, she experienced a great deal of stress. "The responsibility is awesome" she explains. "I often felt like it overtook my entire life . . . This is the main reason I stopped. I wanted to collect myself and I realized that I really was not happy . . . I felt very isolated." When asked why she decided to become a teacher, "Debbie" responded, "I realized that much of what I enjoyed about being a doctor was the education of my patients." Not all of "Debbie's" motivation is idealistic, however. She adds that "the schedule of teaching will be better for me now that I am expecting my first child."

"Marie" is a 36 year old married nurse with four children ranging in age from three to eleven. Returning to work after time at home raising a family, she cites the work hours as one reason for entering teaching. Teaching is "a profession that seems to be worthwhile, fun and challenging," she explains. "And it doesn't hurt to have good working hours which coincide with the rest of my family."

In September, 1968, "Susan" began her working life as an elementary school teacher, but left after seven months. She left, she says:

> . . . after my fifth month of pregnancy, I was not unhappy to leave. I really enjoyed the children and parents, but I didn't have too much confidence in my teaching abilities. There was little in-service or support. There was no time for planning and no special subjects such as art or music. The staff was split politically over union representation issues and there was a lot of tension in the school. The four of us who were new graduates were caught in the middle between the two sides. All in all, it was not the best foundation for a teaching career.

"Susan" remained at home for four years, raising two children. Her husband also left teaching and began medical school. During that time, "Susan" decided to become a nurse and entered nursing school.

> I was becoming more interested in medical issues because of my husband's experiences in medical school and my work with LaLeche League. It also seemed to me to be a more practical career for someone with small children and a husband in medical school. There were more opportunities for part-time or weekend work, which would provide an opportunity for supplementary income with minimal child care problems.

"Susan" sees her interest in a special education career as the ideal way of combining her background in education with her skills as a nurse. Her goal is a career in early intervention, working with children who exhibit early learning problems.

"Theresa", 42, married with four children, is also pursuing a masters degree in special education. "I need to find some direction for myself," she says, "and to my surprise, I genuinely enjoy kids. Teaching is an important job. I think it is becoming a well-paying job. And it's a job which will not interfere with my family's needs.

"Nina", "Paul", and "Jim" all express highly idealistic reasons for entering teaching. "Nina", a 31 year old married stock broker, says that "after finding money making a dead end spiritually and morally, I felt I really needed to do something with my life that was more altruistic."

"Paul", 32, expresses a need to "embark on a career track that would make his work life meaningful. Previous to his teaching career, work was simply a means to pay the rent." And "Jim", a 48 year old management consultant, explains, "I want to be of use, to repay in a way some of the debts I feel that I owe to my teachers. And I love kids and am committed to seeing them to the future—which is in their hands.

It is interesting to note that while all the respondents feel that teaching is the right decision for them now, most indicated that to have entered the profession at 21, right after graduating from college, would have been a mistake. "Theresa" admits that at 21 she had no patience. "I thought everything was the parents' fault," she muses. "I was afflicted with the 'Not My Kid' syndrome. I did not enjoy children. Today, she says, she is much more tolerant of others and she realizes how much she truly cares about children.

"Elizabeth" feels she was too demanding, both of herself and of others to have been a good teacher at 21. She was impatient too, expecting immediate results for her efforts. Today she knows herself better and is more flexible and more understanding of others.

Self-knowledge, or rather the lack of it, is also what "Jim" feels was lacking in himself at 21. "I really didn't know myself—who I was, what I was good at, what I wanted to do. Experience with life is a key ingredient in a good teacher—and that I surely lacked then and certainly have now."

"Debbie" feels that for right now teaching is the best choice. "I love to teach and I love the students," she states. "Each one brings their own unique self to the learning experience and I enjoy finding ways to interest them and help them to learn."

"Marie" also is sure of her new career path. "I'm certain that I want to do this," she explains. "I enjoy learning [about teaching], and I feel competent and confident."

Conclusions

Each September new groups of second career teachers enroll in certification programs. Among the new group this year is a marketing manager planning on taking early retirement to begin a second career as a teacher; an engineer who wishes to share with others her love of learning and of mathematics; a financial analyst, tired of working long hours with no feelings of satisfaction or fulfillment; and a scientist who wants to motivate students through the wonders of science.

The literature describing adults in their 30's and 40's clearly posits that as the years pass, priorities and motivations for work change; that people become more aware of their own mortality and are more desirous of making some lasting contribution to society; and that material wealth, promotions, and other outward manifestations of success become less important than discovering and developing one's hidden talents and following paths not previously chosen.

This brief exploration into the phenomenon of second career teachers investigated the rationale for career paths and decisions of only eight people at one university. Of course, this is far too small and too homogeneous a group on which to base any far-reaching generalizations. Yet, each of these eight made a considered choice to diverge from previous career paths. Some left very lucrative or potentially lucrative posts; some left positions of prestige; all are seeking that self-fulfillment that adults approaching mid-life tend to seek. All chose to become teachers by entering a traditional teacher preparation program at a small but very highly regarded university.

Perhaps the feelings and choices exhibited by these eight respondents are replicated in other adults no longer satisfied by the rewards of their first career choices and standing on the brink of mid-life career change.

Many questions remain to be answered. How many potential second career teachers are there? How does the second career teacher differ from the young and eager college graduates entering the profession? Can the teaching profession capitalize on the changing needs and motivations of the mid-life professional and recruit them to our ranks? How can traditional teacher preparation programs wean the second career teacher away from "eight week wonder" alternative routes so that the knowledge base of the profession is not sacrificed in our desire to attract these people to the teaching profession?

Boyer (1983) suggests that "outstanding professionals be recruited" to the profession (p. 183). These results suggest there may be substantial merit in pursuing a resource as yet untapped, but fraught with possibilities—the second career professional.

References

Boyer, E.L. (1983). *High school: A report on secondary education in America.* New York: Harper Colophon.

Cresap, McCormick, and Paget. (1984). *Teacher incentives: A tool for effective management.* Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals, American Association of School Administrators, and National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). The futures of teaching. *Educational Leadership,* 46 (3), 4–10.

Gould, R.L. (1978). *Transformations: Growth and change in adult life.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Joseph, P.B., & Green, N. (1986). Perspectives on reasons for becoming teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (6), 28–33.

Krupp, J.A. (1987). Understanding and motivating personnel in the second half of life. *Journal of Education, 169* (1) 20–46.

Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & Mckee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: Ballentine.

Okun, B.F. (1984). *Working with adults: Individual, family, and career development.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Sheehy, G. (1976). *Passages: Predictable crises of adult life.* New York: E.P. Dutton.

Viadero, D. (1990, May 9). Graduates of other fields emerge as force in teacher-training ranks. *Education Week,* pp. 1, 10, 11.

If organizations are truly to collaborate, rather than merely cooperate, there will necessarily be a sacrifice of autonomy as they share visions, resources, decisions, and accountability.

Requirements for Collaboration With Schools: Public and Private Leaders Speak Out

by Kathryn S. Whitaker, Richard A. King James A. Lowham, Marie Norby–Loud and Paul Sueltenfuss

The complex problems facing children and families in this country provide an impetus to reexamine service delivery systems. One promising answer to the resolution of these issues is interagency collaboration. This strategy brings together previously fragmented organizations to better assist children and families through coordinated efforts. In addition, interagency collaboration promises to provide more comprehensive service delivery.

Multiple organizations have coordinated and cooperated in various endeavors over the years; yet recent conceptions of collaboration differ from these more passive approaches. Cooperation, for example, may include networking and information sharing (Melaville & Blank, 1991), but agencies do not make substantial changes in basic services provided, nor in the rules and regulations governing their agencies (Hord, 1986). Similarly, coordination "implies joint activity, but does not require participants to share a common goal" (National School Boards Association, 1991).

Hord's (1986) framework examines the differences between cooperation and collaboration in terms of (a) beginning processes, (b) communications, (c) resources and ownership, (d) requirements, (e) leadership and control, and (f) rewards. Whereas a cooperative begins with an agreement for one organization to assist another, the initiation of a collaborative rests on organizations joining forces to outline shared goals and action plans. Communication in a cooperative is characterized as a conveyance of information from one organization to another, unlike the more fluid communication channels among individuals at different levels in collaboratives. An "us/them" process mode typifies the individual proprietorship of cooperative institutions, whereas a "we" process of system ownership and mutual funding of activities distinguishes collaboratives. A cooperative endeavor requires one organization to obtain permission from another to analyze problem areas; a collaborative demands that both groups devote time and energy in taking action and requires each to contribute expertise. Unilateral leadership and central control characterize organizations in a cooperative, whereas dispersed leadership, delegation of responsibility, and mutual control typify collaboratives. Finally, one organization reaps greater direct benefits from a cooperative activity, unlike the sharing of resources and services that distinguishes collaboratives.

In this paper, we describe a study that followed Hord's (1986) framework in understanding the views of public and private sector leaders concerning conditions which are necessary for successful collaboration between educational organizations and non-school agencies, including businesses, social service and non-profit agencies, and community colleges. The focus was intentionally shifted from schools to their potential collaborators—a population that is not always asked about its own views on collaboration despite the movement toward school-linked partnerships. Partnerships are important in the context of this study because, as Houston (1979) noted, collaborative relationships are more likely to grow from successful previous experiences. The extent of partnership activities was documented in a National Center for Education Statistics (1989) survey. In 1987–88, 40% of the nation's public schools had some kind of formal partnership with an external institution.

The recent trend toward the formation of collaboratives beyond partnerships (Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990) urged the collection of data from these types of institutions to ascertain perceptions of what makes for effective collaborative arrangements. Specifically, the research question which guided the study was as follows: "Are shared vision, shared lines of communication, shared resources, shared leadership, shared responsibility for decision-making, shared accountability for outcomes, and yielding autonomy necessary conditions for collaboration among two or more organizations?"

Methodology

A group of doctoral students at the University of Northern Colorado collaborated in designing this exploratory study of necessary conditions for effective collaboration (Lowham, et al., 1992). They interviewed forty-two leaders from selected businesses, social service and non-profit agencies, and community colleges which had first-hand experiences with school-linked partnerships or collaboratives.

Interview questions were developed following the six areas outlined by Hord (1986), and included questions about vision, communication, leadership, accountability, decision making, resource sharing, and autonomy. The semi-structured interview guide included seven two-part questions. First, respondents were asked to rank on a Likert scale the extent to which certain conditions were necessary for collaboration. Second, respondents were asked open-ended questions about advice they would offer concerning each condition. After addressing the conditions, they were asked to offer any additional advice about collaboration with schools and to identify other individuals who might also be interviewed relative to the initiation of collaboratives.

Quantitative data gathered through the first stage were aggregated without reference to the organization of the interviewees. Mean scores were compiled for each of the seven categories. Next, responses to the open-ended questions concerning advice were categorized according to the seven themes. Quantitative methods were used to support the findings from the interviews.

Whitaker is Associate Professor, King is Professor, and Lowham, Norby–Loud, and Sueltenfuss are Doctoral Students in the Division, University of Northern Colorado.

In the following section, we discuss the findings of these conversations with the potential collaborators in relation to advice noted in the emerging literature on collaboration.

Findings

Responses to the interview questions revealed the collective beliefs of these leaders about the necessity of selected conditions to build successful collaboratives with schools. Table 1 presents the number of respondents who indicated each value on the scale and the mean responses. It is clear that shared lines of communication, shared accountability, shared vision, and shared responsibilities for decision making are viewed by these individuals as being essential ingredients. Less important in the general view of respondents are sharing human, financial, and material resources; sharing leadership; and yielding autonomy.

Table 1. Necessity of selected conditions for successful collaboration

		Frequency of Responses*					
Condition	n	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Share vision	41	3			11	27	4.44
Share communication	39			1	7	31	4.77
Share human resources	40	1	5	6	11	17	3.95
Share financial resources	38	5	4	7	5	17	3.66
Share material resources	42	3	3	12	11	13	3.67
Share leadership	39	6	2	6	12	13	3.62
Share decision making	37			2	17	18	4.43
Share accountability	38			5	9	24	4.50
Yield autonomy	37	5	5	10	8	9	3.30

*1 = low, 5 = high.

Shared Vision

One of the primary elements of a successful collaborative is the development of a shared vision (OERI, 1991). This common understanding of purposes and goals is a critical foundation for changes in the current structure of service delivery. Organizations that plan to collaborate need to decide on the broad vision that expresses a need for fundamental changes in the system and a desirable state (National Alliance of Business, 1989).

The importance of clarifying vision in beginning a collaborative relationship is evident in the advice provided by respondents. As shown in Table 1, the mean score for this condition is 4.44, on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Several respondents noted that each organization, as a first step, must examine the rationale and motive for collaborating with another organization. One leader representing a non-profit agency stated that if a vision is not shared, alternative motives may be present. Kagan (1990) noted that the partnership process must be based on a unified view of outcomes participants wish to achieve.

Another emerging theme related to shared vision was the perception that some agreement on goals holds the project together. As one business person put it, "you don't have to share the same path, but you do have to share the same goal." A non-profit leader differed somewhat, noting that the vision itself does not have to be the same for all partners; however, in this person's view, there must be a high level of agreement of purpose to foster effective working relations. Similarly, a community college leader responded that "paths may converge to a point, but the ultimate overall goal doesn't need to be the same."

Agreement on the vision is essential to the buy-in among participants, stated one non-profit leader. A social service agency representative agreed on the importance of buy-in of the vision by stating, "for the collaborative to be successful, shared vision must be high, although sometimes the vision comes along later." Another social service representative emphasized that having a shared vision "prevents communication problems and a lot of emotional garbage later in the process." Gardner (1992) echoed this important consideration by stating that line workers' involvement is important in the early stages.

When asked about the importance of shared vision, three respondents stated the importance of defining a mission for the collaborative. More specifically, respondents recognized the important role of the school in defining the mission of the collaborative. One leader from a non-profit organization predicted better results if the mission is "mandated by the principal" and if teachers are directly involved in discussions about the collaborative's purpose and goals. A community college leader contradicted this statement saying, "The shared vision needs to be created by the collaborating organizations."

Shared vision is clearly an important condition for collaboration. Although respondents differed in perceptions of the extent to which goals and desired outcomes must be the same for collaborators, they agreed that a common vision is important for securing organizations' buy-in and for fostering effective working relations.

Shared Leadership

Whether collaborative arrangements survive or die "depend on the urgency of the problems and the willingness of somebody to take the leadership" (Minneapolis: Youth Coordinating Board, 1990). Few would disagree that collaboration among organizations requires strong leadership, whether by an individual or several people. Leaders are able to envision goals, affirm values, achieve unity among groups, and serve as symbols (Gardner, 1986).

The literature supports shared leadership in collaboratives. Jehl and Kirst (1992) emphasize shared power, responsibility, and ownership; Hord (1986) supports shared, mutual control and dispersed leadership. Melaville and Blank (1991) also caution against a single leader in collaborative efforts. They state that "continued reliance on a single voice will ultimately staunch the flow of new ideas, underutilize the pool of available talent, and undermine the growth of interdependence central to successful joint efforts" (p. 25).

In this study, shared leadership was not viewed as being as crucial to the establishment of collaboratives as were other conditions (see Table 1). Responses to the question on the importance of shared leadership were mixed, and interview findings clarified the apparent divergent views. Respondents seemed to be divided on the issue of whether leadership is found in a single individual or is an equally shared responsibility among collaborators.

Several respondents suggested that one leader should take responsibility and be accountable for the success of the collaborative. A non-profit organization leader stated that the initiation of the collaborative rests with top management, although joint participation and empowerment must occur. Another responded that "it is easier to run the collaborative if everyone knows who is in charge. Someone needs to feed things through." A business leader observed that problems can surface when one person is not in charge: "Shared leadership takes longer and it is possible that two or more leaders can blame one another if the collaborative is not successful."

In contrast to these respondents who suggested that single leadership was preferable, others emphasized the positive impact of shared leadership. Stated a leader from a non-profit organization, "For the collaborative to be successful, leadership needs to be shared; if one person controls, there is a breakdown. Everyone's skills need to be tapped." One individual stressed that areas of leadership need to be decided in advance, such as having co-chairs from different organizations and rotating the responsibility for chairing the meetings.

These organizational leaders' views differ from the prevailing support for shared leadership as has been expressed by Hord (1986), Melaville and Blank (1991), and Jehl and Kirst (1992). They do not question the importance of leadership in collaborative endeavors; rather, they disagree about the degree to which leadership can be effectively shared.

Shared Lines of Communication

The predominant mode of service delivery by fragmented agencies lacks effective communication systems. Professionals and other agency personnel rarely talk to each other and oftentimes do not see each other as allies. In fact, outright rivalry occurs as organizations compete for scarce resources (Melaville & Blank, 1990). The result of poor communication among agencies is children and families "falling through the cracks" and not receiving the services needed (Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990).

As depicted in Table 1, sharing lines of communication is one of the most important conditions. It is also one of the most difficult to sustain in a collaborative effort. Respondents stated that collaboration will not occur without effective communication. "This is the key" to successful collaboration, stated a non-profit organizational leader. "It makes a difference between success and failure," responded another.

Open lines of communication among organizational leaders at high levels are especially important at the beginning stages of establishing the collaborative. Later, open communication also becomes critical among all agency and school personnel, according to one respondent. Participation of and communication with school administrators is particularly crucial because having school support is most important, stressed one non-profit leader.

Several organizational leaders articulated that communication must be on-going, occurring on a day-to-day basis. Hord (1986) stresses that communication roles need to be established and channels created for interaction across the organizations. In addition, many levels of communication need to be established, as clear information is the keystone of success in the effort. Many respondents in this study emphasized the importance of communication occurring through many layers and not resting with, for example, only top and mid-management. As one community college leader observed, "The more information each organization has, the better the collaborative becomes." Another community college leader stressed the importance of communicating with all, even guests and visitors. The community needs to be educated about the value and purpose of the collaborative.

Many problems faced in collaborative arrangements appear to be primarily due to a failure in communications. Melaville & Blank (1990) emphasize that participants need to establish communication processes that provide permission to disagree and one where conflict is viewed as a constructive way to move forward. One business leader in this study said, "The more times information is passed around, the more distorted it becomes, making the need for certain mechanisms to be in place to foster communication." A social service agency leader expressed discomfort with the communication channels between his agency and the school district, noting that the hierarchical structure of the school district caused problems.

Both business leaders and community college leaders offered the strategy of using newsletters to keep all involved abreast of developments. Others stressed regular meetings, at least once a month, with representatives from all collaborating organizations participating and sharing information.

Establishing and nurturing effective communication channels are critical in collaboration. Open and continuous exchange of information builds trust among participants, enhances support in the community, and enables better service delivery.

Shared Resources

The literature advances the view that sharing resources is requisite for successful collaboration; this condition is a key difference between collaboration and cooperation. Melaville and Blank (1990) underscore that collaboratives "need to share staff time and expertise, in-kind services, and especially funds. The commitment of resources is the acid test of any joint effort's determination to make a difference" (p. 32). According to Hord (1986), sharing resources enhances system ownership and creates a "we" process mode.

Although a few non-profit leaders indicated that resources should be shared to "as great an extent as possible," this condition was not viewed to be as important as other components described in the study (see Table 1). This finding may indicate that these organizations were not engaged in collaboration to the degree depicted by Hord (1986), but were engaged in more cooperative efforts. Responses may also have reflected the reality that sharing resources is very difficult; one respondent said, "Ideally it would be great, but it is not realistic."

Several barriers to resource sharing exist. Intriligator (1992) notes, "Garnering resources for interagency efforts is one of the challenges confronting the service community. Agency budgets are strained, and new initiatives typically require additional staff as well as retraining of existing staff" (p. 15). The non-school personnel in this study referred to budget constraints and grant funding limitations that pose limits to sharing financial resources. A community college leader maintained that frequently organizations only have control over their own funding and are limited in the degree to which they can share with other organizations. Non-profit agency personnel cautioned that sometimes the motive for collaboration comes from grant funding exclusively and that this can cause problems. Rather than shared resources per se, these organizational leaders observed that agreement on who provides what resources and how they are used is an important condition.

A representative of United Way indicated that while the agency is in collaborative arrangements with other organizations, resource sharing is not equitable. The agency desires greater resource sharing among all organizations involved. The collaborative arrangement is easier, she maintained, if financial commitment comes from other agencies as well. A business leader agreed: "The more each party is willing to share, the better the chance they have in reaching goals." Another suggested that sometimes businesses can offer more in terms of resources, but schools should contribute to the extent that they can.

While many respondents spoke of financial resources, questions were also asked about sharing human and material resources. One representative of a non-profit organization suggested that contributions be based on the ability of each participating organization to support the initiative, while a business leader indicated that "human and financial resources piggy back on each other; one without the other creates constraints." Others commented that "partners must contribute whatever they can or there is no marriage." In contrast, a representative from a non-profit organization called for access to all resources of all participants.

Although mixed responses surfaced in regard to shared resources, the literature suggests that pooling resources is

important. Intriligator (1992) states, "collaborative interagency relationships are supported with pooled resources which are largely within the control of the interagency unit. In effect, agencies make contributions to the collaborative unit in exchange for ongoing participation in its activities" (p. 17).

Sharing resources may be an essential condition to collaboration, but it is less critical than other factors in the view of these selected leaders. However, it appears that questions about who contributes how much of financial, human and material resources must be addressed to assure successful efforts.

Shared Decision Making

Sharing decisions distinguishes collaborative efforts from cooperative and coordinated ones (Hord, 1986; Intriligator, 1992). Respondents in this study agreed that sharing decision making is crucial to collaboration (see Table 1). A business leader stated, "For the collaborative to be effective, decisions should be shared. Sharing decisions contributes to buy-in and commitment. It is also important to lay out what you have to offer and what you are willing to do." Another business person observed that lack of shared decision making can lead to the destruction of the collaborative.

Although respondents agreed that decision making should be shared, at least one respondent noted that the balance would not necessarily be equal because individuals vary in their expertise. The balance also depends on the type of decision to be made. One individual, representing a non-profit organization, suggested that the major decisions are fiscal in nature. For example, what kinds of resources are organizations going to contribute?

Several respondents observed that policy and governance decisions needed to be shared, but the day-to-day decisions did not. For the decisions that need to be shared, scheduling regular meetings is one way to accomplish this. Hord (1986) also mentions the necessity of having regular meetings, among both large and small groups of collaborators, to sustain efforts.

A community college leader emphasized the importance of regularly scheduled meetings to "increase the trust level because of building closer relationships." Several respondents stressed the importance of establishing trust among collaborating organizations. One participant cautioned that if "trust, mutual appreciation, and respect did not exist up front, the collaborative would likely be doomed for failure." Another non-profit leader echoed the importance of trust by stating that the "level of power among collaborating organizations must be equal or trust will not be present." Intriligator (1992) cautions that inappropriate use of power represents a lack of trust between parties and it is necessary to develop mechanisms such as consensus decision making to avoid power plays.

The importance of shared decisions is evident in responses; nevertheless, it is also clear that the nature of decisions to be made define the degree to which participants express a need to be involved in deliberations. The more that a decision relates to the governance of the collaborative, the more important it is that participants have a voice.

Shared Accountability

To make a difference in expanding and improving services to children and families, interagency initiatives must begin with a clear statement of expected results. The collaborative, and individual agencies within it, should be "held responsible for measuring, monitoring and meeting objectives within a reasonable period of time" (Melaville & Blank, 1991). Another benefit beyond that of improved service delivery is a realistic assessment of that which can be accomplished: "Accountability is a sure-fire way to counter the temptation to over promise, an easy trap for an up-and-coming initiative trying to drum up interest and support" (Higgins, 1988, cited in Melaville & Blank, 1991, p. 34).

In this study, the importance of shared accountability is evident by participant responses. Sixty-three percent of the respondents gave shared accountability a high ranking of "five." Their comments revealed a concern with early agreement on who will be responsible for what results. Business leaders were especially concerned that accountability issues be spelled out early in the process. They urged participants to raise questions such as, "What do you want to do and by when?" and "How will we know when we accomplish this?" A business leader suggested that presently the accountability issue is fuzzy and that an evaluation form is needed to protect both sides. Another, stating that collaboratives fail because ". . . the burden falls back on business," argued that if people are not empowered, they fail to see the need to be accountable.

Representatives from non-profit agencies also emphasized the need to decide accountability issues up front. Two non-profit leaders noted that accountability issues become more of a factor as money issues surface. Others observed that it is people, not agencies, who are accountable: "If individuals say they will do something, they need to do it." A social service agency leader stressed that she would like to be more involved in outcomes as opposed to just the initiation: "I ignite the interest and the schools do the follow up."

One non-profit leader distinguished between full responsibility and task responsibility stating, "It is not necessary for everyone to have full responsibility, but task responsibility. You need to be clear about who is responsible for what." In contrast, another referred to shared accountability: "If you are working as a team, you can't blame one person if something doesn't succeed."

Most community college representatives reiterated the importance of shared accountability; one leader stressed "All need to be accountable for their part; we are only as strong as our weakest link." Another community college representative, however, did not rate this component as high as others indicating, "In certain situations, only one of the particular agencies will be held accountable should something go wrong."

The importance of accountability is overshadowed by disagreements about whether that responsibility for results needs to be shared. Some respondents favored shared accountability by the entire team of participants, whereas others stressed the realization that one agency is ultimately responsible for outcomes.

Interdependence

The issue of autonomy versus interdependence is apparent as many collaboratives struggle to find the right balance. As Melaville and Blank (1991) note, "the natural tendency of participants to maintain their distinctive organizational characteristics gives rise to the 'turf issues,' which, in greater or lesser degree, many joint efforts experience" (p. 29).

Differences exist in collaborative arrangements that attempt to transcend organizational boundaries and those which do not. Intriligator (1992) points to this difference, stating that "collaborative interagency efforts represent a higher degree of interdependence than coordinated and cooperative arrangements" (p. 23). The broader and more complex the interagency arrangement, the greater the need for interdependence.

One of the interview questions in this study asked individuals, "To what extent do collaborating organizations need to yield autonomy?" Findings showed that yielding autonomy was not viewed as a high priority (see Table 1), although the randomness of responses suggested that the question was not completely understood by some individuals. Several respondents, however, provided valuable insights to the issue of autonomy versus interdependence, often referring to issues of turf and territoriality. One community college leader stated:

> This is a real problem for some because of their territorial nature. They fear loss of power, authority, and decision making. Like dogs marking their territory, you need to go

back and revisit this because it's what we're all about. Everyone has different agendas. We need to go back and continually refocus on the goal of education.

Although agreeing that yielding autonomy is important in collaboratives, one non-profit leader suggested that in practice, it is difficult to give up autonomy. Another non-profit leader stressed that it was unrealistic to expect organizations to yield autonomy, stating that "a collaborative requires flexibility, not yielding autonomy or we become one big bureaucracy." A third individual thought that there should be a blending with most of the autonomy retained.

A non-profit leader stated, "Autonomy was given up at the table, but resurfaced when the individuals returned to their respective agencies." This idea might best be described by a quote of one respondent, "Organizations become autonomous within the project, but not anonymous." There is a clear hesitation to forego individual identities.

Business leaders provided mixed responses, but most favored retaining autonomy. One business leader underscored that "You need to have your own identity, but be prepared to become part of the others' personalities—a blending." Another said that it is okay to keep autonomy as long as one group doesn't override the other. A third business leader suggested that the degree to which organizations are willing to yield autonomy rested with the extent of goal commitment; that is, the more committed the organization to the vision or goal, the more it is willing to yield autonomy. Finally, a business leader cautioned that some may see yielding autonomy as an intrusion, especially in the case of teachers who, given their history of relative autonomy in the classroom, might view this as an encroachment on their professional decision making.

Finding a balance between interdependence and autonomy is difficult. Organizations may not want to give up individual identity as an agency, yet many are willing to yield to the degree necessary to achieve jointly desired outcomes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

If organizations are truly to collaborate, rather than merely cooperate, there will necessarily be a sacrifice of autonomy as they share visions, resources, decisions, and accountability. This study of public and private sector leaders' views of conditions for successful collaboration with schools confirms this supposition, but raises questions about the nature of leadership and the degree to which participants are willing to share resources, accept accountability, or yield identities in the name of collaboration.

The questions asked of leaders in business, non-profit and social service agencies, and community colleges were derived from Hord's (1986) framework for distinguishing collaboration from cooperation. It was clear from responses that shared vision, communication, decision making, and accountability are key conditions for effective collaboration with schools (see Table 1). Potential collaborators must explore purposes, goals, motivations, and desired outcomes as agreement is reached on a common vision for joining forces; otherwise, commitments may wane and fragmented services may once again prevail. Open lines of communication at all levels of the organizations and frequent discussions among personnel are essential, not only to share information about clients but also to resolve conflicts and build trust. Similarly, shared decision making processes particularly regarding governance and policy issues contribute to commitments to collaborate. Although recognizing the importance of shared accountability for the results of joint efforts, there seemed to be greater reluctance to commit organizations equally to the burden entailed in this responsibility.

Sharing leadership, yielding autonomy, and sharing human, financial, and material resources were reported to be less important ingredients (see Table 1). Interview findings clarified the thinking of nonschool personnel, suggesting that potential collaborators consider whether leadership is to be shared or singular and the degree to which they are expected to share resources or sacrifice their independence. Rather than denying the importance of leadership per se, respondents differed in whether leadership can be "shared" in all dimensions of collaboration. A recommendation that might be made is that organizations initiating a collaborative consider the nature of leadership up front to avoid later disagreements about who is in charge and who is likely to be identified with successes and failures. To some degree the disparate views of respondents reflect comfort with the prevailing paradigm of leadership in bureaucracies; we speculate that the importance of shared leadership will be recognized as organizations become more familiar with collaboration and more comfortable with sharing leadership, decision making, and accountability.

Sharing human and financial resources was also viewed as less important in creating successful collaboratives. It appeared that it is essential to agree on who provides what resources and how they are to be used. However, the hesitation to yield control over resources reflected constraints of budgets and policies. It may also have been a statement that these leaders had thus far been engaged in partnership efforts rather than collaborative ones envisioned by Hord (1986), Kirst and McLaughlin (1990), Intriligator (1992), and others. If full collaboration is critical to the betterment of service delivery, and if sharing such resources is essential to this goal, then organizations must be willing to share, personnel must be trained, and policies must be written to facilitate this action.

This study also shed light on the degree to which organizations might be willing to yield their identities in the name of collaboration. Although individuals consent to come to the table to discuss more effective ways of providing services through joint efforts, they stop short of sacrificing organizational autonomy. If collaboration means anonymity in the name of interdependence, it appears that partnership or cooperation may be the preferred modes.

In summary, it appears from this study that potential collaborators with schools must reach agreement on the degree to which they desire to share leadership and resources, as well as to sacrifice their autonomy, early in deliberations. It may be far easier to share a vision of better service delivery and to open lines of communication than it is to fully commit organizations' resources or to fully share accountability for results of interagency collaboration.

References

Gardner, J. (1986). *The paths of leadership.* Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Gardner, S.L. (1992). Key issues in developing school-linked, integrated services. In Behrman, R. E., (Ed.). *The future of children* (pp. 85–94). Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Higgins, C. (1988). *At risk youth talk to program planners.* Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Hord, S.M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. *Educational Leadership*, 43 (5), 22–26.

Houston, W.R. (1979). Collaboration—See treason. In Hall, G., Hord, S., & Brown, G., (Eds.). *Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research.* Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Intriligator, B. (1992). *Establishing interorganizational structures that facilitate successful school partnerships.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Jehl, J. & Kirst, M. (1992). Getting ready to provide school-linked services: What schools must do. In Behrman, R.E.,

(Ed.). *The future of children* (pp. 95–106). Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Kagan, S. L. (1990). The care and education of America's young children: At the brink of a paradigm shift. In Macchiarola, F. & Gardner, A. (Eds.). *Caring for America's children.* New York: Academy of Political Science.

Kirst, M. W. & McLaughlin, M. (1990). Rethinking policy for children: Implications for educational administration. In Mitchell, B. & Cunningham, L.L. (Eds.). *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools.* 89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 69–90). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lowham, J., Norby–Loud, M., Nowak, S., Stone, B.J., Sueltenfuss, P., & Tarnasky, R. (1992). *Forming interagency collaboratives with schools: Views from non-educators.* Paper presented at the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Rapid City, SD.

Melaville, A.I. & Blank, M.J. (1991). *What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services.* Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Minneapolis: Youth Coordinating Board. (1990, January). *USA Today*, p. 138.

National Alliance for Business. (1989). *The compact project: School–business partnerships for improving education.* Washington, DC.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1989). *Education partnerships in elementary and secondary schools.* (Survey Report). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National School Boards Association (NSBA). (1991). *Link-up: A resource directory.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1991). *Collaboration to build competence: The urban superintendents' perspective.* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

To the extent that our nation continues to grow farther apart economically and racially, the practical implication for education is that all reforms become more difficult.

DEALING WITH DIVERSITY: School Choice, Race, and Sparsity

by John A. Brown and Jess E. House

Public schools in America fail to the extent that they are unable to meet the educational needs of all children. While there are many factors that contribute to this problem situation, the remarkable similarity of schools across the country may be one of the leading causes. The uniform pattern of schooling and the enormous diversity in learner characteristics result, all too frequently in a profound mismatch between service and needs.

Proposals for the restructuring and decentralization of schools seek to redesign schools so that schools would become more responsive to the heterogeneous populations they serve. When the difficulties of organizational change and the historically sluggish response of public schooling are considered, the controversial alternative of school choice may be seen as a more desirable avenue to reform (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Nathan, 1990; Elmore, 1988; Raywid, 1988).

The conceptual arguments on both sides of the school choice debate are well developed (for example, see Lankford and Wyckoff, 1992) and choice has broad political support (per cent support by group as follows: 62 percent of the general public, 69 percent of minorities, 70 percent of inner-city residents, 71 percent of 18–29 year olds, 63 percent of Democrats and 57 percent of Republicans [Klenk, 1992]. Although scholarly debate on choice provides an important frame of reference, the views of parents faced with choice possibilities yield additional data that must also be considered. This study examines school choice using the beliefs and attitudes held by community members in school districts that are fundamentally and demographically dissimilar. The study attempts to identify important dependent and independent variables and to develop quantitative instruments for measuring them.

Equal Educational Opportunity: A Southern Perspective

Equal educational opportunity as a means of achieving social justice has been a persistent theme in American education. The concept implies that education will provide greater opportunity and "open doors" to minority youth and those from lower socioeconomic groups. However, the facts do not justify such optimism. Stevens and Wood (1992) cite "that among African Americans the gap between middle-and low income families has increased over the past twenty years. From 1976 to 1988 college enrollments of African Americans declined slightly as did the percent of those receiving a college degree. For low income whites, however, college enrollments rose during the same period" (p. 60).

Since the facts undermine claims of equal educational opportunity, it is easier to understand minority alienation from the "American dream" of educational opportunity. This alienation is manifested by hostile behavior in school, dropping out of school (Bennett and LeCompte, 1990), and avoiding the appearance of higher educational aspirations (Bianci, 1990).

School officials in the South cite incidents of racially motivated violence and scenes of voluntary segregation in lunchrooms and sports activities as evidence that the South has yet to overcome its racially troubled past. In a study of southern school desegregation, Wainscott (1990) identified three indicators of second generation discrimination: racial disproportion in the assignment of students to EMR (educable mentally retarded) classes; racial disparity in student suspensions and expulsions, and a dramatic increase of white enrollment (white flight) in private schools. Wainscott summarizes his study by stating "suspicion remains that the racial balance exhibited in enrollment reports is but a facade masking interracial conflict and invidious forms of discrimination within supposedly integrated schools" (p. 84).

Research Questions

The two research questions addressed in this study were: (1) Which of the 11 demographic variables (see Table 2) are the best predictors of the criterion scale (School Choice)?; and (2) Are the main and interaction effects of race, gender, and type of school district (urban or rural) statistically significant on the mean of the School Choice scale?

Methodology and Design

Sample

To better understand the politics of school choice legislation, a state was selected in the southeastern region of the country where school choice was being considered by the legislature. From a pool of five large, urban, public school districts in this state, one district, hereafter referred to as District A, was randomly selected for this study. All five districts provided students with some mechanism of intradistrict school choice using the magnet school concept and philosophy. Two of the districts (District A and one other) were under federal court order (desegregation) to provide intradistrict school choice for district residents.

The second pool (n=54) of public school districts was classified by the state department of education as being rural, and had the following three additional criteria: low student enrollment (less than 5,000 pupils); low educational expenditures (less than $3000 per pupil); and population sparsity (where more than 90% of the pupils are transported to school). The pool was further stratified (n=23) to control for communication bias and general political influences and minority student populations. Those school districts within a sixty mile radius of District A which received the same television and many of the same radio stations, and the newspapers of general distribution to District A residents were selected for inclusion in the study. A second school district, hereafter referred to as District B, was randomly selected from this stratified pool.

To ensure accurate representation, a stratified random sample (n=800) of teachers, administrators, and parents was selected for the study. In addition, a larger number (n=450) questionnaire were distributed in District A to compensate for population differences. Table 1 provides a summary of relevant school district and service area information.

John A. Brown, Associate Professor, The Citadel

Jess E. House, Associate Professor, University of Toledo

Table 1. School District and Service Area Information

	District A	District B
School District:		
School Enrollment	34,994	4,544
Percent Minority	61.3	56.4
Expenses Per Pupil	$3324	$2677
Pupils Transported	16,000	4,322
High Schools	5	4
Junior/Middle Schools	11	1
Elementary Schools	33	3
Private Schools	N=29	N=3
Enrollment	6,884	786
Percent Minority	5.6	2.4
School Service Area:		
Location	Urban	Rural
Population	292,517	21,892
Percent H. S. Graduates	49.2	45.1
Percent Minority	43.2	40.4
Residents Per Square Mile	371.8	28.1

Procedure

To reduce personnel bias, teachers in both districts were randomly selected. Parents were randomly selected from the class lists of those teachers not participating in the study. The endorsement of each school district superintendent was cited in a cover letter which was distributed to each participant. The cover letter ensured confidentiality and gave directions for completion of the survey. In addition, participants received a demographic information sheet and a survey instrument (attitudes on school choice and attitudes toward work).

Questionnaires (n=562 or 70.3%) were received from respondents representing the two school districts. The percentage returns were slightly higher for District B (249 or 71.1%) than for District A (313 or 69.6%). The typical respondent was female, African American, approximately 41 years old, had more than two years college training, was in good health, worked (includes categories for student and homemaker) approximately 40 hours per week, and had worked for approximately 17 years (10 in present position). The means and standard deviations for all independent and dependent variables are summarized in Table 2.

Instrument Design

The demographic information section solicited information concerning respondent school district (urban or rural), number of workers at respondent's work site, age, gender, race (white, black or African American), level of educational attainment, years in current position, prior years experience in a comparable position, current physical health, hours worked per week, and type of work. Responses were entered as actual continuous values (e.g., age, number of years, hours worked, and so forth). A 5-point Likert-type scale (Borg & Gall, 1983) was used in the section on school choice. Respondents circled a response (SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, N=neither disagree nor agree, A=agree, and SA=strongly agree) about each statement.

In the section on school choice, a brief description of the choice plan being proposed in the target state was included. In addition, thirty-five statements were included in the final instrument which solicited perceptions concerning "school choice." Before applying the statistical tests for each hypothesis, the question of the reliability of the scales was addressed with Internal Consistency Coefficient Alphas as defined by SPSS/PC based on the theory of Cronbach (1970). The School Choice scale consisted of 35 items and had a coefficient alpha of .68 estimated on this sample of 562 respondents.

Analysis and Results

The analysis of the first research question was conducted with stepwise multiple regression and simple product moment correlation coefficients. The primary interest was describing the relationships between the 11 demographic predictors and the criterion School Choice. The first regression employed the 11 demographic predictors. Means and standard deviations for this analysis may be seen in Table 2. Correlations between criterion and predictor variables are shown in Table 3.

Table 2. Total Means and Standard Deviations For All Independent and Dependent Variables (n=562)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Type School	1.63	.48
Number of Workers	86.64	100.95
Age	41.29	7.35
Sex	1.72	.45
Race	1.42	.50
Educational Level	4.84	1.50
Years in Current Position	9.83	7.47
Prior Years Experience	7.27	7.03
Current Physical Health	3.39	.72
Hours Worked Per Week	41.64	11.05
Type of Work	3.61	1.69
School Choice Scale	3.46	.30

Table 3. Correlation Coefficients Among Dependent and Independent Variables

	Type School	Number Worker	Age	Sex	Race	Ed. Level	Years Cur. P.	Prior Exp.	Curr. Health	Hrs. Work	Type
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	.00										
2	.00	1.00									
3	.21**	−.08	1.00								
4	.02	−.10	−.17**	1.00							
5	−.02	.07	−.04	.01	1.00						
6	.23**	−.07	.21**	.05	−.19**	1.00					
7	.06	−.02	.32**	−.08	.05	.02	1.00				
8	.08	.05	.26**	−.03	−.01	.03	.59	1.00			
9	.10	.09	−.02	−.10	−.22**	.16*	.08	.05	1.00		
10	.05	.02	.13	−.08	−.14	.18*	−.14	.08	−.01	1.00	
11	.12	−.07	−.05	.10	−.05	.50	.09	−.04	.00	−.11	1.00

* Significant at .05 Level **Significant at .01 level

The null hypothesis (there will be no statistically significant relationship between the criterion School Choice and the 11 demographic predictors) was rejected. Three predictors were significantly related to the School Choice scale: attitudes about work 1, type of work (defined as whether the respondent was a (1) teacher and student, $\underline{X}$ = 3.45, (2) management or administrator and government official, $\underline{X}$ = 3.49, (3) worker and housewife, $\underline{X}$ = 3.56) and race. The multiple $\underline{R}$ = .46 accounted for 22% of the variance in the School Choice scale. Table 4 presents the multivariate summary for this analysis.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Summaries for Both Equations With Raw Multiple Regression Coefficients, Standardized Coefficients, Beta Weights, and Multivariate T-Tests

Variables in Equation	Raw MR Coeff.	St. MR Coeff.	Beta Weights	T	Significance
Equation 1					
School Choice					
Total	.40	.05	.45	7.56	.000
Type Work	–.04	.01	–.24	–4.22	.000
Race	–.09	.04	–.15	–2.45	.015
Constant	2.32	.18		13.08	.000
Multiple $\underline{R}$ = .46, $\underline{R}$ SQ = .22, Standard Err = .27, $\underline{F}$ = 23.16**, DF = 3, 252					

**Significant at .01 Level

Means for the School Choice scale by type of work indicate that workers and housewives favor School Choice significantly more than the other two groups. High values of the School Choice scale were associated with high values on educational level and race (African American) and to high values on educational level and age as can be obtained from the correlation coefficients in Table 3.

The statistical significance of the main effects and interaction effects on the School Choice scale was evaluated in a 2×2×2 analysis of variance. Assumptions of normality were investigated for these tests and appeared to be sufficient for the robustness of the test. The second hypothesis (there will be no statistically significant main or interaction effects on race, gender and type of school [rural or urban] on the means of the School Choice scale) was also rejected. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for the School Choice scale by race, type school and gender.

Table 6 presents the univariate stepdown results of each of the main effects and interactions between race, type of school and gender. The two-way interaction effect for race by type of school was significant as was the main effect for race. With a significant interaction effect, the simple effects must be plotted to understand the relationships which exist. Table 5 shows the means on the School Choice scale for each of the race by type of school groups. One-way analysis of variance with Scheffe' comparisons used to determine the significance between groups indicated that black rural respondents had significantly higher means on the School Choice scale than any other group thus indicating that they favored School Choice. White rural respondents had the lowest scores followed by the black urban and white urban. These three groups were not statistically different from each other. The questionnaire was coded so that the items were positively stated. A high score on the scales indicated a high agreement to the scales. Thus, black rural respondents may be said to feel that they will benefit in various ways by School Choice, whereas the black urban and all white respondents do not feel they will benefit by the plan. Rinehart and Lee (1991) indicate that minority parents, especially those who are economically challenged, view school choice as one method of closing both the economic and education gap. The inclusion of transportation services overcomes the transportation limitations cited by Witte (1990), Moore and Davenport (1990), the U.S. Department of Education (1990)

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for the School Choice Scale by Race, Type of School, Gender and Their Interactions (n=562)

	White				Black			
	Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
	(n=114)		(n=174)		(n=135)		(n=139)	
Choice	M=3.41	SD=0.31	M=3.47	SD=0.33	M=3.59	SD=0.29	M=3.44	SD=0.32
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	(n=31)	(n=83)	(n=49)	(n=124)	(n=38)	(n=95)	(n=36)	(n=102)
	M=3.38	M=3.42	M=3.43	M=3.48	M=3.65	M=3.58	M=3.46	M=3.43
	SD=.30	SD=.32	SD=.33	SD=.33	SD=.29	SD=.28	SD=.35	SD=.31

Table 6. Univariate Summary Analysis on the School Choice Scales By Race, Gender and Type School (Rural or Urban)

	Univariate Analysis			
	Hyp.MS	Err.MS	$\underline{F}$	Sig. of $\underline{F}$
Race	1.13	.10	11.40	.001**
Gender	.00	.10	.01	.939
Type School	.34	.10	3.43	.064
Race × Sex	.19	.10	1.95	.163
Type School × Race	1.34	.10	13.55	.000**
Type School × Race × Sex	.01	.10	.08	.784

*Significance at .05 Level **Significance at .01 Level

and American Association of School Administrators (1992). The low support for choice by white respondents could indicate satisfaction with the magnet concept in the urban school district (for example, Downey & Morehead, 1991; Glenn, 1992; Blank & Messier, 1987; and Price & Stern, 1987), or the preference of private schools overbusing their children long distances (Reynolds, 1984) for the rural school district. Although it was not the purpose of this study to report item analysis, areas of strong preference from the survey include:

(1) statewide responsibilities for monitoring education and paying all students' education related costs, including transportation;
(2) the guarantee of financial support for a high school education for all students, regardless of parental wealth or place of residence;
(3) transportation provisions for students (one-way limit of 90 minutes travel time);
(4) personal support for increased taxes (state income tax) to pay for the choice plan;
(5) increasing taxes on business corporations; and
(6) limiting (placing a cap on) handicapped student costs.

In general, respondents were opposed to parental responsibility for transportation (Moore & Davenport, 1990) and to the collection and distribution of funds by local agencies. It should also be noted that using state funds to support private schools was only mildly supported.

Implications and Conclusions

President Clinton has cast his personal vote for school choice. He enrolled his daughter in a private school in the Washington, D. C. area. Affluent persons have choice options that many others, especially those from lower socioeconomic classes, do not have. The more attention focused on choice, the more controversial it has become (Yanofsky & Young, 1992). Experts agree on surprisingly little, even though the number and range of experiments with choice is considerable (Witte, 1990).

This analysis provides some useful insights about the attitudes and beliefs held by community members in school districts that are dissimilar. Type of work by respondent, attitudes about work, and race were all significant general predictors of support for choice. The combination of these statistical factors will be useful for additional analysis of views concerning choice.

The interactions between race, gender and school location provide additional insights for reflection and additional analysis. Black (African American) respondents from the rural school district indicate a significantly high preference for choice. These results support the findings of Rinehart and Lee (1991) who assert that the economically challenged view choice as one method of closing both the economic and education gap. The study results are perhaps more surprising when we include the fact that the urban school district has a form of choice (magnet school).

To the extent that our nation continues to grow farther apart economically and racially, the practical implication for education is that all reforms become more difficult. Coupled with lower property wealth and fairly uniform levels of state aid, state-local financial support in many of the heavily black, rural districts is among the lowest in the state (Clark, 1987). Poor rural school districts cannot offer the diversity of curriculum that affluent, suburban school districts and inner-city magnet schools afford their students (Rinehart & Lee, 1991).

Findings from this study are not without limitations. Results from this study are based upon perceptions about school choice and the importance of work in our society as measured by instruments from a sample of community members in two districts in one southeastern state. Generalizations beyond this sample should be done with caution.

Finally, this study posits areas for additional research. Future research could delineate and refine the predictor variables for choice. Since most research has been locally oriented (Martin & Burke, 1990), a national or regional study of school choice would provide additional data. In addition, qualitative analysis of community members' views and beliefs would provide information from a different perspective.

Notes

[1]This predictor variable will be analyzed separately and reported in a forthcoming study by Brown and Siskind.

References

American Association of School Administrators. 1992. Voters defeat vouchers, tax cap. *Leadership News*, 109, 1.

Bennett, K.P., & LeCompte, M.D. 1990. *The ways schools work, a sociological analysis of education.* New York: Longman.

Bianci, M. 1990. Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 60,* 181–204.

Blank, R., & Messier, P.R. (Eds.). 1987. *Planning and developing magnet schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. 1983. *Educational research.* New York: Longman.

Chubb, J.E., & Moe, T.M. 1990. *Politics, markets, and America's schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Clark, W.A. 1987. School desegregation and the white flight: A reexamination and case study. *Social Science Research, 16,* 211–28.

Cronbach, L.J. 1970. *Essentials of psychological testing.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Downey, C.J., & Morehead, M.K. 1991–92. Is choice a choice in a democracy? *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 8*(3), 99–111.

Elmore, Richard F. 1988. Choice in public education. In W.L. Boyd & C.T. Kerchner (Eds.) *The politics of excellence and choice in education.* New York: Palmer Press.

Glenn, C. 1990. *Controlled choice in Boston: The first year.* Quincy: Massachusetts Department of Education.

Klenk, J. 1992. *Choice in education.* Testimony before the Tennessee House of Representatives.

Lankford, H., & Wyckoff, J. 1992. Primary and secondary school choice among public and religious alternatives. *Economics of Education Review, 11*(4), 317–337.

Martin, M., & Burke, D. 1990. *What's best for children in the schools-of-choice movement?* Educational Policy, *4*(2), 73–91.

Moore, D.R., & Davenport, S. 1990. School choice: The new improved sorting machine. In W.L. Boyd & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Choice in education: Potential and problems.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Nathan, J. 1990. Progress, problems, and prospects of choice. In W.L. Boyd and H.J. Walberg (Eds.) *Choice in education: Potential and problems.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Papalewis, R., Bushman, J., & Brown, R. 1989–90. District culture and the school site. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, 2*(2).

Price, J.R., & Stern, J.R. 1987. Magnet schools as a strategy for integration and school reform. *Yale Law and Policy Review, 2,* 291–321.

Raywid, M.A. 1988. *The case for public schools of choice.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Rinehart, J. & Lee, R. 1991. *American education and the dynamics of choice.* New York: Praeger.

Reynolds, W.B. 1984, *Statement before the national association of neighborhood schools* (Report No. US 023 780). Pittsburgh, PA: Civil Rights Div. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 296).

Stevens, E., & Wood, G.H. 1992. *Justice, ideology, and education.* New York: McGraw–Hill, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education. 1990. *Choosing better schools.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Wainscott, S.H. 1990. Consequences of southern school desegregation. In R.P. Steed, L.W. Moreland, & T.A. Baker (Eds.), *The disappearing south?* Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 71–85.

Witte, J.F. 1990. *Policy issues: Choice in American education.* Charleston, WVA: Policy and Planning Center, Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Yanofsky, S.M., & Young, L. 1992. A successful parents' choice program. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(6), 476–479.

This article treats humor as one of the rhetorical arts which educational leaders must possess to facilitate problem solving among teachers, students, and parents.

A Rhetorical Legacy for Leadership: Humor

by Jane Clark Lindle

Introduction

The perennial quest for the secrets of leadership have yielded volumes of studies, personal memoirs, and dissertations. These studies have ranged from inventories of desirable qualities to cataloging of appropriate behaviors to more complex attempts to study leadership holistically and in context (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee, 1982; Immegart, 1988; Murphy, 1988). Far from clarifying the complexities of leadership, most of these studies have succeeded in mostly reductionistic, overly simplistic descriptions (De Vries, 1990). Among the commonalities of these studies are repeated references to "a sense of humor," but unfortunately, few of these studies focus specifically on the meaning of humor to leadership.

The purpose of this article is to review the literature on humor and to suggest possible relationships between humor and leadership. Like leadership, humor has long fascinated scholars and the general public. But unlike leadership, humor is rarely studied seriously.

Humor Theory and History

In ancient, and some modern circles, humor and laughter were treated as mysteries to be unraveled by early philosophers and medieval physicians (De Rocher, 1980). Aristotle defined comedy as "an ugliness which is not painful or destructive" (De Rocher, p. xii). All who are familiar with the Greek mask for theatre recognize that comedy is *ying* to the *yang* of tragedy. It is the thin line, recognized by Aristotle, between laughter and tears, pleasure and pain, ugliness and beauty that has baffled and represented the ambivalence of most treatises on humor.

Laurent Joubert wrote *Treatise on Laughter* in 1569. Joubert was a medieval physician who searched for mechanical answers to the ambiguous emotions of humor. Joubert was influenced by his knowledge of Aristotle and also spent much of his treatise trying to explain the underlying pathos of humor (De Rocher, 1980).

The historical concern with the dark side of humor is also found in the Enlightenment Era. Thomas Hobbes provided one of the earliest "theories" of humor known as the "superiority theory" (La Fave, Haddad and Maesen, 1976; Morreall, 1987; Mulkay, 1988). Hobbes believed that laughter was usually expended to denigrate someone else. The "superiority theory" has been tested by both metaphysical analysis and psychological research (Holland, 1982; LaFave, Haddad and Maesen, 1976).

Many humor researchers believe that Freud's work perpetuated "superiority theory" (Holland, 1982, p.47; O'Connell, 1976, p.314). Recent humor researchers suggest that Freud's work presented its own ambiguities about humor. On one hand, Freud presented humor as the essence of psychological maturity; on the other, he pointed to humor as a denial of reality and a manifestation of mental illness (O'Connell, 1976).

Freud's work represents the beginning of modern psychologists' interest in humor. Kohut offered a theory in 1978 which attempted to settle the extremes of Freud's writings on humor. Kohut defined humor as a form of self reflection, but sarcasm was to be distinguished as a defense mechanism (Strozier, 1987). Other psychologists returned to Aristotle and Kant for "incongruity theory" (Morreall, 1987). This theory used a cognitive explanation for laughter. That is, that laughter is the result of a surprise to the mind. Punchlines are thus illogical, unexpected twists to events (Giles, Bourhis, Gadfield, Davies and Davies, 1976; Morreall, 1987; LaFave, Haddad and Maesen, 1976; Rothbart, 1976; Shultz, 1976; Suls, 1983).

The cognitive approach has led to research by developmental psychologists. They suggest that children who produce and understand humor are more competent academically and socially (Masten, 1986; Ziv and Gadish, 1990). Results on gifted children are somewhat mixed, but nevertheless, much of today's developmental and cognitive research on humor explores the relationships between humor, creativity and giftedness (Bruner, 1987; Fern, 1989; Fry and Allen, 1976).

Sociologists trace their interests in humor to the 1970's (McGhee and Goldstein, 1983). Much of this focus involves groups, productivity, organizational development, and problem solving (Bertcher, 1987; Burford, 1985; Davis and Kleiner, 1989; Duncan and Feisal, 1989; Duncan, Smeltzer and Leap, 1990; Hamilton, 1991).

In general, it has been found that humor can increase task performance, job satisfaction, and improve climate (Decker, 1987; Duncan and Feisal, 1989; Ziegler, Boardman and Thomas, 1985). Some of the advantages of humor in work groups relate to "incongruity theory" as humor is seen as a means to problem solving. Thus, the ability to seek the unexpected, the incongruous, in the situation may lead to another perspective on the problem. In addition, humor is a socially acceptable and desirable outlet for stress on the job (Formisano, 1987; Iuzzolino, 1986; Lefcourt and Martin, 1986).

The social acceptability of humor is frequently the topic of business research. Here again the lines of research are strongly influenced by the two theories—"superiority" and "incongruity". In the superiority arena, are researchers who seek to identify the "butt" of jokes in the working relationships between managers and laborers (Duncan, Smeltzer and Leap, 1990) and among workers (Duncan and Feisal, 1989). When humor has a superiority focus, it can be unhealthy. Some of the inappropriate uses of humor include defensiveness, masking of aggression, self-display, and avoidance of issues (Bloch, Browning and McGrath, 1983).

Some political studies of organizations look at humor as brinkmanship. Incongruity may be the underlying theory in work which looks at brinkmanship—a political strategy used by those with less power to challenge authority in socially acceptable ways (De Vries, 1990; Duncan, Smeltzer and Leap, 1990; Thompson, 1981).

Linguistic scholars' interest in humor also may be founded in "incongruity theory" (Flieger, 1991; Gruner, 1976; Raskin, 1985). A concern with semantics, language, and hermeneutics is part of the postmodern era and an attempt to attach meaning

Jane Clark Lindle, Assistant Professor, University of Kentucky

to behavior, words and symbols (McKenzie, 1992). Much of this interest dates to the ancient Greek interest in rhetoric and to a current concern with critical thinking (Rottenberg, 1991). Along with a postmodern revival in the rhetorical arts, debate and argument are seen as more complex models of intelligence than cognitive theory (Billig, 1991; Kuhn, 1992).

Argument as a problem solving strategy requires the use of wit or irony as exemplified in Plato's writing of Socratic instruction (Bizzell and Herzberg, 1991; Keough, 1992). Playing with ideas in an argument can lead to the incongruous (Raskin, 1985; Rottenberg, 1991). The incongruous can force us to rethink the situation and perhaps re-solve the problem.

In summary, the long, but sporadic, history of humor theory and research leaves a legacy of complexity. Humor is both pain and pleasure. Humor theories promote both a separation of people by class or condition (superiority) and a bringing together of group members in problem solving or alleviation of stress (incongruity). Our analysis of the tangle of humor theory and research begins and ends with the Greek gift of the rhetorical arts in which humor played a complex role. Humor's contribution to leadership is probably no less complex and certainly less understood.

The Relationship between Humor and Educational Leadership: A Proposal

No analysis of leadership is complete without some salute to "a sense of humor." Although many now recognize humor as a useful coping mechanism (Lefcourt and Martin, 1986), the development of a sense of humor and the production of humor appear as mysterious to moderns as did laughter to the ancients. Some believe that humor cannot be taught to educational leaders (Hoehinghaus, 1989). Yet there is also literature which suggests that education can be enhanced by the use of humor (Cornett, 1986).

It is the thesis of this paper, that if any of the rhetorical arts can be taught, then humor is amenable to instruction as well. Humor requires no more or less than critical thinking skills. The difference may be that humor is easier to produce than some more complex mental exercises. The foundation for most humor is incongruity, the ability to play with ideas.

Some humorists have suggested that the more graphic the ideas, the easier to produce the incongruity (Machan, 1991; Cornett, 1986). Graphic depiction of ideas is a fundamental requirement of story telling, and thus, more support for teaching humor is found. If you can teach people to tell stories, you can teach them to produce humor.

Besides the graphic, conveying humor requires an awareness of local culture and the sacred and powerful symbols of that culture (Duncan, Smeltzer and Leap, 1990; Machan, 1991). Today, most educational leaders are urged to learn the culture of their organizations (Deal, 1987). Humor production requires one more step beyond understanding that culture, to reproducing it in graphic pictures. These pictures must allow others to see both the possibilities and the incongruities of their situations. Humor can also provide an acceptable outlet for stress and dissatisfaction produced by that culture.

As useful as humor has been shown to be, there are cautions of which leaders must be aware. Some of the cautions represent that thin line seen on the Greek mask of the theatre between tragedy and comedy.

For instance, stress reduction is necessary in the hopes of solving problems. On the other hand, humor as a stress reducer must never be used as a means of avoiding issues.

As another area of caution in the production of humor, leaders must recognize not only the power of incongruity, but the pitfalls of superiority. In other words, humor at the expense of individuals or sub-groups in an organization's culture is always detrimental. Aggrandizing one's self through the use of humor at the expense of another will always backfire. Using humor as a defense is also useless. In contrast, some research suggests that exchanging dignity through a leader's use of self-effacing humor increases his/her power and accessibility (Duncan and Feisal, 1989).

With some of these tips in mind, today's educational leaders can see the advantages of incorporating humor in their repertoire. In addition, using humor may enhance their own development as critical thinkers and skilled rhetoriticians.

Summary

Although the relationships between humor and leadership are not well explored, humor has an extended, if not rich history. Using the historical connections between humor and rhetoric, the implications for leadership and the use of humor become more apparent. The advantages to leaders using humor include enhancement of problem identification and solving, relief of stress, increased performance, improved job satisfaction, and a better climate. Leaders should avoid using humor as a mechanism for self-veneration, issue avoidance, defensiveness or aggression and superiority. Although humor is acknowledged as a legendary quality of leadership, perhaps the rhetorical antecedents of humor can improve the skills of any educational leader.

References

Bertcher, H. (1987). Effective group membership. *Social Work with Groups*, 10(2), pp. 57–67.

Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (1991). *The rhetorical traditions: Readings from classical times to the present.* Boston: Bedford Books.

Bloch, S., Browning, S., and McGrath, G. (1983). Humor in group psychotherapy. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 56(1), pp. 89–97.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), pp. 34–64.

Bruner, M.L. (1987). the effects of humor, creative problem solving, and relaxation on divergent thinking. A dissertation completed at Mississippi State University. Dissertation Abstracts International 48/10A, p. 2575. Publication Number: AAC8728918.

Burford, C.T. (1985). The relationship of principals' sense of humor and job robustness to school environment. A dissertation completed at The Pennsylvania State University. Dissertation Abstracts International 46/10A, p. 610. Publication Number: AAC8516001.

Cornett, C.E. (1986). *Learning through laughter: Humor in the classroom.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Fastback 241.

Davis, A. & Kleiner, B.H. (1989). The value of humor in effective leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 10(1), pp. i–iii.

Deal, T.E. (1987). The culture of schools. In Linda T. Sheive and Marian B. Schoenheit (Eds.). *Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Decker, W.H. (1987). Managerial humor and subordinate satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 15(2), pp. 225–32.

De Rocher, G.D. (1980). *Laurent Joubert: Treatise on laughter.* University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

De Vries, M.F.R.K. (1990). The organizational fool: Balancing a leader's hubris. *Human Relations*, 43(8), pp. 751–770.

Duncan, W.J. & Feisal, J.P. (1989). No laughing matter: Patterns of humor in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 17(4), pp. 18–30.

Duncan, W.J., Smeltzer, L.R., & Leap, T.L. (1990). Humor and work: Applications of joking behavior to management. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), pp. 255–278.

Fern, T.L. (1989). Identifying the gifted child humorist: An exploration of the relationships among cognitive, conative and socioaffective factors in the child's ability to create a joking relationship. A dissertation completed at Columbia University Teachers College. Dissertation Abstracts International 50/610, p. 610. Publication Number: AAC8913109.

Flieger, J.A. (1991). *The purloined punchline: Freud's comic theory and the postmodern text.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Formisano, J.M.P. (1987). The approaches of female public school principals toward conflict management: A qualitative study. A dissertation completed at Hofstra University. Dissertation Abstracts International 48/11A, p. 2772. Publication Number: AAC8800456.

Fry, W.F., Jr., & Allen, M. (1976). Humor as a creative experience: The development of a Hollywood humorist. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 246–258.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R.Y., Gadfield, N.J., Davies, G.J., & Davies, A.P. (1976). Cognitive aspects of humour in social interaction: A model and some linguistic data. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 139–154.

Gruner, C.R. (1976). Wit and humour in mass communication. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 287–311.

Hamilton, B. (1991). A model for managing conflict and anger. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED329847

Hoehinghaus, D.E. (1989). Southern Illinois superintendents' and principals' perceptions concerning assessment of personal characteristics in evaluation of principals. A dissertation completed at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Dissertation Abstracts International 51/03A, p. 696. Publication Number: AAC9022789.

Holland, N.N. (1982). *Laughing: A psychology of humor.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Immegart, G.L. (1988). Leadership and leader behavior. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.). *Handbook of research on educational administration.* New York: Longman, pp. 259–278.

Iuzzolino, R.D. (1986). Perceived job-related stressors and coping strategies among high school principals in Pennsylvania. A dissertation completed at The Pennsylvania State University. Dissertation Abstracts International 47/70A, p. 2396. Publication Number: AAC8617139.

Keough, C.M. (1992). Bargaining arguments and argumentative bargainers. In Linda Putnam and Michael E. Roloff (Eds.). *Communication and negotiation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 109–127.

Kuhn, D. (1992). Thinking as argument. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), pp. 155–178.

La Fave, L., Haddad, J., & Maesen, W.A. (1976). Superiority, enhanced self-esteem and perceived incongruity humor theory. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 63–91.

Lefcourt, H.M., & Martin, R.A. (1986). *Humor and life stress: Antidote to adversity.* New York: Springer–Verlag.

Machan, D. (1991). How you can get a few laughs. *Readers Digest*, 139(836), pp. 78–80.

Masten, A.S. (1986). Humor and competence in school-aged children. *Child Development*, 57(2), pp. 461–473.

McGhee, P.E., & Goldstein, J.H. (Eds.). (1983). *Handbook of humor research: Volume I—Basic issues.* New York: Springer–Verlag.

McKenzie, L. (1992). Educational discourse in the postmodern world. *Educational Considerations*, 19(2), pp. 20–25.

Morreall, J. (Ed.). (1987). *The philosophy of laughter and humor.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mulkay, M. (1988). *On humor: Its nature and its place in modern society.* New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(2), pp. 117–139.

O'Connell, W.E. (1976). Freudian humor: The eupsychia of everyday life. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 313–329.

Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor.* Boston: D. Reidel /Kluwar Academic Publishers.

Rottenberg, A.T. (1991). *Elements of argument* (3rd ed.). Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Rothbart, M.K. (1976). Incongruity, problem-solving and laughter. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 37–54.

Shultz, T.R. (1976). A cognitive-developmental analysis of humor. In Anthony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications.* New York : John Wiley and Sons, pp. 11–36.

Strozier, C. (1987). The soul of wit: Kohut and the psychology of humor. *Psychohistory Review*, 15(3), pp. 47–68.

Suls, J. (1983).Cognitive processes in humor appreciation. In Paul E. McGhee and Jeffrey H. Goldstein (Eds.). *Handbook of humor research: Volume I—Basic issues.* New York: Springer–Verlag, pp. 39–57.

Thompson, B. (1981). Strategies for measuring perceptions of teacher behaviors. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY, 12 pp. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED209198

Ziegler, V., Boardman, G., & Thomas, M.D. (1985). Humor, leadership and climate. *The Clearing House*, 58(8), pp. 346–348.

Ziv, A. & Gadish, O. (1990). Humor and giftedness. *Journal of the Education of the Gifted*, 13(4), pp. 332–345.

Programs in educational leadership ought to include processes to develop the moral imagination, as well as courses which offer the theoretical and practical underpinnings of educational leadership. Without the development and use of the moral imagination, future educational leaders lack a vital resource in sorting out their personal and institutional moral experience.

Educational Leadership and the Development of the Moral Imagination

by Robert Craig

This article will include four parts: (1) A description of the functioning and use of the moral imagination; (2) this will be followed by a "Story" written by an aspiring educational leader; (3) the "Story" will be reflected on using the model of the functioning of the moral imagination; (4) and, finally, I will make suggestions and recommendations on incorporating this process in programs of educational leadership.

The Moral Imagination

Kohlberg (1981) has argued that moral growth is dependent on cognitive development. The supplying of "good reasons," then, becomes the sine qua non of numerous theories and practices of moral development (Lewis, 1990). In fact, Kohlberg (1981) goes as far as to assert that ". . . the presence of strong emotion in no way reduces the cognitive component of moral judgment" (p. 44). If this were the case, human feelings and imagination would have no place in moral decision making.

In my experience, highly rational and logical models of administrative decision making have been popular in recent history. I, for one, do not want to discount logic and reason. The alternative, being illogical and unreasonable, is unacceptable. What I want to demonstrate, though, is that the moral imagination (which is one aspect of human imagination and is a specialized aspect as its content is moral and ethical) compliments logic and rationality (Craig, 1992) I want to argue that moral decision making, which ought to be one aspect of administrative decisions, is a holistic process which includes the use of reason, affectivity, and imagination. A diagram follows.

Evaluation

The moral imagination, then, consists of three specific, yet interrelated, functions (Ricoeur, 1977). The first function is the ability to imaginatively reconstruct events, situations, individuals, circumstances, and so on within a moral dilemma. The second is the ability, partly rational and partly imaginal, to "discover" a moral principle(s) imbedded within the moral dilemma. This is the exact opposite of a purely deductive, logical approach by which the moral principle(s) is "put into" a "fitted into" the moral dilemma from above, as it were (Jacobs, 1989). A deductive approach leaves little room for the moral imagination; and it tends to become mechanistic, legalistic, and static (Craig, 1991).

Diagram 1

MORAL logic emotion rationality feeling IMAGINATION

According to Ricoeur (1977), the third function of the moral imagination, partly affective, rational, and imaginal, is the making of the moral decision. Ricoeur (1974) notes that moral decision making requires a "playfulness" by which individuals free themselves to be able to entertain various *symbolic* meanings as they *interact with* the moral dilemma. This "entertaining" requires an "energy" (psychic and affective) by which the symbolic meaning leads to moral commitment. The moral commitment, usually, leads to moral action.

I will, then, share a "Story" written by an aspiring educational leader. The "Story" is a midterm assignment in one of the graduate classes I teach. An introduction to Ricoeur's thought is presented, so the students probably are influenced by Ricoeur's theory of the moral imagination in writing the midterm assignment. In what follows, the names and some of the other specifics have been changed to respect confidentiality.

Gary's Story

I am an assistant principal of a large, rather affluent suburban middle school. I was very alarmed by the staff evaluations of myself last year, as those who reported to me indicated they viewed my decision making as very conservative. In fact, many claimed I would rather be indecisive than "rock the boat." Although deep down inside I was conscious of the way the teachers viewed my decision making, the extent of their criticism shocked and hurt me.

I thought it might be beneficial (in light of what we have been discussing in class regarding the moral imagination) to begin to imaginatively recollect scenarios in which my indecisiveness was evident. This way I could get a better handle of their criticism. Perhaps I could put a more precise name on the indecisiveness, own it and heal some of my hurt. Perhaps, also, this could be a vehicle for changing, for being more decisive.

One incident, which at the time seemed trivial, came to mind. The school has a contract with a soft drink vendor so that the school gets one-half of the profit from the machines. I imaginatively recollected various "power blocks" within the school, especially the math and reading departments, lobbying for the money. I likewise relived my feelings of inadequacy in

Robert Craig, Professor, University of Houston

making a decision. I thought that the reasons given by both groups regarding the money were good reasons.

Being unable to act, I formed a committee of teachers to make the decision. I consciously tried to include teachers from the math and reading departments, as well as teachers from other departments. I fully realize and felt my sense of inadequacy and indecisiveness. Yet, I felt outrage at the unjust accusations teachers were making. I tried my best to delegate authority, perhaps for the wrong reason; but I was following sound administrative practice. Imaginally reflecting on this one episode made me realize the teachers were correct in their criticism regarding my (sometimes) indecisiveness. But, it was unjust for them to generalize from the few incidents they related on the evaluation forms to my entire range of administrative decision making abilities. I don't need to be more decisive (and I will be in the future). Yet, the teachers need to have "real" assessments (not to mention knowledge of what I do) and not merely label me. I now can share with them the varieties of decisions I am called upon to make, which (hopefully) will allow them to appreciate the times when I am decisive, the times when delegation is important, and the times when I am indecisive. Then they would be better informed about what I do and this should lead to a better understanding as well as cooperation in the decision making process, when applicable.

Reflection

It is obvious that it helped the assistant principal to imaginatively reconstruct the experience of the proper allocation of the money from the soft drink machine. His association of the "power blocks," and his recognition of the adequacy of the two departments' reasons for deserving the money brought rationality to the imaginative experience. The above imaginative reconstructions of experience, among others, are at the heart of the initial functioning of the moral imagination (Ricoeur, 1977).

Then, as he imaginatively recollects the events, situations, groups involved, etc., he begins to "feel" and to "think" further about his inability to make decisions. He recollects the negative reaction of the teachers to the appointment of a committee to make the decision, as many teachers felt it was his decision to make. He mentions the idea of "unfairness" several times; and realizes that the teachers felt he was not delegating authority appropriately. Rather many teachers felt he was delegating authority because of his indecisiveness. This is Ricoeur's (1977) second function of the moral imagination.

Finally, the symbol of unfairness led him to realize more thoroughly his (sometimes) incompetence in making administrative decisions. In other words, there was some truth to the teachers' evaluation. But, he was also able to realize that the teachers' criticism was unfair when used as a generalization of his administrative style.

Thus, he decided to communicate better with the teachers regarding the large amount of decisions he needs to make during his day-to-day responsibility as an assistant principal. This, he thinks, would help the teachers appreciate the fact that not all delegation is an indication of indecisiveness. But, perhaps more importantly, he would now be able to be honest about his areas of indecisiveness, and take steps to improve his decision making ability. Thus, he will grow as an assistant principal and as a future educational leader. This phase relates to Ricoeur's (1977) third function of the moral imagination.

Thus, through the three-fold functioning of the moral imagination the assistant principal was led from the imaginative reconstruction of experiences of indecisiveness (only one was mentioned) to the decision to be honest about his areas of weakness and to do something about them. Yet, his imaginative reconstruction of the experience began to take on, as it were, a moral perspective, as the symbol of unfairness (a moral concern and principle) stimulated him to further action, namely, meeting with those who report to him.

This is a more holistic manner of making moral decisions, as reason, affect, and imagination means "more complete." But, in being "more complete" the decision is also "more appropriate," as it includes a greater involvement in decision making.

Suggestions and Recommendations

(1) Ethics refers to the way we live our personal and institutional lives, how we interact with others, the way(s) we are involved in institutional settings, and our manner of making decisions. This is clear from reflecting on Gary's "Story." The diversity of ethical values, among others, educational leaders and teachers bring to their school interactions can be a source of strength, especially if they are open to dialogue and the sharing of feelings. This recommendation sounds simplistic, but it is difficult to carry out successfully. Thus, this ethical diversity can be liberating or inhibiting, depending on what educational leaders and teachers, among others, decide to do about and with it.

(2) At present, programs of educational leadership seem to emphasize various models of institutional understanding, interaction, and decision making. What I am arguing is that the development and functioning of the moral imagination offers educational leaders important insights into the moral framework inherent in institutional decision making. The moral imagination uses such vehicles as the imaginative association of experience, stories, metaphors, symbols, and so on.

The moral imagination supplies resources which compliment reason and logic, as well as enhance the institutional rationality found in most models of institutional decision making. Thus, programs in educational leadership ought to include processes to develop the moral imagination, as well as courses which offer the theoretical and practical underpinnings of educational leadership. Without the development and use of the moral imagination, future educational leaders lack a vital resource in sorting out their personal and institutional moral experience. The more the moral imagination is developed and is encouraged to interface with personal and institutional moral experience, the richer and better the future educational leader's approach to moral matters will be.

(3) Since the functioning of the moral imagination leads to a heightened awareness of others' value and ethical priorities (Hall, 1986), this awareness ought to increase the quality of discussion at staff meetings regarding ethical issues and conflicts within the school. Individual teachers might disagree with administrative decisions, but at least they would know why (in a moral sense) such decisions were made.

(4) Finally, my experience with future educational leaders' development and use of the moral imagination convinces me that more needs to be done interrelating student's ethical priorities and commitments with leadership preparation (Craig and Norris, 1991). It would be interesting, for instance, to interrelate aspiring educational leaders' modes of decision making and leadership characteristics with their ethical priorities and commitments. The development and use of the moral imagination in programs of leadership preparation is one way to accomplish this. As previously noted, this would give leadership preparation programs a more holistic component.

References

Craig, R. (1990). Ethics and educational leadership. *Texas Study of Secondary Education Research Journal*, 46, 20–24.

Craig, R. (1991). Ethics and public school administration: A portrait. *The High School Journal*. 75, 17–22.

Craig, R. (1992). A portrait and profile of an administrative team: Values and ethical frameworks. *The Saskatchewan Educational Administrator*. 25, 10–19.

Craig, R., & Norris, C. (19910). Values perception and future educational leaders. *Journal of School Leadership*, 1, 222–234.

Hall, B. (1986). *The Genesis Effect: Personal and Organizational Transformations.* New York: Paulist Press.

Jacobs, J. (1989). *Virtue & Self-Knowledge.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice–Hall.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice.* New York: Harper & Row.

Lewis, H. (1990). *A Question of Values: Six Ways We Make the Personal Choices That Shape Our Lives.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Norris, C., & Craig, R. (1992). Charismatic leadership: Revisited. *Journal of Research for School Executives,* 2, 23–29.

Ricoeur, P. (1974). *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1977). *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies in the Creation of Meaning in Language.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

If we are to create schools that are generative and proactive places designed to fulfill the dual purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge, we must attend to the leader behavior of school principals.

NOT "RAMBO," NOT HERO: The Principal as Designer, Teacher and Steward

by Richard Andrews, Bill Berube and Margaret P. Basom

Reflection on what makes a good leader and the tactics, strategies and/or processes good leaders use is not new: Socrates, Plato and Lao Tzu sponsored such issues. Almost every pundit on the educational scene has a favorite tactic, strategy, and/or process that will assure student success if only the principal were to diligently practice the tactic, strategy and/or process. (Andrews, Basom and Basom, 1991) Some writers who offer such antidotes, such as Glickman (1991), suggest that the role be weakly and narrowly defined and practiced as "the coordinator of teachers as instructional leaders". On the contrary, a substantial group of researchers and writers (see for example, Moe and Chubb, 1990; Andrews, Soder and Jacoby, 1986; Brookover and Lezotte, 1977; Cawelti, 1984; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Lipham, 1981; Purkey and Smith, 1982; Andrews and Soder, 1987; Mortimer 1989; Heck, Marcoulides and Larsen 1990; Smith and Andrews, 1990; Andrews and Morefield, 1991; Bennis, 1989; and Senge, 1990) have concluded that due to the relationship between leader behavior and organizational productivity or the causal connection between principal behavior and student achievement, to weakly or narrowly define the leadership role of the school principal is also to weakly define the treatment effect of schools in a positive direction, particularly for children of color and children from poor families.

There are some fundamental notions that school administrators are obliged to do in a compulsory system of schooling. Those who become educational leaders assume enormous obligations under a compulsory schooling system in a democratic society. The most important obligation is to create good schools. Much debate has ensued since the beginning of our schooling system about what is the purpose of schools and what are the characteristics of good schools. We concur with the two fold purpose of schools as set forth by Goodlad, Sirotnik and Soder (1990)—enculturation and access to knowledge. Schools are good, to the extent that they fulfill this dual purpose.

In regard to the first purpose, enculturation, public supported schools have been viewed as essential to induct youth into our culture. This induction process has historically been stated as educating for responsibility as a parent, worker, and citizen. Today, we must educate for self-actualization. Kerr (1987) reminds us that valuing one's self, one's plans, hopes and dreams and unique abilities is a cultural achievement. To maintain self-respect, then, means that education must initiate children and youth into a culture that respects the culture of their families. We must now think of enculturation as the extent to which educators behave in schools to tap the uniqueness of each child so that the child can maximize his/her performance and self-concept. Enculturation is the pursuit of excellence. By excellence, we mean the extent to which the environment in the school maximizes the performance of each child. Concerning the second purpose, access to knowledge, the most frequently and clearly articulated goal for schools is promoting intellectual knowledge. There is a substantial body of evidence that suggests children come to school after five to six years of treatment in families where knowledge that is useful for success in school is not equally distributed. Further opportunities to gain access to use full knowledge is also not equally distributed in most schools. Poor children and youth of color are on the short end of the distribution in both cases. (see for example, Oakes, 1985; Goodlad and Keating (eds.), 1989; and Andrews and Soder, 1985) At the heart of the issue of access to knowledge is equity. By equity, we mean the extent to which entry level differences among groups of children (white versus children of color, affluent versus poor, single parent versus dual parent households, etc.) are reduced over time. A school is instructionally effective, then, in the extent to which the educators in the school behave in ways that promote both excellence and equity in the performance of students in the school.

To fulfill this obligation, the most important task of educational leadership is to build a structure of relationships within schools so that all children learn. There is little question that the school principalship in the American schooling system is a powerful social instrument that is either reactive, bureaucratic and status quo oriented or generative, proactive and change oriented. When school principals behave in a reactive, bureaucratic manner with a focus on keeping the status quo, they seem to focus on being sure that bad things don't happen. School principals must do more than just behave in such a way that bad things do not happen; principals are obliged to behave in ways that assure good things happen to all children. The principalship is a tough, demanding job. The role is not for those who aspire to lead out of a desire to control, or gain fame, or simply to be at the center of the action, but for those who want to design, teach and provide stewardship to create conditions for higher levels of learning for the development of our most precious resource—our children. (Andrews and Berube, 1991, in press)

Principals must decide to behave in such a way that each child in an elementary school will reach 6th grade on time with the knowledge, critical-thinking and problem-solving skills necessary to enter the secondary school experience, no matter what. Every secondary school principal must decide that it is his/her job to ensure that each secondary school student will graduate from high school on time and with the knowledge, thinking and problem-solving skills necessary to become a successful, productive adult. Principals are obliged to decide that no student will receive a decelerated remediation program or be sent off to special education for learning problems unless he/she

Richard Andrews, Professor and Dean, College of Education, University of Wyoming

Bill Berube, Assistant Professor

Margaret P. Basom, Assistant Professor

is seriously handicapped. What do we know about principal leader behavior in schools where the principal has made such conscious decisions, where principals simply refused to accept the idea that a single student will fail?

In 1979, Ron Edmonds started us down a path of research and inquiry which became popularized as the "effective schools" movement. At the heart of the movement was a focus on school level conditions rather than teacher or student characteristics. Over the past decade we have learned much about the conditions in schools that promote learning for children, particularly children of color and children who come from families who have few resources to devote to school learning. An impressive body of research worldwide [Mortimer (1990); Andrews et al., (1986; 1987; 1990); Creamers, et. al (1989); Heck, et al. (1990)] has reaffirmed Edmonds' original correlates of achievement (strong leadership, high expectations, positive learning climate, frequent monitoring of student progress, and clear goals). The findings from this research support not only relationships but causal connections between these correlates and the performance of students, particularly poor children and children of color. The single greatest predictor of children's performance in school is teachers' perception of the quality of their workplace. The single greatest predictor of teachers' perception of the quality of instructional leader behavior of the school principal.

If we are to create schools that are generative and proactive places designed to fulfill the dual purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge, we must attend to the leader behavior of school principals. Much has been learned over the past decade or so about effective leader behavior. Does that research tell us that the school principal should be "Rambo" or the hero who "leads the school up the path of glory" or the guy who comes sharply to mind with the statement, "make my day"? No!

Not "Rambo" not hero, the principal of schools in which all children learn best is perceived by teachers as an instructional leader. A leader who can garner the resources so that the teachers can play their important instructional role, have confidence in the principal's knowledge of teaching and learning, can communicate a vision for the school, and behaves in such a way that the vision is implemented day-in and day-out. Such leaders are not heroes or "Rambos" but are designers and teachers, and engage in the all important act of stewardship for the students in the school. As designer, teacher and steward the principal's behavior gets played out in four areas of strategic interaction between teachers and the school principal. These four areas as conceptualized by Smith and Andrews (1989) are communicator, visible presence, resource provider, and instructional resource.

As communicator the principal provides the design for the school. Organizational design is not moving boxes and lines around on an organizational chart, but crafting the governing ideas of purpose, vision, and core values by which people live. Few acts of leadership have a more enduring impact on an organization than building a foundation of purpose, vision and core values. At the heart of purpose, vision, and core values are beliefs—beliefs about people, about schooling, about learning, and about teaching. As communicator, the principal focuses the conversation in a school around beliefs. The principal decides whether the conversation will be one of power and hope or a conversation as too many schools that can best be described as kid and parent bashing. The conversation must communicate the vision in both formal and informal ways. That vision needs to be one which has "the capacity to relate a compelling image of a desired state of affairs—the kind of image that induces enthusiasm and commitment in others" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 33)—a vision in which teachers move from having ideas that foster a self-reliant, congenial community adapting to the circumstances it finds engulfing it, to a community of learners who feel empowered and who can generate conditions of change, progress and hopefulness.

Utilizing every opportunity to communicate the vision should be a priority task for the building principal. Formal strategies such as the use of public media, school newsletters, supervision conferences and faculty meetings are important and necessary. The principal also needs to communicate through newspaper articles along with presentations at local and national meetings. Informal strategies which enhance communication of the vision are also very important. Being obsessed with the mission by modeling a positive, strong work ethic will assist the principal in this area. What the principal does is more important than what the principal says. Providing informal opportunities for conversation on a one on one basis will pay dividends. The principal must become an active listener in order for the communication process to work effectively in translating the vision. Where the vision is not communicated, there is no vision. Where there is no vision, there is no hope. When the vision is communicated effectively, its presence is felt throughout the school and good things happen for kids. "A dream that is not understood remains a mere occurrence. Understood, it becomes a living experience." (Bennis, 1991, p. 4) The principal's challenge as a communicator is to make the dream understood.

As a visible presence, the principal greatly enhances the probability that the vision will be communicated. Peters (1987) explained visibility as management by walking around, the vehicle that makes it possible for the principal to teach values to every member of the school. A principal does this by being out and about in the school; informally visiting classrooms; making staff development a priority; and, by modeling behaviors consistent with the vision, in other words, living and breathing his/her beliefs about education. Consistent communication with all staff members, positive notes, quick responses to requests, and filling in for staff members who need help are examples of trust building activities that come from being available and accessible. On the other side of the coin, not tolerating unprofessional behaviors and caring enough to confront are also products of visible presence that enhance the vision-keeping role of the principal. What the principal chooses to reward, to notice, to recognize, puts into operation the core values of the school. It is through this process that the design—the dream, the vision—becomes realized. This is the act of stewardship, the keeping of the dream. The principal's visible presence enables the creation and maintenance of the attitude that he/she cares for the people he leads and the larger purpose of mission of the school. Enthusiasm and commitment to a dream is catching. A consistent visible presence is the foundation for trust building, a necessary component for a learning community to build proactive generative school culture.

As resource provider and instructional resource, the principal performs the role of head teacher, by helping everyone gain insightful views of current reality. By facilitating the teaching/learning process through needed resources, the principal enhances the productivity of the staff and thus the achievement of all students. Those resources may vary according to the needs of individuals within the school. For some, it might be as simple as a note or a kind word of encouragement, for others help in sponsoring a school activity, for still others it might be as a listener or intensive counseling. The principal must release time for teachers seeking to observe other teachers, tuition for attending classes, in house study groups, support for individual projects, dollars for equipment or other more tangible forms of support. In essence, the principal becomes a broker of teachers, their ideas and expertise. The principal's role is not to be all knowing about all topics, but to know the teachers, their strengths and needs in order to make appropriate matches. The principal must empower teachers to become more responsible for their learning by encouraging and providing guidance or other resources as needed. The principal then becomes a master coach, a communicator whose goal is to enable teachers to grow through introspection of themselves as teachers. This is

nothing more than what good teachers do with students. The principal as instructional/resource provider is a model teacher.

We have come a long way in understanding the purposes of schools and what makes schools work for all children. We have a clear sense of what we must do if schools are going to overcome the resistors to change. Clearly, good schools demand good leaders—leaders who behave in such a way that teachers buy into the dream that all children can learn, accept no failures and promote success for all. Schools do make a difference. Let us resolve to do what is necessary to be sure that all children have the opportunity to learn in a school in which the school principal knows what he/she wants, communicates those intentions, and provides the necessary design for it to happen. A school where principals see themselves as teachers of others, provide the necessary stewardship for people in the organization, and for the larger purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge. A school that is empowered.

References

Andrews, R., Soder, R., & Jacoby, D. (1986). Student Achievement, Principal Leadership and Other In-School Variables. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.

Andrews, R. & Soder, R. (1987). Student Achievement and Principal Leadership. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6).

Andrews, R. (1989). Teacher and Supervisor Assessment of Principal Leadership and Student Achievement. In Creemers, Bert, Tom Peters and Dave Reynolds (Eds.) *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.* Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger; Berwyn: Swets and Zeitlinger, 211–220.

Andrews, R. & Morefield, J. (1991). Effective Leadership for Effective Urban Schools. *Education and Urban Society, 23*(3), 270–278.

Andrews, R., Basom, M. & Basom, M. (1991). Instruction Leadership: Supervision That Makes a Difference. *Theory Into Practice*, XXX: 2, 95–101.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge.* New York: Harper and Row.

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why Leaders Can't Lead,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass Publishing.

Bennis, W. (May, 1991). 21st Century Leadership. *Executive Excellence*, p. 3–4.

Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L.W. (1977). Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. Occasional Paper No. 17, University Institute for Research on Teaching, East Lansing, MI.

Cawelti, G. (1984). Behavior Patterns of Effective Principals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 41*(3).

Chubb, J.E. & More, T.M. (1990). *What Price Democracy: Politics, Markets, and America's School.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institue.

Creemers, B., Peters, T., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.) (1989). *School effectiveness and school improvement.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. *Educational Leadership, 22*, 22–23.

Edmonds, R. (1982). Speech on his effective-schools research presented at the Annual Conference of the Washington State Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Seattle, WA, February, 1982.

Glickman, C. (1991). Pretending Not to Know What We Know. Educational Leadership, 4–10.

Goodlad, J.I., Sirotnik, K. & Soder, R. (1990). (Eds.). *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching.* Berkeley, CA: Jossey–Bass, Inc.

Goodlad, J.I., & Keating, P. (1989). *Access to Knowledge: An Agenda for Our Nation.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Heck, R.H., Marcoulides, G.A. & Larsen, T.J. (1990). Principal Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Empirical Validation of Causal Model. Paper presented to American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Kerr, D. (1987). *The Ecology of School Renewal.* In Goodlad, J.I. (ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lipham, J.M. (1981). *Effective Principal, Effective School.* National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, VA.

Mortimer, P. (1989). *School Matters.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.A. (1982). Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools. *Educational Leadership, 40* 64–69.

Senge, P. (1990). The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations. *Sloan Management Review*, 7–23.

Soder, P. & Andrews, P. (1985). Excellence and Equity: The Moral Imperatives of Schooling. *Curriculum in Context, 3*(1), 6–9.

Smith, W. & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD Press.

While it is unfair to blame education for all . . . problems, there seems little doubt that the drive to Americanize the schools had an effect on a native culture which varied greatly from a western style.

A Historic and Current Sketch of Indigenous Education in Hawaii: With Emphasis on Funding

By John A. Thompson

Hawaii, as Mark Twain remarked "the loveliest fleet of islands that lie at anchor in any ocean,"[1] has had an interesting transition in its educational relationship with the Hawaiian feudal kingdom that escaped notice in the early waves of European colonization. Thus, the country (actually a conglomeration of greater and lesser chiefs loosely coupled by a polytheistic religion and a rigid social class system) matured and developed its own culture, language, and economic system with little intercourse with other societies.

Obviously, a country with a well-developed culture, including the arts, recreational activities, interisland trade, a maritime tradition, and a three-class social system must have had some type of an educational system. Unfortunately, little, with the exception of the knowledge of the "halau," which was the school for training the art of hula, currently exists.

When Captain James Cook discovered (at least in the European sense) the islands in 1788, he found a well-developed society which had finally united under the rule of Kamehameha I, which he noted and described, but apparently did not attempt to westernize. After discovery, the Hawaiian Islands rapidly became a crossroads for the pan-Pacific traders. For the next 30 years traders and adventurers came to Hawaii but did little to affect the indigenous education "system" (or non-system) until the advent of a remarkable group of Protestant missionaries who arrived in 1820.

This group of six missionaries, accompanied by two of their wives and four Hawaiian youths who had been attending a mission school in Connecticut, were sent by the American Board of Missions to "raise the people to an elevated state of Christian civilization." It is abundantly clear that this group and four subsequent parties from the Board set about this task with great ardor. Their plan followed Calvinist traditions of missionary activity: (1) to reduce the Hawaiian language to a written form, then (2) to establish schools to teach the Hawaiians to read in their vernacular by (3) writing and printing (at least one of the missionaries in each of the parties was a printer) materials for use in the schools, and (4) using the Bible (in the Hawaiian form) to instill the Christian faith through the word to the people.

They set about this activity with great vigor. By 1822, they had developed and were printing in the Hawaiian language and by November of that year 15,000 people (mostly adults) were receiving instruction.[2] This remarkable interest in learning the written word burgeoned so that in a decade it was estimated that 250 mission schools existed and the literacy rate was above 80 percent of adults.[3]

Thus during the mission school period from 1822 to 1840 (officially, but actually until circa. 1855) the entire educational system was conducted in the Hawaiian language, although the educators (at least those in charge) were all Americans. Certainly, a different beginning from the educational endeavors of the missionaries, and others, who began the "civilization" of the indigenous in North and South America.

Early Financing of Indigenous Education

All of the earliest educational activity was in the Hawaiian language and under missionary control. The finance of the missionary phase is not documented other than in the report of the missionary board. All of the money used to support the missionary endeavor was paid by the American Board of Missions. That included the costs of printing materials in the Hawaiian language. The amounts grew from a report in 1822 of $2,000 to $10,000 in 1834.[4]

In addition, the kings, beginning with Liholiho "gave" land to the missionaries to support the schools, and the Hawaiian commoners were to help work the land for these missionaries. Since there was no system of land titles in the 1820's it is difficult to determine to what extent these mission lands contributed to the support of education.

Also, during the first 20 years, the system of taxation was essentially feudal. That is, the king and the subchiefs enforced a work tax on the commoners. As indicated above, the kings assigned some of this work activity to the missions. However, since the feudal system was disintegrating, there was no agency to enforce the work tax, at least for the missionaries. One, however, could conclude that the effect on school finance was, at best, nominal.

The Beginning of Public Education

The official beginning of a public education system occurred with the adoption of a constitution in 1840. The constitution called for compulsory education of all Hawaiian citizens. However, the system to accomplish that goal was not specified. The Organic Acts of 1845 did provide for a Minister of Public Instruction as one of the five cabinet level positions for the monarchy.

The Organic Acts provided for a system of local control and taxation, similar to those in the states in New England, but the local control soon gave way to centralized control system with six school districts. The old labor tax was replaced by a school tax which was collected by the central government, and in 1850 the legislature and the king signed an appropriation bill which transferred the funds collected by the tax to the minister of public instruction for allocation to the districts in the sum of $22,000. From that time forward, the appropriation of funds for the operation of schools came from the legislature.

The school tax, which was levied until after the conclusion of World War II, and money from the lease or sale of a portion of the Crown lands (note the parallel to the Northwest Ordinance)

John A. Thompson, Professor, University of Hawaii

were the financial basis for educational appropriations until Hawaii became a United States territory in 1898.

During the period of the 1840's–50's, the medium of instruction remained the Hawaiian language, although several private schools, which were subsidized by crown funds, including the Royal School to which the "alii" (royalty) attended soon began to use English as the preferred instructional mode.

As additional American and British immigration brought merchants and planters into Hawaii the language of trade and commerce increasingly became English. Also, the Hawaiian monarchy became obsessed with breaking the power of the missionaries, who strongly supported the continued use of the Hawaiian language in the schools, so the royal family began to favor the use of English in the schools. The result of this leverage and some other political and economic matters was that the Board of Education, which had been created by law in 1886, began to require both English schools and Hawaiian schools. The latter steadily lost standing so that by the late 1880's they were abolished. A Board of Education regulation in 1890 made English the medium of instruction and banned instruction in Hawaiian.

Thus, public education which had begun in the 1820's being taught entirely in Hawaiian had by the 1890's become devoid of instruction in that language. As the Hawaiian schools were closed, the teaching about their culture also ceased. Many of the cultural aspects, particularly those which had a religious significance, were derided and devalued. By 1900, there were few pure blood Hawaiians, some estimates were less than 35,000, and those who were of mixed blood tended to hide their native roots and emphasize their "haole" (foreign) ancestry.

Even the Kamehameha Schools (which will be described in a later section of this paper) that were established to aid the education of Hawaiians promulgated a rule in 1887 that required all teaching to be strictly in English.

While the public education of the indigenous people continued unabated, the teaching did not favor things hawaiian. Since the 1840's the finance of public instruction had been through appropriations from either the monarchy or after 1856 the legislature, the upper house of which was made up of appointees from among the chiefs of the realm. Yet, it was these Hawaiians that closed the native schools and subsequently funded a public school curriculum that eschewed both their language and culture. This was how things stood when Hawaii became a territory of the United States in 1900.

The Territorial Period

It was the avowed purpose of those who were responsible for the overthrow of the monarchy, the establishment of an interim republic and finally incorporation into the United States as a territory to become a state of the union. One of their most cogent arguments was that the Hawaii public school system was American in its philosophy, organization, and curriculum. The leaders were sure in 1900 and remained so until 1958 that this was one of the most telling arguments for statehood. Consequently, there was nearly unceasing effort to teaching "things" American, using the English vernacular, and to downplay the culture and language of the Hawaiians. There appears to be no effort to attempt to expend public funds to teach native Hawaiian children in their own language and culture during the territorial days.

This concern even manifested itself in efforts during the 1920's to ban foreign language schools which had sprung up during the period from 1895 onward. They taught young children of oriental descent (mostly Japanese and some Chinese) in the language of their parents. These were private, often sponsored by religious groups, and the students attended after the regular public school day. So concerned were the political leaders of the time (1920's) that they passed legislation which effectively banned these schools. The United States Supreme Court declared these laws unconstitutional, (Farrington v Tokushige 273 U.S. 294 [1927]) and these schools have played a part in the education of some children (not actually indigenous, but an important part of Hawaii's population) up to the present time. Obviously, no public monies were involved.

Thus in the period between 1900 to approximately 1970, the effort was to Americanize children in the educational process. As far as can be determined, no special appropriations were made to teach indigenous children, except on the island of Niihau, which was privately owned and which in 1930 the Board of Education had decided was able to teach students on the island in the Hawaiian vernacular (the current enrollment is only 34 students).

The Modern Era—Post Statehood

The previous part of the Hawaii experience, as far as public education was concerned, ended during the territorial period. Essentially, it involved removing from the schools things that were Hawaiian and stressing things that were calculated to enhance "Americanism." To a large extent, that concept was also stressed in the non-public schools including even the Kamehameha Schools.

During the later territorial period, from 1940–1958, little change in the curriculum in the public schools was evident. With some minor exceptions, the same might be said for the first 20 years of statehood. The exceptions were such things as teaching some songs in Hawaiian, including the State Anthem, "E Pono Mai," and certain cultural events, mostly in the fourth grade curriculum. However, there had been strong "undercurrents" rising among the native Hawaiians and part-Hawaiian groups to infuse a much more prominent role for the Hawaiian culture, history, and language into the public school curriculum.

The route that was taken was through a constitutional convention (Article XVII, Section 2 H.S.C.). "The convening of such a convention shall be determined by electoral question once in every ten years." In the convention held in 1978, two matters of importance to education in Hawaii were passed. The Hawaiian language was made one of two official languages in the state (Article XV, Section 4 H.S.C.). The second was added to the article on Education (Article X, Section 4), "The State shall promote the study of Hawaiian culture, history, and language."

The State shall provide for a Hawaiian education program consisting of language, culture, and history in the public schools. The use of community shall be encouraged as a suitable and essential means in furtherance of the Hawaii program (p. 145 H.S.C.).

These constitutional amendments occasioned significant changes in the curriculum of the public schools. The following are the major program initiatives and the appropriations used to meet the constitutional mandates.

The State of Hawaii uses a program budget structure to allocate funds. The initiatives to fulfill the constitutional mandate are budgeted in ED 106 General Education. All of the funds for the programs under General Education are general fund expenditures which are generated through state taxing sources, i.e., general excise, individual income tax, corporate income tax, accommodation tax, plus several minor revenue raising taxes and fees.

The general education funds are distributed by the Hawaii Department of Education (DOE) on an informal (not mandated by statute) per pupil basis. However, each subdistrict has a reserve which can be used to give additional resources to schools that need funds.

The first program, The Hawaiian Studies Program, is taught to all students whether they are indigenous or not. It has two major parts. One, "kapuna" portion in which there are pre-

sently 365 ethnic Hawaiians who are assigned to elementary schools. They visit classes on a rotating basis and teach about Hawaiian culture. Some Hawaiian words used in songs, chants, etc. are taught but not the Hawaiian language (per se).

The second aspect is a set of three curricular experiences. The grade four social science curriculum studies ancient migration, customs, and culture. The seventh grade social science is a study of the Hawaiian Monarchy. In grade eleven a one-semester course in modern Hawaiian history is mandatory. In addition, under the Asian, European, Pacific Language program, Hawaiian is one of several "foreign" language options given in elementary and secondary schools. It is not a requirement. This program was established by the Board of Education in response to the constitutional mandate. It began in the 1980–81 school year with a budget of $90,732. In 1992–93 the budget will have grown to $3,403,495.

The second ED 106 program which has a more direct relationship to the indigenous (although due to the nature of the public school system cannot be limited to only Hawaiian children) is the Hawaiian Immersion Program. In this program the regular public school curriculum is taught in Hawaiian. English is taught for a maximum of one hour per day. The amount of instruction in English is to increase as the student moves into the secondary schools. Presently, there are five elementary schools that offer the program (mostly in areas of high Hawaiian population). It began in 1987 with kindergarten and has advanced one grade per year. The current enrollment is 251 pupils and will rise to 350 by 1992.

The budget in 1987–88 was $33,085 and has grown to $747,615 in 1991–92.

The Board of Education, against the advice of DOE administration and superintendent, voted to increase the program beginning in 1992–93. If funded, it will ultimately allow students to complete all of their education (K–12) in the Hawaiian language.

In addition to the immersion program, one school with two teachers and 36 pupils on the privately owned island of Nihau has for at least 50 years taught all students in Hawaiian. The funds are allocated for this activity are part of ED 106, and do not appear as a special appropriation by the legislature.

This is the extent of the public education effort to teach indigenous students. The philosophy in 1990's appears to be the same as in the 1880's which is to bring Hawaiian children into the mainstream American culture rather than to make active efforts, with the exception of the Hawaiian Immersion Program, to maintain the distinct Hawaiian language and culture.

A final note to this section is that the DOE has entered into several joint arrangements with the Kamehameha Schools which have placed additional resources into schools with large ethnic Hawaiian school populations. These will be discussed in the next section.

The Kamehameha Schools

These unique non-public schools came about as a philanthropic and civic desire of the last of the Kamehameha line that had been the monarchs in Hawaii since 1787. Princess Pauahi, the last heiress, received substantial land holdings at the time of the land division in 1848. Subsequently, she married Charles Bishop and in her will she left her entire estate (the two were childless) in trust to establish schools for the education of Hawaiian children. The estate, which at her death was valued at $477,000, has grown to between 1½ to 2½ billion dollars by 1990. All of the profit from the estate, is used to support the Kamehameha schools and certain other educational projects to benefit indigenous children.

The boys school, interestingly enough, named the Manual School, began in 1887. In accordance with the times all instruction was to be in English, and the curriculum was generally vocational in nature. The girls school began in 1894 and for at least 50 years the emphasis was on home life and service.

Hawaiian language and culture were not introduced in the schools until 1923 when courses in the language were established.

A shift from the manual curriculum to a college preparatory (the boys and girls schools were merged) occurred by the 1950's. Students, with some minor exceptions, were admitted on the basis of high test scores and the entire K–12 enrollment has been limited to approximately 3,000 to 3,500 students.

Two factors should be noted:

1. There are very few pure-blooded Hawaiians left so nearly all the students are of mixed blood lines. Names such as Ching, Thompson, Klien, and Yamamoto are as common as Naahoopii or Akana, but we are still talking about the education of indigenous children.
2. Because of the use of test scores and size limitations at the school, the great majority of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian children do not attend this school. During the past 20 years the trustees have recognized an obligation to try to benefit these children as well. Thus, outreach programs have grown significantly. Probably the largest is the KEEP Program which has become involved with research leading to programs to enhance learning for Hawaiian students who attend public schools.

The current enrollment of the Kamehameha Schools (both the lower and upper divisions) is approximately 3,000 students which includes 450 boarding students from the other islands in the state. They attend school on a scenic 600 acre campus in Honolulu. The Kamehameha Schools do not calculate a per pupil cost (at least for public use) which can be compared to those of public schools throughout the United States. However, the following data which are excerpted from a handout given to parents present data that are fairly close to a traditional concept of per pupil cost.

Figure 1. Educational Costs at Kamehameha School, 1991–92[5]

		Parents' Share			KS/BE
Grade	Tuition	Fees	Meals	Total	Cost Per Student
K–6	553	81	288	922	11,182
7–12 Day	688	172	357	1,217	14,458
7–12 Boarder	688	239	1,545	2,472	24,216

The handout indicates that "since the beginning of Kamehameha Schools the cost of educating students has been shared by both parents and the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate. For the school year 1992–93, trustees have decided to retain the present tuition; meal charges amount to 7.3% of total costs on average across all grade levels. The KS/BE share, on the other hand, amounts to 92.7% of the total costs on average.

It is clear that the six percent of the students of Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian heritage in the state who matriculate in the Kamehameha Schools receive an elite education. There is a lively competition among parents of Hawaiian ancestry to enroll their children in the school.

The Kamehameha Schools proclaim that they are a college preparatory school (in 1991, 96% of the graduates enrolled in post-secondary institutions). Thus, students in the secondary division are admitted based upon standardized test scores. The state is divided into districts based upon the percent of families with Hawaiian heritage and prospective students compete with others within their area for admittance.

Pre-collegiate training has been the goal since the 1950's. Prior to that time, as noted previously, the schools tended to stress the manual trades with relatively few students attending college.

Kamehameha Outreach Activities

In addition to the campus activities, the KS/BE attempts to reach other children and students of hawaiian ancestry with a variety of outreach programs. They are divided for administrative purposes into two divisions, the Early Education and Community Education Divisions. The Early Education has three programs (1) a pre-kindergarten which provides a parent–infant section which features trained home visitors to work with both parents and offspring. There are 349 families served. (2) Traveling pre-schools which hold meetings twice weekly with two and three year olds and their caregivers at parks, schools, or other gathering places. The teachers instruct in preschool learning activities and encourage parents to continue the teaching between sessions. There are nine sites statewide and approximately 3,000 students are involved. Finally, there is a center-based preschool which serves 467 four year olds in classrooms. The focus is upon developing language skills and school readiness. The total budget for 1992 is 4 million dollars of which $1,557,000 or 39% comes from federal funding (see Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers, Title IX, Section 4004).

The Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP) is a language arts skills program which was initiated after ten years of research and development at the Kamehameha Schools. It is in use at the elementary school there, as well as in a joint program with the public schools (DOE). The public school sites with large Hawaiian student populations use the program. Not all teachers in these schools use KEEP. About 50 percent of the students in these schools are taught with this program. KS/BE furnishes training for the public school teachers who volunteer to use it—aides, books and materials, and consultant assistance. The program is budgeted at $1,770,418 for FY 1992. Part of the money in the Native Hawaiian Model Curriculum section (4003) of the federal Native Hawaiian Education Act is used to evaluate the effectiveness of this program.

The Community Education Division operates a variety of programs, many of which are short-term classes for adults, summer sessions for student, special federally funded programs such as drug education, and a variety of post-secondary talent searches and scholarships for Hawaiians. The 1992 budget is $4,100,000.

Two programs fit into a true K–12 format. Alternative Education provides classes and counseling for high risk students. A total of 337 public school students are served. The Kamehameha Schools Intermediate Reading Program is operated in conjunction with the public schools to help seventh grade students improve their reading. While not all the students are Hawaiians, the programs are placed in twelve schools with a large percentage of Hawaiian students so that a majority of the 394 students served are indigenous.

Counting those students who receive all or a significant portion of their education through programs of Kamehameha Schools, it would appear that this educational entity serves approximately 15 percent of the indigenous students in Hawaii. There are in addition short-term and enrichment activities which serve many more students and adults as well as infants and the very young that are not included in the 15 percent.

Funding

The funding for the schools and the outreach programs comes from the resources of the Bishop Estate (see the description of the establishment of the estate in a previous section of the paper). The estate was for many years the largest private landholder in the state. For much of its history, the estate needed all of its resources to fund the operation of the schools and occasionally operated at a deficit. As late as 1972, the yearly Masters Report indicates income of 5 million and operating costs of 6 million dollars. The rise in land values during the 1970's and 80's allowed the trustees to fund the experimental and outreach programs described above as well as the Kamehameha Schools. The 1990–91 Master's Report reported that the Education Division of the estate had total expenditures of $53,116,327[6]. The diversification of assets into stocks, shopping centers, and ventures of various types as well as the continued increase in land values and lease rents in Hawaii make the financial future appear very promising.

The Bishop Estate has, for over one hundred years, been a major force in the education of native Hawaiians. However, even with expenditures in excess of 50 million dollars, the estate touches only about 15 percent of the Hawaiian school age population. The trustees of the estate, who are selected by the justices of the State Supreme Court, have not been representative of the indigenous population. Only within the last ten years has a majority of the board been of Hawaiian ancestry. Often trustees have been selected for their political clout rather than for their business acumen. The first president of Kamehameha Schools who is of Hawaiian ancestry was selected only two years ago; all previous presidents have been Caucasians. While these are steps in the proper direction, many Hawaiian activists believe that they have come much too late to help the native people.

Federal Educational Assistance to Indigenous People

A third player, the U.S. government, has recently been added to the cast of those involved in the education of Hawaiians. Under Title IV—Education for Native Hawaiians, Public Law 100–297—the federal government added Hawaiians to the list of those special indigenous groups who receive federal funds for education.

Using a variety of reasons, including the trust responsibilities for Hawaiian Homelands, the fact that Hawaiians score below state and national norms on standardized tests, and are under represented in the professions and at institutions of higher education, plus in some cases geographic isolation, special efforts to preserve the culture are necessary through the use of supplemental educational programs.

The original authorization for the title, which began in fiscal 1988, was for $9,150,00, however, the actual appropriations were less than the authorizations. These are five sections with the following titles: Section 4003, Native Hawaiian Model Curriculum Implementation Program (KEEP). The Bishop Estate, through the educational development of Hawaiian children. This section was designed to install the KEEP in selected public schools throughout the state which had a substantial native Hawaiian student body, as well as to continue research and development and to assess the results. The amounts expended for this and the other sections that affect public education are recorded in Table 1 which follows the descriptions of the titles.

Section 4004, Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers, made grants to Hawaiian Organizations including The Kamehameha Schools to establish family-based education centers throughout the state. The centers, some of which are housed in permanent structures and others that use a mobile format, are to establish and operate parent–infant programs and pre-school programs for four and five year old children. By 1992, twelve such centers were in operation. The section also provided for additional research and development and assessment.

The third section (4005) established a Higher Education Demonstration project. Since the money was not K–12 education, no description is made here.

The fourth section is entitled, Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented Demonstration Program (4006). The statute named the University of Hawaii at Hilo as the grantee to establish a project to address the special needs of Hawaiian elementary and secondary students who are gifted and talented. The project was to identify gifted students and to provide them with educational, psychological and developmental activities which show promise of meeting the educational needs of these stu-

Table 1. Amounts Expended for Each Sub-section of Title IV Education for Native Hawaiians from 1989–92

Year	4003	4004	4005	4006	4007
1989	395,000	1,778,000	1,500,000*	790,000	494,000
1990	494,000	2,765,000	1,700,000*	741,000	741,000
1991	535,000	2,860,000	2,659,000	887,000	600,000
1992	6,400,000* no delineation into specific sub-sections				

*Estimate from the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs

dents. Included was to be exploration of the use of Hawaiian language and exposure to native Hawaiian cultural traditions. The project was to provide leadership for replicating promising activities and to conduct research on the needs of these children, and provision of certain services to their families. This section was funded for three years at which time a new grant was to be created and funded on a year to year basis.

The last section, 4007, created the Native Hawaiian Special Education Program. It provides for identification of special students and links this title to part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Thus, providing additional funding for the Hawaii Department of Education to address differential needs of native Hawaiian handicapped children who might otherwise qualify under PL 92-142.

The amounts expended for the four years for which data are available are presented in Table 1.

The federal government, through the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, chaired by Senator D. Inouye (Democrat–Hawaii), has made a specific recognition of the unique educational problems of Native Hawaiians. The fact that Title IV is a part of the Indian Education Act is evidence that the federal government perceives Hawaiians as part of the indigenous peoples that deserve special treatment in terms of education. In 1992, the appropriation was not delineated into specific titles. Rather, the funds were sent to the State of Hawaii to be distributed among the programs according to the perception of how they have impacted native Hawaiians.

While the total appropriation is not large, it seems targeted at several aspects of which appear to be related to matters which affect the ability of the indigenous peoples to achieve fully in the educational process, particularly, the curriculum section (4003) and the Family Based Education Program (4004) are designed to remediate problems of long standing.

Summary and Conclusions

The history of educational governance and support of the Hawaiians differs greatly from that of other indigenous groups in North America in several ways. First, the original educational "system" was brought to the islands by Christian missionaries and the curriculum was all in the Hawaiian vernacular.

It was the Hawaiian royalty who fought and finally succeeded in the dissolution of that system, not the European and American colonizers. For example, Princess Pauahi Bishop in her will said, "I desire my trustees to provide first and chiefly a good education in the common English branches, also instruction in morals and good and useful information."[7]

Second, the desire of the populace to become a part of the United States in the post monarchy period led to the creation of a school system that emulated the American system in every respect.

Third, except for the very earliest missionary schools, the public system has been governed by some type of locally appointed or elected board of education. The governance was not imposed by outside governmental bodies.

Fourth, the school system has always been financed by local (meaning state) taxes raised in the islands, not with money sent from Washington.

Fifth, Hawaiians were not excluded from any part of the educational system by government action. As, for example, the Russians did with Aleuts.

Thus, at least from a governance and funding point of view, the education for Hawaiians was quite different from that of other indigenous peoples in North America.

Although, the education system for the native Hawaiian population differed from other indigenous groups in the United States, the present day results among them seem strongly similar. For example, Hawaiian children in public schools tend to under-perform other ethnic groups. Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian students in Department of Education have a mean performance in the 36 percentile in total reading and 47th in math. The mean for all public school students is 48th percentile in reading and 61st in math (1991 data). Although the DOE does not compare reading and math scores among ethnic groups by school site, the schools with the largest ethnic Hawaiian populations tend to have more children in the lowest three stanines. With two exceptions, the absence rates in schools with higher percentages of Hawaiian students are higher. When the legislature created a statute called Special Needs Schools H.R.S. 296D, the first school district (actually a sub-district of the single statewide district) to receive funds had the second largest number of students of Hawaiian ancestry (and that by only 200 students). The juvenile intake records (similar to arrests) have for the last ten years shown a higher proportion of Hawaiians than any other ethnic group. Census data indicate a larger poverty line than any other established (non-immigrant) ethnic groups in the state. The median income of the Hawaiian family is well below that of the state—$16,345 for families with children in public schools, $26,995 in Kamehameha and the state median of $37,866.

While it is unfair to blame education for all of these problems, there seems little doubt that the drive to Americanize the schools had an effect on a native culture which varied greatly from a western style. Even the non-public Kamehameha Schools did little until the 1950's to reinforce the culture of those who attended there.

What should be done? Not an easy answer. Currently, there are efforts in public schools to enforce the constitutional amendment relative to Hawaiian culture, history and language. Devoting additional resources both time and money, might invigorate a minority (23%) at the educational expense of the majority of students (who do not seem interested in an additional culture) a questionable idea at best. Segregating Hawaiian children for a native in the vernacular is not the same as it is, for instance in Alaska. This is a small state with a very interactive economic structure. There will be very few adults that could operate in a substance environment.

Throwing money at the problem has not produced results to date. As with many of the social problems in this country, identifying the problem is easier than providing a solution.

Bibliography

Books:

Andrew, R. *The Hawaiian Islands: Their Progress and Condition Under Missionary Labor.* Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1864.

Hawaii Revised Statutes Comprising the Statutes of the State of Hawaii Consolidated, Revised and Annotated. Vols. 1 and 5. Honolulu, 1985 and 1990.

Wist, O.H. *A Century of Public Education in Hawaii.* Honolulu: Hawaii Education Association, 1940.

Other Materials:

Clements, S. *Mark Twain, Letters From Hawaii.* Sacramento, CA: Sacramento Weekly Union, 1866.

Duffy, J., Report of the 105th Annual Report of the Bishop Estate Trustees (unpublished) First Circuit Court of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1991.

Kamehameha Schools. Various untitled reports, 1991–92.

U.S. Public Law, 100–297, Indian Education Act, 1988.

Footnotes

(1) Clement, Samuel. *Mark Twain's Letters From Hawaii.* Sacramento Weekly Union, Sacramento, California, 1866.

(2) Andrew, R. *The Hawaiian Islands: Their Progress and Condition Under Missionary Labor.* Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1864, p. 229.

(3) Wist, O. *A Century of Public Education in Hawaii.* Honolulu, Hawaii Education Association, 1940, p. 23.

(4) *Ibid.*, Wist, O.

(5) Kamehameha Schools, unpublished material, mimeo. Honolulu, 1992.

(6) Duffy, James. Report of the 105th Master Report of the Bishop Estate Trustees (unpublished), First State Circuit Court, Honolulu, 1991.

(7) Duffy, J., op. cit.

LEGISLATIVE COMMENTARY

School administrators are challenged to respond and meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, including minority, poor and disabled students. Now is the time for school administrators to apply their knowledge of the law and their understanding of democratic principles to support school diversity and lead staff in developing equity within their own classrooms.

An Analysis of Kansas Due Process Hearings 1977–1992 Support for Special Education Inclusion

by Jane Adams

National legislation during the last ten years has encouraged the inclusion of students with disabilities in the mainstream of the education system. Public Law 94–142, P.L. 99–483 Individuals with Disabilities Act, Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the results of fifteen years of special education due process hearings, many of which resulted in district and state court rulings, stress free appropriate public education for all and stress that education must take place in the least restrictive environment.

In the 1990's the demands for special education inclusionary practice from individual parents, state and regional parent advocacy groups, and the state boards of education are intense. School administrators must be keenly aware of identification, placement and least restrictive environment regulations. The principal must ensure that all due process safeguards are protected as students move from restrictive resource and self-contained traditional placements to general education classrooms. Building teams throughout the state are making decisions to place individual and whole classes of special education students in general education.

Jane Adams, Assistant Professor, Washburn University

The Principles of Special Education Inclusion

The cumulative chronological impact of these laws and acts has been to progressively move special education students further and further into maximum participation in the normal school program. From the early parent efforts to open the school house doors to students with disabilities (PARC 1972), to the mid 80's thrust for integration in the mainstream to the demands of the 90's for full inclusion, students have moved into general education classrooms. General education teachers are expected to teach them. Inclusion is a radical philosophical and programmatic orientation toward a student's right to be in the general education classroom and to be educated in non-segregated environments. With inclusion, services are offered in general education classrooms in neighborhood schools regardless of the student's categorical label or extent of disability.

Inclusive schools are places where all students are included in the mainstream of their regular neighborhood school and are educated in general classes. According to Thousand and Villa (1991), students are educated together in groups where the number of those with and without disabilities approximates the natural proportion. Within these groups, students who have disabilities participate as full members of the class and participate daily in shared educational experiences with other students and at the same time. Even though students are involved in the same activities, their learning objectives are individualized and may be different.

Inclusion emphasizes the performance expectations of the student's same age peers. Special and general education teachers work together to specify curricular outcomes and outline the supports and services the individual student needs to reach the general curriculum outcome goals in the general education classroom. The placement, where the services are offered, in the classroom, in the neighborhood school are paramount.

Kansas Due Process Hearings Have Been Placement Hearings

A review of the Kansas due process hearings since 1975 (all hearings are on file with the Office of Special Education, Kansas State Board of Education) indicates that placement issues have been the primary focus of parent/school disputes in this state. Fifty-seven of 133 hearings on record at the KSBE represent 43% of the total. When secondary issues are added, another 36 of the 133 cases bring the total to 70%. Third level issues dealing with placement add another 10 cases for a grand total of 103 of the 133. Seventy-seven percent of the due process hearings in Kansas have addressed placement as one of the top three issues in dispute.

Other issues which dominated hearings have been identification, with 34 cases; evaluation, re-evaluation, with 19 cases; free appropriate public education (FAPE), with 8; Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and related service issues with 5 cases; procedural safeguard issues with 3; and extended school year with 1. No due process hearings were filed by districts or parents over such issues as graduation, or transportation.

Each hearing recorded in the state has been catalogued by KSBE staff with the following field descriptors: Case number, hearing dates, decision, issues (first second and third level), whether or not the case was appealed, etc. The issue field was searched to compile, in four year increments, the numbers of cases in each of the above categories. Table 1 highlights placement as a primary issue of concern in the due process hearings filed in this state. Parents care where their children receive services. In fact, they seem to care more about **where** (57 cases) than **what** (34).

With the placement issue dominating Kansas due process hearings for the last fifteen years, an analysis of the categorical areas in which cases were most frequently filed shows Behavior Disorders dominating the field with 34, Learning Disabilities and Educable Mentally Handicapped tie with 21 each. Gifted follows with only 10 cases.

Table 1. Issues Tabulated in Four Year Increments: 1975–1992

	1975–78	1980–84	1985–89	1990–92	Totals
Evaluation/ re-evaluation	1	10	2	6	19
Extended school year			1		
FAPE		5		3	8
Identification	5	18	10	1	34
LRE	4		1		5
Placement	20	21	8	8	57
Procedural safeguards	1		2		3
Related services		3	2		5
Unknown					4
Total	31	57	26	18	133

Schools implementing inclusionary practices frequently select BD, LD and EMH students as the first groups of students or individuals. When placement becomes, for this group of students, a continuum of services within the general education classroom, almost 80 percent of unresolved parent–school discord related to special education may be prevented. The resulting fiscal savings which is taken from the general education budget and ultimately the district tax payer can be used to support children instead of attorneys.

Hearing officers' decisions were overwhelmingly in favor of the district position: 90 of the 133 cases were awarded to the district. Of those 29 were appealed with 8 decided for parents on appeal. Of the 19 cases decided for parents, three were appealed resulting in 1 for the district, 2 for parents and 1 compromise.

Table 2. Issues Grouped by Categorical Area: 1977–1992

	BD	DD	ECH	EMH	GI	HI	LD	OH	SL	TM	VI
Evaluation/ re-eval.	2				2		1				
Extended school year											
FAPE						1	2	1			
Identification	10		1	8	8		3			1	
LRE	1			2							
Placement	19	3		10		4	14			1	1
Procedural safeguards	2			1							
Related services							1	1	1		
Unknown											
Total	34	3	1	21	10	5	21	2	1	2	1

Only 37 of the 133 cases were appealed to the KSBE reviewing officer. Of the 37, the KSBE reviewing office ruled in favor of the parents in 10; in favor of the district in only 13. In five, compromises were reached. Four cases were dismissed. In only 1 is the disposition unknown because no report was filed with the KSBE.

Due process issues presented and the hearing outcomes support inclusionary practices. A longitudinal examination, 1977 to the present, profiles changing trends in the interpretation of LRE, from hands-off in the early years to active insistence on the placement of children general education classrooms or very close to them. In the early years, 1977 to 1979 courts and hearing officers practiced a hands-off policy regarding placement issues. In 1979 the hearing officer was so bold as to state "placement was outside of the hearing officer's realm." In two other early cases, the hearing officer decisions enforced moving the child to attendance centers other than the neighborhood school. Since 1985, though, hearing officer decisions support placement in the neighborhood school and the general education classroom in which the child would attend if not disabled.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Seventy-seven percent of the state's due process hearings have occurred as a result of placement disputes between parents and schools. One half of all cases were filed by the parents of Behavior Disordered, Learning Disabled, and Educable Mentally Handicapped.

Special education reform has targeted placement of children with disabilities. Terms such as mainstreaming, least restrictive environment and full inclusion describe various reform stages. Special education advocates, the Kansas Board, and teacher trainers are disseminating practices and strategies to integrate in schools.

School administrators are challenged to respond and meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, including minority, poor and disabled students. Now is the time for school administrators to apply their knowledge of the law and their understanding of democratic principles to support school diversity and lead staff in developing equity within their own classrooms. Administrators can empower teachers and hold them accountable to work together for the benefit of all children. Administrators can speak the language of possibility and support the development of collaborative partnerships between general and special education to create opportunities for student progress.

Bibliography

KSBE data files

References

Blackman, H. (1992). The Disability of Isolation. *The School Administrator.* February, 1992, 28–29.

Clark, G., Chaffin, J., Meyen, E., Harrod, C., Neilson, N., Rodriguez, F., Tollefson, N., & Whelan, R. (1991). *Policy considerations on outcomes-based accreditation for students receiving special education services.* U.S. Department of Education Project #H029H0017.

Goodlad, J. (1963). *Planning and organizing for teaching.* (Washington: National Education Association, pp. 25–50.

Hill, P., & Kimbrough, J. (1981), *The aggregate effects of federal education programs.* The Rand Publication Series. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children v. State (PARC), 343 F.Supp. 279 (1972).

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Support networks for inclusive schooling.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (Eds.). (1990). *A practical guide to empowering students and teachers: Implementing cooperative group and partner learning, creative problem-solving & social support systems.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (1992). Collaborative teams: A powerful tool in school restructuring. In Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. *Restructuring for caring and effective education.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION ON
LEGAL PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION
OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION AWARD

PURPOSE: To recognize exemplary dissertations by doctoral students in the field education law. In addition to the traditional legal research type of dissertations, studies that utilize empirical research on specific problems will be considered. Topics selected should reflect a direct relationship between educational statutory and case law and its impact on school/university operations.

AWARD:
* One year complimentary membership in NOLPE.
* Presentation of a plaque during the annual convention to be held in Philadelphia in November, 1993.
* Free convention registration for one year.

ELIGIBILITY: Dissertation defended or degrees awarded between August 1, 1992 and July 31, 1993

CRITERIA:
* Theoretical base, i.e., legal theory.
* Conceptually clear and important problem or hypothesis.
* Comprehensive and relevant review of applicable literature.
* Utilization of methodologically sound approach.
* Cogent analysis of data.
* Significant results and discussion.
* Scholarly writing style and appropriate documentation.

PROCEDURE: By August 1, 1993 mail five (5) copies of the dissertation, which will not be returned to:

R. Craig Wood
Professor and Chair
Department of Education Leadership
2403 Norman Hall
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

In additional to the actual submission, the faculty member who makes, or supports, the nomination should submit a letter of endorsement attesting to the nominee's eligibility and specifying the meritorious nature of the dissertation.

A blind review process, with multiple readers, will be utilized in considering the submitted dissertations.

Although the NOLPE Outstanding Dissertation Committee makes every attempt to recommend a meritorious dissertation each year, the award will only be given if the Committee finds an exemplary dissertation.